



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08185836 1







(Wyatt

53MA







(Wyatt

503MA











# FINE ART

A SKETCH OF ITS  
HISTORY, THEORY, PRACTICE,  
AND APPLICATION TO INDUSTRY



**Cambridge**

**PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY M.A.  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS**

# FINE ART

A SKETCH OF ITS

HISTORY, THEORY, PRACTICE,

AND APPLICATION TO INDUSTRY

BEING

*A COURSE OF LECTURES DELIVERED*

*AT CAMBRIDGE IN 1870*

BY

M. DIGBY WYATT, M.A.

SLADE PROFESSOR OF FINE ART

London and New York

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1870

[All Rights reserved]



ROY W. B. B.  
2121  
1111



DEDICATION

TO

THOMAS HENRY WYATT, ESQ.,

*PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF  
BRITISH ARCHITECTS, &c., &c.*

TAVISTOCK PLACE,  
Nov. 1870.

MY DEAR TOM,

Standing indebted as I do to you,—not only for opening the door to me of the profession in which we have mutually delighted, but for many and many an act of paternal rather than fraternal kindness from my boyhood upwards,—I desire, in asking your acceptance of the dedication of this volume, to place on record my sense of gratitude to you,—and not less, my true and never clouded affection for you.

I am your loving brother,

M. DIGBY WYATT.

THE WARRIOR  
OF THE  
FUTURE

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LECTURE I.	
INTRODUCTORY . . . . .	1
LECTURE II.	
ARCHITECTURE—HISTORY . . . . .	27
LECTURE III.	
ARCHITECTURE—THEORY . . . . .	55
LECTURE IV.	
ARCHITECTURE—PRACTICE . . . . .	81
LECTURE V.	
SCULPTURE—HISTORY . . . . .	111
LECTURE VI.	
SCULPTURE—THEORY . . . . .	146
LECTURE VII.	
SCULPTURE—PRACTICE . . . . .	175

	PAGE
LECTURE VIII.	
PAINTING—HISTORY, ANCIENT . . . . .	211
LECTURE IX.	
PAINTING—HISTORY, MODERN . . . . .	237
LECTURE X.	
PAINTING—THEORY . . . . .	265
LECTURE XI.	
PAINTING—PRACTICE . . . . .	290
LECTURE XII.	
FINE ART APPLIED TO INDUSTRY—ANCIENT . . . . .	318
LECTURE XIII.	
FINE ART APPLIED TO INDUSTRY—MODERN . . . . .	349



# LECTURE I.

## *INTRODUCTORY.*

MR VICE-CHANCELLOR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

In addressing you for the first time from this Chair it is natural that I should feel a certain amount of embarrassing emotions. Any such emotions are however but in a remote degree of a personal nature, since I regard myself simply as an instrument to carry out the wishes of the Founder of the Chair; and provided I bring to my duties (as I do) an earnest conviction of the importance to you of the subjects upon which I may have to address you, a zealous intention to communicate all I know, which may appear to me in any wise likely to be profitable to you, and in short a hearty goodwill to do my duties, my conscience will be relieved, and I may feel that you will give me credit for more perhaps even than may be the real value of what I may have to say to you.

My emotions rather arise from the fact that it is for the first time, I believe, in the annals of your University, that the Fine Arts will have received that consideration which I believe to be their due: a consideration which may I hope in time remove the reproach, that our leading Uni-

versities confer degrees as "*Masters of Arts*" upon students, from whose course of study almost all reference to the Fine Arts has been as it were sedulously expunged.

A cultivation of those arts ought never, in a highly civilised country, and especially in its Universities which are clearly the "foci" of its civilisation, to be regarded otherwise than as a most important branch of education; important under at least four aspects;—Firstly, from the humanising influence which such studies exert upon the student:—Secondly, from the fact that in proportion to the gravity and preponderance of such studies in the educational scheme of the population of a country, results the greater or less excellence of the works of art produced, either through their agency, or under their correcting judgment;—Thirdly, because it is impossible to study the principles upon which beauty in the Fine Arts depends, without discovering, gathering up, and storing, knowledge of laws, the action of which will be found to extend from the realms of the Fine Arts, over those cognate branches of Literature and Science, which naturally form the staple of every most advanced "curriculum" such as that adopted in your University;—and Fourthly, because one cannot but regard those whom I have the honour of addressing in this room, and such other students as in other places may be favoured with the instructions of my colleagues, as but, as it were, leaven, destined to permeate and influence the general masses of the population of this country, with whatever knowledge of Fine Art they may acquire through the Slade Foundation.

From the great Universities of the land (if the education at those Universities be but made, as it should be, to reflect and supply the intellectual wants most generally felt, corrected by a conservative respect for wisdom, not of the passing hour, but of all time) should to a great extent issue potent influences upon mind and matter specially

adapted to develope and elevate both. Such influences should mould and fashion succeeding generations to tread boldly and steadily in those arduous paths of scientific investigation, intellectual labour, and the highly refined appreciation of the beautiful, upon which the Finest Art must ever rest; and the importance of which to our prosperity, as a country standing in the van of civilisation, increases from year to year with the intensity of the cumulative competition it has to enter into and sustain with other nations.

In France, in Germany, in Switzerland, in Italy, and even in far-away Russia and other regions of the North, those arts which will specially engage our attention henceforth in Cambridge have long and constantly received due and systematic cultivation.

In England the efforts to induce any such recognition have been more recent and more spasmodic, occasionally strenuous, and then again relaxed; the eccentricities and defalcations (if I may use such expressions) on the part of the teachers, and of the system, or rather want of system, under which they may have hitherto laboured, being partially compensated for only by the peculiar native energy of the British student.

It would be absurd to deny that the English, as a body of artists, do not at this present time stand respectably before the world; but it is rather to that vital energy to which I have alluded, than to any systematic cultivation of their abilities, that they stand indebted for the honourable position they may be held to occupy.

There is, however, left to us the happy reflection that if, with the interjectional and interrupted studies hitherto pursued by English artists, they have attained the position they now occupy as compared with their continental rivals, how much may we not hope will be effected by their talents, when fostered and encouraged, and indeed helped over the

earliest and perhaps most difficult stages of their studies, by foundations, such as that which has been so nobly endowed by the liberality of the Founder of this Chair?

This naturally leads me, before entering upon the specific subject of my first discourse, to a few words of respectful tribute to the memory of the late Felix Slade. It was my pleasure to know him, and to have learned to recognise that consolation under many trials in his old age, which he derived from his attachment to the studies and tastes of his manhood. The collections of glass, the prints, the books, and minor specimens of the art industries of the past, by which he surrounded himself, became never-failing sources of happy relaxation, when increasing infirmity rendered it difficult for him in his later years to derive the pleasure his hospitable spirit once led him to enjoy in the society of his friends. It would almost seem as though he had determined to assist others to become acquainted with the arts, from the manifestations of which he had himself derived some of his highest intellectual enjoyments, in gratitude for the pleasure and consolation he had found in cognate studies, and the friendships, sympathies, and humanising reflections to which they led him.

Permit me now to remind you of the precise terms used in the definition of the annual duties of a Professor under Mr Slade's bequest. He is bound to "deliver a course of not less than Twelve Lectures on the History, Theory and Practice of the Fine Arts, or of some section or sections of them; and no Lecture shall be twice delivered. The Lectures shall be delivered in full Term, and shall be open to all Members of the University, free of charge."

It appears to me that my first duty should be to explain to you the sense in which I understand that definition of my duties, and the action I hope to cause to result therefrom.

I trust in the course of the present year to be enabled to give from this Chair the following Course of Lectures,



which will be found I trust to strictly coincide with those prescribed by the Founder.

The first, which I am now engaged in delivering, will be introductory to the Course, and will consist mainly of an attempt to answer three questions concerning the Fine Arts, as a whole; namely, First, what is Fine Art? Secondly, why should Fine Art be studied? and Thirdly, how should Fine Art be studied?

My second Lecture will be on the History of Architecture, my third on its Theory, my fourth on its Practice.

I give precedence to Architecture, because, as ministering to man's earliest necessities, it may be held to claim priority in date; and because almost from its birth it began to include and call into being the second, third and fourth branches of the Fine Arts upon which I shall have to dwell.

My fifth Lecture will be on the History of Sculpture, my sixth on its Theory, and my seventh on its Practice.

I have given to Sculpture the second place in the family of the Fine Arts, because its earliest manifestations grew up out of Architecture, and were almost indissolubly associated with it.

My third group of Lectures will treat of that Art, Painting, which is essentially superficial, and which, in its earliest form, consisted of the decoration of surfaces prepared by the Architect and Sculptor to be enriched by the art of the Painter.

My eighth Lecture therefore will be on the History of Painting, my ninth on its Theory, and my tenth on its Practice.

The remaining two Lectures of my Course will be devoted to the Application of the Fine Arts to Industry.

I shall thus hope to pass over a vast space of ground, so vast indeed that I can only touch the most salient features of the great subject. Such light as may emanate from

my remarks may perhaps feebly illumine the mountain-tops: but it will rest with you to trace out at your leisure the less elevated features of the plateau over which I shall have to conduct you. Into the valleys intersecting these, in such a course of Lectures as this, I can never hope to make any feeble light which may irradiate from me penetrate. You will, in the patient exploration which I may suggest, but cannot lead, find intellectual delights of infinite variety; for you have but to dig deeply into the soil, and as miners you will extract riches incalculable. Ores, you may rely upon it, abound of all but virgin purity. For myself I can only hope, firstly, that you may obtain and enjoy them, and secondly, that with a liberal hand you will dispense of your abundance to all in need thereof. They will be so enriched, and you be none the poorer.

You will find one of the charms of such investigations to be that the character of their results is essentially communistic. They will never lead you to hoard for yourselves. Your greatest enjoyment will be to spread your gains broadcast; you will make your delights the delights of others, and the hand of friendship you stretch out to all fellow-labourers in the field of Art you will find grasped with generous ardour by many.

The sympathies such kindred pursuits bestow are Free-Masonic, and will at once admit you to a fellowship and brotherhood with all who, like yourself, may be led to seek the beautiful; and, having found it, to appreciate it as "a joy for ever."

It has been a doubt and an anxiety with me whether it would be necessary or desirable that this my first course of Lectures should be illustrated by diagrams; and I have come to the conclusion that it will not be well to so illustrate them, for the following reasons: namely, that while I would desire to fix your attention upon what is most perfect in the Fine Arts, it would be impossible for any illustrations I could

bring you not to fall far short of the standard to which I think your taste should be raised. Further, even supposing my diagrams could be of such excellence as to be worthy of your admiration, the short space of time during which they could be exhibited to you would in that case be inadequate for your deriving equivalent instruction from an inspection of them. Again, it will be well rather, I consider, that your Professor should encourage you to seek out for yourselves in every direction illustrations of the subjects of his discourses. For such purposes it is rather in the Museums and great national depositories of works of Fine Art,—in the churches and country houses strewn broadcast over our land, that I would urge you to trace the abundant illustrations to be readily found therein, of application of the general principles I shall have the privilege of laying before you.

Should my expositions be correct, such studies on your part will only confirm you in what is good; while, if I should be led, as I may naturally be frequently, into error, it is by such studies that you may be best enabled to correct my inaccuracies and to supply my deficiencies.

In lieu of the exhibition to you of diagrams to illustrate the twelve Lectures already referred to, I shall hope to give you one extra or supplemental Lecture, in which I shall endeavour to call your attention specifically to the monuments of Art by which you are surrounded in this town; and to point out to you the local facilities for the study and practice of the Fine Arts, which may I hope be increased in value and importance as your demand for such facilities may become more and more urgent. One indeed of the most precious fruits that could result from Mr Slade's endowment of this Chair would be to stimulate those who may have it in their power to forward the good work, to so clear a recognition of what was, and ever will be, excellent in Art, and what was, and ever will be, bad in Art, as to ensure that, in all which may be done for the encouragement of any

branch of Art in this great centre of intelligence, the highest standard only may be aimed at, and the loftiest results only attained.

As it has appeared to me that it would be a pity to detach our examination respectively of the History, of the Theory, and of the Practice of any branch of the Fine Arts from one another, by any such interval of time as would allow you to forget the leading features of one discourse before entering upon the consideration of another, I propose to give my discourses on the History, Theory and Practice, of each Art, on three consecutive days; leaving fair intervals of repose between each of these groups of discourses. It being my earnest desire to give the fullest development to the bounteous intentions of the Founder of this Chair, I propose (at any rate experimentally, and subject to the approbation of any authorities upon whom I may be dependent) not only, as I am bound to do, to open the Lectures "to all Members of the University free of charge," but to any ladies or gentlemen of the town or neighbourhood who may honour me with their attendance. I can only hope that among such I may find friends willing to learn, and indulgent to whatever shortcomings they may detect in one, who, while he assumes to teach, is yet profoundly conscious of what he has yet himself to learn.

With these few words of more or less personality, and from this time forward, I shall endeavour as far as possible to forget myself, and to lose individuality altogether in the infinitely more interesting subject which demands our specific attention.

In attempting to answer the question of "what is Fine Art?" it would be unwise and unprofitable to lead you into any metaphysical fogs; and it is preferable to seek a solution of the question in the observation of man's practice, rather than in an investigation of his perceptions and intellectual affinities.

A comparison of the conditions of more or less savage races in various stages of social progress, has shewn us an inherent tendency on man's part, after the supply of the first and indispensable wants of his nature, to something more than the satisfaction of those necessities. That something more has generally taken the form, originally of Ornament, naturally of a barbaric kind; tattooing in patterns upon his flesh, adorning his person with feathers, flowers, skins, and ultimately with plaited and woven apparel, then of the enrichment by cutting notches, and ultimately patterns, upon his arms, his boat, his dwelling. All such tendencies exhibit the savage as mindful only of to-day. What quickens or makes enjoyable an existence beginning and ending with his short span of life is all the propensity to Fine Art, which, in the first stages of his culture, dawns upon the savage.

His second condition is to note the passage of time by a reference to something beyond his own existence. This tendency to seek a record, for the first time lifts him out of himself. The cairn or mound which marks the burial place, the heap of stones that indicates the site of the battle field, and ultimately the rude temple in which men meet together for worship, however dreadful or barbaric, mark those stages in the cultivation of memory and imagination which ultimately lead to the development of artistic individuality.

Language marches with ideas, and words are found gradually to express more than the first wants and sensations of humanity; epithets enrich language, new substantives are created of epithets; and attentive students of the history of language have been enabled to trace how terms, corresponding with qualities distinctly expressing perceptions of Art, have been gradually incorporated into vocabularies; proving conclusively the development at definite periods of those advanced perceptions, which correspond with the emotions derived from things sublime and beautiful, in Nature first and ultimately in Art.



Perceiving Art then, in its broadest aspect, to mean something more than necessity demands from primitive man, we have to look to his sense of vision, and its correspondence with his brain, as the especial medium through which he experiences that class of enjoyment which we are in the habit of referring to as derivable from the Fine Arts.

Architecture, as I have already observed, stands first in order of the Fine Arts, and is compounded of man's endeavour to provide himself shelter by rude structure, and that inherent love of ornament which leads him to add to his bare structure something more—which, making it more comfortable, makes it at the same time more beautiful.

It is at this stage of culture that the perception of nature's ever teeming beauties seems to dawn upon the individual. The leaves, and flowers, and wattling, plaited and twisted and overgrown with creepers, that make shade and coolness about the simplest hut, afford materials of decorative grace and beauty; but the very evanescence of such ornamental features, leads man to endeavour to surround himself in his habitation, with beauty in some more permanent form. Hence rude carving of wood and stone, and an attempt to realise by human means, some imitation of the natural forms with which creation has stamped on matter, abundant evidences, which he who runs may read, of Divine origination.

When many combine to create for common use, what in the earliest stages of society each savage made for himself alone, a great stride towards a social system has obviously been made. Such association is the parent of polity, and in polity is to be recognised the nursery of the Fine Arts. The moment man works for the delight of others as well as for his own, he exhibits to the world the commencement of a manifestation of Fine Art, destined to be transmitted, encouraged, corrected, and ultimately carried on traditionally by his fellows. Hence starts that cumulative movement, which,

corresponding with momentum in mechanics, is a compound of force and matter destined to serve as the foundation of the subsequent continuous movement of mankind.

Through this principle of association creeds become special to races, and the Temple finds its origin; the forms of Temples always varying architecturally with every varying form of creed. As we shall see more fully, when we come to the History of Specific Arts, from the religious sentiment, as embodied in the idol, the tomb, and the Temple, sprang the earliest monuments of architecture, invoking, for their perfect type, Sculpture and Painting.

For those who would desire to enter, in greater and stricter detail, upon the study of the successive stages by which men have realised art perceptions, and the distinctions which separate Technical Arts from Fine Arts, and purely intellectual culture, from culture in which the education of the senses plays the most conspicuous part, I would earnestly recommend a study of the admirable essay on "Beauty in Art," by Mr Fergusson. In that work they will find correctly classified and tabulated, all the almost infinitely variable family of human studies and intellectual perceptions. To Rhetoric, Music, Science, Poetry, and the Fine Arts, their respective places in relation to one another and to all other technical and intellectual studies will be found assigned; and I think it will be also found, that the great and special characteristic, which separates that group of the arts which it is our duty to consider, namely, the Fine Arts, from all the many arts he dwells upon with such enthusiasm and learning, will be found in the fact, that the delight to be derived from them comes to us, primitively, through our admiration, of all we may be able to deem perfect in the works of man's hands, as contra-distinguished from the works of God.

Although the Fine Arts depend for their perfection upon those principles which are found to constitute the perfection

of beauty in works of God's creation, it is solely with the work of man's hands that those arts have to busy themselves. The closer, in his creations, man can approach to the principles which God has exhibited in his creations, the higher and purer will be the emotions of delight experienced on the sight of man's humble followings in the footsteps of his Creator.

We should imperfectly convey an idea of the nature of Fine Art in anything like a state of high perfection, if we failed to notice the identity of, or at any rate connection between, the class of emotions we derive from an inspection of the noblest monuments of Fine Art, and such moral sentiments as may be derived from the philosophical study of many of the attributes of the Divinity. Those attributes which in some of their highest forms take the shape of good, true, beautiful, enduring, perfect, in the highest degree, are all qualities we recognise and appreciate as most sublime in works of the Fine Arts. Happily, there is, running through all God's works, and all the ideas which spring from the study of His works, so perfect a strain of harmonious relation between the greatest and the smallest, that we cannot but perceive principles of eternal unity in the works of an all-bountiful Deity, which give us, as it were, the keynote to test the harmony of all we would ourselves strive to produce. Man's efforts in creation should be to emulate the purity and excellence of all that God has made, and hence, while we correctly recognise man's Art in striving to originate and perpetuate Beauty as Fine Art, we should recognise God's Art, not as Fine, but as Divine Art.

It is perhaps due to this very principle of concord deduced from the careful study of Divine Art, binding together all the ideas connected with every branch of *Æsthetics*, that we find our consideration of the nature of Fine Art has already gone far to foreshadow our reply to the question of "why should Fine Art be studied?"

The first and obvious reason man may, naturally and at once, give for such cultivation, is the sense of delight it yields him. His sense of beauty is one of his first feelings of pleasure. To admire is to enjoy. To enjoy is almost always to long to imitate or create; firstly for himself, and secondly in such wise that his fellows may share his delight. To make a work of art lasting is to perpetuate delight; to cause delight is to win honour; and hence probably sprang artistic emulation, and the desire (through the practice of Fine Art in some higher shape than that in which it had hitherto been practised) to be regarded as a benefactor to mankind, through the enlargement of the circle of permanent human enjoyment.

A second reason why Fine Art should be studied is to be found in that spirit of gentleness and refinement which follows as a sequence of its cultivation. The poets in all ages, I need scarcely remind you, have looked upon the practitioners of the Arts as fashioners of good manners; and wherever in history men have exhibited gentleness in their relations to one another, and especially to women, it has been in periods corresponding with their creation of the highest types of human art. Where exceptions exist, and where the artist in his person fails to display gentleness and refinement, we may be sure that something has gone wrong either in the physical or mental constitution of the individual, and that he is to be regarded as an illustration of an abnormal type.

A third reason why art should be studied is to be found in the fact, that it is in the work of creation, so far as his limited means enable him to create, that man is permitted to most closely approximate to the attributes of Divinity. As Byron says,—

“’Tis to create, and in creating live  
A being more intense, that man endows  
With form his fancy,”

and I need only appeal to those who have ever felt in any way the almost intoxicating delight of that quickened existence, in which man can alone create forms of beauty, to declare whether they have not found more enjoyment in that state of being, than under the influence of any other source of enjoyment, except perhaps some direct communing, in the temple or the closet, with Divinity itself. As Gibson the sculptor has said, "The beautiful elevates us above the crowd in this world,—the ideal higher,—yet higher still is the celestial beauty, the fountain of all. Socrates said that outward beauty is the sign of inward. In the life of man, as in an image, every part should be beautiful\*." Mengs, a better critic than painter, has elegantly expressed a somewhat similar view. "*La Bellezza*," he says, "*consiste nella perfezione della materia, secondo nostre idee. Siccome Iddio solo e perfetto la Bellezza e percio una cosa divina. Quanto piu di bellezza si trova in una cosa, tanto piu essa e spiritosa. La Bellezza e l'anima della materia.*"

A fourth reason why art should be studied, is to be recognised in the fruits such study bears to our national importance.

We have seen already that the tendency of the culture of the Fine Arts is to refine men. The refined citizen constitutes the best subject. Gentle and peaceful existence to him becomes a necessity; he best represses disorder, greed, tyranny, presumption; he best holds an even and temperate hand when power is entrusted to his care; he best wields the sword of justice whose tendency and cultivation lead him to desire to sheathe it: in short, that country is foremost in the race of nations to reach the goal of general happiness, the constituents of which study with the greatest zeal, energy and discretion, those arts which refine without enfeebling mankind.

I am of course aware that there are heroic stages of a

\* Lady Eastlake's *Life of Gibson*, page 240.

nation's progress when it may be great in despite of an almost general neglect of the culture of the Fine Arts. When the hearts of men are throbbing with instincts of self-preservation, or even of national aggrandisement, there may be found few who seek that intellectual peace, and isolation from the current cares of this world, suitable for the engendering of beauty; but it has almost always happened that, as though by a compensating regulation, increased vigour has been given throughout such dark moments to the few who were enabled to isolate themselves in the midst of distraction; and that by such an exceptional increase of vigour, they have been enabled to preserve from entire extinction, the sacred fire it fell to their instincts and charge to maintain unextinguished, when the hurricanes of faction and the storms of war, were raging from every point of the compass, as though bent upon nothing less than "total eclipse."

Before proceeding to the last section of this discourse I would desire to note a fifth inducement to the study of Fine Art.

It is, briefly, that by that study alone we learn how to see. The difference between the world of vision enjoyed by the artist, and that of one who has never directed his earnest attention to an analysis of what he sees, can scarcely be conceived. The former may be said to live in a new, clearer, and more ethereal atmosphere, in which an unaccustomed light brings minute differences of surface, texture and organisation to his consciousness. With these increased powers of vision come increased intellectual activity, and aptitude for the retention of the lessons imprinted without an effort upon the vigorous imagination of youth.

The earlier in life this quickening of organisation takes place, the more easily does the human subject assimilate with, and as it were work up to, his altered conditions of existence; and the more rapidly does he learn to absorb instinctively those infinite lessons of beauty with which nature is ever teeming.

The artist sees, not only the works of man, but the works of God, with increased delight. As his mind dwells upon the manifestations of Omnipotence upon the one hand, and of man's feeble powers, struggling upwards in the creation of works of beauty, on the other, the man who has been properly educated in Art learns to sympathise with every stage of the artist's effort, and even in the imperfections of his work to be scarcely offended, recollecting the imperfect constitution of its designer. As the artist more justly apprehends the difficulties of his own task, he becomes juster and yet more indulgent to the works of others. He learns to admire perfection, or such a measure of it as man may attain to, more; and to appreciate a struggle even while pitying an obvious defeat.

Before proceeding to the last branch of this discourse, I may be permitted to urge yet one other reason why Art should be studied.

It is from the fact of its universal and perennial interest. Art is a goddess who smiles upon all, though mostly on her votaries, and whose charms are ever young.

"Age cannot wither her,  
Nor custom stale her infinite variety."

Men may perish, thrones may fall, and customs change, but as long as men remain men, the principles of eternal beauty woo the imagination, and repay the student, crowning him, as years roll on, with ever new delights.

The great artists of every age are the true mute, though not inglorious laureates of each age. Crowned themselves with unfading laurels, it is theirs to twine the bays around the poet's brow, to deck the conqueror with all the flushing attributes of victory, to fix the memories of the statesman's triumphs in "perennial brass," or marble scarcely less perennial, to embalm for posterity's admiration noble deeds, noble forms, noble things, doomed but for their intervention

to "overcome us like a summer's cloud and pass away," and we not know it. It is theirs to "keep honour bright," "to show virtue her own image:" "they shall assist the deeds of justest men," and so work "their country's good, with a respect more tender than their own lives." The honours they confer are reflected on the arts through which those honours are conferred. The great artist who feels that the theme he may select will live in men's memories long after he may "lie in cold obstruction's apathy," cannot but glow with pride, even while he ought in some measure to tremble with a sense of responsibility. He may be potent, for good or for ill, in the measure of the excellence, or the reverse, of the silent teaching of his works; and therefore it is that he should take undeviating care to let "all his ends be God's and his country's."

With equal propriety and elegance that profound archæologist, M. Beulé, perpetual secretary of the Academy of Fine Arts at Paris, has sketched the happiness which attends the artists to whose care may be confided the creation of monuments of art of all kinds worthy of a great and free country. In an imaginary dialogue between Phidias and Alcamenes, the scene being laid in the studio of the former, he makes him paint in glowing terms the temples and other edifices by the erection of which he proposed that the Greeks should celebrate at once the triumphs of their arts, philosophy, and arms. "Heureux," exclaims Alcamenes to whom his share as a sculptor in the creation of such monuments had not been as yet revealed, "heureux les architectes qui suffiront à peine à tant d'entreprises!" To which Phidias is made to reply, "Non moins heureux les statuaires et les peintres, car c'est pour eux que les architectes travaillent! A mesure que les monuments s'acheveront, vous les couvrirez de sculptures et de couleurs brillants; vous y tracerez l'histoire des hommes et celle des dieux. Plus puissants que les poètes, vous donnerez la vie à tout ce



qu'Athènes chérit ou vénère. Sur la frise du Parthenon vous représenterez la ville de Minerve célébrant les Panathénées. Tandis que les autres pays consacrent l'image de leurs rois, c'est l'image d'un peuple entier que vous transmettez à la postérité. Combien est douce la tâche qui nous est tracée! Libres au milieu d'un peuple libre, nous n'avons qu'à produire sans contrainte les œuvres les plus propres à honorer notre patrie." Happy indeed the artists called to such lofty duties! and happy the country worthy of such monuments, and worthy of artists fit for their worthy execution!

In turning practically to the question of how art should be studied, an immediate solution is of course to be derived from a just apprehension of the nature of Fine Art in its several branches.

Two of these differ essentially from the third. Painting and Sculpture are mainly imitative arts, while Architecture may be regarded as one, which,—while deriving all that raises it out of a simply useful into a Fine Art from a profound study of what is beautiful, and therefore delightful, in nature's own, and everlasting principles of construction and combination,—is mainly a conventional art.

The present moment appears to me a fitting one to dwell upon the meaning of these terms, which must naturally frequently recur in the sequel to this discourse. An imitative art is one in which primarily the source of pleasure is conveyed to the spectator in the degree in which the work of art conveys to the spectator's mind the effect produced upon him by any object he may have seen.

In the earliest stages the efforts of the artist will be to imitate directly, or in other terms, to project upon a plane by delineation, or to model a plastic substance, or to carve a hard one, as far as he possibly can, into the absolute image of the object he may desire to represent. But let a number of artists represent the same image, and test the

effect produced upon the spectator by their various representations, and that artist will be found to produce most effect upon the spectator whose work shall be found to deviate in certain particulars from direct imitation. It is the nature of that deviation, and the propriety of its uses under various circumstances, which constitute the element of conventionalism; which, to produce perfect results, requires to be superadded to or substituted for direct imitation: and more especially is this the case when the object represented is one partly founded upon existing things, and partly an image which may find its existence only in the mind of the artist. As that distinguished critic, whom I have already quoted, M. Beulé, has well said on this subject "*la nature ne doit nous offrir qu'un point de départ, et non pas un but. L'art qui la copie est un art servile.*"

In architecture the primitive idea of structure is the basis upon which all effects must be calculated. The reason for the existence of such an art is not because by its means an artist desires to imitate any existing thing, but because it is essential for him to provide mankind with permanent shelter, and the idea of rendering that shelter beautiful comes to him at a subsequent stage of mental operation. Having found beauty in imitative art revealed to him in his earliest efforts at Painting and Sculpture, he will lavish upon his structure, firstly, those ornamental adjuncts. The taste for beauty so fed and developed will induce him to see deformities in the simple necessities of structure. It will also lead him to convert forms which might otherwise be gross and voiceless, into others which, while strong may be graceful, and while but ordinary stone, wood, or marble, may yet speak to the admirer's eye a powerful language; realising to a certain extent that source of expression which Mr Fergusson has with so much propriety designated as the "phonic" element in Art.

Perceiving the desire to imitate existing things, or to

realise by rude representation the idea of things unseen, to constitute the basis and form the stimulant for man's first efforts towards the practice of the Fine Arts, we may fairly conclude that the first quality to cultivate on the part of any one who would aspire to practise those arts with success, is the education of the eye ; the next step is unquestionably to provide such an education of the hand as shall allow the tool to follow with facility the will of the workman.

The first efforts necessary for the education of the eye will be to realise the constituent parts of complex form.

The moment attention is concentrated upon the leading forms of any of the most sublime works of nature, the primitive ideas of geometry force themselves upon the attention. As I have elsewhere had occasion to observe, "From Nature's delight in simplicity man probably derived his earliest perception of geometrical figures. The term horizontal at once betrays the source from which our idea of such a line may have been derived. Upon the horizon as a base, endless perpendiculars are erected in every plant that pierces the soil at right angles to its tangent. A plain in nature furnishes the idea of a plane in geometry. Every variety of triangle is indicated by the outline of the snow-clad peaks of the loftiest mountains ; every kind of cone by their substance. The thin clouds that sweep along the sky at sunset, hanging over the distant blue line of the ocean, form exquisite parallels, and where cut by the lines of trees and plants suggest every variety of square and oblong, rhombus and parallelogram. Where compactness is indispensable, the honey-yielding hexagons abound, and in her endless variety of crystals Nature has furnished us with models of the most exquisite solids. In the rainbow we have her noblest arch ; in the parabola at once one of her most graceful curves, and most elegant formulæ of projection."

Such coincidences between the elementary lines and forms which the artist and art-critic are bound to marshal

and classify in their memories for constant reference as tests, and for constant use in all branches of design, and those grand leading impressions of sublimity most readily gathered from Nature's inexhaustible storehouse of beauty, are of the utmost import, and exercise a marvellous influence upon all human Art. The means by which they do so most directly is through the "association of ideas," giving to forms and lines otherwise expressionless the power of recalling at the artist's will echoes of and reflexions from the emotions of delight experienced in the enjoyment of their original prototypes. When, under the artist's hands these primitive forms are reduced to a tangible existence as abstract forms, the wonderful arithmetical and mathematical properties pertaining to all the leading geometrical forms and figures gradually admit of patient evolution. Pure forms become classified in his recollection by their geometrical conditions and affinities, as well as through their associations with Nature, and the artist's memory so stored is converted into a great bank of deposit upon which he can draw such draughts at will for illimitable amounts of beauty as need fear no dishonour nor exhaustion, while he may always have the great delight of feeling that the more he draws for the more remains behind.

A correct estimate of the mechanical value of the great families of form under varying conditions and aspects, is a fund of knowledge which once arrived at never deserts the artist, and will be found useful to him every day and every hour, when called upon to combine those lines and forms into what we habitually recognize as works of art.

The next stage in the developement of his appreciation of pure form should be his profound study of the various conditions under which the same form may be made to wear different aspects, and convey different ideas, to the spectator. Form in creation is made visible to us by light; but if there were no counterbalancing element to light we should be faint with "excess of light," and the power of vision would convey

to us no clear perceptions. Shade once introduced restores the equilibrium,—that equilibrium which permits our functions to reassert their powers, and we at once become sensible through its means of every undulation of surface and every variation of contour, in the objects we may examine.

As fulness of light is cheering and elevating to the spirits, so is its opposite conducive to repose, and, in a yet higher degree, to gloom, to tragedy, and through tragedy to sublimity.

It is the study of the maintenance of just balance under varying circumstances between light and shade, and of so using both as to make them subservient to the perfect expression of form, which artists generally understand as the study of *chiaro-scuro*; and this study will be found of equal importance whether the student's attention is specifically directed to architecture, to sculpture, or to painting.

Another quality abundantly possessed by nature, and manifested in all her noblest works, is variety. Its study will be of infinite value, either to those who are called upon to design—the minority—or to those who hereafter, in wandering away from the domains of art, may be able to give but little specific attention to the riches her realms contain—the majority—but who may yet be the chief users and causers of the artist's inventions and works.

When either class study that endless variety which pervades every work of the Creator, they will find that such variety is in nowise the result of heedlessness, and is in nowise causeless. Its basis will be found to rest upon the endless variety of function which each object in nature has to fulfil. Strong and compact substances in nature will assume one class of form, while fragile and yielding substances will assume another. In vegetation the supporter in all cases asserts its verticality with, as it were, a strong and vigorous bound from the soil which creates it. The climber winds around it in sinuous undulations, falling, where support fails,

in graceful festoons, and rearing itself aloft by a series of coiling springs; while the supporter continues its upward course of perpendicularity with vigour; such perpendicularity being only the measure of its strength enforced by the contrast with it of the growth of the limbs and boughs. Even in the very form of the attachment of these to their parent stem, variety will be found at every stage. As the bough is young, or as it seeks the light, its upward direction is asserted with apparent feebleness. As it gathers wood and strength, and other and higher stems spring above from it, its attachment to the parent trunk becomes more vigorous, and is asserted by an angle more clearly and definitely marked.

From the observation of such changes of form, coincident with changes of necessity in nature, the artist will learn that it is incumbent upon him to vary his creations to infinity; but in all cases to make those variations correspond with some definite laws based upon the purpose which may have to be effected by the creation of his fancy. Supply in art, as in commerce, he will find, should be made to correspond with demand, not in quantity only, but in the most judicious union of utility with beauty. Useless beauty constitutes the most perfect idea of waste: useful beauty is at once delightful and philosophical.

The next province in nature's vast domains which the artist should explore with zeal is that boundless and most fruitful garden of colour. Take that happy quality from nature, and only conceive how blank the world would be. All its joy and gladness would seem to be spent, and one of its greatest powers of speaking to the heart would be lost. The lovely blue of the sky, the tender pink upon the cheek of beauty, the fervid glow of ruddy sunset, the rosy tint of incense-breathing morn, the deepening purple of the thunder-cloud, the soft green glades of spring, the full-toned browns of autumn, with all their associations of peace and plenty, poetry and joy, would find no living echoes in our hearts, to stir and

move us with their deep and spontaneous throbbings of gratitude and delight.

Such being some of the principal directions in which the student who would cultivate the fine arts successfully must be continually lifting an anxious and inquiring gaze, I would now advert to one other way in which the question of "how art should be studied," may be fittingly answered. To such a question may we not reply, Unceasingly, laboriously, unselfishly, comprehensively? The old maxim, *Ars longa Vita brevis est*, will at once occur to your recollection, an adage which should never be out of the true artist's memory. If you shrink from "love's labour," recoil from wooing so exclusive and jealous a mistress as, if you once don her livery, or wear her colours, you will find Art to be. If she would be won, you must bear in mind that it is only by devoted "suit and service" that her heart of hearts is to be reached. She only grants her fullest measure of favour to those whose constancy approves itself as equal to their zeal. "She must be wooed, and not unsought be won." Art must be studied unceasingly, because to stand still is infallibly to go back upon the only path which can lead to excellence. It must be worked at laboriously, or life will be spent in possibly learning to do, and never doing. The fruit may set, but will never ripen. It must be practised unselfishly, or all its purity will be tarnished, and in lieu of "thrice-refined gold," the treasury of your fancies will but hold in store base metal, "which not enricheth you," and leaves the world of art, so far as you can be regarded as its benefactor, "poor indeed." Art must be studied comprehensively on account of her own universality. Practise if you will her specialities,—devote yourself, if you will, to excel in one or more of her departments, but learn to know her as a whole. Theoretically to sever with her is to destroy. Regard her as you would any animated body to every limb and member of which a distinct function is allotted, but which exists only by virtue of the

instant and therefore simultaneous response of every member to the calls made upon them for action by the dominant will,—the life,—which pervades them all. Art, as a reflex of intelligence, has a vitality of her own, endangered if any of her various members are long neglected, or suffered to decay or mortify through injury or misuse. As human life can only be sustained by constant nourishment, so must the life of Art be kept up by an incessant supply of art-making food. As the tree withers which is not constantly watered and manured, either by man's or heaven's ministrations, so we may never hope to repose under the goodly shadow of the far-stretching branches of the tree of art planted in the midst of us; or to gather its refreshing and abundant fruits, unless we tend it heedfully, not in its leaves, and in its twigs, not in its buds and in its blossoms only, but in its stem and in its roots, in its soil, and in its nurture, in its planting, its grafting, and, if need be, its pruning. Think of the end and heed no trouble. Work even in a good cause may be hard at first, but ultimately a true solace and enjoyment. "The labour we delight in physics pain."

Time warns me to dwell no longer upon the tempting theme of "how art should be studied," a subject which might very fitly demand a whole Lecture to itself; but I must pass on rapidly to urge upon you the necessity of losing no opportunity for the cultivation of your taste, and a concurrent training of the eye to appreciate noble works of art; to which I would, if possible, desire to add the acquisition of a power to delineate what you see, with correctness, if not artistic grace. Train, and do not waste, the powers with which nature may have endowed you with liberality. Such education must be both mechanical and intellectual to have any value. Keep a just balance between the head and the hand. Remember, as Shakspeare tells us, "Men's eyes were made to look;" and as man must both look, and by labour and the sweat of his brow earn his title to existence, it may be profitable,



not only to himself, but to his fellows, to convert his looks intuitively into looks of gladness, his works into works of beauty.

This is only to be done by practically studying the Fine Arts after an earnest and systematic fashion. Do you only your best, and permit me to assure you that so long as I have the honour to occupy this Chair, such assistance as a Slade Professor may be enabled to give you shall never be wanting on my part.

Let me, before we separate upon this our first meeting, urge upon you as strongly as my poor words may suffice to do, that we should, and shall, but ill study human arts if we fail to be raised by such studies to stretch forward to a higher and more extended apprehension of the perfection of "Heavenly Beauty." All will no doubt be right with us, if we can but bring to our studies the fervour and humility of the true Poet, and devout Christian, the worshipper alike of Nature and of Art, the sweet-voiced Spenser, the spirit of whose most apt supplication in his Hymn to Heavenly Beauty, I cannot do better than commend for your admiration and adoption. Let each one of you, say with him—

"Vouchsafe then, O, thou most almighty spright,  
From whom all gifts of wit and knowledge flow,  
To shed into my breast some sparkling light  
Of thine eternal truth; that I may show  
Some little beams to mortal eyes below  
Of that immortal beauty, there with thee,  
Which in my weak distraughted mind I see.  
That with the glory of so goodly sight  
The hearts of men, which fondly here admire  
Fair-seeming shews, and feed on vain delight,  
Transported with celestial desire  
Of those fair forms, may lift themselves up higher,  
And learn to love with zealous humble duty,  
Th' eternal fountain of that heavenly beauty."

## LECTURE II.

### ARCHITECTURE.

---

#### *HISTORY.*

THE subject which will engage our attention to-day comprises the history of that art—Architecture—which, while it has administered to some among man's first necessities, has also supplied him with the shrine with which his noblest religious aspirations have been in all ages associated.

It will at once be obvious to you that it can scarcely be considered to have existed so long as the dwellings occupied by man were limited to holes in the earth, caves, or mounds raised around stakes or sticks to give stability to central cavities, so as to form artificial caverns or caves, or even to those rude erections of poles covered with skins, or thatched with reeds, which sheltered the primeval man. It is only when the habitation is reared for something beyond the immediate wants of the individual who erects it that the first idea of giving it embellishment may be said to come into existence.

This fact is interesting as illustrating the unselfish tendency of art generally. He who once properly feels its influence desires almost as much to communicate the enjoyment he himself derives from it to his fellow-men, as he does

to minister to his own cravings for such a supply of agreeable sensation.

So far as we can at present discover, the earliest attempt at architectural effect was the decoration of the face of the cave which formed the dwelling of the individual. Openings made for the access of light and ventilation, with more or less rude cutting, scarcely worthy of the name of sculpture or architectural decoration, were executed with rude implements at a very early age. Masses of stone left to support the superincumbent rock, as the natural cavern was enlarged, gave origin to those rude piers which, at first misshapen, subsequently squared, then reduced by the cutting off of the angles to an octagonal shape, and further shaped by additional cutting to a polygonal section, ultimately assumed the form of the cylinder slightly tapered; which, while occupying the least area in the chamber in which the columns stood, afforded the greatest supporting strength in proportion to any height in the smallest cubical area.

While on the one hand this was probably the primitive stone structure, there no doubt came into being during the same ages the rude hut of wood, such as, according to the Vitruvian theory, has been usually regarded as the primitive type of the Temple. Certain it is that at an extraordinarily early period in the history of mankind we meet with structures in which stone and other mineral substances simulate constructions in wood. It would be unnatural to suppose that these constructions had not their prototypes in buildings of wood, although, from the perishable nature of that material, all evidence of their existence, other than this repetition in more permanent substances, may have disappeared.

As it will be obvious that to trace the history of structure is almost to trace the history of civilization, it would be folly to expect that in the course of this address it is possible to do more than glance at the great families of style in architectural construction. The details I must leave you

to fill up from the many excellent elementary treatises which are now brought within ready access to all those who may desire to consult them.

Of such I would especially recommend the *History of Architecture*, by Mr Fergusson, a work at once accurate and philosophical, and in which just criticism is based upon the fullest data derived from the labours of multitudes of earnest students in all countries.

Much has been said, and much has been written, about the "great Asian mystery" which seems to hang about the nursery of oriental civilization. This mystery you must not expect me to be able to pierce; and, in common with many other investigators, I can only record the entire failure of my studies to lead me to any source from whence I can conceive it possible that, at so early a date as 1700 years before Christ, the Egyptians could have acquired the artistic ability which enabled them at that period to create the monuments which still remain for our admiration.

It seems certainly wonderful that the two great Pyramids of Egypt should be at once the earliest and largest structures in the world, and, at the same time, destined apparently to outlive all others.

One of the chief features of interest in those structures, which I need scarcely tell you were intended for the tombs of Chofu, King of Memphis (known as Cheops, through the account of Herodotus), and of Nefchofo, his successor, is that in the small cells, which form as it were the hearts of these enormous structures, have been found sarcophagi, formed to hold the bodies of those kings, decorated with hieroglyphics, exhibiting an accurate knowledge of form, and power to carve it with great dexterity in the hardest materials. These wonderful structures also serve to demonstrate that even at this the earliest period of their architectural history, the Egyptians had attained the art of transporting the heaviest blocks of granite, which they carried in this case from Syene

to Memphis, of squaring them with mathematical precision, and, as Mr Fergusson observes, "of polishing them to a surface as smooth as glass, and of raising them higher than such blocks have ever been raised in any other buildings in the world, and setting them with a truth and precision so wonderful, that they now lie there without flaw or settlement, after thousands of years have passed over them and swept the more modern buildings of other nations from the face of the earth, or laid them in undefinable and indiscriminate ruin.

"At that early period, too, the art of sculpture in Egypt was as perfect as it ever afterwards became; the hieroglyphics are as perfectly cut, as beautifully coloured, and told their tale with the same quaint distinctness which afterwards characterised them. It is in vain to speculate on how long it must have taken any nation to reach this degree of perfection, more especially a nation so little progressive as the Egyptians were. We must content ourselves with the fact, and in our wonder at its immensity learn from it more humble notions of our own antiquity and knowledge, and more extended views of ancient history."

These two earliest Pyramids were covered with limestone, but a third, that of Mycerinus, is covered with the beautiful granite of Syene.

The investigations of Colonel Vyse enable us to recognize with considerable precision the vast dimensions and singular details of these invaluable monuments. Some notion of their enormous dimensions may be gathered from the fact that the largest of them occupies a square of 764 feet, from which the building rises uniformly on all sides at an angle of  $51\frac{1}{2}$  degrees to a height of 480 feet;—higher than the highest spire of any cathedral in Europe.

The construction of the Pyramids in Egypt appears to have been speedily followed by the erection of temples, under the Theban kings; and in the earliest of these, that



of Osirtesen I., subsequently adopted as the inner sanctuary of the Great Temple at Karnac, we find supporting piers, or columns, already reduced to a polygonal transverse section.

In the same reign, that of Osirtesen I., we meet with the earliest of the obelisks,—a monolith, or single block of granite, 67 feet in height.

Probably contemporary with the earliest of the Theban monuments were some of the tombs of Beni Hassan, which exhibit those features of the architectural façade, and the excavated pier or column, serving to support the roof of the cell, to which I have already alluded.

The great interest however of these early tombs is to be found in the decorations of their internal walls. Amongst these we meet with representations illustrating most admirably the manners and customs, the life, the faith, the works, of the profoundly interesting people by whom these structures were raised.

Although in point of date it is impossible to place the Indian cave-structures upon the same footing with those of Egypt, there yet reigns sufficient resemblance in certain of their leading features to make it desirable to allude to them before dwelling further upon the Egyptian structures which, under the Theban kings, constituted the bulk of what we usually regard as most characteristic in Egyptian temple-construction.

The earliest caves in India, those of Behar, are believed to date only from about the year 200 B.C. Those of Cuttack appear to be next in date.

Those at Ellora, which we know probably best from the popular engravings of the late William Daniell, date from the fifth century A.C. to the eighth or ninth, and are but imitations of the earlier caves. They are of vast extent, however, and produce much grandeur of effect. Although hewn out of the rock, they do not strictly constitute caves, since the rock has been cut away from them externally.

Some ideas in the plan of these structures, and indeed in some of the Indian temples, appear to correspond with those of the Egyptian monuments of the same class, particularly in the vast propylon, or entrance-block, and the great internal hall with smaller chambers. At the same time there is not the slightest coincidence in decorative detail or any architectural feature. The hieroglyphics, which throughout Egyptian monuments constitute the dominant enrichment, find no corresponding feature in Indian art, where all the ornament consists of rudely conventional foliage and symbols and representations of innumerable deities.

Returning briefly to Egypt, we have to notice the enormous scale upon which their great national monuments were cast. The avenues of sphinxes, the enormous temples, the endless groves of columns, and the profusion with which their sculpture was combined with their structures, exhibit to us an enormous population labouring to carry out the behests of a despotic sovereign, and a yet more despotic priesthood.

Unlike the course of progress in almost all other styles, in the Egyptian the tendency, as time rolls on, is to degenerate rather than to improve. The earliest structures in Egypt are the simplest in their architectural forms, and at the same time the most beautiful. The bell-shaped capitals of the highest pillars of the enormous temple of Karnac are some of the most elegant which have ever been designed. The great colossi which constitute the façade of the temple of Abou Simbel, in Nubia, in their dignified repose are amongst the most majestic applications of colossal sculpture to structure which have ever been executed. •

In the later periods of Egyptian architecture the temples at Denderah even increase in definition and elaboration, but, as they spread in plan, they become complicated and lose those features of simple and grave beauty which characterize the monuments of the age of Rameses.

It would be wrong to pass—however want of time may urge us on—from the subject of Egyptian architecture without noting that in several of its monuments are to be found the primitive forms of the arch. Sir Gardiner Wilkinson, whose labours in the illustration of the arts of Egypt can never be alluded to with too much respect, found at Thebes a tomb, the roof of which is vaulted with bricks, and inscribed with the cipher of Amenoph I., of the eighteenth dynasty.

Although in other monuments of very early date stone arches have been found in many cases in Egypt, there seems to be little doubt that the invention and construction of the arch were due to the necessity of spanning over considerable areas when other materials were not available for the purpose than rude bricks; such as those on the formation of which the children of Israel may have laboured in the age of Joseph.

Even in their earliest structures the Egyptians had advanced far upon their road to a correct conception of what architecture might achieve. That important principle may be found vindicated throughout their works, which assures us of their conviction that beauty was to be alone obtained by incorporating sculpture and painting with their architecture. It was only when, in the practice of those arts, they attempted to run close to nature and to copy form directly, that the fact of their being yet but in a state of infancy with respect to the theory of those arts was made apparent.

So long as their imitation was highly conventionalized it appeared to be fairly perfect, and no sense of deficiency was experienced. Nothing can exceed the beauty, both in form and colour, of some of the capitals of their columns, the enrichments of the columns themselves, and of the great hollows which usually serve as the crowning features of the propylons which form the gigantic masses through which the spectator passed on his way to and through multitudinous groves of columns. Beyond these new propylons and new

groves of columns extended, culminating in the holy of holies, in which all that was most mysterious seemed to be guarded with an almost awful secrecy.

Already we find amongst the Egyptians some sense of that principle which the Assyrians in their architectural arrangements carried to its very utmost limit, viz. that of making the walls of their temples their "books of chronicles."

The Egyptians carved and painted their structures externally and internally with creatures of their imagination, and occasionally with matters of fact and historical interest of the highest importance.

It is singular that in the group of monuments to which I shall next invite your attention, those of Assyria, there should exist, in the substructure of the south-eastern palace at Nimroud, a pointed-arch construction, covering a great drain, no less perfect than some of the arches discovered in Egypt; nor indeed were these the only ones of the kind discovered by the indefatigable energy of Mr Layard. To his exertions, and those of M. Botta, we stand indebted for having revealed to us a "city of the dead" hitherto almost entirely hidden from our cognizance otherwise than through the scanty allusions of Holy Writ.

One of the most interesting of the anomalies which meet us on the threshold of any comparison between Egyptian and Assyrian architecture is the fact, that in spite of the subjection of Assyria to Egypt (if we may believe the Egyptian records) for no less than five centuries—from the 19th to the 14th B.C.—the Egyptians have left no evidence upon the soil of Assyria of the long period of their ascendancy.

The art of Assyria is neither like that of Egypt nor that of India, and serves to demonstrate, what we may readily believe, that intercourse between great nations in those ages consisted of little else than invasion of one another's territories, and by no means extended (save in certain excep-

tional instances) to that peaceful intercourse which tends to assimilate the arts of one country to those of another.

The monuments of Assyria scarcely carry us back to an age quite so remote as that to which the monuments of Egypt ascend—the great north-western palace of Nimroud not extending to an earlier period than that ranging between the date of Ninus, 1341 B.C. and that of the revolt of Arbaces, 821 B.C.

Unlike Egypt, Assyria seems to have advanced in both architecture and sculpture, instead of retrograded. The earlier monuments are neither so magnificent in conception nor so beautiful in execution as the later, which are comprised within a period of about 220 years, reaching to the destruction of Nineveh about the year 600 B.C. The palaces of Khorsabad and Kouyunjik exhibit to us the extraordinary features with which the publications of Mr Layard, and the remains brought by him to this country and deposited in the British Museum, together with the restoration of an Assyrian palace executed by Mr Fergusson in the Crystal Palace, but unfortunately destroyed in a calamitous fire, have made the English public familiar.

Some idea may be formed of the vast extent of the palace of Sennacherib at Kouyunjik—the grandest of all the buildings discovered on the site of Nineveh—from the fact that no less than seventy-one halls, chambers, and passages were explored, whose walls, almost without exception, were panelled with slabs of sculptured alabaster recording and illustrating the wars, the triumphs, and other great deeds of the Assyrian kings. Mr Layard tells us that nearly two miles of bas-reliefs, with twenty-seven portals formed by colossal winged-bulls and lion-sphinxes were uncovered. "It would be difficult," says Mr Layard, "to form any idea of the solemn appearance of the vast underground galleries in which the explorations were carried on. The colossal human-headed monsters scarcely emerging from the dim light, the long

lines of bas-reliefs recording the ancient glories of Assyria, the Arabs wandering to and fro, the gloomy passages, formed a picture which imagination could scarcely realize, and which, once seen, could scarcely be forgotten."

Although no doubt the arts of Egypt and of Assyria exercised a considerable influence upon the Greeks, we fail to trace its manifestation in the monuments of the last-mentioned people to anything resembling the extent to which one might naturally assume it would have been likely to show itself. Upon the art of Persia, however, Nineveh unquestionably exercised a commanding influence.

The Assyrians and Persians seem to have made their pictures and sculptures, as incorporated in their architecture, in almost every case subservient to the record of the exploits of their sovereigns. It is the essentially human and naturalistic character of the Assyrian bas-reliefs, their quantity and power of expression, which rivet the attention of the student in contemplating their monuments. If the Egyptians desired to plant upon their monuments records of the greatness of their gods, the Assyrians seem to have aimed with no less energy to preserve for all times records of the greatness of their kings and people.

In the early monuments of the Hindoo races, that expression of labour which, however great it may have been, owing to the nature of the materials chiefly used, is rather concealed than revealed in the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments—being made subservient to the general effect of a majestic simplicity—was brought emphatically into the foreground. The despot who could imprint upon the monuments he caused to be executed the expression of his boundless command over the lives and labours of multitudes, would seem to have been considered as the potentate who made the worthiest offerings to his deities, and who in so doing left behind him the noblest record of his sovereign grandeur.

To cut out of the hardest and least tractable materials



endless legends and endless ornaments in the highest possible relief, every square foot of the surface of which may be suggestive of a man's labour for many months, and to multiply such works to infinity, must unquestionably have conveyed to the barbaric mind an overwhelming sense of power.

The great remains of Persepolis, especially those of the palace of Xerxes, have many points of coincidence with their great prototypes at Nineveh; and it is precisely the loftier structural features of the early Persepolitan remains which enable us to supply and complete much that is wanting in the ruins discovered in Assyria.

While Assyria and Egypt no doubt concurred to give the vast strength and solidity which characterize that group of architectural remains which, spread over many lands, we have been accustomed to designate as Cyclopean, they failed to influence Asia Minor to the extent that might have been apprehended.

In the principal monuments of that land, as mainly revealed to us through the researches of Sir Charles Fellows—and confirmed by the monuments brought by him to this country, and now in the British Museum—we may recognize the distinct reproduction, in durable materials, of wooden structural forms. It is in those remains that we meet with the best possible confirmation of the Vitruvian story of the derivation from wood of all the features of importance which ultimately distinguished at least the Doric temples of Greece.

The division which exists, in fact as well as in theory, between the orders of architecture which have been designated Doric and Ionic, in all classical monuments, derive their origin distinctly from the two races who inhabited Greece, and the fusion of which upon its soil led to much of the power and greatness of that God-like people.

These races were, on the one hand, the Pelasgic, believed to be aboriginal, spreading, even before the war of Troy,

over Etruria and Asia Minor, as well as Greece; and, on the other, the Dorian race, whose first distinctive appearance as a race of builders may be traced to something like 700 years B.C. Sparta constituted the head-quarters of the Doric, Arcadia of the Ionic. In Athens the races seem to have been nearly equally mixed, and in other states they dwelt together, peaceably, but rarely losing altogether their national characteristics, in varying proportions.

The Pelasgi may be regarded as the parents of Etruscan architecture, and of all those monuments in Grecian architecture of which the spiral is the peculiar characteristic. This spiral appears upon their earliest monuments, and was preserved as the favourite ornament until the date of their latest. To them and to their skill we are indebted for all those beautiful structures the roofs of which are supported by columns of what we know as the Ionic order, having for the leading characteristic of their capitals the double Asiatic spiral which we call the volute.

Of this the temple of Erechtheus at Athens is by far the most beautiful example, and in it the utmost perfection of refined architecture was attained. Every proportion is exquisite, and the enrichments of all the different parts and architectural members exhibit a finish and grace which have never been surpassed.

There may be found preserved in the British Museum many fragments of the ornamental details of this structure; and I may aver, without hesitation, that there are no other architectural fragments so beautiful in all the world. How and why it may be my duty to trace in one of the discourses of my next year's course; it is enough for me here to record my belief.

The Dorians, who erected their temples in the Doric style, were a people of singular energy and ability. It is not for me, in this University, to pronounce eulogia on races, with the triumphs of whose literature and with the details of

whose history it is one of your greatest privileges here to make yourselves acquainted.

I can only refer you to the monuments they erected as proving that their ability as artists was no less remarkable than their ability as warriors, politicians, and philosophers.

The earliest of their temples appears to be that at Corinth, dating from about 560 B.C.—a simple Doric monument of remarkably striking form and proportions.

Their next temple in point of date, that at Egina, is more popularly known through the preservation at Munich of the extraordinarily interesting sculptures which adorned it. It belongs to the middle of the 6th century B.C., and was adorned with a portico of six columns of the Doric order. This order was characterized by the absence of a base to the columns, by a considerable difference between the upper and lower diameters of the shaft, by the spreading echinus of the bell of the capital, upon which rested a square blocking, supporting the architrave, which was plain, having above it the frieze, decorated only with the triglyphs, corresponding with the ends of the beams of the wooden structure from which its forms are said to have been derived, and the metopes, or square compartments, forming the interspaces between the triglyphs. Above all reigned the cornice, mainly rectangular in form, of bold salience, forming a basis, at the ends of the structure, for the sculpture which filled the tympanum, or flat vertical triangular space, enclosed by the sloping sides of the inclination of the two sides of the roof constituting the pediment.

In future lectures I may have occasion to allude in detail to the principles upon which the Athenians depended to a great extent for the magnificent effects produced by their greatest structures. I do not therefore propose to do more now in the way of allusion to special masterpieces of Grecian architecture than to call your attention to the fact, that in the Parthenon and the Propylæon (two of the most im-

portant structures which crown the Acropolis of Athens) the utmost perfection of human architectural skill appears to have been attained.

I cannot however leave the subject of Grecian architecture, even in this hasty sketch, without drawing your attention to the fervour with which Architecture was venerated, and indeed art generally, by the Greeks, in the persons of the leading artists of all kinds. Amongst them we first meet with systems of philosophy, in the scheme and scope of which art is dignified by an admission of its social and national importance, and by a recognition of its dependence for perfection upon laws, based upon science, to be eliminated only by time, patient observation, and the persistent exercise of some of the highest powers of human reason.

It is not until we reach the group of monuments executed by the Hellenic races of high intellectual power that we meet with a consistent pursuit of abstract beauty for its own sake. They perseveringly elevated themselves to a really philosophical analysis of the phenomena and wonders of the vast field of nature and study offered to man's reason by Divine ordination.

When the Greeks elaborated a theogony ascribing to their deities qualities, not of barbaric power only, but of the highest wisdom and noblest virtues, it was but natural that in the structures which served as shrines to their symbolic representations of those deities, they should bring to bear upon the elaboration of those temples a reflex from the qualities they venerated in their gods. The massive strength of Hercules, the breadth, simplicity and power of Zeus, the wisdom and rectitude of Athenæ, and the pure beauty of the Uranian Venus, all found echoes in the masterpieces which still make the soil of Greece hallowed ground to the architect.

It is not here now that I can attempt to dwell upon those refinements of proportion, and exquisite delicacy of mathematical correction of optical aberrations, which have been so

well investigated by Mr Penrose and Mr Watkiss Lloyd; neither can I enter upon the masterly introduction of sculpture into structure, and the perfection in arranging contours of mouldings, so as to heighten, by judicious management of light and shade, the effect of those sculptures, which have engaged the attention of men like the late Mr Cockerell, and one well known at Cambridge, both as an architect and a scholar, Mr Wilkins. I can only upon the present occasion invite the student who may desire to realise how far human ingenuity may go in producing an unerring effect of delight from the contrivance of architectural form, to give his most serious attention to the laws which appear to have guided the Athenians in the days of Pericles. The masterpieces of Mnesicles and Ictinus must ever command the highest admiration so long as human art retains its sway over men's minds.

From such a height it would be only mournful to trace the subsequent fall. I may however utter the treason that it was through the luxurious graces of the Corinthian order that the declension first manifested itself. I am far from underrating the beauty of a monument such as that of Lysicrates, but I cannot but trace in it Ionian beauty past its flowering time, and just running to seed. That seed we shall subsequently find fructifying on Roman soil, and by transplantation acquiring a vigour it never attained on Attic ground.

We have thus seen that what are familiarly known as "the orders" of Classical Architecture found their origin in Greece, so far at least as the Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian are concerned. These three orders were retained in modified forms by the Romans, who added to them two others, namely, the Tuscan, which was a simplification of their form of the Doric, and the Composite, which was but a union of Ionic and Corinthian.

In Greece two orders were not used in the same structure, but the Roman practice was different, inasmuch as they did

not hesitate to superpose them in some of their most excellent buildings. They always however preserved a relative succession from the soil upwards, based upon the comparative substantiality of the parts and proportions which were the attributes of each order. Thus, on the ground-floor of the Coliseum they used the Doric, above it they placed an Ionic, and above that again a Corinthian story, with a top story of irregular proportions, but distinguished in the capitals of its columns by ornaments of a Composite character.

In Egypt the soil retains only now of ancient buildings remains of such as had been erected for the clergy or for the service of God and the king. In Greece we meet with temples and theatres; in Etruria with little else than tombs; but in Rome we recognize a people carrying a system of polity to a great extent of refinement, and using magnificent structures, not for purposes of worship or residence only, but for every variety of civic use, from the basilica to the bath.

Nowhere do we better form an idea of the municipal and social system of the Romans, for every department of which they availed themselves of the ministrations of art, and every function of which found its appropriate structure, than within the narrow limits of the marvellously preserved city of Pompeii. There we find in well contrasted juxtaposition the ruins of the original and early buildings, with their strongly marked Grecian imprint, and those of the later buildings, down to those scarcely completed at the date of the submersion of the beautiful little city in the fiery waves which poured down upon it from Vesuvius. These remains illustrate a social system but little differing from our own, and artistic wants not far removed from such as might exist among us even at the present day.

Roman Architecture was especially remarkable for five characteristics:

1. The admirable stability and ingenuity of its structure.

2. The excellence of the materials employed in building, and the good and sound methods of converting them from their native condition into the specific forms which fit them for the builder's use.

3. The free employment of the Arch, and its cognate forms, the cylindrical vault, the conic vault or semi-dome, and the complete dome.

4. The variety of the forms of plan into which all its great structures were cast, so as to adapt them, without any slavish respect for tradition, directly for the practical uses to which the structures were to be put.

5. An elaborate magnificence of decoration tending at last to over-elaboration.

This over-elaboration ultimately occasionally converted structural elements into decorative ones; a practice subversive at once of simplicity and propriety in all Architecture.

In later imperial times, under Constantine and under Diocletian, Roman art became all but barbaric—grand in its utilitarianism, but wanting in artistic repose and dignity.

The Romans in their works, as in their theology, worshipped less pure gods than the Greeks. They found that to be magnificent was easier than to be beautiful, and they learned to heap up splendour with a boundless profusion. Still their monuments must ever command our respect from their excellent building and common sense adaptation of plan to necessity. All their edifices are eminently useful and fitted to answer the purposes for which they were intended. In this sense the Romans were masters of the economy of structure, and they set us a noble example in their practice of that true wisdom which in architecture may be said to consist in making all that is built answer the uses for which the building was intended in a thoroughly utilitarian fashion, but without any stint or degrading parsimony.

Their architecture is essentially social. The cultivated citizen, and the noble leading a refined and intellectual life, find in Roman architecture all their wants adequately supplied. Of this there can be perhaps no better example than the magnificent baths, which ministered at once to use and intelligent enjoyment. It was the pride of the Romans to regard no luxury as luxury unless it wooed them in association with forms of beauty.

In treating of Roman architecture as thus characterised, allusion is naturally made to its condition under the earliest Emperors. In republican times it no doubt partook of the simplicity and comparative rudeness of Etruscan architecture; while, in its later forms, its magnificence lost elegance, and degenerated into that aspiration for splendour irrespective of refinement which culminated in Byzantium.

As mankind lost its appreciation of Grecian wisdom and philosophy, more barbaric elements were necessary to impress them with ideas of grandeur; and hence all that dazzled the eye in luxury of surface, combined with vastness of scale, superseded purer sources of architectural effect in the earliest works of the lower Empire. Under Constantine at Constantinople, and Honorius at Rome, architecture certainly fell to zero.

For the resuscitation of the art some new and all powerful stimulus appeared to be altogether indispensable. Such a stimulus and revivification speedily supervened. It was not alone the transplantation by Constantine of Roman artificers and artizans, and degenerate Greeks to Constantinople that produced this new life. It was rather the introduction of an entirely new set of artistic wants, and a certain amount of fire struck from the accidental meeting of Eastern with Western artists. When Justinian desired to raise a monument which should be worthy of the God of the Christians,—the principle of “Divine Wisdom,”—and of his own dignity as Emperor of the East, he sought, like a great and wise man, to break away from the effete traditions of the



degenerate Romans, and to find new inspiration through the aid of oriental artists. His conclusion of a treaty of peace with Nushirwan, and the intercourse he carried on with Persia, brought to him many skilful designers from the East, and supplied him with much of that artistic element by means of which he was enabled to make his greatest buildings monuments of beauty, such as have never been surpassed from his time to the present.

The greatest of all the monuments erected by him—the Church of Santa Sophia at Constantinople—differed from all previous structures, from the fact that its beauty was mainly derived from its magnificently vaulted areas, covered internally with the gold grounded mosaics, by means of which he not only decorated his structure but recorded the tenets of his faith. In all subsequent buildings on the soil of Italy, down almost to the present date, the use of this decorative adjunct exercised no unimportant influence. The early Christian church, whether it assumed the type of the ancient basilica, that is, a long parallelogram divided into a nave and aisles by rows of columns and terminated by semi-circular apses at the ends opposite to the entrances, or whether built with vaultings on the principle originated by the Romans in their simple brick structures, alike offered large areas for the introduction of mosaic; and the effect of splendour was obtained by its introduction little less than by the large dimensions and simple recurrence of majestic architectural parts in the lengthened vistas of the early Christian interiors.

Before proceeding to follow the influence exercised by Byzantine architecture proper upon the Mediæval architecture of Europe generally, it behoves us to dwell for a moment (and far too briefly for its interest) upon the readiness with which its leading features were accepted, and yet diversified in the act of acceptance, by the earliest followers of the prophet Mahomet, so soon as their cessation from the immediate

task of conquest left them leisure to turn their attention to the arts of peace.

The same energy with which this young but powerful faith animated its followers to wield the sword and grasp the sceptre led them with equal daring to aspire at once to gigantic creations in architecture.

The mosques and tombs of Ispahan and Cairo are amongst the largest, the earliest, and the most lovely of all Mahometan remains of structural beauty. While they retain the general methods of brick building and of stone cutting, of vault construction and decoration, popular with the Greeks of Byzantium, they speedily exhibit a richness of geometrical combination and a peculiar conventional style of sculptured and inlaid and Ceramic ornament, which rapidly altered the aspect of such monuments. In Ispahan, Damascus, Tabreez, Sultanieh, Bagdad, and other great cities of the Caliphate, mosques and palaces were erected upon the vastest scale.

So soon as the arms of Mahmoud (A. D. 977—1030) carried him to Ghazni, and those of Kootub to Delhi, the art of the Moslem to a great extent superseded the traditions of the followers of Buddha and Brama in India.

In the far south, in Sicily, the north of Africa, and Spain, the horse-shoe arch, and indeed every leading characteristic of Arabian design, found a new field of developement, and probably a more refined type of expansion, than it obtained in any other portion of the world. At Cordova the monuments of the greatness of Abder Ahman, and, at Grenada, those of the sovereigns immediately preceding the unhappy Boabdil el Chico, still remain to delight us with their freshness, their intricacy, and their beauty.

While those by whom these exquisite creations of architectural art were given to the world sank into nonentity under the dominion of the Spaniards—, who as a nation may be truly said to have cared for none of these things—, the traditions of Mahometan excellence, which had been so nobly

founded from about the year 1000 on the continent of India, were admirably sustained under the magnificent sovereigns who ruled at Bejapore, Delhi and Agra.

The Great Akbar in the middle of the sixteenth century called into being monuments at least as important both in dimensions and splendour as any of those under cotemporary erection in Europe.

The King Mahomet, who reigned from 1626 to 1660, erected the great Domes at Bejapore, wonders alike of construction and decoration; while the acmé of perfection was contemporaneously attained by Shah Jehan (1628), the builder of the magnificent palaces at Delhi, and that most perfect of all existing mausoleums, the Taje Mahal, at Agra.

I cannot quit this subject, which I feel to be more pregnant with suggestions for the student (at the present juncture) than any other which could be pointed out to you, without referring you to the admirable works published upon these monuments by Mr Owen Jones and Mr Fergusson. The former, from an almost intuitive affinity for the arts of the Saracens, has analysed their method of surface decoration with far greater skill than any other illustrator; while the latter, from his long residence in India, great intelligence and unremitting zeal in the collection and comparison of materials for the illustration of the monuments of the East, has well earned the gratitude of all who would desire to make themselves acquainted with the details of the class of monuments which, but for such labours as those of Mr Fergusson, we could never hope to realise.

The more closely we examine the "bifurcation" of style (if such an expression may be permitted) which started from the station or stand-point of the declension of the arts of Pagan Rome, on the divergent lines of Mahometan and Christian Arts, we cannot but wonder how from any common point of departure human intelligence could have shaped out courses of thought and design differing so absolutely and

entirely "ab ovo" and "toto coelo." Having far too rapidly surveyed the Eastern or Mahometan, let us return briefly to the Western, or Christian, line in direct succession from Rome through Byzantium.

As churches were raised by the exigencies of early churchmen, on soils remote from the classic land of Italy, the dominant forms of Roman architecture by degrees lost their purity, alike of contour and proportion.

Over the face of Europe during the centuries which elapsed between the age of Justinian and that of our Conquest, three influences may be said to have been exercised over Ecclesiastical Architecture; the only form of architecture which found any substantial encouragement at the hands of either peoples or sovereigns during that period.

The first of these, both in date and probable importance, was that derived from the traditions of Roman structure. The extension of Roman dominion over almost the whole face of Europe had brought the inhabitants of the countries colonized into more or less intimate acquaintance with the practice of Rome in such respects. Hence came an influence which lasted long, and which may be traced into even fairly recent mediæval art under the denomination of Latin.

The second was that which came from the energy of the composite Byzantine race, who long held sway over the world of Art, as it then existed, partly through their proficiency in technical arts peculiar to themselves as a people; and partly through their preservation, at a time when other nations were steeped in barbarism and torn by war and faction, of certain of the traditions of ancient processes of art-workmanship, and of the leading types of iconography, or sacred portraiture esteemed by the Greek Church, which long remained the all but sole authority in all matters connected with the special decoration of ecclesiastical structures.

The third, and ultimately dominant influence, which drove the others from the field, was that spirit of originality which

speedily distinguished mediæval art, and which we cannot fail to trace in some degree to a Celtic origin.

As the fervour of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries carried their modes of faith amongst the barbarian races still unconverted in many parts of Europe, so did they carry with them an acquaintance with original types of art peculiar to the lands in which they had been reared ; and which they procured to be introduced at first perhaps in manuscripts and metal-work, but ultimately in monuments, far and wide, over the continent.

As these three influences waned,—as they ultimately all three did, their place was taken by that which has been foolishly called Gothic, but which really was, as I believe, a spirit of affection for the really beautiful in art, which sprang into existence during the latter part of the twelfth century.

With the introduction of this sentiment the form of arcuation generally changed. For the round was substituted the pointed arch ; a lighter scale of parts took the place of the heavy proportions, derived from the exigencies of unscientific structure and an abuse of what was vainly supposed to have been the practice of ancient Greece and Rome, and retained in the heavy Norman ; piers still of ponderous section were substituted for columns ; and long reeded shafts, such as those which carried the Rhenish vaultings, took the place of pilasters as they had been used in classic ages.

From the banks of the Rhine, as has been admirably traced by one whose name can never be mentioned in Cambridge but with respect,—the late Master of Trinity,—there spread over the face of Europe new systems of vaulting, and new uses of vaulting shafts and ribs.

In France, as the Church acquired wealth, power and consistency, its monuments became more and more majestic ; and at Rheims, Paris, Chartres, Bayeux, Rouen, &c. monuments

were successively reared, in which the perfect type of fully developed First Pointed architecture, was carried to perfection.

We in England followed closely, if we did not occasionally lead our contemporaries, and, in cathedrals which time will not permit me now to dwell upon in detail, such as those of Salisbury, Wells, Lincoln, Westminster, &c. we attained no less beauty in perfect mediæval architecture, than did the inhabitants of any other country in Europe.

The monuments of Italy were naturally slower to exhibit the influence of this, which may be characterized as a strictly ecclesiastical, style of Gothic architecture. Owing probably to their being already provided, from the remains of antiquity reused and recombined, at a very early date, with structures suitable for the performance of the most magnificent rites and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church, the Italians had no longer, as the faithful in most of the other countries of Europe had, occasion to construct vast new edifices in response to imperative national demands. Hence although, as in churches such as that of Sta Caterina at Pisa, Sta Anastasia at Verona, St Andrea at Vercelli, in the Baptistery and Campo Santo at Pisa, as in the cathedrals at Orvieto, Sienna, Milan, and Ferrara, in the conventual churches of San Domenico at Bologna and Perugia, Santa Chiara at Naples, San Francesco at Assisi, and many others, spread over the face of the country, the Italians shewed themselves ready enough to adopt the details, proportions, and many of the beauties of trans-Alpine mediævality, they never exhibited the same general readiness to adopt the Gothic type, and standard of form, which marked the peoples of England, Germany, Spain, and France.

As a recompense however, and as an indication of their practical superiority, they endowed architecture continually with new technical processes, and the rarest perfection of excellence in religious sculpture and painting.

We in England failed probably to adopt many of these

new elements with the same readiness which was exhibited by other countries nearer to the land in which they were originated; but, on the other hand, we succeeded in attaining in many of our abbeys, monasteries, and parish-churches, a beauty of refinement in the execution of foliage, mouldings and architectural parts, which I believe to be unequalled, otherwise than exceptionally, in other countries in Europe. In my opinion there is no Mediæval Architecture upon the Continent so beautiful as that of some of the great abbeys of England, such as those of Tintern, Rivaulx, Fountains, &c. It is never to be forgotten how good a friend Cambridge proved itself to the conservation of these and similar monuments of ancient art throughout the country. The labours of the Cambridge Camden Society spread just principles both for the conservation of ancient and the construction of new buildings to assimilate in style with the best ancient monuments, at a time when architects, the clergy and men in general, were but as it were groping after a right path. Those labours are worthy of all praise, and should always receive due honour at the hands of every student of art throughout our native land.

As I may hereafter have an opportunity of dwelling again, and in greater detail, upon many of the leading characteristics of mediæval architecture, I shall not now extend my remarks upon the subject, but will only remind you that the triumph of the Pointed Arch, and the age of the highest purity in mediæval architecture, were but of short duration. It may be said to have almost sprung into being and culminated in the thirteenth century. The monuments of the fourteenth are less satisfactory; those of the fifteenth are, very generally, in ecclesiastical structures, far from excellent models.

At the same time the architecture of domestic structures gradually improved, not in England only, but throughout Europe. With the cultivation of the intellect, and a more general spread of education than had previously obtained, the

social system improved; and the individual man,—his wants, his objects, his pleasures, and his artistic predilections—assumed a marked importance. The profits of trade led to the accumulation of capital, and the expenditure of capital produced luxurious dwellings.

As more luxurious habits of life found no prototypes in the early mediæval system, men were thrown back upon the classic ages for instruction as to how to live with greater licence and enjoyment. Gradually, an admiration for monuments of ancient art, which had heretofore lain unnoticed and neglected on the soil of Italy and elsewhere, revived; and, with respect for the monuments came respect for the literature, and every relic of the arts of the ancients. Possibly it may have been that with increasing respect for the literature came respect for the monuments of the ancients, and as men's admiration for the monuments revived, so they were led to investigate with respect the artistic formulas, technical and æsthetic, in accordance with which those monuments had been fashioned.

To this revival of everything connected with the classic ages we are indebted for the origination of that new life in architecture which the French christened the Renaissance and the Italians the *Renascimento*.

The five orders were exhumed with all the various parts belonging to them, and through the labours of men such as Fra Giocondo, Alberti, Bramante, Baldassare Peruzzi, Vignola, Michael Angelo, Palladio, Sangallo, Sansovino, and ultimately Serlio, Scamozzi, and Bernini they received new forms of application, and new types of detail.

Men at length arose of whom Michael Angelo must be looked upon as the pioneer and leader—impatient of all rule, full of enthusiasm, gifted with fiery imaginations, and altogether incapable of control. By such men rules were absolutely scorned, and before long their enthusiasm overstepped their discretion.



While this was the tendency to degeneration from a satisfactory revival of antique art in Italy, the more remote countries of Europe, such as our own, were but casting off the traditions of the long dominant mediævalism, and slowly taking up the more regular types of classical architecture. During the reigns of Henry VIII., Elizabeth and James I., a hybrid style prevailed, by no means devoid of picturesque beauty, and in many respects assimilating, with a grace peculiar to itself, to the predominant scenery of our beautiful country. Happily we yet preserve, as does France also, many elegant residences of the aristocracy, in which details of a semi-classical character combine harmoniously with forms of structure traditionally derived from less regular architecture.

In modern days in all the countries of Europe a gradual respect has arisen for monuments of architectural beauty of all classes. Fortunately for the preservation of such monuments this conservative spirit has been one of considerable catholicity. So great is the spread of knowledge on the subject of these monuments, that those who in anywise affect a liking for architecture in the present day cannot fail to become eclectics, owing to the abundance of types by which they find themselves to be surrounded.

Whether or not this spread of catholicity in architectural art, which induces us to tolerate a Gothic church in one street, a Renaissance house in another, and a Roman concert-room a little further on, mixed up with a variety of buildings, which, whether good-looking or ugly, can be said to affect the style of no particular historical period, is for the advancement or detriment of our art, is a matter just now of some uncertainty.

We, and indeed all the other nations of Europe, are at present in a state of transition as to our architectural art, but whether we are on the road to improvement or the contrary, it would be extremely hard to say. Much is done now, from day to day, of very great beauty, and much that is very

eminently the reverse. I believe that we need much, and very general, study of the subject, before we shall find a satisfactory clue to uniform excellence in our art. What may not be for my generation, Gentlemen, may come to pass in yours, and sure I am that it can alone do so by the fact of many becoming, as I hope you may, seriously interested in the advancement of the Fine Arts generally of this country.

## LECTURE III.

### ARCHITECTURE.

---

#### *THEORY.*

THE subject of our present Lecture is, I may remind you, the Theory of Architecture.

You may possibly remember that I have already taken pains to explain to you that while painting and sculpture were arts which found their basis in direct imitation, Architecture is one in which imitation enters only as quite a secondary and ornamental ingredient; and although a valuable adjunct the groundwork of the art is to be found in other elements of causation.

Many writers have almost rashly described as simple the fundamental bases of Architecture. My impression is that they are exceedingly complex, and hardly to be arrived at by any synthetical statement, it being an art which in its perfect form so interlinks itself with its sister arts, that it is scarcely, until some knowledge of the principles of those sister arts is acquired, that the student can at all safely reason upon the constitution of that art which is, as it were, the mother of all others.

This forms only the natural converse of the proposition "that it is impossible to predicate safely concerning the Fine Arts, as a family, without knowing the nature of all its constituent members," the character of which is also modified by

the fact of their being members of a common family, as well as possessing an individual organization.

The necessity for such a complex and concurrent study, of the whole, and of each of the parts, has been well expressed by Quatremère de Quincy in the following passage:—"Each of the Fine Arts," he says, "presents itself to our view within its own particular and distinct province, as one of those confederate states which, with others, forms one whole and the same empire; but which, though submitting to the general laws of a central government, has no less its customs, its privileges, its laws of exception, and its especial character impressed upon it by Nature. Consider then how many studies, and how great an extent of knowledge must needs be united to constitute a proper qualification to treat thoroughly the particular theory of all the Fine Arts, since so much labour is requisite to work out that of one only. The entire theory of one art alone is not so very simple a matter."

Of this necessity for caution in theorizing upon architecture, and indeed upon art generally, Pope, with a poet's inspiration, seems to have been conscious, when, in the following few lines, he traces the fate of those who would rush upon generalization, with more zeal than discretion:—

"Tir'd at first sight with what the muse imparts,  
In fearless youth we tempt the height of arts,  
While from the bounded level of our mind  
Short views we take, nor see the length behind;  
But, more advanced, behold with strange surprise,  
Far distant scenes of endless science rise."

In no one of the arts more than in Architecture are those visions of "endless science" rather near than distant. The basis of the art we shall find to rest at least as much upon considerations of prudence as upon considerations of beauty; and it is perhaps, on this very account, one of the most improving to study, as exhibiting, in the highest degree, the perfect compatibility of the union of the highest reason

with the highest beauty ; and proving the power of the two, so combined, to imprint upon the mind of the spectator the strongest impressions of sublimity which it is in the power of any of the arts to produce.

At a first glance the peculiar alliance of architecture with, and reliance upon, *reason*,—together with its strictly technical necessities,—would seem to remove it from that realm of beauty over which we may imagine our sense of the ideal the only legitimate ruler. There would seem to be something incompatible between lofty thought and the indispensable ministration of architecture, through the labours of many uncultivated workmen to some of man's first necessities. This was well felt and the concurrent difficulty was admirably solved by the late Cardinal Wiseman, whose powers of exposition on matters of art were as rare and great as his taste for and knowledge of the subject. "It may," he says, "seem superfluous to observe in writing of architecture that it obviously divides itself into two branches ; the purely artistic, and the constructive, or scientific. If, on the one side, it seems to descend towards the class of mechanical pursuits, on the other it rises so high as to command its other two sisters, and to be almost necessary for their perfect existence. I have sufficiently intimated that one great difference between ancient and modern art, including mediæval art under the first division, consists in this,—that ancient art was public, and modern is private. Galleries of sculpture were anciently unknown. Its most matchless pieces were in temples, or in public halls, such as those of baths, or in open gardens, perhaps adorning fountains, but generally accessible to the most plebeian eye ; but this very circumstance shows how architecture is in the highest sense a Fine Art, and must always necessarily grow, as such, commensurately with the advancement of the other two branches of the art of design."

So long as architecture ministered only in an incomplete form to the selfish wants of individual man, an almost perfect

uniformity in its earliest local types prevailed. The shelter of primæval man was little else than the shelter of the savage of to-day; but the instant that an effort is made, either to recognize by structure belief in the material existence of a Deity, or to perpetuate the memory of a man, each race seems to strike out something different from all other races.

It is this tendency to create specific variety in form, the moment the imagination is excited, which calls into being what are known as architectural styles. These are in fact compounded of the hereditary inclinations of races, and the facilities for building existing in the materials for structure by which any such races may be surrounded.

Architecture being based, as I have said, upon reason,—that is, human reason,—cannot but vary with the conditions of reason of those by whom it is originated; and, as men change, so do styles. In the architecture so created, whatever phase or phases it may assume, there must always co-exist two principles which by patient analysis we are enabled to separate. The one is that which is permanent, and therefore common to all styles; the other what is fluctuating with every change, or developement of style.

As Socrates replied to Protagoras, “Man is the measure of all things. By descent deeper into his personality, you will find that underneath all varieties there is ground of steady truth. Men differ, but they also agree; and therefore, as to what is fleeting, they agree. As to what is eternal, difference is the region of opinion. Agreement is the region of truth. Let us endeavour to penetrate that region.”

The preservation of the element which is permanent gives us that true theory of building up form which constitutes the syntax of the art; while that of the second or temporary provides us with materials for studying the history of fashion, a subject not only amusing and interesting, but most useful if rightly investigated.

Now the syntax of any art can only be arrived at by two

processes;—the one, which we may regard as the Aristotelian, by the synthetic construction from first principles; and the other, which we may term the Baconian, by analysis and inductive abstraction from experiment.

The first system of evolution, I need scarcely remind those who have studied the works of the late illustrious Master of Trinity, is in the highest degree dangerous, while the second is the only safe process.

We may therefore hope, while going slowly, to go most safely, if before attempting to examine that synthetical system, which we may believe to have been evolved by the Greeks, with wonderful philosophical ingenuity, we proceed to test for the presence of theory,—as a chemist might any fluid for traces of alcohol or any other special essence,—each of the successive dominant schools into which architecture has been divided historically.

In this examination I purpose following the same order I pursued in announcing to you, far too briefly yesterday, the historical succession of the various styles.

When we look to the theory which appears to have animated the ancient Egyptians in their enormous structures, which, as I told you, seem to have been almost entirely limited to tombs and temples, we find, on the threshold of inquiry, that their first aim appears to have been to create a sort of protest against the mutability of nature, and man's evanescence. The aim was not only to be great to contemporaries but to be great for ever; and the means by which this sentiment of greatness, whether of the Deity, or of his earthly representative, the Sovereign, was sought to be expressed, was through the sentiment of bulk. With the Egyptians everything was colossal, and the greater the power of the object represented the greater the bulk of the representation.

We find them, in their ranges of colossal columns, already acquainted with the principle which Burke has recognized as one of the elements of sublimity,—the heightening the

appearance of bulk to infinity by multiplying equal parts to a greater limit than is within the power of the mind to count within the space of time in which any first impression can be obtained from any one point of view. In the elimination of architectural "true principles" I fear that the monuments of Assyria, Persia, and India, help us forward to little more than the enforcement of the lessons derivable from a study of ancient Egyptian Art. To the Classical Theory of design we shall presently recur: and it may suffice now only to note, that Rome gave out but a feeble echo of Greek excellence. In Rome traditions of sound structure were sedulously maintained, while the more volatile spirit of pure beauty which had flashed with electric light over the favoured land of "the citron and myrtle" was allowed, in architecture and the other arts to evaporate, as emperor after emperor held sway in the Seven-hilled City, and was gathered to his fathers.

The Byzantine tendency to splendour in vigorous but somewhat unmethodical fashion was brought, by the affinity inherently possessed by the Mahometan races for symmetrical regularity and duly balanced colour, into order and perfection. Their faith, which forbade the introduction of representations of animated nature, deprived them of one of the highest resources of architectural art—the capability of writing upon structure a legible expression of purport and story; that quality which Mr Fergusson has so well described as *phonetic*.

The principal quality, which we may find invariably vindicated by Romanesque architects, or those who connected the traditions of classical art, through various types, with mediæval art, consisted in a knowledge of the effect of vastness produced by the multiplication of regular subdivided parts, equally subdivided themselves in their turn. The long rows of columns which decorated the early Christian churches, the arcadings, which ultimately formed one of the principal characteristics of the style, all exhibited excellent ideas of general



effect cast into often uncouth and eccentric detail. Yet in all this uncouthness and these eccentricities there may be perceived vigour and life, indicative of the state of germination, a casting off, as it were, of an old skin to put on a new one, and after the throes of labour to give birth to an entirely new creation.

As otherwise than an entirely new creation it is impossible to regard mediæval architecture. If it should be necessary in a single word to state what appears to be its dominant sentiment it is possible that the word "aspiration" might, better than any other, convey that elevation of sentiment which induced men to lift their structures as they lifted up their hearts towards the Supreme Power which reigned over them. Men's minds and men's architecture rose together upwards; and as the old predominance of horizontalism had shown men thinking of themselves, and running parallel with the soil, "of the earth, earthy," rather than breaking away from it, so the vertical tendency of the mediæval architect seemed to be expressive of a springing from the world to a something higher and purer.

Men like Pugin, Viollet le Duc, Lassus, De Laborde, Boisserée, Moller, Reichensherger, Puttrich, Otté, Parker, Sharpe, and Ruskin, like Whewell and Willis, and many another zealous student, who have profoundly investigated the principles and practice of the mediæval architects, have found them no less amenable to laws of wise construction and reasonable planning than they have fitted for the expression of the most spiritual beauty. They have admired especially, as we must also, the truth and simplicity, and the honesty (if I may be permitted to borrow from the nomenclature of moral qualities a term applicable to art) with which all materials were used in mediæval ages; the propriety with which ornament was introduced—always developing and never running counter to structure—the unfailing aspect of grace and elegance acquired by the just proportion of support to load, and the true equilibrium of parts.

From this unerring and satisfactory adjustment of parts in structure arises that impression of equilibrium which is essential to the appearance as well as to the existence of repose.

Another quality which is always attained in mediæval architecture is a sense of due subordination between essentials and non-essentials in structure. The mediæval architect never fails to draw the spectator's eye, first, to that which should be first seen ; and subsequently, to direct his attention to whatever may seem essential to convey to him a sense of the minor beauties by which he may be surrounded.

Want of time will not permit me to dwell more upon this subject. Your own natural tastes and the monuments which constantly demand your attention cannot do otherwise than lead you to an investigation of principles easily to be gathered from those monuments ; and which it is impossible to convey any idea of within the limits of a single lecture.

In looking for the "*ultima ratio*" of the original revival of ancient art I fear we shall find that sensual delight was somewhat of a prime mover. Every addition to man's knowledge of the arts or literature of the ancients furnished suggestions for the introduction into the contemporary social system of epicurean ministrations to the enjoyments of this world.

The especial struggle made by the Renaissance architects developing out of Gothic architecture was towards the increase of domestic enjoyment, through the hall, the hearth, and the home ; while the tendency of the Italian Renaissance architects developing out of culture direct from classicality, was towards that semi-public domesticity which took the form of the more stately palace.

That modification of the later Italian architecture which became popular in France from the time of Louis XIV. onwards, was essentially aristocratic and courtly. Vast in extent, but poor in proportions, the architecture of the Frenchman of

Louis XIV.'s time was no bad reflection of the characteristics of Louis himself; at once pretentious, and incompetent to convey any other idea than that of inability to rise to the grandeur which he felt it his duty to aim at, even while unable to attain it.

In most of our modern architecture, up to within a comparatively recent period, men throughout Europe have seemed content to follow a sort of accidental system, based, not upon the study of principles, but upon the works of any fashionable or successful contemporary. A species of rule of thumb, varied only by the endeavour to do a little better than some immediate predecessor, seems to have ruled very generally, and it was not until periods of revolution had wakened men to a free assertion of their rights of intellectual judgment in all directions, that an effort was made to throw off the feeble shackles of an empty academic system.

With this free trade of thought sprang up a respect for many a long forgotten mind, whose existence beyond the pale of the academic curriculum had doomed his life and labours to all but oblivion. With new respect for such men came new respect for old systems, and with respect for old systems, for old monuments. The reaction from the destruction which took place in revolution was naturally increased care for all that revolution had spared.

More accurate ideas came to be current as to the ancient styles of architecture, as of all the other arts; and hence the materials for a widely extended and intelligent eclecticism were accumulated for the information of the student.

At present his only difficulty consists in finding his way over the vast tracts which the multiplicity of teachers, and the almost superabundance of teaching, spreads out before him. The only solution of the equation is to be sought in a long continued process of cancelment. Rival claims of styles and theories are only to be satisfactorily adjusted by a process of elimination which shall take from them all that is transient,

and leave them all that is enduring. All that human art has ever produced constitutes as it were a crude ore which must be submitted to the process of "cupellation" before the pure and standard metal, the only menstruum for the future, can be satisfactorily evolved. "Faint with excess of light," and distracted by the claims of what will at first sight appear to be irreconcilable rivals, the student must stand upon the threshold of the art of architecture, as all but bewildered. His first effort will naturally be to recur to the confident statements of empirics, and those dogmatists whose voices in the past have been most potential in directing the labours of the architect.

Let us for awhile see what they will offer to him.

Throwing aside altogether the views of many writers, who have either treated partially upon the subject, or mainly dealt with transient fashions instead of permanent principles, I believe we may arrive at two distinct forms of architectural creed,—the one advocated by the Classicists and the other by the Mediævalists. At first sight these would appear to be irreconcilable, but the opposition is more in appearance than reality, as, before I have concluded this lecture, I shall hope to be able to demonstrate to you.

I am somewhat averse to introduce into these lectures two much abused terms, common in art criticism, viz. subjective and objective; but they are still, rightly apprehended, so simple and expressive, that I am tempted to define their meaning at this stage of our inquiry, especially because the one of the theories I am about to explain to you is essentially subjective, and the other objective.

What I may call the classical theory of architecture is subjective; that is to say, an artificial constitution, constructed on what is believed to be principles consonant with man's nature, and only allowed existence as principles because they were presumed to be in harmony with the immutable principles of man's physical and intellectual condition. The things

themselves treated of were considered to be as nothing when weighed in the balance against what man demanded for his accommodation and gratification. He was to be the lord.

In the mediæval theory, on the other hand, man was regarded as comparatively nothing. Each variety of matter was considered to possess properties and rights of its own, which man could in no wise contravene with impunity. The object gave the law, and not man. Hence the term objective as applied to analogous theories.

Between the demands which the necessities of every occasion made to be complied with and satisfied, and those which sprang out of the materials with which man had to deal, a natural series of laws and regulations were supposed, as it were, to be called into being by nature; and by sequences of cause and effect over which man could exert comparatively little command, he became the servant rather than the lord, when called upon to act in the capacity of creator of beauty. The one system supposed that man was to do all, and the other that nature was to do three parts, and man one only.

The above may be regarded as a popular explanation of the terms subjective and objective when used in art phraseology, the present being scarcely a fitting occasion for the discussion of those more complicated significations which have been attributed to the terms, mainly by German metaphysicians. Others may teach you, far better than I can, the value of the "ego," and "non ego," the I and non I, of Kant, Hegel, Schlegel and Fichté.

It may be well for us also to avoid dwelling too long upon the exceedingly debateable ground as to whether theory in architecture preceded creation of structure in accordance with that theory, or whether it was from such structure that the theories were framed. Personally, I incline to the latter belief, to a considerable extent at all events, since I hold it as most probable that improvement in structure and improvement in theory obtained tangible shape almost *pari passu*.

Unfortunately, even if they existed, we have not had preserved to us in any strictly lucid shape the synthetic laws which guided the ancient Greeks in the creation of their architectural masterpieces.

But, what is more important, we have their structures; and, by a minute and studious examination of them, patient and zealous investigators like Mr Penrose and Mr Watkiss Lloyd, Mr Cockerell and Mr Wilkins have arrived at the deduction and establishment of many beautiful harmonic principles both of quantity and quality of form.

What has always done duty as an exposition of Greek theory has been derived from the writings of Vitruvius; and, valuable as what he says may be, I am bound to confess that it is, to my sense, somewhat deficient in the clearness and lucidity which are to be regarded as never wanting in the careful statements of their philosophy given to us by the Greek writers themselves.

Vitruvius commences his definition "*Quod sit architectura*," what architecture may be, by the following lofty definition of its functions:—"Architectura est scientia disciplinis et variis eruditionibus ornata, cujus judicio probantur omnia quæ ab ceteris artibus perficiuntur opera. Ea nascitur ex fabrica et ratiocinatione." In other words that architecture is a science adorned with many experiences of various branches of learning, by whose judgment all works are approved, executed by means of various arts. It takes its origin from building and reason.

When however Vitruvius attempts to convey the meaning of each of the Greek terms to which he alludes as designating the different branches into which the theory of the art which he so defines may be divided, he becomes so confused, as to evidence what I cannot but regard as an imperfect understanding of the very terms of which he makes use.

I have therefore endeavoured to reconstruct from his text, and with the best reason I can bring to bear upon the subject

from the study of the remains of Grecian architecture which have come down to us, what may have been the theory of Grecian philosophy upon the subject of architectural theory.

Vitruvius tells us that the qualities the Greeks most regarded were seven in number, consisting of, 1. Solidity. 2. Convenience. 3. Order. 4. Disposition. 5. Proportion, including Eurythmia and Symmetry. 6. Decorum. 7. Economy.

I would especially invite your attention to the succession of these various headings, because I believe them to be coincident with the natural sequence in which the different branches of the study of his art require to be taken up by any architect who would elaborate a design on philosophical principles.

The principal obscurity which occurs in the explanation of the meaning of the limits of these different sections given by Vitruvius occurs in his definition of the fifth of them, viz. Proportion, and it becomes almost impossible to gather from his words the respective functions of Eurythmia and Symmetry.

Under the first head, that of Solidity, may be comprised the architect's study of materials. Whoever is about to build has, before he can exercise his art as a technicality, to see what nature provides for him to build with, and where nature is absolutely deficient in the provision of good building materials, to see how far human ingenuity can supply what nature may be deficient in.

He has therefore to select stable materials and to acquaint himself with their greater or less durability, and with those natural laws of statics which ensure their retention of the form into which he may primitively dispose them.

In all ages the materials employed in architecture have exercised a most potential voice over its form and character. As is well observed by Dr Memes, in his *History of Sculpture, Painting and Architecture* (Constable and Co., 1829),

"This influence has worked not only in the peculiar styles which have separately been adopted in different countries, but in the general and essential principles of the science. The materials of which buildings in all ages have been chiefly constructed are stone, wood, and factitious substances, as tiles and bricks. The first adoption of these materials, and of course the style of building, must have been recommended by the resources of the country. The law however which determines their arrangement is universal, arising from exigencies over which taste and even ingenuity exert limited control. This evidently arises from the nature of the case, for, since a mass of stone is heavier in all, and weaker in most positions than timber of equal dimensions, the whole congeries of supporting and supported members, that is, the whole system of architecture, will be affected as the one or the other material is employed. Thus in wooden erections the supporting members may be much fewer and less massive than in structures of stone, because, in the former, the horizontal or supported parts are both higher, and will carry the incumbent weight, as a roof, over a much wider interval than in the latter. It is apparent also, even for the ordinary purposes of stability, that in constructing edifices of stone, whether of the perpendicular or horizontal members, the dimensions will be greater than in elevations of wood, and, in the case of columnar structures, that the altitude in proportion to the diameter will be far less in stone than in similar supports. Hence the two grand characteristics of a massive or solemn, and a light or airy architecture. Hence also when genius and taste had begun to consider the arrangements of necessity and use in the relations of effect and beauty, new combinations would be effected which approached to one or other of those leading divisions. It must however be obvious that the field of these experiments is narrowed by the very principles on which they would be first suggested. In the art we are now considering, the human agent has less power over the inert-



ness of matter than in any other. Imagination comes in contact with reality at every step, and the laws of nature impress the boundaries of that reality, not at the risk of absurdity but of very being. Beauty becomes here, not the creation of fantasy, something pleasing only as it reflects our associations or harmonises with our feelings, but as more especially the creation of science, the object of demonstrative wisdom. Hence perfect architectural beauty is the most sublime and the most rational of the objects of taste ; because, while the susceptibilities of the mind are awakened, the powers of judgment are gratified by the certainty with which the sources of pleasure can be traced. We feel the arrangement to be beautiful : we know that it is necessary. Hence also the perfect modes, the true combinations of the art are few ; the error in departing from them great."

Thus it is that the architect's study and right apprehension of the utilitarian value and modes of conversion of the materials he has to deal with, go far to determine the style in which he will find himself compelled to work ; and the Greeks have therefore rightly placed this study as first in order of all those which must engage the architect's attention.

Their second heading, Convenience, comprises a careful study of how best to supply the wants of those for whom the architect may have to build. It is obviously one of his most important functions to identify himself with the views of his employers, from the immediate date of his employment. If the wants of his employer should appear to be inconsistent with one another, to be imprudent, too grandiose, or too mean, trivial, or beyond the occasion, it will be his duty to give to his employer the advantage of his experience as to the mode in which wants of the same class have been more or less successfully supplied on other or former occasions, and with what modifications.

To be in a position to advise then, under the head of Convenience, the architect must make a severe and careful

study of what are likely to be the usual wants of those who are likely to be his employers, and the greater or less success with which those wants have been supplied by others than himself.

The third section of the subject which should engage the architect's attention is, according to the Greeks, what Vitruvius calls Order. By that term I consider we may most rightly understand what we call style.

To proceed to design, without determining style, is to waste both time and invention; since, as it is obvious that an expression of unity of thought should be manifested in the completed work, unless a certain definite mode of using materials, which we understand as style, is determined upon and adopted as a rule throughout our subsequent operations of thought, the work will be but a medley, "a thing of shreds and patches."

Where an art like architecture was, as amongst the Greeks, in the comparative absence of written laws, an art taught by oral communication and practice only, what they understood as order became a much more coherent and imperative principle than anything equivalent to what we can understand as style.

To build in the Doric mode, or in the Ionic, or in the Corinthian, with them meant distinctly that a certain series of parts would require to be used, essentially different from each other in form, proportion and aspect. We now speak of the Grecian style as a coherent thing, whereas in truth there was very nearly as much difference then, between building in either of the three modes usually adopted by the Greeks, as there is now in our building in the classical or Gothic styles.

With the exceptions that Doric and Ionic temples minister to something like the same wants, and that they were both constructed of similar materials, they represent two absolutely distinct and different styles, in all parts and forms.

Viewed through the harmonising medium of ages, we are now scarcely impressed with the differences which examination proves to have existed between these styles. Great as those were, to us they have melted into unity, and if it was in the power of the Greeks to so model those diversities as to give them the power of harmonious fusion in the future, may we not hope that, great as the differences may be between the very styles in which we are now accustomed to work, time may so reconcile our varieties of practice as to give an appearance of cohesion and harmony of principle to our system of architectural progression by antagonism?

The fourth section of Greek theory under the heading of Disposition included all the study connected with the placing of the structure and the modes in which the wants of the employer might be supplied so as to take the greatest advantage of the surroundings of his structure. The study of this matter obviously included salubrity, light, air, position, both with regard to health and beauty, and such a convenient arrangement of all apartments as to make them most delightful. Disposition served to dictate which were to be the summer, and which the winter apartments, how those apartments most used should enjoy the loveliest prospects, how the richest apartments should be so placed as to be most and best seen, how due privacy was to be obtained, and yet how the general aspect of the structure might be a delight to those without it, while its internal elaboration was to be a source of constant pleasure to those privileged to remain within it.

In almost all the sections we have yet enumerated reason and utilitarianism appear to dominate over pure esthetic considerations; but in the fifth, Proportion, embracing with it Eurythmia and Symmetry, art assumes its ascendancy.

Under the general considerations of proportion the Greeks, I believe, studied the relative bulk of the parts of which their structures consisted, as the distance apart of

the columns and other supports, the diameters and heights of those columns, the relation of length to breadth and altitude, in plan and elevation; the sizes of openings and the allotment of mass supporting to mass supported, so as to gratify statical as well as esthetic requirements.

By Eurythmia I believe was meant the study of the succession and grouping of parts. The minds of mathematicians like Euclid, his rivals and his pupils, would never have been satisfied unless the mysterious harmonies of nature had been duly represented in the theory of Grecian architecture. The earnest study by the Greeks of measure in music and metre, demonstrates their partiality for the refinements of time and rhythm; and for such temperaments their architecture, to be perfect, required a corresponding field of development. Hence arises that well understood division of parts in architecture, the harmonious gradation of which is testified to by the retention of certain terms common to architectural and musical science to the present day. Modulation as a system was, at once in architecture and in music, a method of uniting and levelling by gentle approximations all parts otherwise unequal or discordant, the only way of passing agreeably from one set of associations of idea in any shape to another.

It was these very exigencies of modulation which formed so important a branch of the study of Eurythmia, which induced the organisation by the Greeks of that subtle system of optical corrections which they carried to a far greater refinement than has ever been aimed at by any other people in the history of art: refinements which, I believe, if we could have still presented to us the masterpieces of Grecian painting, as we have of their architecture and their sculpture, we should find to have constituted a portion of their daily practice in every branch of the Fine Arts.

We find it in their technical arts, whether in the simplest form of the cheapest vase thrown on the potter's wheel or

in gigantic monuments, such as that of the Parthenon, the Erechtheum, or the Temple of the Olympian Jove.

Connected with the science of proportion they had also one more element, without which their eurythmic allotment of the succession of parts would have been cloying with too much sweetness. It is that of Symmetry; teaching them how to so balance the various parts of their structure as to gain by regular reduplication a continual sense of order and subjection to some common principle of regularity.

Such order and regularity the eye demands as the background and complement to and for all undulating form and irregular measure. The latter would be unfelt if the former were non-existent. And hence arise those infinitely subtle forms of contrast in architectural form which no people ever wielded with so great a mastery as the ancient Greeks. In their works Proportion, Eurythmia and Symmetria reached their utmost limits of perfection and refinement; and as their works under these heads reached the utmost limits of human perfection, one may fairly assume that the principles by which that perfection was attained were no less perfect than the works produced by them were excellent. It is deeply to be regretted that the Athenian canons under these heads should have come down to us only through the confused version of them given to us by Vitruvius.

The sixth branch of study dwelt upon by Vitruvius he designates under the head of Decorum, and by that we may consider to have been implied what we should call now, in structure, its prudence and fitness. Decorum measured out the precise amount of ornament to be incorporated in every part of the structure. It maintained the due relation of size between the various parts of a building; it prevented secondaries being drawn into the position of primaries, and vice versa; it gave extra stability to the parts intended either for defence or special dignity; it

gave vigour and simplicity of form to those parts of the structure most exposed to the action of the elements, and due protection to the more delicate accessories of the structure. It ensured the spectator's gathering a right impression of the character and purport at once of the building and of its author, on leaving it, as well as upon arriving at it. It ensured harmony between his first and last view of the building; it made him reach it with joy and leave it with regret. It was in fact the application to it of a cultivated and intelligent good sense; the quality of all others which is perhaps most wanting in the majority of our structures of the present day.

The seventh section was no less important than any of the preceding, and there is no term the use of which has been much more abused in our generation; it is that of Economy. Rightly understood, it means as imperatively the supply of all which should be in the structure, as it does the absence of all which should not. We too often use it as an excuse for the absence of what should be present, and we too seldom apply it to restrain the presence of what should be absent. It, perhaps more than any other, represents the sentiment of just criticism. If in any building all the other qualities have been fairly studied and attained, and yet by waste or parsimony the judicious conditions of economy have been neglected, reproach will sooner or later overtake the architect, and judgment will be pronounced upon his work with an almost judicial authority from which there can be no appeal.

One of the most important laws it lays down, which can never be evaded without danger, is that of a necessity for the most rigid simplicity, consistent with the production of the effect aimed at. It cuts off excrescences and impertinences, rejects futility and applies the test and law of fitness to all the architect's labours; it is in fact his best critic and best corrective. Happy it is for him if he can

anticipate, before he calls the creations of his fancy into permanent form, censure or approbation on the score of his measure of regard to the exigencies of Economy.

Such being, as I believe, a fair exposition of the classical subjective system, or elaboration of the theory in which by the exercise of qualities in which men inherently delighted perfect architecture was according to the ancients to be produced, let us now endeavour to trace the most comprehensive and best form in which the mediæval or objective system has been stated by various and sometimes conflicting authorities.

As most earnest and earliest amongst these we should unhesitatingly place the late Augustus Welby Pugin, to whose efforts it is mainly owing that Christian architecture no longer requires apologists amongst us. We are, I am happy to say, no less alive to its beauties than we can possibly be to those of Athenian art.

He has been succeeded by many great amplifiers and commentators; such as Ruskin, Viollet le Duc, Lassus, Willis, Parker, Scott, Brandon, Sharpe, Street, Otté Moller, Reichen-sperger, Selvatico, and others, who have grafted on to his original declaration of "True Principles" many valuable additions and corrections; but still he must ever stand forward with a just title to our respect, as the original and ablest vindicator, in our generation, of a set of principles too long neglected amongst us.

The theory of the mediævalists may be considered to rest upon the basis of utility, primarily. Stones of greater or less degree of hardness, wood of various kinds, metals with different properties demand, they allege, to be consistently used in definite scales of proportion, and to be used only in situations for which their qualities imperatively fit them. They look upon the necessities of every case as dictating almost absolutely the plan and leading parts of every structure. If any of those necessities demand symmetry the building may

be symmetrical, but the slightest deviation from regularity of necessity should, they contend, be accompanied by an indication of the fact through a corresponding change in the plan of any structure. It matters little, they contend, for instance, where or how a door or a window may be placed if by a singular disposition of it the slightest increase of light or facility of communication may be obtained by disregard of regularity. Climate, they maintain, should absolutely dictate the leading form of structure, affecting obviously the forms of all roofs, the amount of shade and protection from weather provided for in every building, and the sizes and positions of doors and windows. They hold that the form and proportion of every structure should depend primarily, if not absolutely, upon its function, and that anything which may tend to disguise or efface an appearance as well as reality of functional fitness in the parts of the structure is inevitably detrimental to beauty. By this assertion of function they would constantly remind the spectator of the conditions under which work is executed, and so furnish him with a scale for the right estimation of the consistency between the mode of fulfilment of conditions and the nature of those conditions.

One of their most imperative laws is that ornament should be superadded to structure, and not be structure; that no one material should ever simulate another, but should be fashioned only in subjection to the ordinary technical process by which it may be most readily shaped.

I need scarcely remind you of those Seven Lamps from which my colleague at Oxford has thrown brilliant rays of light over the whole scheme of mediæval design. His lamps are those of Sacrifice, of Truth, of Power, of Beauty, of Life, of Memory, and of Obedience.

He maintains, with the utmost rhetorical skill, the indispensability of an atmosphere of light, not for mediæval architecture only, but for all architecture, and perhaps not for our architectural existence only, but for our



moral being as well. It is under the head of Sacrifice that he would engage us to hold back nothing from our work which may be fitting for our work. Considerations of self and selfish ends are in all cases to be merged in considerations for common welfare and enjoyment; the individual is to be nothing, the work is to be everything.

If we would obey his teachings under the Lamp of Truth we should have neither in our architecture nor in our dealings any kind of falsehood or fiction; trick and deceit are to be put behind us, and our work is to be true and honest, as our hearts are to be clear and guileless. As Shakespeare says,

"Oh, how much more doth beauty beauteous seem  
By that sweet ornament which truth doth give."

Out of this very humility and abnegation will arise the vivid light of the Lamp of Power. Our strength will be in our sacrifice, and in our devotion to the cause of truth; men will be affected by our power as they may be made to believe in our sincerity. Our exercise of power must always be proportioned to the degree in which we cherish and enjoy liberty, and in the degree in which our aspirations tend towards the vastness and magnificence of the example set us in the great works of creation. It is the careful study of this which will give us strength. As we increase in strength to create so shall we gain in keenness and perception. A new sense of refinement will steal upon us and lead us to add Beauty to all that we may have to do. We can conceive of no condition of things under which willing genius will not find out a way to convert rudeness into elegance. Circumstances may retard the full development of beauty through the instrumentality of genius, but the life of genius will never have been spent on any art in vain. Change, and change in the right direction, must and will have been made through it. It is a slow operation to convert the rude primitive supplies of architectural necessities into the utmost forms of

refinement which the parts involved may be capable of receiving, without losing that functional propriety which almost dictates the form into which they should be cast, and the right appreciation of the proportions to which they should be reduced.

There is something, Mr Ruskin would contend, delightful in the evidence which a structure may be made to convey of the human knowledge by which it may have been called into being. It is this manifestation of individual life in every part of a design which he would classify under the rays emanating from his Lamp of Life.

In proportion to the spectator's recognition of this humanity of production will be his spontaneous sympathy with the work effected by his fellow-creature. He feels himself dignified and elevated in his own person by contact with manifestations of the genius of his fellows; his life may be influenced by their lives, and by the memories of lives of genius well spent.

From these memories, and indissolubly associated with them, would spring those associations of idea which will link in harmonious relation all those elements which may be supposed to be but broken elements of a world of perfect beauty, the scattered fragments of which can be but exceptionally reunited by man in his fallen condition, but when so reunited seem to reassert their primitive and heavenly unity and identity. How much of our sense of beauty in architecture is derived from the light shed upon us by the lamp of Memory, I would refer you to Mr Ruskin's eloquent pages to duly appreciate. I can only tell you, in the words of Shelley, that

"When the lamp is shattered,  
The light in the dust lies low."

And if at any time or under any circumstances we fail to be affected, as the majority of men are affected, by the great monuments of architecture and indeed of all arts, we may

accept it as a test either that we have neglected the cultivation of that glorious spirit of memory, or that our powers are waning from us, and the lamp of life shedding but a feeble and intermittent ray upon our path. If we would strengthen that ray, we must steal a gleam from the last of our series of mediæval lamps, that of Obedience.

Under its influence we may arrive at a just sense of our own position and responsibilities both moral and artistic. The sense of those responsibilities will lead us to purer service, to purer work, and to more entire sympathy with what is pure and good in the work and service of others. Thus may our energies be rekindled, and our work catch a reflection from the renascent flame.

In this vindication of the value and nature of the lights thrown upon architecture and mainly upon mediæval architecture by Mr Ruskin, I have but taken the same liberties of interpretation and analytical exposition I have permitted myself in dealing with the seven corresponding great lamps of Athenian tradition.

I cannot feel that there is anything jarring or warring between the respective series. I see no reason to doubt that the same principles of governance which Mr Ruskin has thus laid down for one desiring to excel in the practice of mediæval architecture may have been followed in every particular by the classical architect; and on the other hand I feel equally strongly that the most successful works of mediæval architecture exhibit a just accordance in every particular with the principles deducible from the laws of solidity, convenience, order, disposition, proportion, decorum, and economy.

I find alike in the best examples of Grecian and mediæval architecture that functional propriety of the parts is never neglected, hidden nor confused; that each material receives the proportion of substance, bulk, and surface treatment corresponding with its physical peculiarities and best methods of technical elaboration. The grille or candlestick of the

medieval architect assumes no greater tenuity and no more happy variety of metallic treatment than does the candelabrum or tripod of the Greek. The terra cotta of both exhibits its plastic origin and style of finish. Marble and stone are worked and combined with no less propriety in Grecian than in medieval art. There is no doubt greater variety in medieval art, but there is no greater propriety. Each style is true to itself, and all that is most majestic in either is common to both. It was against the abuse and not the use of Classical Architecture that Pugin chiefly fulminated in his "Contrasts," "true principles" and "Apology."

I would then gladly hail a declaration of peace in our architectural camp. I would have the followers of the two armies in no wise neglect the banners under which they may have achieved past victories, but I would recognise them rather as walking hand in hand as in a joint triumph, and labouring to one common end of union and glorification of all the Fine Arts as perfected, and as made to harmonise with the highest civilisation and the most excellent forms of life. I sincerely believe that we may trust much to the efforts of individual genius provided that we endeavour to give it a large and secure basis from which to start. If that basis consists only in a general affection of the people of our country for the arts themselves we may safely trust to the artists whom that love is sure to engender for a fair and satisfactory progress. If we unite the objective practice of Pugin and the medievalists to the excellent subjective system transmitted to us from the classical ages, I believe we shall have no reason to fear in our practice the attainment of results commensurate with theirs, and yet reflecting simply and justly the condition and historical situation of our nationality and advanced scientific culture.

## LECTURE IV.

### ARCHITECTURE.

---

#### *PRACTICE.*

IF, in dealing with the subject of this discourse, the Practice of Architecture, I may seem to be somewhat too professional, I am to be excused on two heads; firstly, because architecture being the art which it is at once my business and pleasure to practise, I may naturally be led to look at it primarily as a Practitioner; and secondly, because it is to be remembered that the objects of professionals and laymen in all the arts are strictly identical in the scope, if not in the means, by which the end is to be attained. The one desires to create good architecture, and the other to obtain and enjoy it. Both, in due cooperation, effect the elaboration of excellence in art, although the degree in which each may contribute to the end may vary considerably in manner and quantity.

The object then of the Practice of Architecture being recognised to be the creation of good architecture, we have to see what is to be laid down as indispensable to carrying out that end.

Here, on the very threshold, we are met with a great and serious embarrassment, arising from the variety and number of the various styles from which a selection will have to be

made, unless we should desire to tread on the very dangerous and almost untenable ground of entire innovation.

I believe that the solution of this difficulty is to be found in a right appreciation and apprehension of what styles really are, and what they are not. Styles alone do not constitute architecture, as taken separately; although, as taken collectively, they may do so. As taken separately, they are but varieties of types into which from accidental circumstances traditions have gradually moulded themselves. Sometimes their peculiar characteristics are due to climatic influences, at others to ethnographic; sometimes they vary with conditions of conquest, invasion, or even temporary communication through the interests of trade and commerce. The best analogy by which we may apprehend their position and influence is I think to be derived from that which they present with the conditions of language. They are in fact but modes of speech in which either different or the same ideas may be expressed. As a bank note printed in one language may differ from others for the same amount printed in fifty different languages, each will present a different object to the vision; and yet represent an equivalent sum only, in anything that may be regarded as a common standard by mankind.

What we have to ensure is, firstly that our language in architecture shall stand for what is good, and secondly, that in whatever language or types of forms it may be expressed, that language and those types of form shall be correctly cast and consistent in all their parts. Errors and vulgarities, and even commonplaces, are alike prejudicial in language and in architecture. Some men may have the gift of language, and express themselves almost equally well in many languages. So some men may have an aptitude for versatility in architecture, and be enabled to convey excellent ideas in many various forms: but to those to whom this gift of language may be denied prudence dictates that they should concentrate their attention upon the one form of speech in which it

may be most easy for them to express themselves, and to use that only as their vernacular.

So, in architecture, circumstances as well as natural aptitude may lead men to acquaint themselves deeply only with one branch of the study. They will be wise if they practise that only, and exhibit as little inclination to attempt to use forms and fashions in architecture which they may not perfectly apprehend, as they would to speak in public in a language with the elements of which they were but partially familiar. Prudence will again lead a man to study most deeply the language which is most readily understood by those by whom he may be surrounded; and so in architecture. That man will be wisest, for his generation at least, who gives his greatest attention to that most in demand with, and most easily understood by, those who may be most likely to employ him to create.

In the long run it has been found in literature, not that that which is most elegantly expressed, but that that which is best worth elegant expression is most enduring; and so in architecture. That form of building which best supplies the combined artistic and utilitarian necessities of man will hold its place in general veneration, while much which may be beautiful in parts, but deficient in the coherent strength which the union of beauty with utility gives, will pass by as a fashion; and retain but little hold upon the memories or affections of mankind.

There are two other aspects under which it may be well to examine the analogy of language and architecture, viz. the fact that as the classics of any country must always be the guides its best authors must follow, and the models upon which they will most readily frame their literary styles, so must the great monuments of architectural art, spread upon the soil of any land, be the dominating influence which will fix, as far as it can be fixed, the style of the most popular architecture of any country.

The second analogy consists in the fact that let man make what efforts he will to preserve from change the language of his country, as new ideas, new wants and new thoughts constantly spring into being that language will of itself change almost imperceptibly. So, let the architect endeavour to bid his "sun stand still" at any point of its career, the inevitable laws of nature will but rebuke his presumption, and change will affect his architecture, no less than it will the language of his country.

I sincerely believe then that there will be much wisdom, as a general rule, in adhering to that which is most readily within our grasp; but it would be foolish to refrain from incorporating into our national architecture features derived from the monuments of classical lands, or more picturesque regions than our own. It would be equally foolish to refuse to enrich our literature with models of style, based upon the great authors of antiquity, or upon the great leading minds of the more recent writers on the continent of Europe. All that has to be taken care of in this process, which is one, to some extent, of eclecticism, is to see that, before use, the novel feature is translated accurately into the vernacular. Hence, and in this way, we may adopt and enrich ourselves with the essence, while we avoid the impertinence, of foreign innovation.

In spite of the assistance we may hope to derive from a just estimate of this, which I hold to be a true and useful analogy, there can be no doubt that in his adoption of any style, during the processes of conversion of new ideas, received from without, into ordinary ones accepted within; in the blending, in fact, the exoteric with the esoteric, a considerable residuum of embarrassment will be left for the architect. He has many snares and pitfalls constantly to avoid. He has alike to venerate, and yet have no slavish respect for antiquity; he should learn from a rival, but not feebly copy his contemporaries; he should study to gratify the public, but not at



the expense of what he may hold to be his duty to his art; he should be true to it, but not unmindful of the necessity of ministering to what he may even fancy to be a fleeting delight on the part of the public. Often his ideas may rise far above the practicabilities of execution, and he may be quite unable to move to any useful purpose with the wings of his imagination so clipped. On the other hand he may fail to rise to any lofty or sudden occasion; his theories may be excellent, his ability to practise deficient. Happily, however, if he brings ordinary average industry to bear upon his art, with due regard to its importance and true constitution, he may enrich the common stock of intelligence with by no means unsatisfactory models; and, in whatever style he may work, as in whatever language he may speak, he will find that in style and in language, the one element which is most universally appreciated, and which is most effective in the national results to which a veneration for it leads, is that of common sense.

Fortunately also for architects, and for the progress of their art, their works stand peculiarly patent and conspicuous, and are constantly liable to be arraigned at the bar of public opinion, which too often expresses itself with greater energy than discretion.

One of the great objects with which I believe the founder of this Chair endowed it was that, as far as possible, it might exercise a beneficial influence upon the formation and action of public opinion. To the effect of public opinion in and upon your generation for good or for ill you, gentlemen, must hereafter in your intercourse with the world contribute. I can therefore with propriety appeal to you upon the necessity of your acquainting yourselves with the various points upon which architectural criticism may be most justly and readily exercised. It will be the architect's duty to hold himself amenable to such criticism; and it will be your duty to express it if any architect should offend upon the following points:

Firstly, through an exhibition of a want of reason and

prudence in his practice. If he should frame or you should find a building destined for a specific purpose, but not answering that purpose, you may at once say that he has not done his duty.

If, secondly, you find him spending money upon what is productive of neither useful nor beautiful results, he will be, and you may hold him, guilty of waste.

If, on the other hand, thirdly, he allows what should be noble to be mean, and his work to be as it were "out at elbows," he will be shewn to have yielded to a parsimony by which he should not have permitted himself to have been bound.

A fourth fault which you will readily detect, should he commit it, will be if you find him blind to or neglectful of the special advantages which may have existed for the creation of an excellent work on any particular occasion. If, for instance, you should find him avoiding a good material close at hand, and taking to another at a distance, of inferior capabilities, he will have committed a grave error.

If, fifthly, you find him choosing a style the dominant expression of which, and the associations connected with which, are repugnant to the class of structure to which he has applied it, find him guilty again.

You will most justly measure him, as he will most justly measure himself, firstly by comparison with his contemporaries, and secondly with the great masters who have preceded him in his art; and if you should find him falling far behind either, you may inflict upon him your sixth phase of condemnation.

Another and seventh measure of his incapacity may be recognised by his introduction of incompatibilities. If one part of his building should be on one scale of dimension and another on one quite different from it, if one part should be in one style and another in another, if one part should be lavish and another mean, he is to be held guilty of incongruity, one of his most easily besetting sins.

There is yet another and an eighth quality which is

perhaps the most hopeless of all an architect can display, and by which his want of ability may be recognised. It is the quality of baldness: when, after a great effort, the result is eminently commonplace, I can only recommend that the architect be permanently reduced to the ranks of his profession.

We have been told that, in railway management, safety may be found by the execution of a director; and so it is possible that architectural safety may be found in the capital punishment of some offending architect. But, gentlemen, I would only beg you to give the culprit a fair trial, to take care that you form an intelligent and disinterested jury, and last, but not least, that you do not hang the architect when it is his employer who really ought to be made an example of.

While on the one hand it is the duty of the architect to make up his mind to bear the consequences of rightful judgment, and of an educated public to administer it in the form of correction and punishment, it is equally the duty of the latter to recognise excellence wherever it exists, and to do so as dispassionately, but with far more zeal than may be brought to bear upon the detection of offence. You may rely upon it that more is to be done by rewards than by punishment; and there is no stimulant which can be applied to the mind of an artist of a more potential character than just and well merited praise. If the public of a country would only learn to give laurels freely and justly, there is no fear but that there would be plenty of aspirants for them. Nothing disheartens a true artist more than to see them withheld when deserved, or given to the undeserving.

Another practice most disheartening to the architect, and one which is common enough with half educated judges, is to base a judgment as to the merits of an artist (and an architect perhaps in particular) by comparing him and his works with others who, in the past, under favourable circumstances, in which he never has been or could be placed, have produced more excellent works than his. To be continually using

the names of the great masters of antiquity, and declaring that all men are feeble because they do not produce the same results that those great masters produced, is unjust in the highest degree, and exercises as ineffectual an agency as can be conceived for the introduction of general improvement. There may be errors in cotemporary art, but it is not to be elevated by vague parallels between things which really do not admit of just comparison.

"Art," as has been well remarked, "has never been reformed, after a lapse from high eminence, by mere imitation of examples, however excellent, nor by only following rules for the correction of error. It is here, as in morals, that example succeeds where precept would fail. Some mind of uncommon firmness and good sense is required, who, beginning with nature, brings to the work of reformation original powers and severe judgment, fancy and feeling, with correct and cultivated taste; one, in short, of those rare minds whose merits, great in themselves, become incomparably greater viewed with the times in which they commenced their career; and whose exertions, wonderful in their own accomplishments, are yet more admirable from the progress which thereby others have been able to effect<sup>1</sup>."

. If such be the influence (as I believe it to be) of genius, it is surely the duty, primarily of professional men, and secondarily of cultivated public opinion, to recognise such minds when, from time to time, they present themselves; and to aid, as far as may be, with no littleness of envy or jealousy, the onward footsteps of those whose heaven-born gifts may fit them to lead rather than to follow.

Nothing in history is more unsatisfactory and detrimental to real progress than to recognise in the lives of great men the miserable jealousies and misapprehensions which have retarded them in their career, and militated against the good

<sup>1</sup> Dr Memes, in *Constable's Miscellany*.

which, but for those drawbacks and that unreasonable friction, they might have effected.

Happily architecture, as an art, is not so liable to unreasonable criticism as other branches of the Fine Arts. Its very firm alliance with utility, as well as with beauty, gives it a practical character which allows of the ready application of reason as an element in testing success or the reverse.

The great danger in the exercise of this reason, with respect to architecture, consists in regarding the constituent elements which make up the art as separate parts rather than as one whole. There has been a doctrine spread amongst us of late years which, based upon correct analysis, has yet, I believe, led to many injurious results in the practice of architecture. Writers have so separated the elements of utility and beauty from one another in treating of architecture as to conceive the propriety of constructing by the light of utility independently of that of beauty, and of ornamenting by the light of beauty independently of the light of utility.

We have been told constantly and emphatically that we should first construct, and then ornament construction. I hold that doctrine to be most pernicious. The idea of beauty should be present to the architect in the very first conception of his design, as the sense of utility should guide and restrain him in the last touch of the brush he may apply to his building.

The great object for which an architect should prepare himself by study, and by practice as a professional man, is to realise as far as may be possible every condition of the structure he may design at the earliest possible date after his first conception of the plan. His work in all its parts must be concurrent to be excellent; and the vision in his mind which by drawing or by description he may endeavour so to define as to make capable of execution by any workman, must be a concrete and complete image of a finished thing, and not a series of steps towards its realisation. It is in fact not by

conceiving a skeleton, and then clothing it, that the artist is to proceed; but by conceiving a perfect man, and then reasoning out his anatomical construction and functions.

The completeness of the image presented by his first conception is no bad measure of the imaginative capability of any architect, and it is the gift of that capability of seeing the invisible in a tangible and definite form—, one which while being both sublime and beautiful shall be so practical as to admit of realisation—, which really constitutes the highest measure of architectural genius.

Genius in practice is but of little value as creative genius, if it be not accompanied by that physical energy, strength and perseverance which convert the fantasy of the imagination into the practical reality of the mind. Thus men who possess this rare combination of power to imagine and power to realise have never in history failed to exhibit those persistent efforts to acquire knowledge by which alone they are enabled to command utilitarian resources and make possible what weaker minds might consider to be impracticable. They in fact exhibit the true mastery of mind over matter, they are the “makers” of the Greeks, and best exercise that very power of directing the artistic labours of others to a successful issue which the Vitruvian definition gives us as the leading function of the architect.

The genius of the architect, in his practice, unlike that of the sculptor and the painter, which may be manifested in their highest forms almost single handed, and within the four walls of the studio, deals with sterner materials; and has to wield not only the intractabilities of matter, but the even greater intractabilities of men’s adverse wills, and to move the apathy, and frequently the ignorance, of ill constituted public opinion.

There is no shutting our eyes to the fact that we live in a state of great and almost unnatural excitement. The activity of the human intellect of the present generation

scarcely admits of those intervals of repose which are necessary for the patient evolution of strictly philosophical systems of criticism. We live, and to-day admire what to-morrow we forget; and so the identity of the thoughts of many noble thinkers becomes lost, even though the effect of their words may remain. It is the architect's privilege to lose no such identity. His works are so large, so tangible and so lasting, that his influence for good or for ill upon taste may be regarded in the measure of its extent as all but permanent. Within the lapse of many centuries his work stands for good or for bad, and upon the proportion of good works of architecture to bad will stand recorded for future generations not only the condition of the practice of the art at any period, but the concurrent existence of a learned or ignorant public judgment.

It behoves you then, gentlemen, as representing one of the greatest and best educational bodies of the country, to take care so to inform your private judgments, as by aggregation to constitute a body representing intelligent public opinion. As occasion may offer itself you will be called upon and bound, not in architecture only, but in all the arts, to exercise and exhibit a right judgment. To you, and to men like you, the architect and artist will have to look for his redress against injustice and unfair depreciation. It will be your duty to strengthen him when he is weak, to call in question his practice if you see it leading to unsatisfactory results, and to confirm him by your support in that practice in every particular in which you may conceive it likely to tend to the perfection of his art, and to the benefit of his country.

We may now do well I think to illustrate the practice of architecture, by what I believe to be both usual and best in the education of the student.

We have hitherto regarded architectural art as a tangible one, but before it can assume the shape of tangibility, it

must go through a process which assimilates it to graphic art.

The architect can do little or nothing until he has educated his hand to the operation of defining form with strict accuracy. Before he can so delineate it he must make himself acquainted with its nature and varieties.

Geometry is one of the first sciences with which he must make himself familiar, and with that conventional mode of delineation which records the abstract and actual conditions of geometrical forms he must unite such a study of light and shade and colour as shall enable him to draw those forms in various aspects, and as they present themselves to the eye, as well as in subjection to those methods of projection by which their actual dimensions and mathematical laws may be projected upon a plane.

His first studies then are given to the art of conventionally representing, to scale, the simplest architectural forms. He acquires some practice in copying the drawings of others, and he then learns to portray architecturally—that is, to scale—in all its parts, some existing structure. This he is of course only enabled to do by measuring all the parts of the structure, and then laying them down by scale of feet and inches, in accordance with those measurements.

Before all the facts connected with the structure selected for representation can be recorded, this “laying down” must consist of Plan, Elevation and Section.

A ground Plan, I need scarcely explain to you, is a horizontal section, taken at any given level, parallel to a tangent to the earth’s surface, at the point upon which the centre of the structure may stand.

A vertical Section is equivalent to an upright plan, or to a representation of what would be exhibited if the structure was cut down and laid open in a line at right angles to the tangent which forms the plane parallel to which the ground plan may be taken as running.



An Elevation is a view of what would be seen by the spectator's eye, if that eye could be moved close to every portion of the structure on any one side of it.

It will of course be obvious that this mode of representation differs from a perspective view of the same face of the building altogether; and in this wise:—To constitute an architectural elevation of a reasonable size, we may consider that horizontal rays may be drawn from every point upon the face of a building until they are intersected by a plane interposed at right angles to those rays. If it were possible to mark upon that plane the points at which those several rays met the plane, we should have upon that plane a picture of the face of the building corresponding with it in actual dimensions. If by the application of a scale we can reduce this picture to one tenth, one twentieth, or one fortieth, or any other proportion which may suit the size of the paper on which we design to project the image of the elevation, we obtain a representation corresponding in reduced dimensions with that which really exists in nature, and forms the face of the building. Of course plans and sections may be taken upon other planes than those above referred to.

While alluding to the use of scale as a method of expressing the relative dimensions of parts at large, in small, in architectural drawing, it may be well to dwell upon the diversity of the scales used by ancient and modern architects.

The ordinary scale, and that which the workman best understands, is naturally a scale based upon the current lineal dimensions of the country.

Of such, no doubt the metrical system of the French is the most perfect, but long habit has now in this country made the duodecimal system so easy to the artisan and architect that, although the substitution for it of the metrical system might be more amenable to correct theory, I am in some doubt whether it would lead to many advantages in practice.

Occasionally architectural drawings are made in which the relation of the parts is only sketched with rough proportional accuracy, and precision is given by means of figuring only. It is well for the architect, as an exercise, to acquire the habit of sketching with a due regard to scale and proportion, although without actual measuring off from a scale of feet or inches, the precise dimension of every part of his work. But he will expose himself to needless risk of disappointment when his work shall be executed if he does not cause his own rough sketches in good proportion to be tested by a positive projection, by means of which each part is seen upon paper in the relative position it must occupy in the finished work, to all other forms with which it is brought into contact.

The second kind of scale is one which comes to us from remote antiquity. After a rude fashion it was adopted by the Egyptians, and after a more perfect one by the Greeks. In its utmost minuteness it formed the accepted guide in common use among the architects of the Italian Renaissance. Its use by the mediæval architects has been a matter of much debate.

As in sculpture we shall have occasion to trace the early existence and development of the canons of proportion, whereby due regularity in the bulk of every part of the human figure was regulated at successive periods in the history of art, so in architecture we find that a certain member was invariably fixed upon as the unit of multiplication, and by its subdivision minute dimensions were regulated, as by its multiplication were all larger ones.

The Egyptian system of scale appears to have differed in this respect from that of the Greeks, that while the system of the latter was based upon the use of the lower diameter of the shaft of the column as the unit of multiplication and division of dimensions and parts, the Egyptian system approximated more closely to that system which

painters usually adopt to enlarge or diminish their drawings; viz. covering a given space with lines forming squares, like those of a chessboard, and then allotting to each of these various squares a specific portion of the subject to be represented.

This system is admirably illustrated by incomplete works left upon the walls of various tombs at Thebes, but in none so well as in that discovered by Belzoni, and named after him. On the walls of that tomb may be seen the setting out, or squaring, for the representation of colossal figures; and from the regularity with which leading parts of the figures correspond with the precise intersections of these squares, it is obvious that an arbitrary system existed whereby a certain number in height or breadth of the squares was allotted to definite representations of the human form. An erect figure was divided into 19 squares in height, and a sitting figure into 15. The length of the foot corresponded with three squares, and the cubit also corresponded with three squares; the foot and the cubit, the latter especially, having always been regarded as a modulus of length, from the most remote antiquity, as indicated to us by numerous allusions to that denomination of measurement in the Bible.

There can be no manner of doubt that the Greeks adopted a similar system for their sculpture, and for their architecture as well; and they carried out a system of subservience to dogmatic proportioning by means of their scales to a refinement of which we can scarcely have a conception.

The eye alone of the spectator cannot fail, in examining any fragment of Grecian architecture, to be sensible of the beneficial influence of the exquisite delicacy with which every portion of surface of any structure was adjusted, so as to occupy an area in just relation to the surface of the whole.

When the minutest measurements are taken of the leading divisions of any such structure, the eye's impres-

sion that some settled law of arithmetical or geometrical proportion governed the setting out of the various parts is absolutely confirmed; and to realise the extent to which this was carried, I have only to refer you to Mr Watkiss Lloyd's essays on the subject, and to Mr Penrose's account of the means by which he detected the almost microscopic devotion to these laws in the operations which he conducted at Athens about five and twenty years ago for the Dilettanti Society, and afterwards published for that body.

It is a curious circumstance, as illustrating the practice of architecture by the Athenians at the best periods of their art, that while we find that a system of allotment of dimension to architectural parts by scale in each building is coherent and consistent, it was in no wise empirical; since another structure erected at much the same time and in the same style will equally have its parts coherent and consistent amongst themselves, and yet diverse in certain respects from the cotemporary monument.

With the Romans, and still more with the Italians, in the revival of Roman architecture, the system of allotment of parts by scale, based upon the subdivisions of the lower diameter of the column, or what is known as the subdivision of the module, became no longer elastic, as it had been with the Greeks, but dogmatic.

The most accomplished architects fought, during the sixteenth century, over what may be called the true theory of modulation applicable to each of the five orders, but all their efforts tended to the establishment of each man's canon as the infallible and inflexible canon of universal application.

What was originally then intended as an assistance to the architect became only a prison and strait waistcoat for him. Such scales of proportion, however carefully devised, produced monotony and consequent feebleness in architecture; and only tempted the enthusiastic, who broke away

from too strict confinement, to launch out into excesses, by which any excellences the system may have possessed were utterly thrown to the winds and lost sight of.

To this tendency to rebel against constituted authority much of the extravagance which in Italian architecture became introduced successively through Michael Angelo, Bernini, Borromini and others may be considered as due.

At the same time, what may be injurious as an inflexible rule of practice may constitute an excellent system of training for the student, and in spite of all the complaints which have been made as to the time wasted by architectural students in what is called "drawing out the Five Orders," I believe that the precise system of learning how to proportion one part of a structure to another which may be gained by such practice is a most valuable exercise, and one tending to assist the ultimate practice of the architect in a very great degree. Rightly followed out, this course of study compels the architect to learn how to make drawings to scale, with plans of every portion and detail of complicated architectural forms, with minuteness and geometrical accuracy, so as to be able to convey to others the knowledge of the way in which from regular cubes any portion of what he may draw may be evolved. He thus familiarises himself with the tangible basis of the geometry of solids, upon which all masonry must depend.

Such drawings as these are indispensable to the architect; forming the means by which he obtains a knowledge of his structure without seeing it, and by which alone he is able to convey to another the precise nature of any building he may be desirous of causing to be erected.

If he confines his practice to making or studying such drawings only, he may obtain a thorough knowledge of what buildings are, but not of how buildings look. To do that he must study the modes of projection of existing things in perspective.

Having explained what a projection in elevation means, I will now proceed to describe what a perspective projection means, and you will at once perceive the difference between the two.

If, for the parallel rays which I described as intersected by a plane at right angles to them in the construction of an elevation, you substitute rays drawn from all the angles or other features of a building to the eye of the spectator,—placed at any distance from which the whole of what may have to be represented is visible at the same moment and in one position,—and suppose those rays to be intersected by a plane at right angles to the central one of all those rays, there would occur upon the surface of that plane a variety of points corresponding with every point in nature from which a ray had been taken to the spectator's eye. If you can imagine a means of taking a record of the relative situation of these points upon that plane you will have imagined and foreseen the possibility of obtaining an accurate transcript of the appearance of the structure sought to be delineated.

This, whether applied to buildings or to any scene in nature, constitutes a real and legitimate picture, corresponding with the image drawn in the act of vision upon the retina of the spectator's eye. The difficulty consists in connecting this image with an image based upon the actual measurements of the structure, and the projection upon a plane of its aspect as revealed by those dimensions.

It is this operation which constitutes what is called the art of Perspective, with the details of which the artist imperatively requires to make himself acquainted. By it he is enabled to test what will be the appearance to the eye of that which he may imagine as fitting and reasonable in reality; and of which he may, by the methods of drawing to scale and projecting on a plane, in plan, section and elevation, obtain a record of in all particulars, excepting that of its material aspect. His perspective views will be for his own

instruction and guidance and for his client's information ; his drawings to scale for the information and guidance of those by whom his conceptions have to be realised.

Such is the amount of graphic skill without which the architect cannot be supposed to satisfactorily practise ; but there is a far larger amount of graphic power and experience demanded from him before he can in any wise expect to be able to really cope with the difficulties of his art.

He must for instance acquaint himself most thoroughly with the laws of the projection of shadows, and all the varying conditions of illumination under which his building or any parts or portions of it are ever likely to be seen. He will have to learn all the various laws of *chiaroscuro* ; and to appreciate the extent to which, by a dexterous management of them, he may be enabled to concentrate the spectator's attention upon one part of his work, and to cause another to sink into a secondary or altogether subordinate position.

He must learn not only how to focus light but how to heighten it by judicious contrast with strongly concentrated shadow. He will have to learn how, by management of reflection from highly illuminated surfaces thrown upon parts in shade, to produce those delicate half tints upon receding mouldings which constitute a soft and gentle method of uniting the deepest black of any shadow he may desire to contrast with the most highly illuminated surface from which the shadow may be projected.

If he would go yet further in his art, he must learn the value of shadow projected upon varying local colour : he must make himself acquainted with the artistic value of the advancing or receding qualities of all colours, both in full light and in every degree of shadow ; so that when he is called upon to use materials of varying tint he may know how to reconcile inconsistencies and maintain an equal balance between architectural parts which, without a wise distribution, would inevitably cause an appearance of instability.

As he advances in graphic power he will naturally take care to advance in knowledge of the history and theory of his art.

It is at this stage that he will probably become most sensible of the necessity of knowing how rightly to incorporate Sculpture and Painting in his structure, and to take advantage of the various effects resulting from the decorative application of the technical processes of industry. He will find that the resources of his art can only be developed and displayed through his perfect acquaintance with the processes of those arts. It is not enough to know the nature of the materials he uses, but he must know by what steps those materials can be converted and made to assume the most beautiful aspects.

At the same time he must take great care that such studies do not seduce him altogether, or indeed at all, from his allegiance to that which constitutes the structural basis of his art. Too often, delighting in the facility with which, in the fulness of his knowledge of technical arts, he can introduce them at will,—and not of technical arts only, but the sister arts of Painting and Sculpture as well,—an architect will, not infrequently, allow excellent specimens of those concomitants with architecture to do duty for good architecture itself.

It has been well remarked by M. Viollet le Duc in his 15th *Entretien sur l'Architecture*—speaking of the Roman architect in the most luxurious ages of Roman architecture—"He occupies himself above all in employing, as far as he can, every resource of decorative art simultaneously. Precious stones, granites, jaspers, porphyry, marbles, painted stucco, bronzes, mosaics, everything is used at once, with more display than discernment. For him, to charm is to overwhelm with surprise, and he is only moderately sensible to the refinements of Greek genius. He cares little whether his decoration harmonises with the



nature of the material in which it is executed; whether his decoration belongs to, and is based upon structure only, or whether it is in a high degree imitative; or whether while affecting to be structural it is still imitative. All imitation is good for him, provided it is rich."

Such an architect in spite of all training will lose sight of the due subordination of non-essentials, in order to develop essentials in his structure. He will lose sight of the necessity of enforcing the functional characteristics of each part of his structure. Little columns will be left to carry enormously heavy arches, or great columns of Cyclopean dimensions will be allowed to support little or nothing.

The *raison d'être*, as the French term it, of such an architect's design will be entirely obscured in a cloud of trivialities; and the spectator who leaves his structure will only remember of it as he goes away that he may have indistinctly seen some good painting or some good sculpture, but he will never remember that he has seen a beautiful building.

This advance in knowledge should be accompanied by an advance in artistic power, and the architect should be able to pourtray, in such a form as may be readily understood both by his employer and by the workmen he may have to engage to realise his conceptions, the most complex work within the range of his art, as practised in the best ages of its perfection. By such studies he may be supposed to have become acquainted with his art as an abstract thing; but it is at this stage that its really most important duties and functions will present themselves to his reason. He will find that architecture may be divided into civil, military (entirely neglected at the present date), and ecclesiastical. He will require to make himself acquainted with all the current wants of structure of the age in which he may live, and the wisest, most beautiful and most economic means by which those wants have been supplied. He will have to remember, for use, all the excellences, and to remember, for avoidance,

all the defects of usual practice; and if he would step one inch before his fellows, he will have to observe in what respect the best models are still defective, and to learn to supply or remedy the deficiencies or errors which his predecessors may have committed, in the event of his ever being called upon for the design of a structure fulfilling the same ends.

At this stage the necessity of foreign travel will be felt to be almost imperative. It is not enough to know works of art by engravings, drawings, or even by photographs. They must be seen to have their value fully apprehended, and not seen only, but drawn from, and patiently observed during long hours of critical comparison and examination.

With the choicest of the forms, aspects and proportions of such structures the mind must be stored, and if the student should aspire to practise in any more than one prevalent style; or in any degree to move with the progress of the age towards an eclectic development; he must make himself accurately acquainted with many of the architectural details of most importance in every style in which he may desire to practise, or from which he may consider it well to derive the materials for recombination in an attempt at originality.

This sketch may represent to a considerable extent the leading features of an architect's study of his art as a Fine Art.

But how much is left behind, if he would aspire to combine with his practice of it a really scientific comprehension of many of its highest functions! The geology and chemistry of the materials used; the statical and mechanical systems of wielding and distributing the materials he employs; the laws of optics, acoustics, and sanitary science, in their broad features at least, should be comprehended by the architect; while, if he would rightly appreciate the conditions under which the great monuments of his country should be preserved and restored, or even imitated, he must

make himself acquainted with an infinite quantity of details of historical and archæological information.

If his practice is to lie mainly in large cities he will have to learn the nature of the laws which restrain one neighbour from injuriously affecting another, and all the conditions of municipal regulation. If his practice, on the other hand, is to be mainly devoted to dealing with ecclesiastical structures, he will have to learn their nature and import, liturgical, constructional and æsthetic, at every period of his country's history.

Such, gentlemen, is but a faint picture of what, now-a-days, it behoves the architect to acquire at least the rudiments of in the course of his professional education. But it should ever be remembered by the architect that his education is never complete. He is not to be supposed to go through a course, and then to take a degree, and be qualified for practice without the necessity of further study. The lessons which implant themselves most firmly of all upon his memory will be those which he derives from experience. When, from drawings and books, he comes to the actual superintendence of work, he will begin to take the keenest delight in the mechanical operations by which his conceptions are realised. As he sees rude unformed masses of stone gradually converted into the beautiful images of his creation; as he sees masses of material reared aloft and balanced against one another, so as to cover vast voids, solely in obedience to mechanical laws of equilibrium; he will come to enjoy the realisation of the practical problems of mechanics and statics; and his nature will become so incorporated with the structures he creates, as to allow them to become a part almost of his moral being. They will, in the measure in which that incorporation is perfected, reflect the true tendency of whatever may be most original and valuable in his genius.

It cannot of course be expected that laymen in art,

and particularly the students at this University, whose time is mainly occupied with other studies, of even greater importance to their future position in life, should attempt to follow anything like a similar curriculum. But the knowledge, that such a curriculum exists, of its extent, and of the difficulties which must naturally attend a student in passing through it, may make them indulgent to his defects, and increase their appreciation of his merits, should they in after life have occasion to come in contact practically with members of my profession.

A portion at least of what the architectural student learns may be learnt by any man; and before men take upon themselves to criticise, if they would do so rightly and honestly, it is necessary that they should possess a share at least of the knowledge which it is incumbent upon the architect to possess. Nothing is more common than to say, "I know nothing about it, but I know what I like;" and then the ignorant judge pours forth a string of inconsistencies which are really unworthy of the native of a country in which education is generally carried to a high pitch.

I am bound to confess that upon the subject of architecture I once even heard Lord Palmerston talk an amount of nonsense of which, if he had probably thought seriously for a few minutes, he could only have felt himself ashamed. When great men set such an example, little ones are too apt to follow and exaggerate it.

If the institution of Slade Professorships should in any wise tend to diminish the number of such rash critics, it will have done much for the profession of art; and I can only trust that such a result may to some extent at least attend the exertions of my colleagues and myself.

Before concluding this discourse I would desire to allude to the fact that an architect's responsibility is shared by others than himself. There can be no architectural practice

without there being two parties to that practice. There must be an employer and an architect, in other words, there must be a demand and a supply. To produce a perfect result from their combined labours, for labour they both must, it is necessary that each party should rightly apprehend and fulfil the duties specially devolving upon him.

I will venture to trace what appear to me the most salient points of obligation for the fulfilment of the contract into which they may be virtually said to enter when they combine for the production of a definite result.

It behoves an employer not to rush into building rashly. He must first feel a real and definite want, and he must work out for himself the problem of what it is that he may with greatest propriety want. It would be obviously as ridiculous for a country clergyman, in need of a modest parsonage house only, to want a princely palace; as for a nobleman of the highest social position and unbounded resources to propose to content himself with so humble a structure for his own accommodation, and for the support, in a fitting manner before the world, of an hereditary dignity.

Having clearly realised what it is that in the way of structure will best suit his needs and accord with his practical or æsthetic necessities, he must endeavour, by comparison with what may have been done by others, to ascertain approximately the probable cost of something like what he will require; and he will then be wise if he sets himself to provide the requisite funds, leaving a fair margin for contingencies, of which he can form little or no estimate.

It is at this stage that he will do well to select his architect; and here I would point out to him that he must look, if he would have his work satisfactorily done, almost as much for moral as for artistic qualifications. He should not call to his counsels a man of whom he cannot make a friend. He should, with openness, explain to the architect

he may select his own views and necessities, but he should by no means be so far wedded to them as to be unwilling to receive, should it be necessary, a clear demonstration of any points of error of judgment into which he may have fallen with respect to them. On essentials, provided that they commend themselves to his reason as essentials, he should be entirely unyielding to his architect; within whose power it should be left to amplify or give an improved form to the supply of those necessities; but by whom the employer should never allow himself to be "talked out of" the omission of what he may himself consider to be indispensable to carry out the object for which he desires to call the structure into existence.

It is this very reasonable firmness on the part of employers which forms the most valuable check against the possible domineering of an empiric. The possession of professional knowledge is always a snare to humanity, and a temptation to dictate too arbitrarily.

The architect himself is frequently under the domination of the traditions of his craft, and to give him a wise and clear programme, in accordance with which he must frame his ideas of design, is often to inspire him with the best elements for legitimate novelty, and wise innovation upon effete precedent.

There is yet one other duty strictly incumbent upon the employer. It is, not to set his judgment against that of the professional man he may employ upon a matter of the laws regulating which he is really ignorant. He will get best work out of his architect who leaves the architect most free, subject to a few rigid and wise conditions.

The employer will have also in matters connected with outlay to be honest and unreserved with his architect. It would be as foolish for him to hide from the architect his ability to spend a large sum as it would be to conceal from him his inability, should it exist, to spend a large amount.

In the one case he will miss the supply of much which would have improved his building, and made more delightful much of the supply of his wants; and in the other, he will involve himself in unnecessary and unwise embarrassment. If his architect tells him honestly and clearly that his ideas and wants cannot be satisfactorily supplied for the sum of money it may be within his power without difficulty to provide for the purposes of his structure, he will do well to either abandon doing what he had proposed to himself to do, or consent to a remodelling of his views altogether. To make a great scheme and then to cut it down is almost infallibly to spoil everything. If all the conditions of the employer's case are properly made known to the architect before he commences the design, and borne in mind by him sedulously in the formation of that design, in nine cases out of ten the first mode of working out the problem will be found to be the wisest. Doubts and hesitations and partial pulling about of an architectural idea almost invariably destroy its unity, symmetry and proportion.

Some of the duties of the architect under our imaginary contract between himself and his employer have been hinted at in the above definition of the duties of the latter; but sufficient prominence has not been given as yet to the obligation on the part of the architect to be rigidly true and honest, firstly, to his employer; secondly, to his art; thirdly, to himself; and fourthly, to those practising other arts whose services he may have to direct in the course of the realisation and embellishment of the structure he may design.

Honesty and truth to his employer lie at the basis of all their relations to one another. He must be neither lazy, nor over zealous; he must be neither over reticent, nor over communicative. His object should be in the first instance to identify himself as strictly as possible with the position of his employer, taking into consideration carefully the propriety or impropriety of his employer's wants and views.

If he should find them at issue one with the other, or inconsistent with what he believes to be his client's true position and interests, he will do well to state his views, modestly, to his employer, and to assist him in distinguishing between essentials and non-essentials in the programme laid down for action.

He will have to advise his employer as to site, style, materials, proper cost, &c. of all that may be proposed, holding, in the advice he may give upon these heads, a wise balance between the duties he may consider himself to owe to his employer, and those obligations laid upon him by the imperative propriety of in no wise contributing to realise structures which he may consider to be senseless, needless, or derogatory to the dignity of the art he practises.

His duty to his art lays upon him the obligation of lending himself to nothing mean. Of course for the creation of a structure obviously intended for temporary purposes it is in no wise necessary to insist upon the employment of durable materials or on an entirely enduring mode of structure, but there will be no excuse for his combining in the same structure materials calculated to endure for ages, and others which cannot but bring upon his building a premature old age. He will as much sin against the canons of good taste in his art as against a wise economy if he uses in the same structure and for similar functions too much or too little material. He must be no party to an economy for either reducing material below the standard of statical propriety, or shaving off or reducing features, projections, or architectural members which may be essential to the proper development of the style in which he may have to work.

In all such matters he should remember that he is not called upon to refuse to let his client have anything he may please to demand, since it is the client who finds the money, and who should have a potential voice in all he may conceive likely to affect his comfort or enjoyment, but the architect



is at liberty, and is bound to exercise the liberty, of retiring from the work if he should find himself called upon to do that which he may consider to be wrong in any wise to do. He should first remonstrate, and then refuse; or, what is perhaps better than the latter alternative, he should submit to his client such a modification of those views from which his client may dissent as may be likely to carry out the client's wishes without offending the architect's sense of propriety.

In his duty to himself the architect must be rigidly just both to his employer and to the builder or workpeople with whom he may have dealings. He must allow neither to impose upon one another; and he must stand as a righteous arbiter between the two. His duty to his client is in no wise to assist him to any harsh or unrighteous exercise of plenary power towards an honest and well-intentioned tradesman, but to reserve those powers for his client's protection in case of his having to deal with a dishonest tradesman. He will have to keep his conscience clean in the matter of his anxiety to protect his employer's interests, and he will also as an artist have to see that study and consideration are never withheld from those parts of any edifice which require study and consideration. It will be his duty to undertake no more work than he can himself originate, control, and see to the due execution of.

To other artists, such as sculptors, painters, carvers, engineers, glass or mosaic workers, &c., whose labours he may have to direct, he will have to shew a front of at once firmness and modesty. He must be absolute in the terms in which he dictates the leading conditions of the employment of their arts; he must clearly make up his mind where and how, and to what extent and in what degree of prominence or subordination, it will be well for the general artistic effect of the structure under his charge that those labours which he may control, but cannot himself originate or execute, may be exercised.

At the same time if he sets his judgment upon matters of detail against, or as superior to, the judgment of those who must have made themselves thoroughly acquainted with the principles and practice of their arts, he will be as unreasonable and unwise as his client would be if on a matter of purely architectural judgment he should endeavour to overreach and override the superior knowledge and experience of his architect.

In the relations of the architect and employer it is not by antagonism that progress is to be made. It is by strict harmony. Neither should think meanly of the other, and the more perfect the unison between the action of both, the more perfect will be the result. Both should above all things be patient and tolerant of one another's infirmities or shortcomings. We have yet to educate employers, as we require further to educate architects. Both should have that fair general knowledge of all the Fine Arts, which it is my privilege to endeavour to extend amongst you. Community of studies will produce a common understanding, and in the long run we may be sure that when the demand is created and educated, and the supply is elevated to the character of that educated demand, it is impossible for the arts of a country to do otherwise than honourably represent an honourable state of intelligent activity.

What a nation energetically and with due deliberation wills to have good, it will have good; and we have only, I believe, at this time, to will wisely and with due deliberation, for the arts of this our native land to reach a position which may be honourable in the eyes of our cotemporaries and of our descendants.

## LECTURE V.

### SCULPTURE.

---

#### *HISTORY.*

THE broadest definition which may be given of the art of Sculpture consists in describing it as a means whereby the emotion of pleasure can be conveyed to the intellect through man's fashioning of solid form into images at his will.

Those images, from the earliest ages, have assumed two forms, the one isolated, the other combined. In the isolated forms they have generally constituted tangible symbols, or embodiments of the idea, of ruling powers, both supernatural and natural. The god and the hero have been the earliest types. A still ruder form of sculpture may be found in the memorial stone, something between Architecture and Sculpture, according to the idea which may have presided over its elaboration and erection.

In the combined form the art of the sculptor is so intimately connected with that of the architect as to be all but inseparable. The influence exercised by this double character of sculpture has ruled even to the present time; and in looking back over the history of the art we shall find that sculpture first existed in its isolated shape. It was in that

shape almost superseded by combined sculpture under the Egyptians, Assyrians and early Greeks; but, by the last-named, isolated sculpture was gradually revived; and ultimately, in the later Greek periods and in most of those of the Roman dominion, isolated sculpture again rose to the ascendant. Through the dark ages, the prevalence of mediæval and early renaissance styles combined, predominated to the almost entire extinction of isolated sculpture. Under the later Italian masters, and down to our own days, this preponderance has been reversed.

I believe that that period is most likely to be most excellent in which isolated and combined sculpture are nearly equally balanced; because, while sculpture is fulfilling its noblest function in heightening architectural effect, a due study of that acme of perfection in detail which can only be bestowed upon single figures, or groups of one or two figures, tends to maintain the refinement of the art, and to duly qualify the sculptor for keeping up to the requisite pitch of excellence in architectonic or "combined" sculpture.

Philosophers have held that one of the best tests of the intellectual condition of any people is to be found in its conceptions, spiritual and physical, of divinity.

Where written testimony on that head fails, the testimony which is afforded by those remains of the art of sculpture in which deities are represented by tangible forms is frequently most valuable, as supplying otherwise hopeless lacunæ. No doubt men's minds have always been a little in advance of their arts; but, broadly speaking, while the primitive representation of the god assumed a terrible shape, the attributes of terror and fear superseded all considerations of beneficence on the part of the deity. Where the type, as in the early Egyptian monuments, was usually one of inflexible repose, the predominant conception of the deity was obviously one of latent but enduring power.

In those theogonies in which, as in the early Grecian, men

began to invest their deities with the highest moral and heroic qualities, the forms in which those images were embodied for man's admiration were cast in such wise, and moulded into such types, as most readily expressed those elevated distinguishing qualities.

As the conception of the Deity rose to its ultimate perfection, short of that derived through divine revelation, the artists, echoing the aspirations of the philosophers and poets, sought, in a "beau ideal" of sublimity and beauty, the loftiest embodiment of their ideas of divinity. To the maintenance of a high pitch of excellence in both alike the worship of a "beau ideal" is essential.

From the culmination of human intellect under the more perfect philosophic system of the Greeks to the present time, the minds of those men who have sought to carry the Fine Arts to their highest perfection have been almost uninterruptedly engaged in a search after the philosopher's stone of Art—, a source of perfect beauty.

Whether a universal menstruum may really exist by which this perfect beauty may be called into being at the artist's will, or not, there can be no question that the search after it has been productive of unqualified good, as constantly leading him, in his aspirations for purer types, from earth upwards.

No one, so far as I know, has ever more beautifully expressed the artist's and the poet's sense of what perfect beauty might be, and what its influence upon the matter which it is the artist's province to fashion may be, than Spenser in the following lines :

"What time this world's great Workmaster did cast  
To make all things such as we now behold,  
It seems that he before his eyes had plac'd  
A goodly pattern, to whose perfect mould  
He fashioned them, as comely as he could ;  
That now so fair and seemly they appear,  
As nought may be amended anywhere.

A wondrous pattern, wheresoe'er it be,  
 Whether in earth laid up in secret store,  
 Or else in heaven, that no man may it see  
 With sinful eyes, for fear it to defile  
 As perfect beauty, which all men adore.  
 Whose face and feature do so much excel  
 All mortal sense, that none the same may tell.

Thereof, as every earthly thing partakes  
 Or more or less by influence Divine,  
 So it more fair accordingly it makes,  
 And the gross matter of this earthly mine,  
 Which closeth it, thereafter doth refine,  
 Doing away the dross which dims the light  
 Of that fair beam, which therein is emight.

For through infusion of celestial power  
 The duller earth it quickeneth with delight,  
 And life-full spirits privily doth poure  
 Through all the parts, that to the looker's sight  
 They seem to please\*."

It is time however to enter regularly upon our present theme, the History of Sculpture.

What influence the sculptor's devotion to the mystic and unseen goddess of perfect beauty has exercised upon the theory of his art, it will be my duty to trace in my next discourse. My business at present lies with the history of the art, but I could scarcely enter upon that history without previously touching upon the predominant philosophic tendency which has really presided over its casting into material forms, during all the successive stages which the art of sculpture has passed through from the infancy of the art.

In speaking of the history of architecture I endeavoured to carry you regularly, but too rapidly, through the succession of the great dominant races of mankind; and having explained to you the intimate association, from almost the earliest dates, of sculpture with architecture, it will be obvious that it must be my duty now to pass over an almost corresponding course.

\* *An Hymn in honour of Beauty.*

In looking to the primitive idols of savage races, from the fetish of Africa to the rude black and misshapen images of the Blessed Virgin still worshipped in shrines, such as those of Montserrat and Loretto, one can but be struck with the corresponding types in which barbarism has persistently embodied superstition.

Another point, in regarding any such primitive monuments, whether of Chinese, Mexican, Polynesian or Scandinavian origin, is the extraordinary slowness with which these primitive images become modified in aspect. Even in countries in which we find the technical arts carried to a fair degree of advancement, as amongst some of the tribes of the North American Indians, and the South Sea Islanders, we yet find the idols long retaining the utmost barbarism of type. It would almost seem as though those uncultivated races felt that they could inadequately express divinity by simply imitating the forms of men, and that they sought refuge in the matter by adhering to the frightful types they had received from their forefathers. They no doubt considered that their only mode of expressing superhuman powers was by the casting of images into supernatural types. Hence came those unions of animal with human attributes—the lion-headed, and eagle-headed man, the winged genii, the many-headed and armed divinities of India and China, the many-breasted "Nature" of the Greeks.

The earliest mythologies which have been at all embodied systematically in sculpture have been full of such indications of power; and it was not until the Greeks, with their more philosophic views of art, as of the attributes of Divinity, conceived the idea of selecting the most perfect qualities from the most perfect human beings, and causing them to appear to coexist in the images of their divinities, that barbaric and incompletely philosophical types of representations of divinity began to be banished from the domains of Fine Art.

In one of my previous lectures I enlarged upon the extraordinarily interesting fact, that even at as early a date as 1700 years before Christ the architectural monuments of the Egyptians exhibited themselves technically in combination with Sculpture and Painting in an advanced stage of perfection.

That there was however an incompleteness in the ideas of beauty which those technical arts were employed to express is a patent fact, and no less so is the fact that a corresponding incompleteness in the expression of the highest attributes of humanity manifests itself in their earliest embodiments of the art of sculpture.

It is clear however that the two modes by which matter is shaped to represent forms either existing in nature or in the artist's imagination, namely, cutting solid, or modelling plastic substances, were alike well known to the ancient Egyptians at a very early period. Through what ages of uncouth civilisation, through what long passages from barbarism to comparative civilisation these arts had passed, and how and where, and under what circumstances, this long preparation, this stage of gestation, had been matured, it is not likely that anyone will now ever know.

Arguing by the analogy of all other countries with the changes of which from utter barbarism to comparative civilisation we have had opportunities of becoming acquainted, almost incalculable ages must have been requisite for the slowly maturing transformation.

Winckelman and all other writers on the subject have divided the history of Egyptian sculpture into three periods; the first, that purely Egyptian; the second, that in which the art of Egypt reflected some of the attributes of Grecian advance in the art; and the third, which may be considered almost entirely factitious, when Grecian and Roman artists imitated the works of primitive Egyptian style.

In the first of these eras the expression of power and endurance was sought to be given by colossal scale, and the



embodiment of the mysterious conceptions of the Egyptians with regard to their divinities in every material which appeared most durable.

As we have seen that the two great pyramids remain the vastest of human monuments of architecture, so we find the cotemporary Great Sphinx the hugest monument of the art of sculpture still existing. It is a most curious construction; partly built of stone and partly carved out of the living rock, standing in front of the Pyramid of Nef-Chofu. Some idea of its dimensions may be formed from the fact that it measures about 180 feet from the front of the paws to the tail. I need scarcely remind you of the awful and picturesque appearance which such a statue must exhibit in such a situation, and invested by time and historical association with memories so mysterious and sublime. It consists of a recumbent figure of a lion with a human head and a lofty cap, the symbol of dominion and authority. The expression of the head and the forms of the animal are very grandly conceived, and expressed with a vigour which even yet astonishes us. The style is of course highly conventional, but the proportions of all the parts are good, and the indication of power is extraordinary.

The ancient writers of Greece were long held to have told travellers' tales on the subject both of the number and dimensions of the monuments of Egypt, but the more closely that wonderful land has been examined, and the more carefully its great monuments have been disinterred from the sand with which many of them have been for ages overwhelmed, the greater reason does there appear to be to believe in the marvellous tales of Herodotus.

The culmination of early Egyptian sculpture we may recognise in the reign of Amunophth III. (B.C. 1260), in which were executed the extraordinary colossi which still sit "side by side on the vast plain opposite to Thebes, every morning casting their long shadows on the white Lybian hills, and

having their feet washed every autumn by the inundation. They sit in front of a small temple built by this king, and the most northerly of the two is a sacred statue, and after the fall of the city it was visited by travellers as one of the chief wonders in that wonderful country, to hear the musical sounds which it uttered every morning at sunrise."

The present condition of these statues scarcely enables us to judge of their merits as works of art; but of their magical picturesqueness and grandeur on the site they occupy all travellers are agreed.

Fortunately we in England possess, in the British Museum, specimens calculated to convey a very perfect idea both of the magnitude, difficulty of execution, and relative beauty, of much of the early Egyptian sculpture: and at the Crystal Palace my colleague, Mr Owen Jones, had succeeded in presenting an even more complete idea of the grandeur and vastness of some of these monuments than can be derived from the study of even the finest remains in the Museums of Europe most rich in relics of Egyptian art, such as those of London, Berlin, Turin and Rome, until the calamitous fire in that structure destroyed his reproductions of the enormous colossi of Abou Simbel, with the avenue of sphinxes leading up to them.

The original temple, the façade of which was decorated with four such colossal statues, each 61 feet high, was discovered by Burckhardt, buried in the desert sands of Nubia, at a spot called by the Arabs Abou Simbel. This vast façade, 117 feet long and 100 feet high, was excavated from the living rock by Rameses the Great, who has been held by many to have been the Sesostris of the Greeks, B.C. 1565. In all these grandly sitting figures a strict symmetry prevails, and in the regular and corresponding action of the legs, with the hands resting upon the knees, a perfect expression, of tranquillity and at the same time of a watchful readiness to act when called upon, are combined.

In spite of the destruction of the Crystal Palace figures some idea of the grandeur of these statues may be still formed from the original cast from the head of one of them, made in Egypt by Mr Bonomi for Mr Robert Hay of Linplum; by whom it was presented to the British Museum.

Mr Owen Jones has well pointed out that "it has been customary to imagine that rock-cut temples preceded constructed buildings, and to have been the earliest attempts at architecture; but the rock temples of Nubia contradict this theory. They are all imitations of constructed buildings, and would furnish evidence of their being later creations, independent of the historical evidence of the monuments themselves. The positions they occupy on the banks of the Nile furnish more than sufficient reason for excavating from the rock itself rather than constructing from stones cut from the rock. Wherever the valley of the Nile is narrowed, as in Nubia, by the mountains approaching on either side, grandeur was obtained by using the rock itself. Where the Nile ran through a plain, as at Thebes, colossal monuments were required to be raised to obtain the same effect." Mr Owen Jones's observation applies no less to sculpture than to architecture, since in the age of Rameses to a great extent architecture was sculpture, and sculpture architecture.

If Mr Hay's cast of the head of Rameses gives an admirable idea of the character of this greatest and most ancient of portrait studies, the original head of the young Memnon, from the Memnonium, or temple of Memnon, gives a still more perfect one of the celebrated Theban monument. Its material is granite, and the portion now in the British Museum is about one-third of the whole height of the statue. Those who have been best acquainted with Egyptian sculpture are of opinion that this is one of the finest specimens of Egyptian colossal sculpture now known to exist, and it certainly conveys an impression of the ability of the artist to imitate nature successfully, and at the same time to express

dignity and power in the hardest and most intractable of any substances which have ever been made subservient to the sculptor's art. The cutting of the mouth, of the nostril, and of the ear of this most interesting fragment clearly proves that if the arbitrary laws of the Egyptian priesthood had been relaxed in the artist's favour, there was no want of power on his part to give much greater truth to nature in his work; than he was ever permitted to do during the days when that priesthood reigned in the full despotism which superstition can alone exercise.

In much of the minor work of the Egyptian sculptors, in the execution of which the rigorous laws of the hierarchy were somewhat relaxed, the Egyptian sculptors shewed their ability to copy from nature with considerable skill and freedom. In the representations, particularly, of animal life in their hieroglyphics much characteristic expression is embodied, and in many of the historical scenes, in the subordinate parts at least, the story is well and dramatically told.

The laws, however, which appear to have prescribed definite attitudes, and definite dimensions in proportion to other personages, for the person of the sovereign, of the gods, and of the principal officers of state, interfered to a great extent with the just delineation of those historical pictures which are to be found so abundantly carved upon the linings of the earliest tombs and monuments.

The means by which these original bas-reliefs were generally executed is exceedingly curious, and furnishes an interesting illustration of the earliest combination of the arts of Painting and Sculpture. They appear to have been for the most part thus produced; "The wall was first chiselled as smooth as possible; the imperfections of the stone were filled up with cement or plaster, and the whole was rubbed smooth and covered with a coloured wash. Lines were then ruled perpendicularly and horizontally with red colour, forming squares all over the wall corresponding with the proportions

of the figures to be drawn upon it. The subjects of the paintings and of the hieroglyphics were then drawn on the wall, with a red line, most probably by the priest or chief scribe, or by some inferior artist, from a document divided into similar squares. Then came the chief artist, who went over every figure and hieroglyphic with a black line, and a firm and steady hand, giving expression to each curve, deviating here, and confirming there, the former red line. The line thus traced was then followed by the sculptor. In this stage there are instances of a foot or head having been completely sculptured, while the rest of the figure remains in outline. The next process was to paint the figure in the prescribed colours; and in some cases the painted line deviates from the sculptured line, shewing that the painter was the more important workman, and that even in this process no possible improvement was omitted. There are other instances, where a considerable deviation from the position of a leg or arm has been made. After the sculpture was finished and painted, the part was recarved, and the defective portion filled in with plaster, which, having since fallen off, furnishes us with this curious evidence of their practice. The whole of this may be seen in various tombs at Thebes, but in none so well as in that discovered by Belzoni, and which bears his name.\*

Occasionally the whole of the exterior, as well as the interior, is covered with such relievos, representing processions, battles, sieges, military engines, buildings, horses, soldiers, feasts, funerals, and endless illustrations of the life, manners and customs of this most interesting people.

Although never reaching the real perfection of art as architectural embellishments, and as records of the great characteristics of nationality, these relievos are most valuable and interesting.

\* Owen Jones, in the "Handbook to the Egyptian Court of the Crystal Palace."

Unlike the arts of every other race, those of the Egyptians declined in excellence with the course of ages, instead of advanced. Their intercourse with the Greeks, while to a certain extent it destroyed the really national characteristics of their art, did not imbue it in exchange with any of that excellence which distinguished cotemporary Grecian sculpture, and the later monuments of Egyptian art are but exhausted and effete reproductions of all that seems to have been strong and really dominant in the arts of the Pharaohs.

Those which may be considered to be included under the third era of Egyptian sculpture, when the Roman had superseded the Grecian influence, are strictly speaking but Roman works; and the masquerading of Hadrian and his much loved Antinous in the guise of ancient Egypt was but a sort of Walpolean affectation of relapse to what were generally regarded in Hadrian's time as the dark ages of art.

The principal cotemporary and rival of ancient Egyptian civilisation was that of Assyria, and ultimately of Persia; and although, in all its types, the sculpture of those lands differed from that of Egypt, still in the architectural manner of the treatment of the art there was a fair coincidence.

The Assyrians seem to have principally applied the images of their divinities to constitute the portals of their palaces, and to express thereby at once the fact that they were the guardians, and causers of the going out and coming in, of the sovereign, and the basis upon which all indications of grandeur and magnificence had to be reared. I can fancy no more powerful deterrent to treachery or attack on the part of a superstitious people, than such an external indication as this habit presented of the guardianship by mysterious divinities of the sacred person of the sovereign.

Once within the portals, the miles of bas-relief of which I have spoken in a preceding lecture record clearly the acts and doings of the sovereigns, and the extent and dominion of the wielders of the destinies of the Assyrian empire. In

these representations a considerable advance is made upon Egyptian practice in sculpture. Characteristics of race, costume and ornament are better made out than in the Egyptian monuments, and every object represented is depicted with a relaxed severity of convention. Attitudes are no longer so constrained, and the accidental incidents which may have characterised any particular engagement or circumstance seem to have been portrayed with a freedom of imitation indicative of considerable advance in artistic liberty. Anatomical details begin to be expressed with a due regard to those which exist in nature; the attitudes are more varied, and there is no longer the same monotony in the treatment of the person of the sovereign.

Many of the Assyrian bas-reliefs coincide curiously, especially in their ornamental details, with those of early Grecian art, as particularly revealed to us through the remains of the labours of the Pelasgi.

Persian sculpture was but a reflection in its earliest forms of the sculpture of Assyria, as Persian architecture was of Assyrian; the sculptured monuments of Persepolis being only a little more naturalistic, but not so elegant as those of Nineveh.

In the earliest specimens of the complete figure, representing the divinities venerated by the archaic Greeks, the arms were represented close to the sides, and the legs united so as to make the deity little more than a rude block of wood or stone.

To Dædalus has been ascribed the first great step towards a juster representation of humanity, if not of divinity. Payne Knight believes him to have flourished some three generations before the Trojan War, and, according to the most generally received chronology, about 1400 B.C. His principal and best authenticated works were all statues in wood, some of which remained until the general destruction of art under the later Roman Emperors, and, in spite of the rudeness of their forms, they struck Diodorus Siculus with the grandeur

and dignity of their air and character, even in an age when almost every city was crowded with masterpieces.

Whatever uncertainty or mystery may hang about the person and genius of Dædalus, there can be no doubt that about the period in which he is supposed to have flourished some great genius was born, who exercised an extraordinary influence over the technical arts of his native country. The mantle of his greatness fell upon Hephæstus and Smilis of Ægina.

Apparently these early artists worked for the most part in wood, and to one or other of them may be attributed the invention of that execution of images of the gods in various materials, which ultimately obtained consistency and popularity in the form of chryselephantine statues.

The great steps made by these early artists appear to have mainly consisted in the liberation of the types expressed in their art from the stiffness and rigidity due to an inability, and perhaps also to an unwillingness, to imitate nature freely. This cultivation of the faculty of direct imitation was the first upward stage in Greek sculpture; and through it mainly were the Greeks enabled to attain their ultimate perfection. They came in time, and step by step, to appreciate the real nature and value of imitation in their art. "Imitation," says Sir Joshua Reynolds, "is the means, and not the end of art. It is employed by the sculptor as the language by which his ideas are represented to the mind of the spectator. Poetry and elocution of every sort make use of signs, but those signs are arbitrary and conventional. The sculptor employs the representation of the thing itself, but still as a means to a higher end, as a gradual ascent, always advancing towards faultless form and perfect beauty. It may be thought at the first view that even this form, however perfectly represented, is to be valued and take its rank only for the sake of a still higher object, that of conveying sentiment and character as they are exhibited by attitude and expression of the passions. But we are sure from experience that the beauty of form



alone, without the assistance of any other quality, makes of itself a great work, and justly claims our esteem and admiration."

To the direct imitation of beauty of form as they found it, the Greeks soon added the practice of selection, that is to say the taking from a number of different models the part or feature of each which seemed most elegant, and then combining those beauties in strict subordination to the usual course of nature in subjecting the human frame to varieties in form according to types of race, occupation or country. They separated in fact the "constants" of human beauty from its "accidents."

One of the first qualities of which the works of the early Greeks expressed a singular appreciation was the allotment of the respective characteristics most expressive of sexual distinctions. To their representations of the one sex they gave swelling muscles, large and bony articulations, vigorous expression, and the appearance of sinewy elasticity, all indicative of the highest degree of energy of life combined with resolute determination. Upon the other they implanted the tenderest graces, the modest elegance, the rounded forms, the graceful action, the timid restraints which modesty imposes upon freedom of movement in girlhood, the refinements of ornamental costume, and that nameless charm which hangs about the lovely form of woman. Even in their representations of the goddesses of wisdom and of war no unfeminine characteristic was ever introduced: a grace and beauty distinguish no less the Minerva than, in a different form, they adorn the Venus.

It is not to be supposed that this absolute perfection was attained without long and painful efforts; and between the Dædalian age and that of Phidias, Greek art traversed a wide tract of highly interesting country. Step by step, and almost year by year, we may trace rigidity relaxing, and the acquisition of some new grace for the realm of art. The attributes

of race and the leading types of human physical and intellectual beauty became gradually classified; at first in leading features and ultimately in every refinement of proportion and anatomical structure. From the human they rose to the ideal type, and learnt to distinguish with unprecedented skill between the suitable physical portrayal of the god, the hero, and the man.

There is no doubt that the sculptors owed much of their progress to the universal interest which their works appear to have excited in the minds of their countrymen and contemporaries. The conquest of a new and beautiful form, or the creation of a new and beautiful monument, were to all Greeks but additional symbols of that transcendent ability which even the meanest among their gifted races considered himself to possess. The artist for them, as well as the warrior, vindicated national transcendancy. It is the loss of this very spirit of identity between national character and national art which has proved the fruitful source of declension and feebleness in the history of less favoured races.

Passing rapidly by the curious sculptures of Selinus, dating from some 600 years before the Christian era, and consequently some half century before the better known series of *Æginetan* remains, we may advance to the latter; which it must ever be a regret to Englishmen that we permitted to be acquired by the Bavarian Government instead of caused to be purchased for the British Museum.

What gives a peculiar and special interest to these sculptures is the fact of their being as it were the prototypes of the subsequent perfect development of sculpture in its application to architecture to be met with in the chief monuments of Athenian greatness. As Mr Cockerell justly observes, there is admirable ingenuity shewn in the mode by which so many animated figures are placed in the contracted space of the tympanum of the pediment without the smallest appearance of constraint. The difficulty of adapting to a regular mathematical figure, such as the pedi-

ment of a temple, a composition of statues which should be at once picturesque and symmetrical is overcome with singular success. The formality necessary in architecture is maintained whilst the several figures, in perfect equilibrium in point of mass and general attitude, have each their distinctive forms and characters. The eye traces through the whole a delightful variety, at the same time that nothing disturbs the tranquillity of the architecture. With much action in the figures, there is a majesty and order that impress while they please. There is a fine crossing in the attitude of the bodies, and of the different limbs, and there is a link through the whole which connects the picture.

Many learned writers have puzzled themselves over the direct subject which these sculptures represent. All that seems clear in the matter is, that on the one hand appear what are probably Grecian warriors under the leadership of Ajax, and on the other Trojans under the guidance of Hector; Minerva occupying the central position in both pediments. The drawbacks to the high praise which has been justly bestowed upon these sculptures consist in a certain want of ease in the treatment of the limbs, the faces, the hair and the draperies. The expressionless features, and the formal lines of the hair and the draperies, scarcely duly influenced by either gravity or inflation, are so many archaic traits, while on the other hand the freedom of action, the elegant and rounded forms, and the vigour of the composition, all indicate a passage toward the highest order of excellence.

All such defects are removed, and all such excellences heightened, in the great sculptures of the Parthenon and of the Temple of Theseus at Athens. To speak in any way fittingly of these masterpieces would occupy infinitely more time than we can possibly now bestow upon them. It must suffice for me to congratulate you upon the most im-

portant of them being within your reach in this country ; and I can only say that if you neglect to study them you neglect to study the most beautiful remains of ancient sculpture which exist. While they reflect every quality of ideal grace, power and beauty, as isolated sculptures, as combined with architecture they are no less perfect.

In their use of these sculptures no less than in the execution of them, the Greeks proved themselves perfect masters of the art, and to follow through and point out their various perfections would rather bring us into the province of the definition of the theory of sculpture than keep us strictly to its history. What is to be admired in the Elgin Marbles is not only what they express but what they refrain from expressing. The command over expression, given by emphasising only that which was essential to convey the expression, and passing over details not essential to expression, is wielded with incomparable skill. Well may Gibson declare,—“I have heard some persons say that Greek Art wants expression. They want perception. The natural and expressive touches of art keep you upon earth; it is the ideal only that can elevate the soul.”

“The Greek artists were enlightened by the philosophers. The gods represented by the sculptors were pure, passionless and beautiful. In their art, the Greeks were gods. We with all our efforts find it hard toil to creep upwards after them; the eminence on which they stand is beyond our reach.” Such words from Gibson are no vague expressions of opinion; they were his articles of faith, the lights by which he worked; and, in short, his life was but one long tribute to the power of art in its most perfect type. As he goes on to say, “The grand works of the Greeks are ever new, and always produce fresh enchantment, but in order to obtain a correct conception of their merits, and to understand the sublime and the beautiful

the taste must be cultivated by long study and experience. To surpass the best works of the Greeks is a hopeless task: to approach them is a triumph. How few can come near them."

The Greeks excelled alike in architectural and isolated sculpture. The small bronzes even which were but portable images of the gods, as stimulants to domestic devotion, and for occasional use as amulets, from an early period exhibited great perfection both of design and workmanship. There can be no doubt that one cause of the vast improvement which was introduced into sculpture in the age of Pericles, was the fact that the principal artist whom he employed, Phidias, was alike able in painting and in sculpture. It was this quality which no doubt added to all his conceptions grace and ease, and at the same time bestowed a softness upon his flesh and an easy flow to his draperies entirely unknown to his predecessors.

One of the great secrets of his power consisted in the mastery with which he commanded the great geometrical lines of his composition. So obtaining symmetry in essentials he was freed from the obligation which had been a stumblingblock to his predecessors, of maintaining regularity in details, which nature varies freely to infinity.

Thus it was that he combined due subordination to the architectural framing of his compositions with perfect ease of movement and natural expression in every portion of his figures. It fell to his lot, in his colossal statues of the Athenian Minerva and the Olympian Jupiter at Elis, to settle those two god-like types upon a perfect basis, and in them to express a beauty which Quintilian says, "appeared to have added something to religion, the majesty of the work being so worthy of the divinity."

It is one of the great privileges of the possessor of the highest order of genius not only to create masterpieces himself, but to call into being others, who, following in his

footsteps, multiply those types of beauty which the cares of human life, and the limitation of human power, permitted him to conceive but forbade him to execute.

Thus, after Phidias, came Alcamenes, Polycletus, Gorgias, Miron and Scopas. The first-named of these, Alcamenes, owes his especial celebrity to his Venus Aphrodite, only excelled by that of Praxiteles at Cnidos. Alcamenes was an especial master of proportion, and the canons of Alcamenes and Polycletus bore an unrivalled reputation; the statue of the Diophorus, or lancebearer, being popularly known to Athenian sculptors as "a rule for form, outline, and lineament."

Amongst the beautiful productions of Praxiteles, I have always looked upon the "Apollo Sauroctonos," and the "Cupid bending his bow," as amongst the most perfect works of antiquity.

Miron's Discobolus, or quoit-player, presents a no less perfect type of vigorous manhood than Polycletus gave to the world in his Diophorus.

Ctesilaus must ever be honoured for his two exquisite creations, the wounded Amazon and the dying Gladiator.

The Niobe of Scopas must have been a group in which the very highest perfection of refined Athenian art was attained. In the Laocoon the acme of skill in composition and command of vigorous expression reached the highest point to which those qualities have ever been carried in any corresponding group, and it has served to win for another father and two other sons, more fortunate in their lives than in their deaths,—Agesander, Polidorus and Athenodorus, and through them to the Rhodian school,—an undying reputation.

To dwell upon the beauties of the Apollo Belvidere and the Venus de Medici can scarcely be necessary, since they have ever been, by the consent of all judges, considered the finest of all the Greek specimens of ideal art which have

been preserved to us. No one has better characterised their merits than Byron, whose lines will no doubt be present to your memories, and if they are not they should be.

In taking a general glance at the characteristics of Grecian sculpture, which is of course all that it is possible to do in an address like the present, one cannot but feel impressed by the assurance that it was in their discoveries in science, and in their improvements in philosophy, that the Greeks found the elements which led their artists on and guided them in their search after beauty. We have no reason to believe that in the external physical qualities of their frames the Greeks were more perfect or much more beautiful than other races equally trained with them in habits of muscular and athletic exercise; but the features in which they did excel—the intellectual—gave them their place, almost without contestation and won for them that lofty position in the history of human races which has never been challenged; and which having exercised an unbounded influence over every generation from their days to the present, would still entitle them to veneration, without chance of abasement, could every material relic of their greatness pass away from the midst of us.

"Geometry," as Flaxman says, "enabled the artist scientifically to ascertain forms for the configuration of bodies, to determine the motion of the figure in leaping, running, striking, or falling, by curves and angles, whilst arithmetic gave multiplication of measures in proportions. The anatomical observations of Thales, Pythagoras and Alcmeon, prepared the way for the more connected inquiries of Hippocrates. Thus, by the gradual advancement and connection of art and science, painting and sculpture obtained sound principles to ensure a certain and felicitous practice which introduced the age of perfection or consummation in the time of Pericles and Phidias."

The gravity of Greek thought and the propriety with

which on all occasions fitting subjects were selected for literary illustration, found its echo in the singularly happy choice of subjects selected for embodiment by their sculptors. It was not only their mythological, but their ordinary history, which furnished subjects for their continuous bas-reliefs; and whether in such illustrations as those of the Panathenaic Procession of the Parthenon, or the contests of the Centaurs and the Lapithæ of the Temple of Theseus, or the exquisite combats between the Athenians and the Amazons of the Temple of Apollo at Phigalia, we find a beautiful natural simplicity of representation combined with a masterly subordination of every subject to the laws of balance, of graceful geometry, and contrast in composition.

To trace the falling off in Grecian Sculpture as its professors sank under the Roman dominion would be but a "grief and a regretting." They sang their sweet songs only as cage-birds, and wasted their powers in gradually weaker and weaker echoes of their primeval greatness.

For the sake of distinctness in order of time it may be well just to remind you, that while Grecian art may be supposed to have commenced in a clearly distinctive form about 1000 years B. C., it may be looked upon as having attained its acme of ideal beauty in connection with architecture in the time of Phidias, about 500 years B. C.

This form of excellence was carried to the utmost limits of grace and perfection, in masterpieces which have ever commanded the world's respect, in the age of Alexander the Great, about 300 B. C., and from thence a decline may be perceived, ending in the all but total eclipse of nationality which befel the Greeks from the Christian era downwards.

The tendency which manifests itself in the works of the latest Greek sculptors to adhere to the literal rendering of the accidents rather than the constants of typical form in the human subject, while it struck a death-blow to the elevated character of ideal sculpture, with which the Romans had but



little sympathy, gave to iconographic or portrait art, in which they delighted, a new, fresh and most vigorous life. So long as the imitation was speaking, the Romans cared but little what it conveyed. Given but in a secondary degree to reflection, they better still appreciated that which afforded them amusement, and hence originated that devotion to the grotesque in art, in which they both delighted and attained a rare excellence.

Nothing can be more natural and vivacious than are the busts of the early Roman Emperors, nothing more humorous than their representation of Fauns and Satyrs. Their animals are of peculiar excellence, and in the combination of figure sculpture with architectural ornament, upon a small scale especially, their efforts are crowned with unvarying success.

In Roman Sculpture two especial characteristics were wanting, creating blanks which no manual dexterity could possibly atone for. The one was the expression of the triumph of intellectual over physical beauty, and the other such an incorporation of sculpture with architecture as made both perfection. While there can be little doubt that the enormous number of works of the highest merit brought as spoils to Rome, and gracing triumph after triumph of their arms, supplied them with models of technical excellence, their very abundance rendered unnecessary the concentration of Roman intellectual power upon the supply of similar original works.

It was far easier, and probably less costly, for a Roman Emperor to adorn his portico, or aula,—his atrium, or his triclinium,—with an ancient Greek statue, than himself to cause one to be executed to supply the same want; and hence there was less employment of an elevated class to be given to the Roman artist. His talents were employed either in architectural carving, in copying acknowledged masterpieces, or in working out original ideas, many of them of great grace and beauty, in gems, silver plate, mural and sepulchral

slabs, tombs, and the thousand and one minor objects of luxury which ministered to the complicated wants of the imperial patrician.

Where, in late Roman art, we meet, as we occasionally do, with some attitude, or some cast of drapery, of distinguishing elegance, we have generally to go but a little way backwards to find its Grecian prototype.

As time rolled on, such sparks of grace and beauty flashed less vividly and less frequently, until at last one follows slab after slab, and monument after monument, by hundreds and by thousands, to find,—as in such alto-relievos as those which decorate the column of Trajan and the arches of Septimius Severus and Constantine,—a dreary waste of monotonous commonplace.

Upon the removal of the Empire to Byzantium ensued an utter declension from the palmy days of art in Sculpture. Men's minds seem to have turned altogether in other directions, and although we find exceptionally, now and then, in work of Byzantine origin, a certain amount of elegantly ornamental treatment of bas-relief in connection with ornament, it would seem as if in the creation of the new cycle of subjects in which Christian faith was to find its tangible exposition, the whole work of construction upon which the art of the sculptor had been built in Pagan ages required to be constructed *de novo*.

In the land over which the triumphs of the sculptor's art still lay thrown down and neglected, a new set of subjects, and a new set of types, had to be created as it were from a state of primæval barbarism.

Under the Lombard sovereigns every attempt at sculpture was rude and uncouth, and, not in Italy only, but over the whole face of Europe, all the work of the gradual elimination of ugliness from beauty, as affecting sculptured reproductions of the human form, seems to have required an entirely new organization.

No doubt, from time to time, during the dark ages, men like Tutilo the monk of St Gall, Bernward of Hildesheim, St Dunstan, or St Eloy, appeared upon the theatre of art, endowed with capabilities, under more auspicious circumstances, for advancing the arts with a knowledge equal to that which the successive races of Greek sculptors have shewn; but such were the influences by which they were surrounded, and the absence of a present platform from which their abilities could take rapid upward flight, that their efforts appear to have been limited to but a scanty amendment of certain errors in common practice.

Gradually however, through their influence, and the influence of their pupils, some return to elegance of composition, to natural forms, to dramatic expression, and above all, to the power of appealing to human emotion, was gained; and from the moment that material difficulties, with their overpowering weight, were removed from the shoulders of the Christian sculptor, the spiritual essence of his faith seems to have helped him onward.

With the origin of Mediæval Architecture, and the new artistic life which called it into being, Christian sculpture appeared, as its essential concomitant. The Christian sculptors rapidly emancipated themselves from reminiscences either of Greek or Latin types, and appeared inclined to realise energies of an absolutely new conception. I am inclined to believe that those artists who worked in monuments such as the cathedrals of Rheims, Wells and Leon, respectively in France, England and Spain, worked with an absolute disregard to any other than the legends of the sacred persons and the sacred incidents with which it fell to their duty to embellish the great architectural monuments of Christian faith.

Working strictly under the orders and inspection of the clergy, their chief and especial merit would naturally consist in the power with which they were enabled to enforce the

lessons of faith inculcated by the priesthood. Hence the spirituality of their work would be held to be of infinitely more account than its elegance, or subordination to artistic rule. Still, as man's tendencies towards beauty increase happily with the cultivation and practice of every art, by degrees, in these new cycles of thought and subject, pure elements of beauty assumed a material shape.

There can be no doubt that the attention to the remains of ancient art which began under the Pisani in Italy in the 13th century, speedily restored to mediæval sculpture some of the technical excellences with which classical art had abounded; and through the labours of those who followed immediately upon the Pisani, grace and elegance were unceasingly sought out and when found prized.

It is perhaps at this moment that we begin to return to the individuality of artist life. During the bulk of the middle ages the sculptor, with rare exceptions, had lost his personal identity, which had been, as it were, incorporated into the structures he adorned, until his work passed rather as that of the architect than that of the sculptor. But, from the days of Nicolo Pisano onwards, in Italy at least, the artist becomes individualised, and the sympathies of his countrymen become actively excited in his progress towards perfection.

The works of Nicolo Pisano and his son Giovanni (who were at once, as were most of their contemporaries, architects, sculptors and painters), at Orvieto, Pisa, Pistoia, Sienna, and Bologna, exhibit no less grace and feeling in the figures than truth to nature in the dramatic arrangement of the incidents, and in elegant simplicity of grouping. Giovanni can scarcely be regarded as having manifested genius equal to his father's, but his tendency to realise with facility the spiritual expression of that new faith which seemed to spring into being with the earliest labours of the Franciscans and Dominicans, greatly assisted in the embodi-

ment in stone and marble of the improvements conceived in the sister art of painting by the immortal Giotto.

Considerable progress was made in sculpture by various artists during the 14th century in Italy, especially through the genius of Andrea Orcagna of Florence; but, with rare exceptions, a similar progress was not manifested in other countries than Italy. In fact it may, as a general rule,—of course subject to certain exceptions,—be stated that mediæval sculpture as well as mediæval architecture reached its culminating point in the thirteenth century almost simultaneously throughout Europe; and was destined from that stage of perfection to gradually decline in excellence in every country, excepting in Italy, in which a steady onward progress was maintained.

As we shall hereafter have occasion to observe, it was not until an irradiation from the artistic glow and fervour which animated the Italians under the *Renascimento* was reflected in the minds of western and northern sculptors, that the foundation was laid of any satisfactory revival of the art in the west and north in a form widely different from those furnished by the types specially affected by the mediæval sculptors.

To follow the illustrious men who during the fifteenth century made Italian art famous in sculpture, as well as in many other directions, would be a delightful task, but would involve us in far too great detail for this hasty sketch. I can touch only upon two or three of the most eminent amongst them.

The three greatest of all I believe to have been Luca Della Robbia, Ghiberti, and Donatello.

The earliest impulse towards a return to the easy nature, combined with elegance of ornament, and detail, which distinguished the best period of Roman Sculpture, was effected by Jacopo della Quercia, whose public fountain in the market-place at Sienna was a truly typical work for his period.

Luca della Robbia is well known through his works in terra cotta, no less than by his inimitable groups of singers executed in marble for the cathedral of Florence. In some respects he, as well as Ghiberti, adhered in their early works to somewhat of a mediæval type, more especially in their treatment of draperies; but both of them manifested a rapid dexterity in imitating nature, which gave to their compositions a life and human interest scarcely manifested before since the days of Diocletian.

The celebrated Gates of the Baptistery at Florence by Ghiberti obtained for him a world-wide reputation. Even now in their way they remain examples of perfection, and artists study them (as they should) as perfect models of the application of ornamental metal work to similar uses.

The third master I have mentioned,—Donatello,—was especially celebrated for his perfect comprehension of the practice of the ancients in all that regarded *basso relievo*. His skill as an original artist is shewn by his inimitable statue of Gattamelata at Padua, a work absolutely without a rival at the date of its production; and equalling, if it did not exceed, the merits of the most remarkable equestrian statue handed down from classical ages, that of Marcus Aurelius at Rome.

To these artists, and others whom I cannot dwell upon, succeeded the celebrated Andrea Verrochio, whose equestrian statue of Colleone at Venice is the only existing worthy pendant to that of Donatello at Padua.

From this period Italian sculptors appear to have ranged themselves under two distinct banners; those who adopted ornamental sculpture, in minute and most perfect detail,—cabinet sculptors,—and those who inclined to the art in its larger and broader form, as taken up by Michael Angelo.

I know no branch of artistic criticism more difficult than to correctly express what is to be followed, and what is to be avoided, in the model set to artists in the life and works of this great Florentine. It would be alike unjust to refuse

him admiration or to load him with it at the expence of the ancients, or of the best of modern artists. What will ever distinguish him was his admirable knowledge of the appearance of the human form under every possible condition, and the amazing vigour with which he was enabled to transfer to marble or to the flat surfaces of wall or ceiling his gigantic and sublime conceptions. I am inclined to place above all other of his sculptural works in merit, one of his earliest, the *Pieta* which adorns St Peter's. There, from its unfortunate position it cannot be fitly studied; but a careful examination of the cast my colleague and I were enabled to obtain for the Crystal Palace, will, I think, demonstrate its extraordinary beauty, and the patient zeal and intelligence with which it was wrought.

Powerful and grand as unquestionably are the immortal monuments of the Medici at Florence, and the Moses at Rome, there is yet a certain uncouthness in their rendering which leaves them far beneath the best figures of Grecian art. To have risen however to a position which justifies such a comparison being instituted was no small triumph for the modern artist.

The followers of Michael Angelo were grand only exceptionally; Benvenuto Cellini, in his *Perseus*, probably reaching the highest point of greatness. Sansovino was a sculptor of merit, as were Tribolo, Mocchi, Della Porta, Montorsoli, Torrigiano, Bandinelli, Ammanati, and Alessandro Vittoria; but it must be confessed that few amongst them rise to the level of their great prototype.

Giovanni di Bologna was a sculptor of most unequal merit, rising in some of his works to the very height of his profession,—as in his *Flying Mercury*, and in his *Rape of the Sabines*,—and falling in others into exaggeration, and that ridiculous abuse of sinuous lines as elements for the production of beauty which Francavilla carried to its climax.

The besetting sin of all these masters was a want of clear

perception of the limitations of the art they practised. The greater the difficulties which attended the realisation of their conceptions the more merit they appear to have thought the sculpture possessed. They lost sight of the distinction which should ever exist between works in painting and in sculpture, and lent themselves to the realisation, through the latter medium, of works which should have been confined to the former.

This it is which especially degrades much that is excellent in the work of Bernini, an artist of rare power, but far too great audacity. His celebrated group of Apollo and Daphne, in the Villa Borghese, executed when Bernini was 18 years of age, remains a monument of the perfection of marble cutting, but is far from occupying an equally high position as a work of admirable sculpture. Sir Joshua Reynolds has justifiably criticised, in his Discourses, the presumption of Bernini. With him began the reign of fluttering draperies and all sorts of frippery and conceits. The *concetti* of the Arcadians found fitting correspondence in the trivialities of late Italian sculpture. Flying Cupids, rays of lightning, fluttering draperies, saints tumbling over one another in utter confusion, are amongst the commonest subjects adopted, until at last the conviction is forced upon one's mind that there was nothing which could be imagined ridiculously impossible which an Italian sculptor of the end of the seventeenth century would not undertake to realise in marble.

While Italian Art was degenerating from its highest excellence the French school attained considerable distinction. The masters of their Renaissance, Germain Pilon, Jean Goujon, Jean Cousin, and Barthelemy Prieur, executed many works of original genius in many particulars, but, reproducing the somewhat long-drawn proportions of the human figure affected by Cellini and Primaticcio,—the Italians who mainly grafted on the French stock the characteristics of contemporary Italian art-growth.



In England there seems to be little doubt that in the reign of Henry VIII. a new life was given to our somewhat degenerated mediæval sculpture through the advent to this country of Torregiano, the contemporary of Michael Angelo and several other Italians of merit. With Torregiano's visit sprang into being, and for awhile flourished, and then apparently died out, a school of excellent sculpture corresponding with the good features of contemporary Florentine art.

In subsequent reigns art seems to have been filtered to us, to a great extent, through the Low Countries, and we inherited only degenerate versions of continental art. For a long time Dutchmen seem to be the principal purveyors of sculpture for English taste, and it was scarcely until the last century (if we except the work of some few native artists who worked on our Elizabethan structures) that we can be said to have possessed any native sculptors of merit.

As the subject of our national art will hereafter in various forms probably engage our attention, it will suffice if I now call your attention to the names of the principal men who laid the foundation of our modern comparative excellence in sculpture.

The earliest of these, if not actually foreigners, were at least of foreign origin. The father of Grinling Gibbons appears to have been a foreigner, if he himself was not one. Caius Gabriel Cibber was a Dane, and Roubiliac appears to have been born at Lyons, Scheemakers and Ruysbrack were Dutchmen; and it is not until we arrive at Wilton's that we meet with an English name of distinction in this art.

There is not much to be said as to his original merits, but his long study in Italy, and general cultivation of mind, were not without influence upon contemporary sculpture.

In the person of Thomas Banks, who practised from the middle of the eighteenth century, we meet with the first Englishman of taste for poetical sculpture. He was

a man emphatically born before his time, and may be looked upon as the professional parent of the immortal Flaxman. Nollekens as a bust-maker has rarely been surpassed, and the name of John Bacon cannot be altogether passed over.

It is however in the person of Flaxman that we first meet in English sculpture with real genius. It is very satisfactory that we should have preserved in the Hall of University College, London, an admirable collection of the works and designs of this great master, whose reputation is fully as great upon the continent of Europe as it is in his native country. His conceptions are at once bold and exquisitely beautiful. He studied every branch of his art, and was sufficiently free from prejudice to have admitted into the course of his studies, and into his Hall of Worthies, the monuments, and the authors of those monuments, of mediæval sculpture. He was amongst the first to study the works of Giotto, and of our native sculptors of Wells, Lincoln, &c., alike without prejudice and without overstrained admiration. He appreciated what was excellent and refined in the spiritual expression of those monuments, while rejecting their forms and proportions as models for the student's guidance. His Lectures on Sculpture bear witness to the profundity of his study as well as the liberality of his professional creed. His thoughts were always pure, and his works always beautiful.

In France the Academical system produced men who modelled with great dexterity and considerable anatomical intelligence. Pug t, Girardon, Coysevox, and Coustou, executed a great quantity of very clever marble-cutting for Louis XIV. and XV., and, in their busts especially, exhibited considerable talent. Real originality however in the French school appears to have been attained at the end of the last century by Houdon, the vivacity of whose style, and whose command over expression, have scarcely ever been rivalled.

It was in Italy however that the new bright light of

modern sculpture came into being, through the genius of Canova, a master whom it is too much the fashion in the present day to decry. Tested by comparison with the antique his style may occasionally appear weak, and his ideas too often find in their embodiment an almost too great appearance of artificiality, but his works, when contrasted with those of his immediate predecessors, stand out as light from darkness. The nature, purity and beauty of the forms of which he made use, the simple but most elegant execution of his work, and his refined taste and appreciation for beauty of every class, deservedly stamp all his works with real and unquestionable merit. A man of extraordinary versatility, he laboured in every class of his art. His monuments are frequently well designed, and he entirely re-created basso-relievo in subordination to the laws of reasonable fitness in such compositions. It is ever to be remembered that he was one of the first, if not the first, to pronounce authoritatively upon the merits of the Elgin Marbles; and but for the energy and firmness with which he proclaimed his conviction of the value of these masterpieces, our country might never have retained them for the public good.

One of the great charms about Canova was certainly his personal character, his elegance and purity, and the entire absence from his character of any of that petty jealousy which too often accompanies highly artistic development.

He was no less happy in his pupils than they were in their master; and the names of Thorwaldsen, Rauch, Tenerani, Gibson and Wyatt at once proclaim the popularity of his studio and the value of his instructions. Beloved by one and all of his pupils, his instructions formed the basis of their practice, and never was he mentioned by any of them excepting in terms of the utmost respect and veneration.

Each of these men in his turn exercised a marked national influence. Treading in the footsteps of Rauch of Berlin, we have had Rietschel of Dresden, an artist of

extraordinary ability, and many others who have revived the art in Germany. Schwanthaler, though somewhat removed from the immediate influence of the school of Canova, cannot be omitted from any reference to the great masters of modern German sculpture. In quantity, combined with quality of a considerable order of excellence, he was in all respects most productive.

Following after Thorwaldsen should be enumerated Dannecker and Jerichau.

The influence of Gibson, from his art having been practised at a distance from his native land, has not been so powerful as might have been considered likely to correspond with his unquestionable genius; but as that genius was employed to supply an exceptional rather than a popular demand, one can be scarcely surprised to find that its influence has been exercised less extensively than it otherwise might have been, or than, as I believe, it is likely to be in the future. As a general taste for pure sculpture is spread amongst us, I believe that the merits of Gibson, and of his life-long friend Wyatt, will be more intimately appreciated, and held in greater veneration year by year, amongst all intelligent appreciators of true merit in the sculptor's art.

The names of these distinguished men bring us so close to our own days that we seem to have almost arrived at the end of the history of Sculpture. Fortunately however we have still living men, in almost all the principal countries in Europe, who seem destined to create a new era in that history.

Vela of Milan, whose statue of the dying Napoleon formed the great object of admiration amongst the sculpture at the last Parisian Exhibition, and Pietro Magni of Milan, whose Reading Girl occupied the same position in the Florentine Exhibition, are artists of the highest power and distinction, while in England we yet enjoy the honour of having a Foley

labouring amongst us, and the younger genius of Woolner may yet be considered to have a brilliant future before it.

What especial form *the sculpture of the future* may take it is now hard to predicate, but we may with tolerable accuracy define the direction in which most impetus appears to be wanting to the art. I believe that the hope for the future of English sculpture is to be found in three sources:—firstly, in the much more frequent incorporation into our structures of sculpture as an attribute of architecture, not necessarily as converted into architecture, but as applied to it, and in its application allowed to retain, and to work in subjection to its own proper laws;—secondly, in an endeavour to elevate the class of subject usually embodied in sculpture, exercising especially a right power of selection of such subjects as fall within the legitimate sphere of the art to properly portray;—and thirdly, and mainly, in such a turning of men's minds to what is good and bad in sculpture, as shall, while increasing and cherishing a delight in the art, tend to create for it, and apply to it, a reasonable code of equitable criticism which shall at once applaud the good and condemn the bad.

## LECTURE VI.

### SCULPTURE.

---

#### *THEORY.*

OF all the various branches of the Fine Arts in which imitation is the great moving cause and originator, Sculpture, perhaps more than any other, assimilates itself to one of the original technical arts of early civilisation before Fine Arts existed.

Sculpture is, after all, but the sublimation of mason's work, and the stages from the rude shaping of the stone for structure to the elaboration of a monument which may either appertain to, or be detached from, a perfect building, are easily traceable.

It is this peculiar technical origin which has given to sculpture an obvious limitation of power: the fittest materials in which it can be embodied being those specially appertaining to structure, and the processes by which it is elaborated being no less those by which structure is ordinarily effected.

Isolate sculpture as we may, it will still be bound by the necessary limitations accompanying the materials out of which it is created, and the means by which it is brought into being.

By such limitations I obviously allude to the imperfect extent to which works in sculpture can be made to realise the direct imitation of natural objects. It will be at once obvious that those substances must, unless indeed colour is added superficially, differ from the objects represented in variety, if not in nature of colouring, in rigidity, and general want of portability.

In the face of such obvious wants in the technical resources of sculpture, it seems almost strange that mankind should ever have sought by its means to so imitate natural objects, as, by means of that imitation, to aim at exciting the pleasurable association of ideas connected with the objects selected for representation.

The secret is to be found, I believe, in the desire of men to produce something which should outlive themselves. The notion of permanence, superadded to their growing delight in the acquisition of mechanical skill, led them to shape enduring materials into the likeness of those more perishable objects the contemplation of which they had found to afford them in life the greatest delight. This view is to a certain extent borne out by the singular fact that from the earliest date at which we can find records of the execution of sculpture at all, we find that execution limited to works in the hardest possible materials.

The granites, basalts, and porphyries of ancient Egyptian art, and a similar range of materials, in which the earliest representations of Indian gods are found, all point to the very primitive connection between monumental sculpture and the idea of extreme durability.

The very notion of permanence, as opposed to the finite scope of human life, is at once a symbol of power, and of divinity. The first conception of Deity would naturally take the shape of the supposition of something which lasted, while man perished; and the thought of such a being, freed from the conditions of man's mortality, would lead to an attempt at

the eternal perpetuation in their representations of divinity of whatever most special attributes of physical as well as spiritual power an ignorant and superstitious people might ascribe to their gods.

When one considers the length of time, the concentration of labour, and the energy of will, by which alone a gigantic image in such a material as granite could be called into being, one cannot but feel that its production must have been the result of a religious conviction no less definite than profound.

The misshapen stone selected for its rude resemblance either to a human being, or to some other object in nature, was never by them heightened, by cutting here and there, to increase the accidental resemblance, but before chisel was put to stone or marble, some commanding will had determined that out of a vast misshapen block of material, an image, every form and attribute and peculiarity of which had been already definitely determined upon by that supreme will, should be evolved.

Now when we look at the great difficulties surrounding the execution of a permanent memorial of any kind, and recognize the serious conviction of the importance of the record which must have existed before such labour and consequent cost could have been faced, we may naturally ask, with what qualities of expression men would be likely to invest the images created with so much toil and devotion.

The primitive type, and indeed the means by which alone they could convey expression, could only be found in the type of form by which they were surrounded. Those qualities of expression they might find alike in human beings and in animals. At first admiration might probably be centred upon the gigantic expression of strength conveyed in the forms of the lions and other wild beasts, which primæval man found superior to himself in muscular strength. It is natural that finding themselves unable to rise from the



ground, as they observed birds to do with facility, they should at an early period, have added wings to the figures of their divinities, to express their command over the means of locomotion denied to man.

Given to the sculptor these sources of expression, he would be enabled to express strength and power, but there would be still wanting a source from which he could derive his indication of intellectual superiority, which should convey the feeling that the strength and power represented were under subjection to a wise intelligence. From the head of man alone could they take their ideas of the expression of wisdom, and to make up their primitive embodiment of the God it was but natural than they should superadd the human head to the superior physical characteristics they had derived from the animal kingdom.

By imagining some such process of thought we may arrive at the conception of that family of sphinxes and winged and human-headed Chimeras,—those amazing animals we occasionally find alluded to in Scripture,—and which abound in the monuments of both Egypt and Assyria.

A great advance in the physical conception of the art of sculpture was made when the artist arrived at the conviction that, by the use of characteristics derived from an accurate observation of the human form alone, an expression of power and dignity might be reached far superior to any which could be derived from blending together the external signs of qualities observable in the forms and muscular development of the lower animals. He then appears to have recognized the great distinction so well noticed in the first chapter of Genesis, that while "God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after their kind," and "saw that it was good," God's next great stage in creation was to "make man in his own image and after his own likeness;" "in the image of God created he him, male and female created he

them;" an assurance of itself sufficient to confirm the sculptor in the selection of typical human form to fitly embody and express the highest attributes of divinity.

A curious struggling towards a blending of various attributes in one form, no part of which should contain anything suggestive of derivation from any type but that of man, is to be found in some of the many-headed and many-armed divinities of the Indian mythology.

We may therefore conceive that man's first effort in the selection of subjects to be recorded by sculpture would be to aim at the expression of moral qualities rather than physical, and then as his conception of those moral qualities improved, and became localised, so did his power of expressing them in permanent form by sculpture increase.

Thus, from the earliest to the latest embodiments in sculpture of the idea of divinity there has never been wanting the selection of a type of vigorous manhood in which supreme command over all human things was attempted to be expressed by the absence of any indication of human passion and a sublime expression of serenity.

The type selected for the Bona Dea, the Venus, the power presiding over reproduction, would obviously be that of the perfect woman; and as, with civilisation men arrived at a just estimate of the graces of modesty, gentleness, sweetness and benevolence, the expression of the moral qualities in the sculptural embodiment of such an idea superseded the original ruder expression of simply sexual distinctions. Hence it has been a world-wide act of uniformity on the part of sculptors of all ages to agree to the leading tenet, that that sculptor will arrive at the greatest perfection in his art, and will wield most sway over the minds of men in all generations, who expresses most perfectly in his works the highest order of human moral sentiments and attributes.

In no other art probably is the value of the accumulation of traditional experiences, and the transmission of them from

generation to generation, of so much importance as in the art of sculpture. What the Germans call the "aufbildung," or building up of an art, "line upon line, and precept upon precept," is indispensable to the progress of the art of Sculpture. The creation of any new type of beauty, in this art especially, is an operation of great labour and involving much time. Once created however it becomes a permanent resource, and a basis for the elaboration of other and still more refined types.

The tendency of the art, in its gradual developement amongst each of the great families of mankind who have successively developed it, has always been to proceed from a general indication of certain simple attributes of a supernatural character to the expression of those qualities, such as benevolence, courage, justice, power to reward and punish, to protect and legislate, which, although not essentially superhuman, may be regarded as the attributes of demi-gods or at least of heroes. To this expression of heroic qualities has succeeded the creation of particular types of human beauty corresponding with the just classification of the leading characteristics of the most beautiful types inherent in ordinary humanity. It is at this stage, from his direct imitation of the most beautiful and characteristic forms derived from the human subject, that the sculptor alone obtains his power of commanding admiration and sympathy from the beholder of his work. He no longer indulges in the expression of heroic strength by impossible muscular developements, or of beauty by sinuosities which find no corresponding prototype in the human form; a wise principle of limitation to what is natural pervades all his work; and he aims only to eliminate in every type he selects for reproduction that order of perfect beauty which he can conceive, without straining nature, to be naturally allied to nature. Most certainly, "within those limits is relief enough;" for what can be more perfectly beautiful in every possible attribute than that

image, which, as we have already seen, God created in his own? It is the very strength and backbone of the theory and excellence of the art we are considering, that it is in portraying the human form that it finds its highest employment.

One of the sculptor's first and most imperative duties is to study minutely, in order that he may portray minutely, every physical characteristic of that wonderful type. As he studies it, the knowledge dawns upon him that, as its proportions are cast in a marvellously harmonious scale of geometrical propriety, so are its motions, and its laws of balance, associated with the utmost refinement of mechanics, statics, and dynamics. Tested by the most utilitarian investigation, the human body in every respect asserts its god-like derivation. The adaptation of means to end is in it most perfect. Every component part has a functional duty to perform, and it is in proportion to the power the sculptor acquires of expressing clearly the function of every portion of his statue of any human being that he makes it life-like, speaking, and impressive.

Gradually, as he studies his subject, and learns its marvellous anatomy, he finds that every variety of action produces a corresponding variety of surface; muscles swell and relax under every varying motion of the body; and vary in quantity and in clearness of expression with the health, and age, and race, of the various types of humanity which may fall under his observation.

In that special attribute, in which man stands distinguished from all the lower animals,—the power of standing upright,—the sculptor will naturally recognize the superior order of creation to which man owes his origin, and he will find some of the most beautiful and graceful attitudes it can ever fall within his province to portray, to be derived from the involuntary and necessary tendency in the human subject to preserve a satisfactory equilibrium under every variety of action.

As his minute studies of the human form are extended he will learn to observe particulars at first lost sight of in his consideration of the more general features of man's frame. With such observation and knowledge of particulars the sculptor will acquire that facility in embodying them in his work which enables him to make his model strictly resemble the original from which it is taken. His eyes will be opened to every slight departure from the leading types of the aspect of the human form with which he may have stored his memory. He will find himself continually reviewing the external characteristics of humanity, and with these habits of observation he will acquire enlarged powers of representing men and women as they are under every possible relation in which they can stand to one another at every stage of their relative structural developement. He will learn how from infancy to old age the forms of the body correspond with every functional change of constitution in both sexes.

The natural danger from which no school of sculpture has, as yet, ever been exempt, has been that, in the very extent and minuteness of such studies the sculptor loses the power of generalising, as he acquires that of individualising; and the culminating point of excellence has always been found in the art at that stage of its developement in which the sculptor has acquired his highest powers of direct imitation consistent with his retention of command over and power of adhering strictly to broad generalisation. Need I point out to you that the perfection of such a stage was found in the age of Pericles in Greece, and remains, I trust for ever, written upon the surface of every fragment of the sculptor's art which has come down to us from that illustrious period?

In the Elgin marbles we find unerring testimony to the sculptor's perfect acquaintance with all that is most economical, most useful and most beautiful in the human form, and with the best means of so representing it, in repose and action, as to appeal most forcibly to our admiration and sym-

pathy. His art is wielded in connection with architecture, but never in such wise as to interfere with the structure it embellishes. In this respect how different was it from most of the architectural sculpture of other periods of art. As though conscious of its own powers of attraction and its own dignity, it seems to be supremely above asserting its own position at the expence of the sister art with which it is associated. Its genuine nobility stands far above that fine ladyism which seems, at other periods in the history of sculpture, too often warning off all other arts as intruders upon the admiration she would claim for herself alone.

So understood and so practised, it is in such association with architecture that sculpture finds its noblest theatre. When isolated it cannot of course lose its command over our admiration, when presented to us in the perfect form of statues such as now form the highest adornments of such galleries as that of the Vatican at Rome. Our delight however in such sculptures corresponds with that which we derive from melody alone. It is when that melody is blended in harmony, as sculpture is when it is allied with painting and architecture, that the highest elements of delight are excited by it. The fulness of the chord touches us more than any simple strain, however sweet it may be.

Having thus faintly traced the processes by which the sculptor may be considered to have conquered all obstacles which stand between him and the power of direct imitation in his art, we may turn our attention to what, in the theory that determines his mode of exercising that power, the sculptor will have to eliminate as beyond its due province, and that which should remain within it.

I have already alluded to the fact of that technical origin and association of sculpture which must always pervade it, and from which alone spring a certain series of conditions which practically set limits upon the propriety of certain modes of imitation in the art.

Every branch of the Fine Arts has of course certain limitations which mark, as it were, the boundaries of their respective provinces, and decree certain specified deviations from the model serving as the basis for imitation in each of those arts. The mode in which the artist, in each and every branch of the family of the Fine Arts meets the difficulties set by these natural laws of wise limitation of direct imitation, is generally known as his mode of conventionally treating the subject through his representation of which he has to awaken associations of delight, or other emotions in the minds of the spectator of his work.

The conventions of sculpture are numerous and highly artificial. They have been well treated of by many writers, and by none better than some of our own countrymen. Sir Charles Eastlake, in his contributions to the literature of the Fine Arts, Flaxman, in his admirable Lectures on the art, delivered to the students of the Royal Academy, Winckelmann, Cicognara, and Visconti, in their respective treatises, and Mr Edward Falkener in his most instructive work, under the name of *Dædalus*, have furnished us with a model code for the sculptor's guidance in some of the most anxious and arduous positions in which he will find himself placed in the varied practice of his art.

One of the first and most important series of conventions of his art to which the sculptor should learn to subject himself, arises from the indispensable necessity of simplifying his work. To tell a story powerfully in sculpture essentials alone should be represented. In proportion to the multiplicity of detail introduced will be the tendency of the spectator's attention to stray from the dominant emotion which should be conveyed to his mind on his contemplation of the story or subject represented by the sculptor. When in actual life we behold a scene, or the action of a group of persons which profoundly interests us, no details distract our attention from the passionate emotion which may animate the action that

interests us. This arises from the activity of our interest in our fellow-beings, and the profound sympathy which reality excites in us. But when any such scene or circumstance is delineated in the colder abstraction of sculpture we have no longer this sentiment of reality to excite us, and unless the sculptor absolutely removes from his work all details which do not tend to increase our sense of the dominant emotion he would make us feel, we shall infallibly remain as cold to his work, clever as it may be in its detailed execution, as the stone or marble in which it may be wrought.

It is this attention to simplicity which will force the sculptor to increase the violence of contrasted action in the movements of the principal personages of his group. In his representations of a combat he will express the equality of the struggle by the regularly opposed and almost correspondent lines of movement on the part of each antagonist. The superiority of one combatant over another he will show by enforcing the ease and energy of the conqueror by his upright and vigorous attitude, while he will throw the conquered into a prone or supine position, with muscles relaxed and energy subdued.

To heighten celestial beauty the judicious sculptor will often associate it with forms of a lower order for contrast alone, and the critical spectator will pardon almost any divergence from what is likely to be probable in the scene the sculptor may portray, provided that by such departure from probability the moral of the theme he depicts may be more forcibly expressed. There is however a limit at which that divergence from probability must end, varying of course with the propriety of the sculptor's aim.

Where it is his object to express and enforce some great moral sentiment by portraying the tragic consequence of some vice, or the triumphant result of the practice of some ennobling virtue, the treatment of his theme may be highly idealised, and, strictly speaking, unnatural; but if, on the



other hand, he is simply depicting a group of loveliness for our delight,—a couple of lovers reposing, the embraces of a Cupid and a Psyche, or the peaceful rest of Sleeping Children,—he will find himself bound by the laws of good taste to adhere to an almost strictly natural treatment of his subject, and any deviation from what is natural and probable would constitute an offence instead of a merit on his part.

It is the consciousness of how far he may legitimately go in the exercise of the conventions of his art that will best guide the sculptor in the selection of subjects which may be fittingly adopted by him. The sculptor who may feel that his technical skill in refined manipulation of his materials and natural sympathies lead him with the greatest success to work in direct imitation of nature, even in its minute details, will do well to select for himself only such placid and yet beautiful subjects as accord with our sense of the delight of moral and physical repose. Loveliness and a certain measure of human interest must not be absent from his creations, and in the expression of new refinements of beauty his art may find a judicious scope, and in that particular branch he may attain a rare and great excellence.

I do not know amongst modern sculptors that I could select a more happy illustration of appropriate selection of subject on the part of an artist, thus peculiarly gifted, than in the person of my relative, the late Richard Wyatt of Rome. His works, from their perfect refinement of beauty, their elegant proportion and harmonious composition under every point of view, must always retain a high and permanent value. Those minute beauties which an intimate acquaintance with a beautiful model leads us gradually to most highly appreciate, he studied indefatigably, and directly imitated from nature with singular success. His contrasts of texture of various substances, of different degrees of smoothness and roughness, were carried to the verge, without ever overstepping what is proper in the naturalistic treatment

of sculpture; but had he either attempted powerful dramatic subjects, which it was not in his intellectual constitution to feel vigorously, or to treat such themes with the naturalistic detail with which he treated the Idyllic ones in which he delighted, he would have failed, alike from want of power as an original thinker, and want of knowledge how fitly to realise such themes within the legitimate limits of the resources of his art.

A constant stumblingblock to sculptors, and particularly those who have lived at periods when public admiration was greatly concentrated on the triumphs of the painter's art, has been the confusion likely to reign at such periods between the principles and resources of the rival arts depending upon imitation as their basis. As there have been painters such as David, Nicolas Poussin, and perhaps Andrea Mantegna, whose pictures have been but coloured abstractions of the sculptor's art; so there have been sculptors who have shipwrecked themselves upon the lee shore of picturesque sculpture. To snatch a grace beyond their fellows has been the phantom syren which has lured them on to those dangerous rocks. With great talent and wonderful powers of execution they have certainly occasionally snatched much grace, but in doing so they have overstepped the judicious limits of their art; and the delight which we might otherwise derive from witnessing these, their successful expressions of grace, has been altogether marred and neutralized by an overwhelming sense of the impropriety of the mode in which they have attempted to realise an expression which would have been more fittingly embodied through the resources of the painter's art than of the sculptor's.

As Flaxman tells us,—“An attention to the materials of sculpture will naturally lead us to the selection of its legitimate subjects. The grey solemn tints of stone, the beautiful semi-transparent purity of marble, the golden

splendour, or corroding darkened-green of bronze, reject as incongruous all subjects the characters of which have not some dignity and elevation. The awful simplicity of those forms whose eyes have neither colour nor brilliancy, and whose limbs have not the glow of circulation, strikes the first view of the beholder as beings of a different order from himself. Angels, spiritual ministers, embodied virtues, departed worthies, the patriot or general benefactor, shining in the splendour of his deeds, or gloomy and consuming memorials of the great in former ages,—such subjects distinguish temples, churches, palaces, courts of justice, and the open squares of cities. At the same time that they symbolise their several purposes they may be comprehended in three classes,—the sublime, heroic, and tender. The sublime represents all supernatural acts and appearances, such as assemblies of the gods, or falls of the giants, &c. In the higher class of Christian subjects are the different acts of Creation, the Angels appearing to the Shepherds, the Transfiguration, the Ascension and the Judgment. In this class can be nothing common in idea, person or action. The idea, whether simple or complex, must be such as cannot be seen in nature. The beauty and dignity of the persons should be more than human, and the action, whether forcible or pathetic, should be action in its essence. Of the heroic class of composition we may account the Battles of the Athenians and Amazons, and of the Athenians and Persians in the Temples of Minerva and Theseus in Athens, and the Temple of Apollo at Phigaleia, with such subjects as the story of Orestes and the Death of Egysthus in the ancient basso-relievos. Of the tender or pathetic are the Death of Meleager, Antiope comforted by Zethus and Amphion, to which may be added such Christian subjects as Michael Angelo's Holy Family, and Charity. For although these two last are paintings their compositions are so perfectly sculptural that they may without impropriety be admitted

into the present arrangement. Another class of subjects are to be observed among the ancient basso-relievos, which may be termed the graceful,—from the prevalence of elegant female figures in the pageants of marine divinities, or in the festive choruses. The characteristics of Grecian composition in the best ages are simplicity and distinctness, in all the examples of painting and sculpture which have come down to us. Where the story does not require much action it is told by gentle movement, and the figures, whether grouped or single, have a sufficient portion of plain background left about them to shew the general lines, with the forms of the limbs and draperies perfectly intelligible. Where complication and force of action may be required, it is done with a grace of concatenation which adds continuity to the act, without causing it to be less distinct; and in such acts as are all agitation and violence,—the force of striking,—the rush of flight,—the agony of dying, and the prostration of the dead,—in which union of action is enforced by repetition, and difference of situation by contrast, still the same distinctness is preserved.”

To ensure this same quality of distinctness under varying conditions of illumination, and under the varying positions at which the spectator's eye may be placed in reference to the work of sculpture seen, involves a special and highly interesting series of artistic conventions.

I will address myself briefly to describing a few of these: and firstly those dependent upon varying illumination.

It will be obvious that in those where the source of illumination is considerably above the spectator every slight projection will throw a considerable shadow. Care must be taken, wherever the eye is to rest with complacency, or for any length of time, to reduce the projections of the several parts or edges from which shadows are likely to be cast so as to maintain a breadth of light upon such spots. On the other hand, to preserve a clearness of expression in all those

parts which must be seen in shade,—such for instance as the hollows over and under the eyes, the nostrils, and the commissures, or meeting of the lips, a much greater amount of undercutting must be executed than would really reproduce the forms copied in nature. Without such undercutting the expression due to these features will be entirely wanting, and it is by such artificial incisions alone that the due amount of drawing requisite to make the parts represented perceptible in shade can be given.

Of this variety of convention the Greeks were perfect masters, and should any of you ever have the opportunity of examining carefully the heads of the Phidian Colossi which still stand upon the Esquiline at Rome, I would earnestly invite your attention to the most remarkable instance with which I am acquainted of the success of such a peculiarly artistic dealing with this section of natural features in sculpture.

Where light is feeble, as occasionally in interiors, it will be necessary to adopt only a very simple relation of parts, so that the masses of light and of shadow may be broad and strongly contrasted, requiring to be artificially heightened by sinking in certain depths and by flattening certain eminences. It is naturally in colossal and architectonic sculpture that this sort of heightening effect is chiefly to be wrought, and it was in this particular form of convention that the sculptors of the middle ages transcendently excelled.

We must all of us remember how frequently, in the chapel of some great cathedral—the whole light in which has proceeded perhaps from a distant window, and where for a few moments after entering, the eye of the spectator, passing from a fully lighted nave into the chapel could scarcely recognize anything—the form of some gothic figure has gradually made itself perceptible in the gloom. The architectural arrangement of the niche in which the figure has been placed has been such as to throw a deepened gloom around the head

from which even a dimly illuminated surface has been defined with marked distinctness. The deeply-cut folds of drapery have been so arranged as to indicate by one or two predominant lines the general sway and balance of the figure. These prominent rolls have been contrasted and made visible by deeply-cut hollows behind them; every feature has been more or less exaggerated in bulk or projection, and every hollow has been cut into a deep hole. The hair has been arranged in lines and masses defined by contrast with deep sinkings and undercuttings. Such a figure, placed in bright sunlight, would be a heap of incongruities, and those points, which alone serve to make it visible in the deep gloom in which it stands, would be but obvious blemishes when revealed in their naked truth and simplicity to the spectator.

Under strong illumination the amount and breadth of light which is allowed to rest upon the parts of a group should be in proportion to the relative interest of the several figures. From the principal figure expressing the general theme, all small and unnecessary parts from which shadows would be cast should be carefully eliminated, while to the less important figures on which the eye should rest but passingly such draperies or other coverings may be allowed, as shall neutralize their tendency to thrust themselves upon the attention. Figures introduced for the sake of balance which may be strictly accessory only to the incident represented should be lowered altogether in salience, and broad but not black shadows should be allowed to form themselves upon their surfaces.

What will always most forcibly attract the eye to itself in sculpture is a broad light contrasted here and there only with very deep shadow, and remotely with the largest mass of shade, or half-tint, or shadow, illuminated by a good deal of reflected light. An equal balance of light and shade, particularly distributed in small masses, the eye will rapidly pass over, and it is well when the sculptor, by artifices which shall

not run counter to probability, is enabled to make the masses of light and shade which he knows will primarily attract or repel the eye of the spectator to or from himself, before his understanding will have gathered the drift of the theme represented, coincide with the relative importance to the story of the different portions of the work upon which such light or shade will fall.

This subordination of parts is less important of course in high illumination than it is under a lowered light, since the intellect is brought more rapidly to a complete understanding of what is represented in the former than in the latter case, and is therefore less dependent upon the order in which attention is called to the several parts of the composition.

I need scarcely dwell upon the treatment necessary in those rare cases in which the illumination is wholly from beneath, as happens to be the case in the lighting of those beautiful Athenian friezes, representing the Panathenaic Processions, and the combats of the Centaurs and Lapithæ. In these those portions of the limbs and heads upon which expression is mainly written, are inclined artificially at such an angle as enables them to catch the light which, but for such artificiality, would pass by them altogether. By such means that is rendered visible which is essential to expression, and which could not be seen if the inclination to one another, and the section of corresponding parts existing in the human subject, had been closely and heedlessly followed.

We may now proceed, secondly, to a consideration of the conventions dependent upon the varying position of the spectator's eye with reference to the sculptor's work.

Work destined to be principally seen from a great distance requires that the figures shall not be flattened as in bas reliefs in any part, but shall be raised, either in the round, or, if relieved from the surface immediately behind them, shall be, if not entirely detached from that surface, but little absorbed into it. In such a case it does not do to

remove the figures so relieved which may be in the round too far from the surface against which they are relieved; as, in that case, light steals behind them and neutralizes the clearness of the shadows which they ought to throw against the surface from which they are relieved. It is at the same time requisite for such distinctness that they shall be more relieved than one half their substance from that ground, since it is the cutting back in a plane at an acute angle to the ground which gives that blackness to the shadows cast from them which is requisite to throw them out from their ground with distinctness.

Where a figure is to be seen from a great distance relieved, not against a substance similar to that in which the figure is made, but against the blue sky, it must be considerably increased in dimension; otherwise the sky will appear to confuse its outline, over-run it and eat into it. This is especially the case where the figure is not in a white material, but is relieved against the sky as dark against light, instead of light against dark.

Of course it is possible, where it is desired to make objects of sculpture visible at great distances, to relieve them against grounds darker than, or different in colour from themselves; but such artificial contrasts are dangerous, since they are apt to attract the spectator's attention to themselves, and to the difference of material, instead of allowing it to be concentrated upon the subject of the story or the dominant lines of the composition.

For the same reason,—to avoid confusion, in parts which from the distance of the spectator cannot be readily seized by his eye on a first view, every non-essential to the story should be banished from the sculptor's work,—ornaments of all kinds should be done away with,—the figures should be detached from one another, and surrounded as far as possible by the ground only from which they have to be relieved. This should especially be the case with the principal personages of



the group, about whose action there should be no mistake. The less important personages in the drama may play their subordinate parts in much greater proximity to one another, and frequently a reduplication and almost confusion in their lines will give additional prominence and expression to the comparative isolation of the principal actors in the drama.

Where, for instance, deities, kings, or heroes have to be represented in company with ordinary humanity, this isolation is still more necessary to preserve the requisite idea of dignity and supremacy. It is alike essential to the preservation of the sentiment of repose in the deity, of power in the king, and of impetus and action in the hero.

In works calculated to be seen from a nearer point of view by the spectator much less conventionality in the imitation of nature may be adopted with success by the sculptor. He may sink his figures into the ground from which they are relieved, more or less, as he may be minded; with the full consciousness that the spectator will see both that which is on an elevated and on a subordinate plane. He will find it necessary and beneficial to heighten the expression of action, or the direction of dominant lines by the contrast presented by smaller parts, running counter to the general direction of the main lines, such as may be afforded by the artificial disposition of draperies or ornaments. He may allow even his principal personages a certain amount of interlocked action, without fear of confusion; and he may venture on subtleties, of minor indications of race, and peculiarities of physical constitution, which, under other circumstances, should only be broadly indicated. He will find it necessary, should the spectator's fixed position be far below the work of art he is to examine, to alter the scale of proportions into which a pertinacious study of the best models in nature will teach the sculptor to divide his figures. He will find it necessary occasionally to alter the scale of horizontal and vertical distances. If, for instance, his figure

is divided, from shoulder to shoulder, into two heads, or other units of denomination, and the length, from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot, into eight,—he will have, if he retains two for the shoulders, to increase the number assigned for the length; or if he retains those assigned for the length, to diminish those assigned for the breadth;—in fact, he will have to pull his figures out at length in all their parts, diminishing them thereby proportionally in width, as the angle of the visual rays from the spectator's eye which embrace the figures he sees becomes acute.

A corresponding operation will have to be gone through in the exceptional cases of a work of sculpture being seen only from a point situated much upon either side.

There is one other mode by which distinctness may be obtained under exceptional conditions of vision, as when a work of sculpture may require to be viewed from a spot very much below it: viz. by slightly altering the planes of certain leading portions of the object executed, so as to present surfaces artificially extended to the spectator's eye. This is a mode of treatment somewhat analogous to that which we have spoken of as requisite when illumination is only obtained by light reflected from beneath, but it will be obvious that it would be unsafe to venture upon any bending forward of certain planes, so as to catch the eye of the spectator beneath if the illumination of the work of art was at the same time to be from above, since in that case the spectator beneath would see only surfaces in shade, and would therefore lose those very impressions which it was the sculptor's object to impress him with when he thought of throwing forward the surfaces in question.

We have hitherto attended to the quality of distinctness and the conventions associated with it, but there are other conventions to be attended to, dependent upon other trains of emotion than those which the spectator experiences in connection with the subject selected by the sculptor. I

allude to that natural feeling of delight conveyed by the subordination of form to geometrical and symmetrical laws. Often pleasure is experienced from sculpture with the subject and action of which we may be either unacquainted, or to which we may be more or less indifferent, arising in such a case simply from the beautiful balance of parts and the symmetry of the whole composition.

It is of course an artificial proceeding to cause lines of light to contrast with each other, and to play before our eyes in forms of sinuous elegance, and especially to do this without making us sensible that the artist has perverted or distorted any type existent in nature.

In architecture, painting and sculpture, the geometrical form which first received universal acceptance, as complete in itself, and expressive in all those arts of vigour and permanence, was that of the pyramid. Adopting that as the leading form by which any number of personages could be well built up in sculpture either in a group or in a simple triangular form, as when relieved against a background, the natural mode by which symmetry could be best maintained was by the erection within it of a perpendicular, dividing it equally on all sides, and then grouping around this perpendicular regularly balanced forms.

In obedience to the problems which grew out of the adoption of the triangle as a satisfactory framing for groups of sculpture when projected against a background, came the satisfactory filling of the pedimental triangle of the Greeks and Romans, especially of the former.

A moment's inspection of any sculptured pediment from that of the Apollo at Egina, to that of the Walhalla of modern Bavaria, will show how absolutely necessary for fine effect it is, that the groups filling any such form should combine themselves with systematic regularity. The figure of the deity given to us, in the case of the Eginetan Temple, in the person of Minerva, forms an admirable centre, on each

side of which the combatants are arranged in due and simple order. A similar position is occupied, according to Mr Falkener's admirable restoration of the sculptures filling the Eastern pediment of the Parthenon, by the figure of a Winged Victory. Nothing can be more highly artificial, and yet more beautifully natural, than the mode in which the acute angles at the base of the Eastern pediment of the Parthenon were unquestionably filled by figures, which while exactly accommodating themselves to the inclined line corresponding with that of the roof of the structure, appear to do so without the slightest distortion, or want of natural connection one with the other. Their limbs form leading lights, so arranged as to admirably balance and contrast with the angle enclosed by the horizontal and inclined corona, or salient square member of the cornice of the structure.

In our own country it is a great satisfaction to be able to point to at least one pediment designed with a due regard to the theories of contrast, in harmonious geometrical relation of parts, one to another. I allude to that of St George's Hall at Liverpool, designed by the late Mr Cockerell, whose services to the art of Sculpture were even more important, if it could be possible, than those he rendered to the sister art of Architecture. To him we might have been indebted, had we been wise enough to sympathise as we should have done with his energy, for the Eginetan marbles. To him we are indebted for those of Phigaleia; and by his admirable powers as an artist and orator he stimulated all of us, alike to an appreciation of the beauties of ancient Greek, and English Christian sculpture. We can neither forget his devotion to the one nor to the other; placing himself, in this respect, for enlightened judgment and liberality on the same platform with Flaxman;—while from his more brilliant endowment with the gift of rhetoric, he was enabled to plead the cause and develop the principles of both with even greater aptitude and power than Flaxman.

It is to the works of the last-named, rather than to his writings, that we must recur for the expression of true theory, and for an illustration practically of how the spiritual element of Christian sculpture can be enhanced by the practice of the conventions originated by the Greeks, and carried forward with unwavering energy by the best sculptors of the period of the Renaissance.

Of that period there are many writers who have left us fair pictures of the principles upon which their concurrent practice was based. In Italy, Alberti, Vasari, Cellini, Cicognara, Visconti and others have enunciated a number of excellent principles which have been amplified by recent writers.

In Spain the treatises of the *Arfés* are full of instruction, particularly in the great importance given to geometry as the basis of beauty in the sculptor's art.

In Germany, from the days of Wincklemann downwards through Lessing, Müller, Kugler, Raczynski, &c., the art has received due illustration, more particularly under its archæological and theoretical aspects.

In France the utmost learning and intelligence have been exhibited in connection with the subject, and I may safely recommend to you for chamber-study the writings on the subject of Millin, Emeric David, Raoul Rochette, Beulé, Quatremere de Quincy, Viollet le Duc, Seroux d'Agincourt and Herbé. To the beautiful plates which illustrate "*The History of the Fine Arts in France, especially of Sculpture and Painting*," by the last-named author, I would especially direct your attention; since I know of none others uniting such delicate, with such truthful, execution.

While dwelling upon the subject of illustrations of sculpture, in connection with developments of the theory and practice of the art, I ought not to omit to point out to you the facilities which we now enjoy abundantly through the art of photography, of studying all the greatest monuments of

antiquity almost as though we had them under our eyes. This ought to be of extraordinary advantage to the diligent sculptor, since no inculcation of the principles of his art which can emanate from any professorial chair can for a moment be compared in value to the lessons he will derive, if he once gets firmly imprinted on his memory the types of beauty presented by those masterpieces.

Accompanying the learning of that lesson with a zealous and earnest desire to probe the practice by which they have been produced to the bottom, the excellences of those works may for a time depress him; and it is well that they should do so. To feel such depression is, I take it, a most hopeful sign,—as repentance may be looked upon as the first step to conversion and amendment.

It is not enough for the sculptor to theorize accurately;—his studies of theory must be ever accompanied with practice. We want from him both *faith* and *works*. But remember, gentlemen, that if we call upon the sculptor for his part of the business, you, as representing an intelligent Public, have not the less to be called upon to fitly educate yourselves to enjoy his works, and through them to appreciate his person. You will be refined by his works, and he will be stimulated and elevated by your applause or censure. It behoves you to take care that neither be ever misapplied. You can only make sure of this result by a pertinacious study of the best models, by educating your eyes as well as your minds, and by recognizing only as worthy theories for the art the feasibility, and desirability, of rising to its highest manifestations.

Too often sculpture, and particularly naturalistic sculpture, has been degraded to sensual representation. It has been made an element of the debasement instead of the elevation of the human mind and affections. For such an application of this lovely art, I would ask your utmost reprobation, and as the best counterpoise to any tendency

its material conditions may appear to endow it with towards assimilation with the grovelling portion of our nature, I would ask you to look for the pure only, and demand at the sculptor's hands the most spiritual application of his art,—neither hide, nor avoid, but purify the nude.

A just appreciation of the value of the principle that the height of art is to conceal art, is essential to the sculptor's success; but he may rely upon it he must already have acquired considerable skill in his art, and study of its dominant principles, before he can successfully carry out work in subjection to any such principle.

As the sculptor cannot, I believe, with propriety recur to colour as an adjunct to his art in any other form than shall be distinctly different from that in which colour exists in his model, the spectator is thrown back, in his search after delight from the sculptor's work, either upon its subject, or upon its inherent beauty. The highest pleasure of all is derived when interest of subject and inherent beauty co-exist.

A sense of this should lead the sculptor to the selection of such subjects as lend themselves best to the development of both sources of interest, and it is a fortunate element and condition of the harmonious relations which lie between our sense of what is most sublime, and what is most beautiful, that the subjects which connect themselves with sublimity in their moral relations are frequently those also which accommodate themselves best for the conveyance of a sense of beauty to those who would embody them, either in verse, on canvas, or in immortal marble.

Amongst such subjects, to the Greeks were eminently those derived from their loftiest speculations in divinity, and from their best phases of hero worship. To the Christian sculptor of the middle ages the beautiful events of the New and of the Old Testament alike offered themes of surpassing beauty and interest. The more carefully one compares the works, the principles and the practice of the spiritually

minged amongst the Greeks, and amongst the Goths, the more fully may we feel convinced that at the culminating periods of their practice a community of theory appeared to pervade both schools of art.

What may be called the Christian theory of sculpture has been well defined by Lord Lindsay in his description of the new life given to the art by Nicola Pisano. "He," Lord Lindsay says, "in practice at least, if not in theory, first established the principle that the study of nature corrected by the ideal of the antique, and animated by the spirit of Christianity, personal and social, can alone lead to excellence in art; each of the three elements of human nature,—matter, mind and spirit,—being thus brought into union and co-operation in the service of God, in due relative harmony and subordination. I cannot over estimate the importance of this principle. It was on this that, consciously or unconsciously, Nicola himself worked. It has been by following it that Donatello and Ghiberti, Leonard, Raffaele, and Michael Angelo have risen to glory. The Siennese school and the Florentine,—minds contemplative and dramatic, are alike beholden to it for whatever success has attended their efforts. Like a treble stranded rope it drags after it the triumphal car of Christian art; but if either of the strands be broken, if either of the three elements be pursued disjointedly from the other two, the result is, in each respective case, a grossness, pedantry or weakness. The exclusive imitation of nature produces a Caravaggio, a Rubens, a Rembrandt; that of the antique a Pelegrino di Tibaldi, and a David; and though there be a native chastity and taste in religion which restrains those who worship it too abstractedly from intellect and sense, from running into such extremes, it cannot at least supply that mechanical apparatus which will enable them to soar;—such devotees must be content to gaze up into Heaven, like angels crompt of their wings."

It seems curious that Lord Lindsay should in the last few



words have appreciated and expressed so clearly what many other enthusiasts in the cause of Christian art have refused to subscribe to; viz.—that in the manifestation of the most spiritual Christian art there has existed a real deficiency of what he designates as the “mechanical apparatus,” which could alone enable them to soar. It was excellence in the provision of that special mechanical apparatus which constituted the main difference between the best of the antique and the best of the Christian sculptures; and it is curious that the words of Socrates, in describing the course of study which might in his opinion most readily lead to a successful practice of the arts of design, an exact definition of the best mode in which that mechanical apparatus might be supplied, should find an apt and accurate definition. He says that “it was to be found by the study of the human form, animated by the human soul, because the human form is the most perfect of all forms, and contains in it the principles and powers of all inferior forms.”

The only defect one can conceive in the apparent theory of the Christian sculptors was precisely, that in aiming at the expression of perfect beauty, they failed to remember that it was only within the limits of human types of form that any such expression could be judiciously conveyed. Whatever veneration the spiritualisation of the representation of a human being, animated by a sentiment of almost divine excellence may excite in us, is utterly marred and thrown down, if we find the frame, irradiated with this “*afflatus*” from divinity, abject or unnatural. The chests that refuse to heave with breath,—the limbs that appear utterly incapable of locomotion,—the arms with muscles which enable them to move but in one direction,—lines of curvature impossible for a human vertebrate animal,—cannot commend themselves to our hearty approbation, however chastened and sublimed may appear the expression of faith which lifts them into the realm of spirituality.

As in architecture I have already expressed my conviction that our progress towards excellence must be a progress of blending, and of fusion of old and new,—and indeed of all that is excellent of all time,—so do I certainly believe, that it is by reconciling theories in sculpture, which at the first glance appear to be dissonant one from the other, that the modern sculptor may hope to attain to supreme excellence in his art, rather than by pertinaciously pursuing to its uttermost any isolated theory.

I can see nothing in the most beautiful subjects for the sculptor's art which could be derived from Sacred History, which,—however spiritually treated,—would not benefit by the fashioning of the actors in the drama represented into the guise of those perfect types of humanity so laboriously elaborated by the Greeks. If the two schools of art meet in sublimity as they have done, in their embodiments of the ideal of the Creator, surely they need not separate for ever in their representation of his creatures.

## LECTURE VII.

### SCULPTURE.

---

#### *PRACTICE.*

THE last time we met I had the pleasure of calling your attention, amongst other things, to the great extent to which technical processes, by which alone sculpture can be elaborated, predominated in that art; leaving the sculptor a free range for the expression of his thought only in obedience to the limitations which that technical alliance dictated.

While the predominance of this technical element should obviously exercise a large influence over the theory of sculpture, in its practice it is obvious that it becomes the really essential element. The education of the sculptor, to be at all complete, must therefore comprise, even in a larger degree than that of any other class of artists, a course of intellectual study to enable him to appreciate the scope and æsthetic aspect of his art, and that habit of daily labour by which alone complete mastery over the materials in which the artist's thought is to be expressed can be gained.

It is somewhat to be regretted that in the present generation the balance is not often well maintained between these two sections of the sculptor's education.

Beginning very early in life the habit of constant and daily labour in the studio, the sculptor is very apt to grow only into the highly dexterous workman, the very facility of whose hand often prevents his duly realizing the extent to which, for his work to be of value, that hand should be constantly guided by a highly cultivated imagination. He is too apt to learn the practice of his art by tradition, and to fancy, when he has acquired complete command over its technical processes, that he has learnt and done all that falls within his duty to either learn or do. This is a besetting tendency which produces mannerism and meanness in art, and one of the worst characteristics of its prevalence is that it tends to make pupils worse than their masters instead of better. The greater the facilities for acquiring dexterity in manual processes, the greater is the danger of their being practised only mechanically and with comparatively little intellectual effort; and the imagination, failing to be exercised, dwindles, as an unexercised muscle would, from strength into flaccidity.

There is another cause too, at the present time, which, while it renders his learning easy up to a certain point, makes it increasingly difficult from day to day for the sculptor to really excel his predecessors. It consists in the facility with which he can recur to the most perfect models in his art.

This may naturally seem a paradoxical statement, but a little explanation will probably suffice to explain what this proposition may seem to contain of self-contradiction. When a man sees the sublimest ideas embodied in his art with perfect technical skill, he is almost more apt to be disheartened than inspired. Feeling that it is no longer within his power to originate what may surpass the model set before him, he is too often content to simply imitate that model blindly, and resign himself to the disuse of those very faculties by the active and incessant exercise of which he

could alone hope to rival or surpass it. The habit of copying once acquired is obviously deadening to the imagination. That it may be necessary to acquire, in early youth, the power of copying minutely the work of another artist, is to be admitted; but if that practice is continued for a moment beyond that point in the career of an artist at which he should begin to originate, the habit of such copying will infallibly diminish the capacity for origination; and precisely in the proportion and to the extent to which the habit of such copying is allowed to preponderate, so will be the injury done to the artist's powers of invention. And this is particularly the case in sculpture, in the practice of which, as I have already explained, the sculptor is but the sublimation of the skilled workman.

If then we recognize that there is a certain stage in the education of the sculptor, at which he must lose the practice of copying, and take to that of originating, if he would hope to practise his art successfully, that moment for origination must not arrive without finding him prepared for the change in the direction of his studies. To call upon a man to originate who has never studied the principles upon which that origination should be based, is like calling upon a horse to draw a load which it is impossible he can move. He must either tamely submit to stand still, or exhaust himself in useless efforts to overcome difficulties which only demonstrate his weakness.

The theoretical education of the sculptor should accompany, and rather precede than otherwise, his practical education, but unfortunately it is very rarely the case that anything of the kind occurs.

When we look round the range of literature in which anything like a curriculum for the sculptor's education is laid down, I think we shall find that, with the exception of the Lectures of Flaxman, and those of some of his successors, professors of Sculpture at the Royal Academy, all that is

most valuable in recent times, at least as the text upon which the canons of his art stand recorded, has been written by others than sculptors.

In this country, Sir Charles Eastlake, who was one of the first to write philosophically upon the subject of sculpture, was a painter; while Mr Edward Falkener, whose admirable essay under the title of "*Dædalus*" contains a body of just criticism and apt illustration of the art, is an architect. Dallaway was an archæologist.

In France, Quatremère de Quincy, Raoul Rochetté, Beulé, Emeric David and Herbé were men of letters; Viollet le Duc, who has so admirably illustrated the principles of mediæval sculpture in his "*Dictionnaire*," is an architect.

In Italy, Alberti was, if anything, an architect; Vasari a painter, and Visconti and Cicognara students and amateurs.

In Germany, Winckelmann, Kugler, Förster and others have been all students and writers by profession.

In fact, with the exception of the good, though somewhat limited treatises of the Arfés, and Benvenuto Cellini—works rather technical than theoretical—and a few observations by Gibson, given in Lady Eastlake's *Memoirs* of that noble artist, we may search the realms of literature and scarcely find a sculptor who has shewn his acquaintance with the true theory of his art by any systematic treatise upon the subject.

It is curious too that even those laws connected with the proportions of the human figure, and the modes in which its muscular action maintains its equilibrium under varying conditions, have all been laid down for the sculptor's use and guidance by members of other professions than his own. Vitruvius in his treatise on architecture has principally guided us to the true canons of Greek proportion, while Albert Dürer, and Leonardo da Vinci, painters, have traced all the laws of the proportions and movements of the human body in all their usual limits of action, and the muscular efforts correspondent therewith.

If on the one hand sculptors have too much neglected the literature of their art, many of them have shewn themselves by their works to have almost intuitively apprehended principles which they have left to others to embody and record. May it not be that to the want of high literary and intellectual cultivation amongst the sculptors of the present day, with rare exceptions, we may attribute a large proportion of the misdirection in which much excellent technical skill may be observed labouring with very inadequate results?

No technical skill can compensate for faults in design; no dexterity in superficial imitation can atone for the selection of subjects which should never be imitated directly by a sculptor. If his work will not stand the test of philosophical examination, as well as that of the instinctive recognition of beauty by the eye which supplies us with a scale for measuring without intellectual effort the sterling ability of the sculptor, it may satisfy the requirements of the ill-educated critic, but can never gratify the truly cultivated connoisseur. If the sculptors in anywise shew themselves inapt to maintain a proper balance between the theoretical study of their art and its satisfactory technical practice, it the more behoves those for whose delight their art exists to qualify themselves to direct the labours of the sculptors into those channels which will alone bear strict analysis.

Having said thus much on the necessity of counterbalancing the natural predominance of the technical over the theoretical in the practice of sculpture, I propose now,—to examine successively the nature of those technical processes which the sculptor must learn in order to make himself an accomplished craftsman in his art,—to dwell upon that branch of his practice which is dependent upon the æsthetic conditions of that art,—and to consider how the peculiarities of these two branches of his education should react upon the work he has to execute, limiting and dominating every successful design.

There occur to me only four operations by means of which sculpture has ever been executed; and these will be found to coincide with and owe their origin to the properties of the various materials it is their duty to fashion. These four operations are cutting, modelling, fusing and beating.

The operations of cutting convert granite, marble, stone, wood, and some few other materials, such as ivory, precious stones &c., from shapeless forms into any which the sculptor may desire to embody.

The operation of modelling enables him to create the same forms out of any soft matter, and his ingenuity must then be brought to bear to convert that soft material into an approximation to hardness.

The third operation, that of fusing, could come into existence only with man's acquaintance with and mastery over the extraction of metals from their ores; taking advantage of the property of that section of the mineral kingdom to approach fluidity by the action of heat, and to revert to solidity on losing caloric.

The last operation, that of beating, could come only at that subsequent stage of man's technical education, when he would have acquired a knowledge of the relative ductility of metals under various conditions of their textures.

By the first of these operations, as I have said, the sculptor is enabled to convert hard and shapeless materials into the realization of his fancies. With the operation of cutting must of course be united that of abrading, or rubbing down, which is in fact only another form of cutting,—a slow and laborious operation particularly delighted in by those races which multiplied with a rapidity consistent with the teeming productiveness of the soil which gave them birth. Thus, this form of cutting has always been affected in the thickly-populated districts and on the highly productive soils of China, India and Egypt.

Where population has been thinner, and more labour has



been requisite to obtain the means of subsistence, men have learnt to be more economical of human labour: and under such conditions they have generally adopted those more speedy processes in art whereby economy of labour may be attained.

To those people to whom labour was a matter of indifference, intricacy and elaboration, amounting often to over elaboration, was a natural source of delight; and hence the highly ornamental character of Oriental Art, especially in the form of sculpture, from its very dawn.

As men rose in the scale of thinking beings their respect for human labour increased, and their desire to avoid its waste led them to eliminate from the scheme and practice of their arts all labour not indispensable to a satisfactory æsthetic result. Hence, no doubt, much of that obvious delight in simplicity which, while it facilitated the execution of Grecian sculpture, preserved its intellectual character, and substituted the beautiful for the difficult as a standard of excellence in art.

I cannot but think that a return on the part of the sculptor of the present day to a correspondent estimation of the dignity of labour, which demands that it should never be spent in vain, would purify many of the manifestations of his art, and only increase, in us and in him, a due appreciation of the really permanent sources of attraction in sculpture.

When the labour of the sculptor was limited to evolving, out of a shapeless form, the image which existed only in his fancy, he was liable in a high degree to misadventure in the operation of cutting. If a stroke too much removed a portion of material which it was essential to preserve for the representation of some important feature of his design, the moment that piece of material was cut away all the previous labour of the sculptor was necessarily sacrificed. It behoved him then in practice, in order to avoid any such great risk, to make for himself a model, in

some material which could be easily altered, of what he desired to carve in a permanent form, before commencing the otherwise hazardous operation of cutting. This it was which no doubt led to the application of our second class of operations to the sculptor's art.

In all the history of civilization, and in every race which has ever appeared upon the face of the earth, we find amongst the earliest of the technical arts acquired that which the Greeks distinguished as ceramic; or in other words the softening of certain substances by moisture, and then their hardening by the evaporation of that fluid through the application of heat.

In those intensely hot countries which formed the nursery of mankind, the sun alone would teach this lesson, and the sun-dried bricks of the earliest of the building races attested their acquaintance with that principle which, in the analysis of the technical arts, has been denominated plasticity. The formation of a mould, and the pressing of soft substances into that mould, and their subsequent restoration to hardness under the action of fire, are all successive stages of this ceramic system.

The substitution for fire of that chemical action by which certain materials having lime for their basis acquire in the highest degree the property of changing from plastic to comparatively hard textures, although an early, was probably a subsequent operation.

All of these arts were unquestionably known to the ancient Egyptians, and formed the fundamental basis upon which their practice of sculpture rested.

The progress of antiquarian and anthropological study has recognized the succession of these operations by generic divisions of the successive races of mankind into those which existed in the Stone Age, the Pottery Age, the Bronze, and the Iron Age; thus clearly falling in with the doctrine of the probability of man's successive acquire-

ment of the technical operations of cutting, abrading, modelling, and lastly of fusing.

A knowledge of plastic operations would naturally lead any possessing that knowledge in time to the provision of moulds made of plastic materials into which molten metals might be run. The first moulds, as is testified by certain Celt moulds which have been found cut in hard material, were no doubt furnished by cutting in intaglio, or sinking the form of the moiety of the object to be cast. To this would succeed casting in moulds formed by plastic operations, and the latest form of the operation of casting would probably be that of learning that casting might be effected in moulds the imprint in which was originally obtained by pressure only, a process now usually adopted for almost all metal casting, and known under the name of sand casting.

The advantage of this last-named process would be learnt only by great experience. Its main excellence consists in the ready disengagement, through the interstices between the moleculeæ of the sand, of the highly and rapidly elastic gases given off by the metal in the act of its conversion from the fluid to the solid state.

In the previous processes of casting from either stone moulds, or moulds prepared by the operations of plasticity, such as those of mixed plaster and brick earth or powdered brick (mainly clay moulds, in fact), those moulds would be found to fly to pieces unless a difficult and highly elaborated system of forming funnels or channels for the liberation of the gases had been carefully contrived.

There are few metals which lend themselves with sufficient freedom to the requirements of the caster to present on extraction from the mould such a surface as would be satisfactorily smooth or even\*. The operations of fusion

\* While these pages are being prepared for the press, an attempt, which gives every promise of success, is being made to overcome the difficulty above alluded to by casting metals in sand moulds under mechanical pressure and "in vacuo."

therefore require to be supplemented by those of cutting or abrading, and hence the labour of sculpture in metal is only abridged, and not entirely saved by the operation of casting.

In chasing, rifling, or otherwise finishing the object, the general form of which he may have obtained by casting, the hand of the sculptor must be again resorted to; and it will be one part of the perfect sculptor's education to learn how to manipulate in these later stages the various materials in which his work is executed.

This laborious operation of hand-finishing can never be altogether avoided, since it must either be given to the perfect completion of the original model, or to its reproduction.

Even in work executed by that most beautiful of all moulding processes,—to which I have not yet made allusion, but to which I ought perhaps to assign a separate action; viz. that of obtaining an image by galvanic agency throwing down within a mould particles of metal, one upon another, aggregated together until a sufficient thickness has been obtained to admit of the removal of the mould,—the sculptor who would obtain a perfect transcript of his model must finish that model as he would chase his work had he resorted to the operation of casting for its production.

Advanced in his command over the operation of fusing, and subsequently finishing his metal image by cutting, rubbing, or chasing, the sculptor will learn to realize the action of different metals under his tool. He will find that he will obtain much greater command over one class than over another, in proportion to the more or less crystalline, laminated or homogeneous condition to which the metal will be reduced by the point at which and the conditions under which its fusion may be effected and that fusion checked.

He will find that with certain metals the operation of

hammering or beating will restore the ductility lost by fusion, and he will learn to take advantage of that property by shaping under his tool any metal the texture of which he may be able to bring to an approximation to homogeneity.

The great value of the precious metals,—the beauty of gold, and the delight with which men seem to have intuitively regarded its glowing colour and property of reflecting light, naturally led to a desire for its use; while the rarity of the metal, and the difficulty of its extraction by the operations of cupellation, &c., would as obviously tend to increase its value. Men were thus led to discover and devise technical operations by which advantage might be taken of the tenuity of substance to which it might be reduced, so as to spread its lustre over extended surfaces. This no doubt led to the preparation of gold in thin plates, which, being applied as in the earliest monuments of the Hebrews to the covering of other substances, would give them the appearance of having been executed in this most precious of all substances. The same technical operations by means of which the goldbeater spread his lump of gold into extended laminæ or plates at once led to the knowledge of the facility with which the form of the laminæ might be changed; and hence came the first knowledge that metal plates might be raised in any of their parts so as to imitate objects of considerable variety of surface. The facility with which, if a blow too much raised the surface of the plate too highly, the error might be corrected by a blow in the opposite direction led at once and naturally to that process of repercussion, which greatly enlarged the scope of application of metal plates as a medium for the expression of the sculptor's art; and by means of this process of beating to and fro, which is so well known under the French title of *repoussage*, the greatest triumphs of sculpture in metal have been wrought, in all ages, from those of the Tabernacle of the Israelites down to the present day.

The materials, then, in which sculptors have always worked have allied themselves with the several operations just dwelt upon, somewhat after the following classification, the leading features of which I may perhaps do well to recapitulate here, viz.:—By means of cutting, and its subordinate form, abrasion, the hardest minerals, such as jade, porphyry, sienite, granite, chalcedony and sard, and comparatively softer substances such as marble, stone and wood have been brought within the sculptor's domain. By means of the operation of modelling, and its subordinate form of casting, clay has been converted into terra cotta; and plaster, wax, sulphur and some other cognate materials have been pressed into good service.

The two last-named of these materials, wax and sulphur, have, to a certain extent, been made subservient to the sculptor's wants by the first stages of the operation of fusing, the principal action of which has been exercised upon the various metals, as gold, silver, copper, bronze, iron, &c.

The last of our operations—beating—has been exercised mainly upon the precious metals, and to an extent fairly commensurate with their relative intrinsic value.

In dealing with these various materials the sculptor has sometimes combined their uses also in subordination to their relative value, so as to adorn a baser or less valuable metal by inlays or overlays of the more valuable; and this practice, which we find carried to an extraordinary perfection in the earliest monuments of which we have any acquaintance, in Chinese and Japanese metal working, we know from the descriptions of Homer to have been equally or nearly as well understood by the Greeks in the heroic ages.

There is yet one more material to which I should allude, upon which the sculptor's art has been very successfully exercised both in ancient times, and, by a happy revival, in the present day, viz., glass. The readiness of this material to soften under heat, its ductility when in a heated state,

and its great hardness when cool, has adapted it for treatment by the sculptor by all the processes to which I have made reference, excepting that of beating. By the ancients it was frequently made in a striated texture, in such wise as to present laminations of various colours. Advantage was taken of this peculiarity of structure to deal with it as certain materials have been dealt with in which nature had herself provided those peculiarities of variously coloured striation.

By the partial cutting away or abrasion of a layer of one colour, more or less of an inferior or sublying layer was denuded; and thus an appearance was readily obtained of an object in one colour relieved upon a ground of another colour.

The conversion, by a similar operation of cutting or abrasion, of the upper layer so separated from the inferior into a medallion or very low relief treatment of form by the sculptor gave its origin to that variety of his art which has always been highly esteemed under the generic designation of cameo cutting.

By means of this mode of working, and its corresponding operation of sinking into hard materials or working in intaglio, many of the most exquisite fancies of the ancients have been preserved to our days. The occasional habit of reproducing in the small forms of cameo or intaglio those contemporary studies which were most admired in those periods of the classic ages in which art has been most highly cultivated, has fortunately preserved to us the types of many forms of extraordinary beauty, which, but for being thus embalmed in the form of gems, would have passed altogether from human cognizance.

The present may be an appropriate occasion on which to notice the varieties of relief which, in these various materials and by these various operations of sculpture, the artist is enabled to give to his designs.

He may of course represent any image or group which he may desire to embody, in completely solid form, and in

the full dimension and isolation in which he may see and place his model. This is what is known as working in the round; and so long as a sculptor adheres to what is called the round, he must deal with the human or any other form in the same sections, and with the various contouring surfaces in the same position, in which those sections or contouring surfaces exist in his model; subject of course to such exceptional deviations from those sections and surfaces which he may find it necessary to superadd by way of complying with those conventions of his art to which I referred in my address on the theory of sculpture.

In what is called alto-relievo the sculptor simply places behind any figures he may model in the round a solid and generally flat backing. The flatness of this backing, and generally speaking the limits of space within which the figures in alto-relievo have to be contained, necessitate æsthetically, if not practically, a disposition of these figures in their leading actions in planes parallel with the surface of the backing; but, subject to such laws of disposition as those to which I have already referred, and others to which I may hereafter refer, in alto-relievo the sculptor deals with his personages in the full dimension in which they exist in nature in all parts.

In cases where this depth is limited it may be necessary as it were to sink, or allow to be absorbed into the background, a portion of the figures represented. In such cases the work may still be regarded as alto-relievo (complete detachment being frequently designated as altissimo-relievo) until one half in depth is absorbed from back to front.

In that case it reaches a stage which is known as mezzo-relievo, and in all varieties of depth from back to front, extending from half the substance of the rounded parts, down towards that flatness which is characteristic of what is known as medallion sculpture, the work remains in the condition of what is known as basso-relievo.



When the flatness is such that scarcely anything but a flat picture is left upon the surface of the back-ground, *bassissimo-relievo* is obtained.

In *basso-relievo* the contour or outline of every form retains a natural scale, while the section from back to front of every part is reduced to a conventional scale, and it is in this process of reduction from *basso-* towards *bassissimo-relievo* that the skill of the accomplished sculptor is most severely tested.

As a general rule it becomes necessary for him to flatten every part in strict obedience to a scale of parts obtained by laying out upon a straight line the full dimension of the depth of every part in the living model proposed to be introduced in the *basso-relievo*, and then obtained by applying that line at such an angle to the surface of the back-ground of the *bas-relief* as may allow its whole extent to be comprised within the parallel planes of the back of the *bas-relief* and a plane parallel to it, beyond which it is prescribed that none of the parts of the *bas-relief* shall project.

There are however certain cases and certain stages in the arrangement of *basso-* and *bassissimo-relievo*, which can be only learnt with great practice and experience in modelling in these forms of relief, at which it is expedient to depart from any such strict determination of relative saliences.

For instance, when a *bassissimo-relievo* is to be seen from a great distance, it becomes necessary to raise the parts meeting the back-ground more from the ground than would be allotted to them if a strict scale of projections was to be followed; but for such an artificial elevation, as it were, they would be lost in the ground against which they should be defined.

When on the other hand the *bassissimo-relievo* may be inspected close to the eye, the forms may be almost lost in the back-ground, and yet be clearly perceptible to the spectator.

Again, to those parts of the bas-relief to which the sculptor will especially desire to direct the observer's attention, he will give a certain extra salience; but in doing so in practice he will require to work with the utmost skill so as to prevent the artifice from being too readily perceived.

One of the happiest modes of concealing his deviations from strict regularity is given by the directions in which he will use his modelling or cutting tool; so as to assist by the almost microscopic lines of varieties of surface he will leave upon the different parts of his work, and by contrasting concavities with convexities in his touch, the relative idea of salience or retrocession of the various parts of his work. Mastery over such dexterities of practice in finish is acquired by the sculptor almost instinctively, but only by long and incessant labour; and they occasion often some of those most subtle elements of grace which captivate the ordinary spectator without leaving him ability to discern the source of his special delight.

It must be obvious from our definitions of the varieties of relief in which the sculptor may be called upon to work, to how great an extent those fore-shortenings which the unrestrained action of figures present must be qualified by the necessary conditions of a parallel projection.

The art of the sculptor in such compositions consists therefore, in the first place, in selecting such attitudes and dispositions of accessories as may retain the main lines in strict accordance with the space which forms the back-ground of the work. The necessity of placing the principal figures upon the same plane renders (as I had occasion to remark in my last address) an almost complete isolation of each figure necessary for the purpose of distinctness; and it is only by binding the leading figures in regular geometrical lines that unity of action in the various parts of the composition can be preserved.

In designs for relief, every principal part of each object, or every feature or limb necessary for telling the story or marking clearly the action of each figure, must be exhibited. An arm cannot without detriment be hidden by a body, nor should it cross any leading portion of the person, so as to break up and cast a confusing shadow over the trunk in its main direction. No one leg should be altogether hidden by another, or the impression will be derived that the figure really possesses but one. There should be no such concealment of any limb as to entail confusion upon those displayed, or so as to allow a doubt to be thrown upon the personage to whom the limb shewn may belong. The direction of no limb should be so interrupted by crossing shadows as to make it difficult to trace it from the hand or foot back to the trunk from which it springs.

Drapery should be always so arranged as to assist this determination of the appropriation of limbs, and the source, direction and cause of motion. It may thus be made an element of expression instead of an element, as it too often is, of doubt and confusion.

Nothing can exceed the skill with which throughout that portion of the Panathenaic Frieze in which the Athenian sculptors represented horses every hoof is shewn, without any appearance of constraint; and it may be perfectly clearly traced to which horse each individual set of hoofs belongs. In fact, throughout this wonderful series of compositions, alike in theory and in practice the artist has vindicated his complete knowledge of and domination over the resources of his art as expressed in the form of bas-relief.

The necessity for exhibiting all the leading portions of every principal figure makes it exceedingly difficult to preserve a nice mean between that isolation which would render the subject disjointed, and which would interrupt the apparent dramatic action of the scene portrayed, and that general appearance of uncertainty which would inevitably

arise from a huddling together of the various elements essential to convey a clear idea of the scene illustrated.

On the special subject of *alto-relievo*, Sir Charles Eastlake has well observed that "a certain open display of the figure is generally adopted, and shadows, or rather the forms which project them, are so disposed as to present at the first glance an intelligible and easily-recognized appearance; and the impossibility of changing the point of view, or changing the light, limits the attitudes more than in a statue; and (as will also appear) more than in a *basso-relievo*; for in the latter, however distinct the outline in which the chief expression and meaning of the figures reside, the shadows within the extreme outlines are in a great measure suppressed. It is in fact to their being so suppressed that general forms become distinct. This is also the case when one form is relieved on another, for it will be found that the nearest object is then very much reduced and flattened."

In *mezzo-relievo* greater liberty of action is admissible, since the attachment of the subject to the wall at the line of its contour insures a clear projection of shadows, indicating the nature of the main outline. Such shadows are less liable to cause confusion than those which may be cast by portions of figures completely detached from the ground against which they are placed. At the same time *mezzo-relievo* is susceptible of surface modelling as round as that which should be employed in *alto-relievo*.

Commenting on the practice of the Greeks in the best ages in their treatment of complicated historical subjects, Flaxman observes that "where the story does not require much action it is told by gentle movement, and the figures, whether grouped or single, have a sufficient portion of plain back-ground about them to shew general lines, with the forms of limbs and draperies perfectly intelligible. Where complication and force of action may be required, it is done

with a grace of concatenation which adds continuity to the act without causing it to be less distinct. And in such acts as are all agitation and violence, the force of striking, the rush of flight, the agony of dying and the prostration of the dead, in which union of action is enforced by repetition, and difference of situation by contrast, still the same distinctness is preserved."

That repetition by means of which this unity of action is preserved usually consists (in compositions in basso-relievo) of disposing limbs and other features of the design in lines parallel one to another.

Attention is artfully called to the fact of many individuals animated by a common sentiment by the expression of that sentiment in identical movement, and by contrasting the unanimity of purpose by the action of some one individual in a directly opposite sense.

On the subject of basso-relievo, and indeed bassissimo-relievo, Sir Charles Eastlake further remarks that "as projection commands shadow, so flatness commands light; and the flattest relief is hence fittest for an invariably dark situation. The flatness which ensures light would however be altogether indistinct and formless, unless the outlines were clear and conspicuous at the first glance. The contrivance by which this is effected is by abruptly sinking the edges of the forms to the plane on which they are raised, instead of gradually rounding and losing them" (thus enforcing a remark I have already made); "the mass of the relieved figure being sometimes very little raised in its general surface, its outline would thus almost present a rectangular projection. In many instances the side of this projection is even less than rectangular;—it is undercut, like some mouldings in architecture which require to be particularly distinct, and thus present a deeper line of shadow. But if the figure can thus command distinctness of outline notwithstanding the inconsiderable light it may receive, it is obvious that its lowness or

flatness of relief will in such a light greatly aid its distinctness. Above all, this contrivance gives to a work thus shown in an obscure situation the effect of rotundity. Indeed it is a great mistake to suppose that the flat style of relief was intended to appear flat, and it is a great mistake to apply it in such situations as in the open air, where it must appear so, and be indistinct besides."

A few moments' consideration of the way in which light and shade would act upon the *bassissimo-relievo*, in which the artifice above alluded to was practised; viz.—that of smartly raising the edges of the subject represented from the ground, by rounded forms entering the ground of the *bas-relief* at right angles, will make clear, I do not doubt, to the student the exact means by which great additional clearness may be given to the subject represented.

Supposing the ground of the *bas-relief* to represent a half tint, as it does, owing to the even distribution of microscopic shadows over its surface, which are cast by the want of perfect smoothness in that ground,—and supposing the light to strike from above at an angle, say of 45 degrees, it will be obvious that it will be caught by a ridge on the upper side of the subject, while a corresponding ridge on the lower part of the subject will cast a distinctly drawn shadow upon all which is opposed to the direction of the light. Its effect therefore will be to throw a continuous line of light round all the upper edges of the subject, and a continuous line of dark under all the lower edges of the subject; thus practically doing exactly the same thing that the outline engraver does when he "backlines" his figure, or indicates the probable action of light and shadow upon the subject he portrays by strengthening and deepening the intensity of his outline on all those parts of his subject in shade or from which shadow would be likely to be cast.

It is in fact only drawing with the modelling tool; and, as I have before said, the lower the relief, the more the

sculptor's work approximates to that of the painter, supposing that painter to be limited to working in monochrome, or little more than outline.

Even in the lowest relief a sculptor will know how in his practice to compensate for deficiency of relief and to give an appearance of salience to different portions of his subject by judicious contrast of texture and surface. The smoother the surface the stronger and more concentrated will be the light it conveys to the spectator. The rougher, the darker will be the effect, and by working the irregularities of surface in such directions with the tool as such an engraver as Marc Antonio would be likely to give to his engraving of an ancient bas-relief, he will be enabled to borrow a legitimate grace from his knowledge of the laws of perspective, and *chiaro-oscuro*, which, without prostituting those laws, will enable him to assist the effect he may desire to express.

In their knowledge of such subtleties as these the sculptors of the Italian Renaissance were but little, if at all, inferior to the ancient Greeks; and Vasari's allusions to the practice of the studios of his time are full of instruction upon such points.

His account indeed of the practice of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries,—of men such as Donatello, Michael Angelo, Cellini, Tribolo, and others may be almost accepted as presenting us with a picture of the practice adopted by the best sculptors of the present time; and I need not therefore hesitate to translate for you his description of the mode in which the sculptors of his time were accustomed to make their wax and clay models, how they cast their draperies, and how they either enlarged or diminished them in due proportion from their models for execution in the marble, how they roughed them out, carved them, cleaned them, smoothed, polished and ultimately finished them.

"When," he says, "our sculptors desire to execute a figure

in marble, they usually commence by making what is called a model—that is a sketch or figure of the size of about half a braccia, or thereabouts, as may be most convenient, either in clay, in wax, or in stucco. In that they seek to express the attitude and proportion which the figure which they may desire to make, should have, accommodating it to the size and height of any block of marble or stone they may have fixed upon for its execution. In order to explain how wax is worked, let us suppose that the model is to be made in wax and not in clay. To render the wax more tender there should be mixed with it a little suet, turpentine and pitch. The property of the suet is to render it more easily impressible, the turpentine to render it more tenacious, while the pitch gives it a uniform dark colour, and a certain tendency to harden after working. Should you desire to make your model of any other colour than black, you may do it easily by adding either red ochre, lake, or vermilion. By adding yellow ochre it may be made of a corresponding colour, or by adding terra verde it may be made green, and so on of any other colour. Care must however be taken that each of these colours shall be reduced to a very fine powder, and perfectly tritured, so that they may readily mix with the wax while melted. White wax will be found most useful for minuter work, such as medallions, little portraits, or such subjects as are suitable to be expressed in low relief on a very small scale. For this purpose, powdered white is added to the wax as above described. Nor should I here conceal that some of our modern artists have discovered a method of mixing in wax all sorts of colours, and of this they are wont to make coloured portraits of mezzo-relievo, expressing the complexion, the hair, the draperies, and everything else existing in their models with such truth that to many of these figures nothing seems wanting, if you may so say, but life and language.

“To return to our method of preparing the wax. So soon



as it is cold, make of it little sticks; these being held for a certain time in the hands, through their warmth soften and become plastic, and with these you may model sitting, upright, or any other figures you desire, having taken care to build up for your wax a little scaffolding or stiffening, either of wood or iron wire, as you like, so as to preserve your figure in its position. The last is convenient, as it is easily bent about at the will of the artist, so as to allow of modifications of attitude. Working then, little by little, with judgment, pressing the wax with the hands, and adding more where necessary, you will press in the wax here and there with little sticks either of bone or ivory, of iron or of wood. With other tools of the same kind you will add to and smooth the surfaces, and at last, with your finger, you will give your modelling the last softening and delicacy of surface.

“Should you desire, on the other hand, to make your model of clay, you should work as we have prescribed for wax but avoid the use of any skeleton of wood or iron, because the moisture from the clay would affect the skeleton, and cause it to crack or move. While you are working at your clay model you should keep it covered with a cloth, constantly wetted, to prevent it from cracking.

“As soon as these sketch models, or figures of wax or clay are completed, prepare to make another model of the full size of the figure you would make in marble, and indeed it should be slightly larger than the finished marble will have to be, since the clay, which requires to be worked moist, shrinks somewhat in drying.

“As any such shrinking takes place care should be taken in working to make up for it by degrees. When you come to finishing your model it will be well to mix with your clay a certain amount of brick-dust or terra cotta, which will keep your clay tender with less moisture; and thus you may manage so that the model at its completion shall scarcely shrink at all, but remain truly similar to the figure which has to be executed in marble.”

Not to trespass too much upon your patience, I propose to give you the remainder of Vasari's description in the general terms of his account, and to touch only upon points of relative importance. He recommends as the best material for making the skeleton of a figure, so as to cause it to hold together, certain portions of wood covered with flax stretched over it, or hay fastened with string, the elasticity of which will prevent any movement in the wood from being conveyed to the clay. On this skeleton the clay is planted, kneading it well together at every stage, and adding it little by little. The figures should be wrought in entire nudity. Should you desire to clothe your figures in thin drapery or otherwise, take some muslin or cloth of proportionate substance and thoroughly moisten it with liquid clay here and there so as to shape the folds as you may think best. In this way the models are completed.

Vasari does not allude to the formation of a plaster cast from the original model thus obtained. The practice of all modern sculptors, when the full size model has arrived at its completion in the clay, is to surround it with plaster to a certain thickness, and so arranged as to cover the whole figure with such a number of different portions of its whole extent as may be easily divided and built together again. When the whole of the figure is covered with plaster of an even thickness, an exterior coat of plaster is applied to a greater thickness, forming what the Italians now recognize as *la cappa*, and the French, *la chape*, or the cope, or large garment in which the whole is enveloped. This outer coating is usually made to divide into two or three pieces. As soon as the plaster has set hard, the outer garment is taken off, and the inner layer of plaster is taken to pieces. Portions of the clay model come away with the several pieces of the inner coat of the plaster, from which they require to be picked out. When all the clay has been removed from the plaster the inner pieces of plaster are fitted one to the other and built up till they are joined together. The *cappa*,

or outer garment, is then put on and bound together strongly on the outside, so that neither the outer garment can come off nor the several pieces of the inner coatings of plaster which are held in place by it be disturbed.

The plaster thus forms a hollow mould, which, being well oiled, is ready to receive liquid plaster poured into it;—the mould being turned round from side to side so as to allow the liquid plaster to flow in and fill up its cavities. When sufficient liquid plaster has been poured in to fill up all the small cavities of the mould, and to form behind them a sufficient substance of plaster to hold together, and the whole has been allowed time enough to set and harden a little, the figure is reared upon its base, and first, the *cappa* or outer garment is removed, and then all the rest of the inner coating of plastering is gradually chipped away as a shell, developing in its interior, little by little, the perfect model in plaster corresponding with the original model in clay.

This is much harder of course than the clay model; it is not liable subsequently to change its form; it admits of being freely handled and is far better for the carver to work from than any clay model could possibly be.

The process I have described is known to sculptors as that of forming a waste mould, because by its means only one perfect model can be made similar to the original clay model. The process of making a mould from which many repetitions of an original model can be cast, is called piece moulding; and while similar in principle to the process of waste moulding differs from it only in such an infinite multiplication of the pieces of which the inner coat of plaster is composed, as shall allow of their removal bit by bit from the original model without injury to it.

When built up strictly in the order in which they will stand, and supported on one another most conveniently, they are backed by one or more extra thicknesses of plaster from which the little pieces can be in their turn withdrawn, and

in which they can be replaced. For every cast that is taken they require a fresh building up, and a fresh pulling apart; but it is obvious that, subject to this tedious operation of building up and pulling apart, they may be used for the purpose of producing fresh models, or what are called plaster casts, over and over again; until, with frequent handling they lose their fineness of contact, or get otherwise injured.

The method by which the original model is reproduced in marble as described by Vasari is the style in most common use even at the present day in France, Italy and Germany, while our sculptors are in the habit of using the ingenious "pointing machine" as it is called, originated by Bacon, and improved upon by Chantrey.

Around the base of the figure, and above its head, and equally around the base and above the block of stone or marble, corresponding square frames of wood or iron are firmly built or planted. The best mode of proceeding before the operation of rough hewing is commenced is for the sculptor to drive into his plaster model a number of small pins in all the leading angles or surfaces of his figure. It will be the duty of the mason, working with line and plummet over and from the wooden square frames to find and work down to in his stone or marble, points corresponding with the situation of these pin heads.

Carefully following as he goes the model before him, he will remove the stone by degrees between all the various points he finds and marks, and he will thus present the sculptor with a reproduction of his plaster model, enlarged only beyond the model by the amount of projection beyond the surface of his plaster cast which the sculptor may have allowed his little pin heads to project.

At this stage the figure in marble presents a general likeness to the sculptor's original model, and it is at this point that the mason's labour ceases, and that of the highly

educated carver commences. He proceeds with great care, and little by little, to approximate as closely as he can to the original model, reserving, either wholly or in part all such difficult features or spaces as the sculptor may consider likely to require alteration, or to which he may fancy his hand alone can give expression or the necessary refinement.

The operation of the pointing machine, to which I have alluded is mainly to substitute a sliding graduated vertical scale for the line and plummet of the mason, together with a graduated pointer, working at right angles to this graduated moving upright. Of course the graduations upon the upright and upon the horizontal pointer which works all round the block of marble find strictly coincident graduations in moveable uprights, and horizontal pointers working or sliding upon a graduated iron frame fixed around the finished model.

Vasari proceeds to describe the tools of greater or less delicacy by which the marble is slowly reduced to perfect correspondence with the plaster model. The whole of the modelling in the clay and the finishing in the marble ought always to be given to his production by the sculptor; and those who are really zealous in good works will usually themselves execute every portion that presents great difficulty, or requires great perfection, and combination between the skilled hand, the trained eye and the really experienced and judicious brain of the perfect sculptor.

It would take too long to enter further upon the details of the practice of his art in the studio involving many ingenious technical operations, or to describe the various methods of executing cast works in metal, or those even which are produced by the operation of *repoussage*, or beating. On some other occasion perhaps I may be able to enter upon these interesting branches of the subject; but for the present I feel it to be my duty to hasten on to the second and perhaps more interesting section of my subject, viz.:—that

branch of the sculptor's practice which is immediately dependent upon the æsthetic conditions of his art.

These æsthetic conditions lead him as a matter of course to study Nature as the basis of his craft. The sculptor will not find it incumbent upon him to express all that is in nature, but he will frequently find that he must express something more than he may find in nature. Under no circumstances is it lawful for him at any time to express anything which shall make his work look contrary to nature. These are canons which must lie at the bottom of his studies, and in order to pursue them rightly in any way his first object will naturally be to realize strictly to himself what nature is.

In speaking of nature from the sculptor's point of view, we must be understood to refer only to the highest type of humanity, that is to say, of external human form as expressive of the dignity, beauty, and other attributes of humanity.

To arrive at a knowledge of the nature of humanity, the sculptor must learn to distinguish the qualities of men and women from the qualities of all the inferior animals. Man, in his highest type, stands at the end of the scale most remote from the leading characteristics of the brute; while man, in his lowest type, stands at that end of the scale nearest to the brute: and to express the position in that scale of the being he represents, the sculptor must know how to select his type with reference to his tendency to the perfect man on the one hand, and to the brute upon the other.

The task is somewhat complicated by the division of the human race into the two sexes, and of course a separate course of study has to be gone through for each. The sculptor will always find that in the most perfect type of man and in the most perfect type of woman, the sexual distinction is shown, both physically and intellectually in the highest possible degree. As man's nature is one thing, and woman's

another, so is man's form diverse from that of woman. The qualities and associations which the representation of those forms portrays and calls up are different,—*toto cælo*; and perhaps the most interesting aspect under which they can be judiciously called into being by the sculptor is when he seeks to enforce by contrast the perfect characteristics of both types of form.

In studying the subject of the actual characteristics in the skeleton, the muscles, the proportions of the parts, the fleshy clothing, and the more or less fine or rough surfaces and structures of the various parts and external forms of the human race, the sculptor must include not only the perfect but the imperfect types. The problem of arriving at a just knowledge of the structure of the human race cannot but include a strict investigation of the influence of climate upon race, and the leading changes of external form peculiar to every dominant race. The condition of the human subject must be rightly apprehended as affected by climate, age, occupation, education, or the want of education. The difference between the type of an Apollo, and that of the Arrotino, or "Slave sharpening his Knife" of the Tribune at Florence, expresses the whole range between the highest and the lowest classes in the current social system. In both, the skeleton, the limbs and muscles are the same; but, given that identity, what further community can there be recognized between the two? The aristocratic type is as well expressed in the one, as the servile is in the other.

Who could ever mistake the Dying Gladiator or the Discobolus for a Mars or for a Young Augustus? As I have already said, the sculptor must learn not to express all that is in nature; he must therefore learn the point at which, under all sorts of conditions, his precise imitation of his model should stop.

To fully explain or work out that problem would be to set before you a course of study, and a succession of con-

clusions pursued intently by every zealous sculptor through all his professional career, and arrived at perhaps only somewhat indistinctly as he stands upon the threshold of inability any longer to embody what his life-long experience may have taught him. In subsequent Lectures I may be able to enter at length into some of these, but in the present one it would be impossible to do any justice to the subject.

I therefore turn to some of the more immediately practical features of the sculptor's professional education.

To every sculptor I would earnestly recommend the study of drawing; and not drawing only as based upon direct imitation of nature; but drawing as an architect has to draw, in an abstract and conventional manner. The practice of geometrical drawing, and the due regard to the relative size and proportions in feet and inches of the objects he draws, will give the sculptor a knowledge of the real size and relation to one another of the parts and forms of the solids with which he has to deal in his art which he will never acquire by modelling alone.

I well recollect Gibson showing me the early drawings made by him, while he was yet a student in Liverpool; and on my expressing my wonder that he, as a sculptor, had thought it necessary to go through so laborious a course of the study of drawing as he had done, he declared to me that he regarded the possession of that power as the very thing which had raised him first above the bulk of his contemporaries, and given him the command of design and composition at the early age at which he began to distinguish himself.

Associated with this study of the art of drawing as a preparation for practice will be an acquisition of a complete knowledge of the best proportions of the human figure. He will have to acquaint himself with the canon of the Greeks, so well illustrated by Mr Bonomi in his explanation to the Royal Institute of British Architects of "The Practice



of the Ancient Greeks, as re-discovered to us by the investigations of John Gibson."

He will find in the works of Audran, and other comparatively modern writers a *résumé* of those laborious investigations which some of the best and greatest artists of the ages of the Renaissance devoted years of labour to arrive at.

Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, and Albert Dürer thought no labour too great to bestow upon an accurate knowledge of the relation to one another of the principal parts of all the leading statues of the best ages of classical art, and of the differences existing between them and the various types of humanity by which they were surrounded.

A constant recurrence to the living model is indispensable to keep the sculptor's eye and hand in perfect harmony with those to whom his works present themselves for sympathy. If in his ideality he so far departs from current humanity, and adopts so abstract a scale of proportions and surfaces as no longer to make his creations look like the finest men and women the spectators of his works are in the habit of seeing, those works will entirely fail to please. If on the other hand he fails constantly to correct the ordinary types of nature he will meet with in his models, by reference to the best precedents in his art, he will fail to raise himself sufficiently above what is common and trivial in life to forcibly affect the imagination and pleasure of those for whom his works may have to be executed.

He will again have to study closely the amount of precise definition to be given in his modelling to the parts of the figure he may have to represent. That large bossing of various parts which, close to the eye may oftentimes look coarse and ridiculous, is but essential to works upon a colossal scale intended to be seen in the open air and at a great distance from the eye. On the other hand, to apply any similar conventions, or similar exaggerations of leading

forms in modelling statues or objects of even full size, destined to be seen near to the eye, or suited to combination with architectural parts of small relative dimensions, would instantly exhibit to a cultivated critic a want of knowledge and experience on the part of the careless or ill-educated sculptor.

Again, his style of modelling should vary with the nature of the material in which his work will have to be executed. A dark-coloured material will demand one set of proportions of solids, and a light-coloured material another; a hard material will require considerable differences of surface treatment from a soft one. Work to be executed in metal by fusion will require one mode of treatment in the model, while work to be executed by beating in the metal will require another; and to aptly seize these variations in the practice of his modelling, the sculptor will require to practically acquaint himself with the technical operations I have noticed in the first part of this discourse.

I would strongly recommend him, where it should be practicable, to tear himself away from his sometimes too much loved studio, and to let his work be tested in varying lights, or more especially in lights and at distances from the spectator agreeing with those to which it will have to be exposed when ultimately completed. To the sculptor perhaps, more than to any other kind of artist, that operation of experiment which is called trying up is of the greatest advantage. His work is subject to the control of such arbitrary conventions as sometimes even to pass beyond his powers of prescience. It is not until his work is ultimately placed that he finds how far he has been misled by the conditions under which his models may have been executed. Against such a snare he should always be on his guard; endeavouring to fortify himself not only by a perfect recognition of all the conditions affecting or likely to affect his finished work, but he should as far as possible learn experimentally how similar

works have failed or succeeded in corresponding situations or subject to corresponding conditions.

Such a consideration will lead him to watch—not with envy nor jealousy, but with an earnest desire to improve himself—the successful practice of his contemporaries. By study of the best practice of the works of sculptors of preceding generations he will endeavour to correct anything which may be fallacious in the current practice of others, and in that way he may fortify himself against failures to which those who neglect such lessons of experience will be constantly subject.

There remain yet two points connected with his æsthetical education which can scarcely be fitly entered upon here; the one is the question of colour, and the other that of finish.

Each of these almost requires a discourse to itself, and I know not how, short of entering upon a full examination of the admirable theories upon both subjects which have been propounded by many learned men, to convey any general conclusions which may be practically useful upon those subjects.

I cannot but think, however, that Sir Charles Eastlake, in a letter which is appended to a book called “The Country House,” has summed up the question of colour judiciously. He intimates that colour in any work of sculpture should be regulated by the position assigned to that work in any general scheme of decoration. So much colour as shall prevent the sculpture from looking like an impertinent intruder in undress upon a full dressed assembly may with propriety be added; but to add what may detract from the perfect expression of a severe work of art when there is no necessity to make that work of art enter into a general scheme of decoration is to incur the risk of unnecessarily marring a grateful and elegant simplicity.

With regard to finish, a safe general rule will be to increase it in those parts which require and demand the

closest observation, and which speak most powerfully to the imagination. To finish highly an accessory, and leave comparatively unfinished a principal is simply to elevate the servant above the master, and to place doggerel above poetry.

Another special law with regard to finish, or, in other words, sedulous imitation of texture in nature, is that the imitation should be least truthful in objects which by their nature appertain to the material in which the sculpture is executed. A flower may be imitated in marble with an approximation to direct imitation that would be quite unfitting in the representation of a piece of rock. Again, things which cannot be imitated perfectly should never be so imitated as to make us conscious of the stubbornness, as it were, of the material in which they are wrought or of its different texture and strength. To imitate, for instance, the fibrous growth of wood, or the laminated building up of bark in highly crystalline marble, is to call painful attention to the obvious imperfection which must accompany any such imitation.

A very few words must now dispose of the last section of our subject; viz. how the two branches of the sculptor's education—the technical and the æsthetic—should react upon the nature of his work, limiting and dominating every successful design.

It will be clear that any design neglecting the technical elements, or in other words, those operations which, as I have already shown, lie at the base of the sculptor's mechanical practice of his art, must fail.

It will be equally clear, I trust, that any design the sculptor may make which runs counter to the objective conditions which those processes entail will fail, however æsthetically correct it may appear to be independently of any such technical subordination. The artist must carry on the teaching of his brain and the teaching of his hand in perfectly well balanced relation one to the other, and then, when called

upon for any design, he may freely leave himself to follow out the bent of his imagination, in full reliance that the habits of thought and practice engendered by his habitual æsthetic and technical education will carry him through to the successful realization of any invention which, so trained, he may be likely to propose to himself to accomplish. What the nature of that invention should be is obviously to be modified by various considerations, and probably the first which should suggest itself to the sculptor's mind are those associated with the purpose or destination of the work he may be called upon to execute.

To design a figure for a Church is one thing, for a Hall of Justice another, for a Theatre another, for a Conservatory yet another.

Again, an element which will limit and prescribe the scope of his inventions, will be the scale upon which his work is to be executed. In one situation a number of small figures would appear as so many puppets, while in another they may be precisely what may be required.

The subject and scale of parts of a bas-relief that would be fit to place high up on the façade of a great public building, would require in its treatment, no less than in the selection of its subject, to be absolutely different from one which the sculptor might be requested to introduce into a drawing-room chimney-piece. He should be prepared to do one no less than the other; but he should know precisely how in either case to modify and alter his invention and his mode of realizing it. It is painful to have to clip his wings; but there is yet one more consideration which is often apt to do so: I refer to the limitations of expense.

His technical education will inform him of the cost of labour of every kind, and of the time and care requisite for the satisfactory execution of works under various conditions. His æsthetic education and practice will teach him how much more labour and consequent cost is necessary for one

kind of work than for another, as well as the exact kind of work that is fitted for every class of invention. He must therefore at once make up his mind as to what the sum at command can fitly and legitimately pay for, and if he finds the sum which cannot be increased unfit to cover the cost of doing that which he honestly believes to be right for the purpose, he must decline the commission.

On the other hand, he must not infrequently curb his views and curtail his inventions, so as to make them provide—not what, if done, must necessarily be done badly, but rather less, if it can be fittingly executed for the sum at command.

In all these branches of his art-theory, practice and experience must all combine to ensure perfection.

But there is yet something more wanting; and that, to tell the honest truth,—in an art so difficult, and subject to such arbitrary conventions as sculpture,—is simply genius.

Unless a man possesses an inborn affinity for that mode of art, I would earnestly counsel him to remain in the ranks of the critics, and never to take upon himself the responsibilities of a performer. He may learn the theory, and yet find his hand and eye inapt. He may arrive at the utmost perfection as a workman, but his work will be utterly spiritless; and unless nature works in harmony with the special line of action adopted by the being she animates, little of that divine reflection from the majestic beauties of nature which imprints on a work of Art the indelible stamp of Beauty will ever be realized in his productions. "*Except*," in such case at least, "*the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it.*"

## LECTURE VIII.

### PAINTING.

---

#### *HISTORY—ANCIENT.*

IF to compress the History of Architecture and of Sculpture within the limits of a single Lecture each has proved a difficult task, to attempt to bring the history of Painting within the same limits would be imprudent, and altogether unjust to a theme so copious, so important, and so replete with human interest, in every form, and at every stage of its history. When we compare the principal treatises upon each of those arts, we shall find that no writer has succeeded in compressing even a tolerable sketch of the history of Painting within anything like the same limits in which a comparatively clear idea of the history of either Architecture or Sculpture has been hitherto brought. I need scarcely, therefore, apologize for breaking off, as I must do to-day, while halfway only upon the road I would ask you to travel with me. The reason of the relative tendency to expand, in treating of the History of Painting to which I have alluded, is the comparatively great importance which individual influence on the part of the artist assumes in the last-named art. The operation of transferring a reflex

of his idiosyncrasy to his canvas is so direct and simple, and hampered by so few restrictions, which the artist cannot modify at will, that in his pictures he may be said to live, and in *his works* we rarely fail to recognize *the man*.

The origin of painting, as an art, was no doubt associated with the origin of writing; and rude pictorial forms have apparently constituted some of the most ancient alphabets of primeval forms of speech.

With the Egyptians this symbolic system of writing was carried to its greatest complication, since by various modifications of pictorial form, they composed their sacred or hieratic, and their popular or demotic types of writing.

What such rude alphabets, and the arbitrary symbols adopted by them for their hieroglyphical inscriptions failed to record and convey, the sculptor—no longer simply as a writer, but as a sculptor—had to supply; and it is at this stage that we arrive at the pictured bas-relief.

The subject intended to be recorded was first of all drawn in outline on a wall, by a draughtsman, and the outline traced by him was subsequently incised into the stone. From this incised line the stone was cut away with a chisel held at an acute angle on the side nearest to the centre of the space enclosed by the outline, and thus a rude approximation to a bassissimo-relievo was obtained.

Gradually more and more incisions, marking subdivisions of the enclosed space, were added; and a similar operation of cutting down one or more of the edges was resorted to; and ultimately, by that operation, variations of all the principal surfaces came to be recorded.

Owing to the shallowness of the relief of these images, or representations, they could of course only be seen distinctly by a spectator whose eye was placed very near to them. To add distinctness and to enable the pictures to be seen at the distance from which a general view of the building to which such bas-reliefs were attached could be



obtained, colour of a crude and staring kind was added; and thus that form of representation which, near to the eye was perceived to be a bas-relief, at a distance assumed the semblance of a picture only.

Such was, I believe, the original form of monumental or mural painting, and, concurrent with its development, was that ruder form of half imitative, half symbolical mode of inscribing or writing pictorially which we find upon the bulk of the Egyptian papyri and upon the mummy cases.

Many of the paintings on the papyri exhibit considerable individuality, especially in the correct seizure of leading characteristics of animal form. In his representations of the human figure, and more especially in those types of it in which the ancient Egyptian painter embodied his ideas of the persons of his gods, the artist seems to have been checked by laws probably imposed by the priesthood, which prescribed certain proportions and certain attitudes only as proper for pictorial representations.

No such law of prescription, however, appears to have attached to his representation of animals, or of other objects, such as plants, &c., by which he was surrounded in nature; and hence we may observe, in tracing the progress of Egyptian art, a certain amount of advancement on the painter's part towards a satisfactory imitation of all types of form but those of the human figure.

Slabs recording historical scenes of a similar half-sculptural, half-pictorial nature abound in the remains of Assyria. Such representations appear to have been made under less severe restrictions on the part both of the priesthood and the sovereign than ruled in Egypt contemporaneously; and in them we begin to find an easy and natural presentment of such subjects as seem to have found favour with the artists of the first-named empire.

In the monuments of Persepolis this facility is still more clearly expressed; and at last, in the early Greek vases we

begin to recognize the painter asserting his individual existence as separated from the sculptor, and to trace him from age to age acquiring juster apprehensions of the proportions of the human figure, of the laws of balance and muscular action in different positions and attitudes, and ultimately of those forms which express character and individual beauty.

Still, after thousands of years of an art-development which was clearly cumulative, we stand, in regarding the early efforts of the Greeks, but at the very threshold of the painter's art. We have arrived only at a picture in monochrome,—that is, in one colour only, or in a few of the simplest flat colours, with scarcely any attempt at gradation either by the softening off of tints, or by hatching.

We have as yet met with no pictorial indication of light and shade, and no education of the eye to perceive the want either of lineal or aërial perspective.

In speaking thus disparagingly of the mode of expression and design attained by the earliest vase painters, and even by those of the best periods of Grecian art, I would desire carefully to guard myself against the supposition of exhibiting indifference to the exceeding beauty of the designs and inventions so depicted by the Greeks. In harmony of line, and in graceful composition, the vase paintings of the best periods still remain almost unrivalled.

Many of the scenes represented are such as portray incidents of exceeding grandeur and occasionally great tragic interest. In almost all such representations there stand revealed a grace and beauty, a truth and dignity, a propriety of gesture, and a skilful subordination and contrast of leading lines and forms which cannot be too warmly praised;—they prove a highly advanced stage in the study of the abstract laws of beauty, irrespective, and as it were regardless, of the progress of art towards accurate and truthful *imitation*. It seems singular that the same Greeks who displayed in their

sculpture, and indeed in the sections of all their architectural mouldings, the most perfect acquaintance with the laws of light and shade,—with, in fact, the science of *chiaro-oscuro*,—should have been apparently content to banish it from their pictorial representations for, at any rate, a considerable period of their history.

Throughout all the history of Grecian art it seems impossible not to recognize that sculpture kept steadily in advance of painting, and, in spite of the eulogia bestowed in ancient writings upon the paintings of the Greeks, it certainly appears probable that they were far in arrear of the excellence obtained in contemporaneous monuments of sculpture.

Although all traces of such paintings as those by Polygnotus in the Lesche at Delphos, and of many of the master-pieces of Zeuxis, Apelles, Protagenes, and others, have passed away from us, we possess numerous contemporary Greek vases upon which we know that the first talent procurable was employed, and which there appears to be every reason to believe were extremely costly objects, valued beyond many oxen, many slaves, and much land.

On these vases we find painted, first of all, an exquisite system of ornamentation. Nothing can be better understood than the distribution of such Grecian ornament, and its appropriation to various and varying surfaces purposely designed to contrast with, and heighten the effect of each other.

In the same vases we sometimes have figures in graceful action, and at other times in action which may almost be regarded as caricature. The figures are drawn in a conventional manner, either in outline partially, or by the contrast of one or two colours, or *en silhouette*—presenting an appearance similar to that which would be produced by cutting out figures in paper of one colour and pasting them upon paper of another colour.

In the writings of Homer and Hesiod indications are clearly given of the acquisition on the part of their contemporaries of the power to see and to enjoy what is grand and beautiful in nature. With the dawn of poetry the real sun of art first cast its lifegiving gleams upon man's intellectual horizon.

Light became enjoyed and valued; gloom and repose were perceived to be attributes of darkness, and there was an obvious delight expressed in the possession and beholding of brilliant colours and highly ornamented surfaces.

All of this indicates the ripening of human intelligence and the fitness of the soil for the germination of the purely pictorial, the really imitative element.

Granting the fact that painting may have been much in arrear of sculpture, we possess even at the present day, in the remains discovered at Herculaneum and Pompeii, and in the admiration expressed by the classical authors for yet earlier works, sufficient to cause us to deeply deplore the loss of the masterpieces of the ancient Grecian painters.

What I have said of the difficulty of detaching primitive painting from primitive sculpture is supported by the apparent difficulty which the greatest artists of antiquity themselves found in confining their practice to any one of those arts.

The primitive artist, it is never to be forgotten, appears to us not as sculptor, not as painter, not as architect, but as "maker,"—combining in his own person all the varieties of artistic skill essential for the completion of the work of art he called into being. Thus we find that Scopas was deemed to be excellent, both as sculptor and as painter. Phidias was a painter before he was a sculptor, and obtained celebrity for his portrait of Pericles.

That painter, who seems to have been to the ancient Greeks what Giotto was to the modern Italians,—Polygnotus,—is stated by Pliny to have exercised the art of sculpture as well as that of painting; and exceeding interest attaches

to the notices given by Pliny of the changes which appear to have been introduced into the art under the influence of this unquestionable genius, who flourished and was engaged upon his celebrated work at Delphos, representing the capture of Ilion and the departure of the Greeks, about the year 470 B.C.

Pliny informs us that Polygnotus was the first who painted women with "transparent garments," and adorned their heads with "many coloured mitres." He was the first to express really pictorial characteristics, representing his figures, where necessary with open mouths, shewing their teeth, and changing their countenances *ab antiquo rigore*.

Lucian praises, in the figure of Cassandra, the expression of the eyebrow, the bloom of the cheek, and the drapery of most elaborate fineness, giving the required indication of the form, while freely yielding to the wind.

Ælian bears testimony to the power of Polygnotus in depicting passion and expressive gestures. Still it seems to be clear that the practice of Polygnotus was limited to the use of white, red, yellow and black, since Cicero classes him amongst the painters who restricted themselves to the use of four colours, concentrating their study upon forms and traits.

All the authors who appear to have seen the works of Polygnotus, although thoroughly acquainted with those of other painters whose command of colour was very great, concur in admiring the harmony of his work; and we have therefore no difficulty in recognizing the fact that the early Greeks attempted no more than they could well perform; and that their conventional style of colouring accorded well with the dignity and beauty of the subjects selected for representation by Polygnotus, the detailed description of the most remarkable of which, by Pausanias, conveys to us a clear idea of the great difficulty overcome by the artist in his representation of multitudes, and of scenes of complicated

incidents such as had never been so well reproduced before.

It would be entering too much into detail to dwell minutely in this Lecture upon the beauty which ~~was~~ doubtless imprinted upon the very remarkable series of pictures described to us by Pausanias as constituting the leading works of Polygnotus; but those of my hearers who would critically enter upon the study of the subject may be referred to two admirable articles upon the paintings of the Lesche at Delphi in the "Museum of Classical Antiquities," by Mr Watkiss Lloyd.

Mr Lloyd thus sums up the condition of the art of painting in the days of Polygnotus :

"Of the use and treatment of light and shade by Polygnotus, we can say little more than that he left it for a future artist to acquire the renown of an inventor by at least the extension of this branch of art; and that while he no doubt painted shadow, and modelled and divided his forms by it (thus much is implied by the general scope of his praise), there is every appearance that the union of masses by its means, or of accounting for aerial distances were problems he left unattempted.

"On the other hand, it seems to me unallowable to draw inferences as to the practice of Polygnotus from that of the very peculiar art of vase painting; in which shadows scarcely make their appearance at all, and never become important; their office being performed by incised lines on dark surfaces, and, when the ground of the figure is light, by dark lines; the strength of which scarcely seems to be affected by any reference to degree or direction of illumination.

"The defect in the painter's resources implied by a restricted knowledge of our power over light and shade, has important consequences affecting principles of grouping and composition.

"The subjects at Delphos which we are about to consider were very extensive, like many others recorded as executed

by himself and contemporaries and successors; and the effective disposition of the numerous figures was doubtless one of the great triumphs aimed at and achieved.

“But linear perspective seems to have assisted in this as little as ærial. We shall find very little allusion to any sort of back-ground or general landscape scenery, and groups are placed one above another in the composition that it is clear were to be considered as following one behind the other, on the same level ground.

“The vases here furnish us with a true illustration, and the vase of Meidias, in the British Museum, with the subject of the Rape of the Leucippides, and the Apuleian amphora with the madness of Lycurgus, may be studied in this connexion with great advantage.

“The Meidias vase also, with others, furnishes an illustration of the painter’s practice in inserting inscriptions on his picture; they agree with the Delphic painting in exhibiting the names of gods or men written against the figures, even when most distinctly recognizable by character and attributes; and they furnish examples of the same seeming caprice of inscribing known personages with new names or titles, and of assigning names to subsidiary figures which are otherwise unknown, and destitute of traditional acceptance and position.

“The significance of these alterations and additions is sometimes detectable in allusion to a pervading principle; but as frequently the solution of the enigma is beyond our reach, and we are disposed to doubt whether it ever had a solution.”

Great and well deserved, as was no doubt the reputation acquired by Polygnotus for his works at Delphi, he seems to have subsequently achieved yet greater distinction by the painting he executed in the *Pæscile Stoa* at Athens representing the principal incidents of the Trojan War.

For this, having refused to accept remuneration, he received public thanks, conveyed to him by solemn decree in the name of the whole nation. It was at the same time

ordained that in all the cities he might thereafter visit he should be lodged and maintained at the public expense.

I note this incident simply as revealing the first public recognition of the dignity of his art in the person of the painter. In States where such honours are rendered to the artist,—and in no others,—will he produce works which, after the lapse of ages, will in their very memories, reflect honour on the country for which they were executed.

The next great change effected in Grecian painting appears to have been by Apollodorus of Athens, who flourished in the 93rd Olympiad. We gather from Pliny's description that it was he who at last discovered the secret of depicting to the life, and in their greatest beauty, the various objects of nature, not only by correctness of drawing, but principally by the introduction of appropriate colour, and the distribution of shades, lights, and *chiaro-oscuro*, in which he carried painting to a degree of force and delicacy which it had never obtained before.

He was, however, excelled by his pupil, Zeuxis, whose excellence and vanity appear to have been upon a par. Every story handed down to us concerning this artist points to the fact that it must have been for the directness and completeness of his imitation, rather than for his invention or his command over design that he obtained his celebrity.

Thus, particularly, the account of the bunch of grapes painted by Zeuxis in so lively a manner that as soon as it was exposed the birds came to peck at them, at once assures us that, both in colouring and in light and shade, he must have attained very considerable dexterity.

In the fulness of his vanity he challenged his contemporary Parrhasias to shew what he could do in the same direction. Parrhasias obeyed, and shewed a painting covered with a fine piece of stuff in the form of a curtain. "Remove your curtain," cried Zeuxis, "and let us see this masterpiece." The curtain was but the picture itself. For once,



the vanity of Zeuxis received a check, for he at once exclaimed, "I only deceive the birds, but Parrhasias has deceived me, who am myself a painter."

Some short time after, Zeuxis painted a young man carrying a basket of grapes. In this case his vanity was corrected by the birds themselves; for, heedless of the presence of the man, the birds still came to peck at the grapes. Zeuxis was clever enough to receive this lesson, acknowledging that the figure of the man must have been very badly done by him, since even the shy birds were not afraid of it.

In spite of the low platform upon which Parrhasias thus seems to have met and humbled Zeuxis, he appears to have been an artist of a much higher grade; for Quintilian praises him for the great improvements he effected in design. Pliny enters into detail upon the subject. "The exact observation of symmetry," he says, "was inculcated by that master, and in his works are to be admired the expressive, delicate, and passionate airs (or movements) of the head, the elegant disposition of the hair, the beauty and dignity of features and person; and, (by the consent of the greatest artists,) that finishing and boldness of the figures in which he surpassed all who went before him, and equalled all who have succeeded him;—thus mastering the most difficult and important part of painting."

As Zeuxis had surpassed his master Apollodorus, and Parrhasias had eclipsed Zeuxis, so Timanthes in his turn humbled Parrhasias, who had shewn himself little less able to sustain with decorum the praises heaped upon him by his countrymen than Zeuxis had done. The two (Timanthes and Parrhasias) entered upon a competition in the city of Samos for a prize to be given to him who should best represent Ajax enraged against the Greeks for having adjudged the arms of Achilles to Ulysses; and upon that occasion the best judges awarded the prize to Timanthes.

In all the accounts of pictures, antecedent to those of

Timanthes, there seems to have been displayed by the painters an odd and rambling disposition to portray more incidents in historical pictures than it is fitting to crowd together into one picture. Occasionally even the "Unities," both of time and place, seem to have been set at naught.

From the time of Timanthes, however, the subjects of most of the best Grecian pictures appear to have been either isolated individuals or several figures rather associated than combined in their action.

His best works seem never to have failed to communicate to the spectator that impression of unity of purpose and dramatic concentration of interest which it is one of the highest privileges of the painter's art to convey.

It was in his manifestation of a lofty appreciation of the right scope of his art that Timanthes appears to have reached the highest excellence. His celebrated painting of the Sacrifice of Iphigenia has been commented on with the highest respect by every great writer upon the history of art, and especially by those whose duty it has been to set before students the best models for the exercise of composition for painting. The execution is said to have been no less excellent than the selection of the subject and its treatment. "It represented Iphigenia standing before the altar as a young and innocent princess upon the point of being sacrificed for the preservation of her country. The grief this sacrifice occasioned was reflected in the personages by whom she was surrounded. On the one side stood the priest, Chalcas, in deep affliction. Ulysses, and Menelaus the uncle of the victim, appeared bowed down with grief. In their countenances it seemed as though the expression of further sorrow was impossible. There remained, however, for representation the father of Iphigenia, Agamemnon. Over his countenance the painter threw a veil; leaving the spectators to judge how deep that sorrow must be, the expression of which the father was compelled to conceal."

The idea may have been conveyed to Timanthes by an expression used by Euripides in describing the sacrifice; but even if that was the case it is no little honour to the painter to have been one of the first to borrow so fine a thought from the writings of a great poet, exhibiting that kindred mastery over human passion which is within the legitimate scope alike of the poet and the painter.

Poussin introduced the same incident successfully in his picture of the Death of Germanicus; and the expedient of concealing what it seems impossible to express, whether it take the shape of the grief of Agamemnon or the beauty of Helen, has been frequently resorted to by many great modern painters.

Pamphilus, who was a native of Amphipolis, was principally celebrated for the extent to which he systematically taught that it was impossible for a painter to carry his art to perfection without thoroughly understanding the laws of mathematics and practical geometry. He it was who obtained, at first at Sicyone, and afterwards throughout all Greece, the establishment of academies in which the children of freed men, evincing an aptitude for the arts, were carefully taught.

It was rather through his pupil Apelles than to his own distinction as an artist, that Pamphilus is indebted for the honour his name has received. The legends connected with Apelles and with his cotemporary Protagenes lie too much within the scope of ordinary classical studies at this University for me to dwell in detail upon them. It is enough for us to note here that the masterpiece of Apelles was considered to be the representation of Venus Anadyomene, in which he surpassed a picture of Calumny which he had painted at Ephesus, and which had greatly advanced his fame. His skill in portraiture was so great that those he represented were said to appear alive; and of one of his most renowned and popular works, his best portrait of

Alexander the Great, Alexander himself declared that "on comparing himself with that work, he recognized two Alexanders,—one the son of Philip, who was invisible,—the other the work of Apelles, who was inimitable."

According to Pliny, the art of painting was indebted to this artist for improvements, not only in the higher elements of design, but in the technical processes of the art, upon which, in the completeness of their development, we shall have to refer under the head of the practice of the painter's art.

In the days of Apelles, Grecian art appears to have reached its acme of perfection, and although we meet with the names of numerous artists whose works excited in their time great admiration, so far as we can at present judge, they appear to have distinguished themselves rather in facility and minuteness, than in real excellence.

The quality of facility at least we find clearly imprinted on the most archaic paintings still preserved at Herculaneum and Pompeii, and which in point of antiquity and authorship may be easily supposed to have been the work of artists of Magna Græcia at various periods during the centuries which intervened between the age of Alexander the Great and the predominance of the school of Apelles, and the date at which those cities were submerged in the lava from Vesuvius, A.D. 79.

It is in the works of these early Pompeian and Herculanean artists that we find the best indications of what is likely to have been good in the practice of the later Greeks, as well as in that of the Romans.

It has been supposed that because Pompeii and Herculaneum were but provincial towns, the monuments of the art of painting which have been there discovered were of inferior merit to those executed in the metropolis; but the discovery of the arabesques of the Baths of Titus and other structures of the first imperial ages

in Rome, and elsewhere throughout Italy, have revealed to us no such superior excellence as some have considered that excavations at head-quarters should have revealed to us.

In the remains of painting at Pompeii we find not only brilliant facility of hand, but a considerably advanced stage in power of direct imitation. Landscapes, sea views, and architecture are represented in very fair perspective; not apparently in subjection to determinate and scientific laws, but rather in such perspective as we find in the clever wood-cut books of the Japanese of the present day;—unscientific transcripts, in fact, made by clever draughtsmen with well-practised hands and well-trained eyes from scenes in which they had taken delight.

Although I do not propose to interrupt the thread of this historical narrative by entering upon the details of the practice of artistic processes, I must be allowed to mention one process which is so different in its origin, and so entirely dissimilar in its practice from all other modes of delineation upon plane surfaces, and which has exercised such an important influence on the history of art that it demands some reference in general terms; although I must reserve a more detailed account of the method by which it is executed for my discourse upon the Practice of Painting. I allude to the art of mosaic.

Although to the best of my belief there are no positive remains of ancient Greek mosaics, there are sufficient allusions to it in ancient writers to convince us that as an ornamental process used for the formation of pavements, and occasionally for wall linings, it was known both to the ancient Persians and the Greeks. It was however apparently confined to simple patterns, and there is nothing on record to indicate that it was employed pictorially.

The earliest pictorial mosaic now in existence is, I believe, that extremely curious one to which Pliny refers as having been executed by Sylla, shortly before the Christian era, and

placed by him in front of the Temple built at Præneste, the modern Palestrina. This mosaic, which is of rude workmanship, forms a pavement, and has two very curious points about it. In the first place it represents a number of animals, such as would naturally be found upon the banks of the Nile, but could never be found upon the banks of the Tiber; while, in the second place, we find inscriptions inserted beside these animals in Greek characters.

The inference certain learned writers have gathered from these facts is that it was rather a spoil taken by Sylla in Greece or Egypt than a native piece of Roman workmanship. Whether it was or was not executed by a Roman artist, it is certain that it immediately found abundant imitators in Italy.

The soil of Rome teems with remains of mosaic art, applied not only for pavements, but as linings to walls and vaultings. There is scarcely a house in Pompeii or Herculaneum which does not present specimens of mosaic pavement. In many of these most important pictures of great elaboration are perfectly rendered by the aggregation of stones and vitreous substances of almost microscopic minuteness.

So popular does the art appear to have been with the Romans, that not content with employing it in their own country, they used it wherever their victorious arms enabled them to plant the Imperial eagles.

In Africa are still to be found some of the grandest of all the subjects depicted by this process. In France, particularly in the neighbourhood of Lyons, many good specimens have been discovered. In Spain, at Italica near Seville, that very fine example was found which has been so well illustrated by Count Laborde. In England the examples unearthed are more coarse in their execution than in any of the other countries above mentioned, although in vigour and ability of ornamental design they may be reckoned as almost upon a

par with the best which have been met with elsewhere. The head of Ceres from Woodchester, the ancient Corinium, and several of the examples found in London, will, I think, fully bear out this expression of opinion.

A comparison, however, of the English specimens with the best Roman examples leads us to the conclusion that the former were designed by Roman artists, and executed—perhaps under the immediate direction of Roman workmen—by natives of Britain imperfectly trained to the practice of the art.

I have dwelt thus briefly upon this interesting variety of pictorial representation, not so much for its isolated interest as practised by the Romans, as because it formed the basis of that more extended use of it which subsequently shone out as a brilliant light for centuries during which, but for it, darkness would have reigned over the realms of art.

Returning to Roman pictorial art in general we observe that, in spite of their beauty of composition and extreme truth of character, (carried occasionally even to caricature,) their works were far from realizing those true graphic conditions of which that art is susceptible. Their groups were for the most part relieved against plain or conventional backgrounds, and it is comparatively rare to find a scene depicted with sufficient verisimilitude to induce the spectator to associate himself in anywise with the actors represented.

As we shall have occasion to find—in the days of Raffaele—one of the principles upon which a scene was frequently laid out for representation in a picture, was to suppose the leading personages disposed in a circle of which one half was painted, while the spectator himself was supposed to stand upon the line of the half of the imaginary circle, at a point opposite to that occupied by the principal figure in the picture. The ancient Roman system, on the other hand—no doubt traditionally carrying on that of the Greeks—was rather to place, as a sculptor would do in arranging a

bas-relief, all the actors in his picture upon a nearly uniform plane. By this practice he was enabled to disguise or hide the comparatively limited knowledge he possessed of the art of perspective.

In all ancient Roman work also we find the painter stopping short of that powerful arrangement of light and shade which really exists in nature, and particularly in the open air under the brilliant sun by which all he shewed would necessarily be illuminated.

By this limitation of the scale of expression both in light and shade and colour, the Roman artist of any skill found little difficulty in ensuring for his work an aspect of harmony and repose—such qualities being of course easier to obtain in pictures painted in a low tone than in those pitched in a high key. All that the eye required for the separation of parts, and for an indication, rather than a representation, of what the colouring of the scene really was, was supplied by the painter to just such an extent as made the truth of the representation subordinate to the human expression, or dramatic interest, conveyed by the subject of the picture.

In subsequent ages we shall often find that this carrying to its utmost the artist's power of forcibly representing the full strength of light and shade and colour which exists in nature has tended to wrest attention from the subject depicted, and to concentrate all the interest of the spectator upon the marvellous dexterity of the artist in catching the flying sun-beam or hues various and fleeting as the evanescent rainbow. So it was to a great extent in the Flemish and Dutch schools; and so we too often find it among the artists who constitute what we are now wont to call the Pre-Raffaellite school. From any such faults and tendencies I believe ancient art to have been almost entirely free.

To return however to the history of the art of painting, we find that by whatever medium expressed, the painting of



the ancient Romans fell into decrepitude with the fall of the Empire, and the decline of all contemporary arts.

On the transfer of the Empire by Constantine to Byzantium, the painter's art, or such relics of it as survived the wreck of art in general, appear to group themselves in two directions; the one, namely, that based upon the ancient Roman practice, in which strong, dark outlines, heavy reddish tints, deep brown-red shades, great propriety of composition, and a certain amount of dignity of form, were leading elements. The general effect of such pictures was that of a full but rather low tone of colour. The other phase of the painter's art which carried with it the attraction of greater novelty, as well as greater brilliancy, was founded upon the natural love of light and colour which has always seemed the very atmosphere of the East through the rapid association of the later Roman painters with Orientals and more particularly with Persians.

There can be no doubt that artists of all nationalities flocked to Byzantium, as to that seat of power in which only they could find that strong sense of security which was necessary to the practice of their arts,—that condition of repose in which alone can the artist work to advantage. It was through this flocking together of natives of all countries that a change was rapidly imprinted on all the arts of Byzantium, and processes which originated both in the West and in the East were rapidly absorbed as national acquisitions.

From the East, and especially from their intercourse with Persia, the Greeks of Byzantium obviously acquired that delight in gold grounds, white outlining, luminous and brilliant colouring which gradually superseded the more sober traditions derived from ancient Egypt, Greece and Rome.

With such an inclination, we cannot be surprised that gold ground mosaic acquired an almost universal popularity. In the great works of decoration executed by this means

under Justinian and his successors at Constantinople, Ravenna, and other parts of the exarchate, we find gold universally adopted as the back-ground to pictorial representations in mosaic.

Vast vaults and vast wall spaces were covered with this beautiful and permanent coating, and in all the pictures, embalmed as it were by the extreme durability of the process, we find a wide departure from any style which can be supposed to have existed otherwise than exceptionally in ancient Rome.

What the art gained by this Orientalism in colour and brightness, it lost in graphic power. Formality succeeded freedom in art; proportion and anatomy were altogether neglected as means of study by the artists, and the whole system sank into a mere trade, or something but little better, ruled by empirical precedent rather than by reason and judgment.

Hence the small degree of real pictorial merit exhibited in the early mosaics. Beautiful as architectural adjuncts, and valuable as they have been to architecture through the facility with which the structural features of the process might be applied to the permanent embellishment of a building, it was the architect rather than the painter who shone by the application of the process.

Concurrently with the practice of mosaic, which I need scarcely remind you formed certainly the principal if not the only coloured decoration of most of the early Christian churches throughout Italy, Asia Minor and elsewhere, there existed a school of both miniature and mural painting, principally in Italy, founded upon the practice of the art of painting by the early Christians. That perfect preservation of the types of ancient Roman painting (for which we are indebted to the lava of Vesuvius) at Pompeii and Herculaneum, finds its parallel in the preservation, in the recesses of the catacombs, of the earliest remains of Christian art. Long buried beneath

the soil, and almost obliterated from the tablets of men's memories there lay hid, as in a mine, the precious ore which germinated into much which is spiritual in the subsequent religious painting of the world. The gradual exhumation of these gems, and the exploration of the caves in which they had lain hidden in subsequent ages, and by the labours of men such as Aringhi, Bosio and others, down to the present day, have revealed to us the successive changes which, during century after century, the early Christians imprinted upon pictorial art.

The earliest remains of painting in the catacombs executed in Imperial times, differ but little in style from the works of cotemporary Pagan painters. The same modes of sketching, and the same style of arrangement of subject, colour, and light and shade, are gradually devoted to the representation of typical and symbolic pictures. The necessity of expressing their religious belief, and the events of sacred history, through some symbolic types which should veil from the eyes of the persecuting Romans the tenets which the early Christians held, and which they so often sealed with their blood, invested their art with an originality and spirituality which but for that necessity might never have been called into being.

In the later paintings of the catacombs we find the work getting more and more barbarous, as though material excellence fell away altogether with the gradually increasing supremacy of the Goths of the North and West. Still, however, attention was paid to the forms in which the personages of the sacred drama were always represented; and as the Greeks and Romans gradually elevated the types in which they recognized the persons of their divinities, so did the early Christians gradually establish and confirm a set of types of form and costume in accordance with which they and their successors almost to the present day, have been in the habit of depicting the principal characters of sacred

history. This establishment of types of form and costume, as persecution of Christianity died away, was carried, by the Eastern Church especially, to such an extent as to include in formality the types of arrangement in which it was alone lawful to depict the events of the sacred story.

The great iconoclastic movement in the Eastern Church however had the effect of breaking up the monopoly in art, which this possession by the Byzantine artists alone, of a knowledge of their traditional lawful types had invested them with, and of carrying into the Western Church the knowledge which the artists of the Eastern had possessed in complete detail, and codified into an almost liturgical system.

The protection extended to the artists expelled from Greece led to their congregation in the Scuola Greca attached to the well-known early Christian Church of Santa Maria in Cosmedino in Rome; a centre of irradiation from which, from the seventh to the tenth century, light and warmth was constantly shed over the uncultivated regions of Lombard conquest and dominion.

It was not until a thousand years had supervened after the birth of Christ, that any reaction from the Roman transmission of Greek tradition was asserted.

I am inclined to believe that the movement of innovation came from the far North, and from the native Scandinavian energy. Certain it is, that both in the Celtic and Frankish races, even while yet unconverted, there asserted itself an individuality and originality of type in ornament which betokened an energy of will and delight in beauty, which with greater cultivation could not fail to fructify into individual artistic character under the guise of painting.

This peculiar originality displayed itself most conspicuously in that land in which learning was carried to a high pitch, when almost everywhere else in Europe the light of science lay all but extinguished in the dust—I mean Ireland.

Very shortly after the labours of St Patrick had reared the cross, and taught the tenets of Christianity among the people of that country, we find that a school of miniature painting arose, at the head of which stood conspicuous the celebrated monks, Columba and Columbanus.

Happily in the few infinitely valuable specimens we still possess of their powers as illuminators, we find a strange co-existence (a co-existence which, at the first blush, would appear almost unaccountable)—of a complete mastery over certain conventional forms of ornament, with an utterly barbarous notion of depicting the human figure.

The only correctives to this barbarism which we can suppose to have been within the cognizance of the Anglo-Saxons, who acquired from the Irish scribes all that they knew, were probably to be found in occasional paintings and mosaics, executed from Roman designs in this country, and in such books as may have been sent to the early Saxon kings by Pope Gregory, through the medium of St Augustine and other early Christian Bishops.

These Greek and Roman types were gradually absorbed by the Anglo-Saxon and Frankish illuminators, and we find the two sources of artistic education meeting and asserting themselves in a most peculiar form in the pictorial manuscripts executed for Charlemagne, under the immediate influence of the venerable Bede.

Of such fortunately there are still many in existence, and in them we find the excellence in ornament proper to the Celtic school, combined with a very fair revival of the types of painting common in the later Imperial times of Rome.

This is particularly the case in manuscripts executed apparently by Parisian illuminators; and as it was in Paris, under the early kings of France, that the Cisalpine Church gradually asserted an individuality of Catholic life, so we shall there find in the sacred books, which were used in the ministrations of that Church, the first assertion of those types

of individuality in pictorial art which gradually displayed themselves systematically, and constituted the earliest really Gothic art.

Owing to the difficulty and intermittent character of the intercourse between these Northern and Western Churches and Rome, the native energy of the several localities appears to have sustained their artists in their individuality, and almost, as it were, preserved them from any rapid absorption of the changes of style which were being carried forward upon the soil of Italy.

It is to that land that we shall have on our next meeting together to turn, in order to trace the germs of the subsequently rapid movement towards pictorial excellence which placed Italy so far ahead of all the other countries of Europe from the thirteenth century onwards.

From the ninth to the end of the twelfth century there seems little reason to doubt that the traditions and practice of the art of painting rested mainly in the hands of the Greeks. Their excellences of manufacture are now best known to us through the mosaics and illuminated books which they executed; and although in exceptional instances there is revealed in them a certain amount of pictorial power, that power is always exercised in a rigid and mannered fashion. Grace and beauty are rarely attended to, and all the efforts of the artist appear to be concentrated upon recording in material form the incidents he is employed to depict.

There was yet another process by which the Greeks occasionally exhibited their skill as painters, viz., by means of the art of enamel working, upon which I do not now dwell, as the subject will probably hereafter engage our attention specifically.

Ingenious as their efforts may have been technically in this art, its mechanical difficulties only increased the inaptitude of the Greeks to give life and vigour to their pictures.

The very tenacity of character which made the Greeks of the lower empire fitting preservers of certain of the traditions of ancient art, unfitted them to move with the advance of other nationalities bent on the creation of new types, new processes, new systems of study, and all we have now learnt to recognize as modern art in painting, in contradistinction to ancient art.

As the latter has engaged our attention to-day, so will the former to-morrow; but I cannot dismiss you, while I have yet a right to dwell upon the subject of classical art, without asking you never to underrate its value because it may appeal to your sympathies through a "dead" instead of a "living language." The themes it embodies may not be those of your predilection; its gods are not your gods—its idylls are not your idylls—its epics are not your epics—its histories not your histories—its memories not your memories; but still its essence of beauty has always been, and must always be, your essence of beauty. "Men may come and men may go," and men's sympathies may "move with the remover to remove," but the true principles of art, inasmuch as they assimilate to the divine laws of creation, are eternal and immutable. No one has ever, I think, touched upon the enduring youth of ancient art more gracefully than Keats, in his "Ode on a Grecian Urn." Well may he say:

"Thou still unravish'd bride of quietness!  
Thou foster-child of Silence and slow Time,  
Sylvan historian, who canst thus express  
A flowery tale more sweetly than our rhyme:  
What leaf-fringed legend haunts about thy shape  
Of deities or mortals, or of both,  
In Tempe or the dales of Arcady?  
What men or gods are these? What maidens loath!  
What mad pursuit? What struggle to escape?  
What pipes and timbrels? What wild ecstasy!

Heard melodies are sweet, but those unheard  
Are sweeter; therefore ye soft pipes, play on;

Not to the sensual ear, but, more endeared,  
Pipe to the spirit ditties of no tone :  
Fair youth, beneath the trees, thou canst not leave  
Thy song, nor ever can those leaves be bare ;  
Bold Lover, never, never canst thou kiss,  
Though winning near the goal—yet, do not grieve ;  
She cannot fade, though thou hast not thy bliss,  
For ever wilt thou love, and she be fair !”



## LECTURE IX.

### PAINTING.

---

#### *HISTORY—MODERN.*

AT the close of the final act of the great drama of ancient art-history, with which my last address to you concluded, the curtain fell, as it should in every well-ordered tragedy, upon the dissolution of those who had played the leading part in the main plot. It rises to-day upon an entirely new set of characters, clothed in different costumes, speaking a different language, and breathing entirely different sentiments from those of the actors who had distinguished themselves upon the Attic boards of the classical ages.

That hearty animosity which tended to the separation of persecuting Pagan from suffering Christian, and the memories of those glorious martyrdoms by which the fathers of the faith sealed their hatred of the gods of the ancients with their life's blood, contributed to insure for centuries an inborn aversion from every relic and tradition of Pagan art on the part of the descendants of the early Christians. They obviously could have little sympathy with memories of a past, which to them and to their fathers had been rather humiliating than glorious; and it was therefore natural, that

when the advance in civilization—which invariably follows the first days of repose from the frantic passions engendered and excited in the task of barbarian conquest—demanded the ministrations of too long neglected art, the form in which those ministrations should be cast, should be made to differ entirely from the types they had assumed in the hands of races at first bitterly hated, and at last neglected and despised, by those who were bent upon the culture of arts suitable to their state, and harmonizing with their faith and spiritual aspirations.

It almost seems as though the Christian blood shed upon the soil of Italy specially fertilized it for the germination and production, in painting at least, of pure Christian art.

The first impulse of real original movement in such Christian art affecting Italy, appears to have arisen out of the contact and fusion of the Norman conquerors of Sicily with the previous conquerors of that island—the Arabs.

Out of the *vis viva* generated by the contact of these bodies sprang mainly, as I believe, that new life which first asserted itself in Italy on the soil of Pisa, and the outcrop of which, at the commencement of the thirteenth century, showed most conspicuously in the person of Nicola Pisano. That Nicola was a sculptor and architect of rare skill we know well, but whether he was a painter, and, if so, to what extent, we are now never likely to know.

Certain it is, however, that the improvements which he introduced into the art of sculpture immediately reacted upon the art of painting; and that after his time, if not at his time, the artists who were most conspicuous for their excellence in one art rarely failed to achieve distinction in the sister arts also.

In Christian art, and especially in painting, the personality of the artist was, before his time, a thing almost unknown. Certain Gothic artists have, it is true, inscribed their names upon their works, in the hope that their names might live as

long as those works endured : but the scanty record of a name is not sufficient to interest us in artists of whom we know nothing more. There must be some biographical record connecting the man with his work, and his individual characteristics with those characteristics which he has imprinted upon his work, before our attention can be withdrawn from the work to concentrate itself upon the artist.

From the age of Nicola Pisano onward the case is different. Contemporary applause and respect followed the execution of meritorious works. Civic pride was excited, and the records of cities were embellished by the preservation of particulars concerning the circumstances under which the leading monuments of the state were called into being.

With the development of personal liberty and security in the formation of the early Italian republics this civic pride grew, and the artists who ministered to it multiplied. Where riches abounded, following the course of trade and manufactures, art abounded also. Surplus profits were invested in works of art as well as in lands and ships, and while the artist was enriched, the labour of his hands enriched also the soil which gave him birth.

As we proceed in time we find the fame of the artist gradually spreading beyond the limits of his particular locality. Invitations came to him to work in other places, and so that individual existence which local schools acquired at first, became merged into a general harmony and an advance of art.

From Nicola Pisano came the first recurrence as a principle to rivalry with the arts of the ancients. Concurrently with those who laboured to that end there were also in active practice a school of divisional painters, who pursued the art on original principles, with which the arts of a Pagan period found neither favour nor sympathy. These were the painters, such as Mino da Sienna and Duccio di Buoninsegna, who have been aptly designated by Lord Lindsay as "con-

templative," and who gradually enlarged and altered the prevalent Greek types, by endowing them with freedom and pictorial grace, reflecting a spiritual liberty of conscience, and faith in a loving and beautiful creed. Of such the great leader and innovator was unquestionably Cimabue. In his works, in the Upper Church at Assisi particularly, we recognize a degree of human sympathy, and a command over the expression of human emotion, which had never been evidenced before his time. In his well-known picture still preserved in the Gallery of the Uffizii of Florence, and in his still more celebrated Madonna and Infant Christ in the church of Santa Maria at Florence, we meet with certain groupings of great beauty and elegance, together with an expression of ease and nature, extraordinarily removed from anything we can believe to have been executed in painting in Italy for centuries previous to his time.

It is true that before Cimabue, who was born in the year 1240, there had been contemporaries of Nicola Pisano, practising the art, at Pisa, and at Sienna and elsewhere—such as Giunta of Pisa, Guido of Sienna, and Margaritone of Arezzo.

There was also one other artist, Andrea Tafi, who preceded Cimabue, who merits special notice; not so much for his excellence as an artist as for the fact that he was the first Italian who acquired from the Greeks a command over the processes of mosaic working. He learnt this art from a Greek of the name of Apollonius whom the Florentines had employed to execute certain works in mosaic in the Baptistery of Florence. From the days of Tafi onwards, the art was almost entirely transferred—excepting perhaps at Venice—from the hands of Greeks to those of Italians.

It may be well to allude here to the great successors of Tafi in the art of mosaic.

Of these, during the thirteenth century, the principal were Fra Giacopo da Turrita at Sienna, the family of the Cosmati and Pietro Cavallini at Rome, and Gaddo Gaddi at

Florence; and by them all the great Italian mosaics, corresponding in style with those which had been executed by the Greeks, were wrought.

The later practice of mosaic in Italy, and especially its vigorous revival under Titian at Venice, was rather independently pictorial—that is, involving the free use of perspective, lineal and ærial—than structural upon a gold or otherwise flat ground.

It is curious that the domination of Italian over Greek art at the commencement of the 13th century, was contemporaneous with the triumph of Latin over Greek arms in the conquest of Constantinople.

The fame of Cimabue has been almost obscured in the transcendent genius of the shepherd-boy, whose precocious talent it was the privilege of Cimabue to discover, foster, and develop—Giotto.

These two men were contemporaries of Dante, and the latter of them of Petrarch, and of all the great Italian thinkers who gave new life to literature in Italy. Of them, Dante, in a well-known passage, says :

“Credette sì nella pittura  
Tener lo campo ; ed hora ha Giotto il grido  
Siche la fama di colui oscura.”

*Purgatorio, Canto ix.*

This “grido,” or world-wide celebrity, may possibly have attributed more individual influence to Giotto than he really possessed ; but it is quite singular to notice how completely the great writers on Italian art concur in recognizing in his person the introducer of the leading improvements in the special directions of art to which they were themselves addicted.

Thus the testimony of Ghiberti to the merits of Giotto, who (as M. Rio says, in his admirable *Poesie de l'Art Chrétienne*) was more competent than any one to appreciate him

from the period in which he wrote, is no less energetic than decisive; he says, that Giotto changed art "*de fond en comble*," "*dal fondo in cima*"—transforming it "from Greek into Latin." Nothing can be more forcible than the actual Italian words used by Ghiberti to express the change: "*Lasció la rozozza di Greci, rimutó l'arte del dipignere di Greco in Latino, e ridusse al moderno.*" Cennini makes use of precisely the same language as Ghiberti, only he confines his observations to the change in the technicalities. Petrarch, with his intense love of the graceful and cultivated, describes in his will a picture by Giotto, which he bequeaths to his friend, Francesco da Carrara, Podesta of Padua, as one "of which the uninitiated indeed do not comprehend the beauty, but before which the artist stands in mute astonishment." Boccaccio, with his realistic tendencies, declares in his Decameron, that "Nature provides nothing that Giotto does not imitate, even to illusion." Giovanni Villani, the great historian of Florence, speaks of him in almost the same terms as those employed by Boccaccio.

The four contemporaries of Giotto, however, who probably exercised the greatest influence over him, and indeed over everybody else in his time in the Christian Church, were St Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, St Dominic and St Francis; the two latter interpreting to the people, and embodying the leading doctrines of the theology which had been systematized by the two former.

From their time, and in accordance with their teaching, arose a new form of representing the legends of the western Church; summoned into being to assist the advocates of the formulas of monastic theology in procuring a more lively adhesion to the spiritual and ascetic faith they taught.

Through such influences, Giotto, and all the subsequent artists over whom his influence was exercised, departed from the mannerism then in vogue in painting, enriching the art with new types, and creating forms more spiritual, and at

the same time far more human, than any which had previously existed.

It is probable that Giotto assisted his master, Cimabue, in most of the works executed by him in the latter part of his life; but as soon as he was free to paint on his own account, he was employed on several compositions representing the history of St Francis, and the life and acts of the Virgin and our Saviour in the various churches of Florence.

In these he showed himself no less a dexterous artist than an original thinker; and in the latter capacity he gave a new aspect to his paintings, differing from all that had gone before him. At a later period of his life he revisited Assisi, where he completed the works of his master, and executed a beautiful series of paintings. It was in that great sanctuary of the Franciscans that he proved how deeply his communings with Dante, whose portrait he painted at Florence, had entered into his being.

In the vault, over the tomb of St Francis, he painted a series of four compartments representing subjects illustrating the nature of the theological persuasion of St Francis. He showed the virtues to which the Franciscan order vowed itself, and, as his principal subject, he depicted the Saint marrying Poverty — a vivid and graceful embodiment of that incident in the legend describing how St Francis loved Poverty, and chose her for his spouse, and won her through every difficulty.

You will probably remember that this is the theme of one of the most beautiful passages Dante ever wrote.

At Padua, in the beautiful chapel of the Arena, Giotto executed that admirable series of representations of the life of the Virgin which has been so much and so justly praised by Mr Ruskin, and so well illustrated by the Arundel Society.

In the Campo Santo at Pisa, he executed another interesting set of pictures, representing the principal incidents recorded in the Book of Job. Unfortunately these have

suffered greatly, but they still prove the power of the artist to represent nature and natural incidents in a manner, and with a vivacity, entirely beyond the range of any preceding artist.

In the church of Santa Croce, at Florence, there is a picture by Giotto, which M. Rio describes as embodying all the innovations introduced by him in other works. It represents the Coronation of the Virgin, "that majestic scene enacted between Heaven and Earth, which, as it does not admit of being treated with facility by either poetry or sculpture, seems to belong in a more especial manner to painting." These innovations are thus summed up by M. Rio: "The Infant Christ is no longer the same, either in character or costume: the primitive type still discernible in Duccio and Cimabue has totally disappeared; the angels in the four compartments are charming, both as regards variety and grace; but he has repudiated the custom adopted by his predecessors, and, in order to render the difference more striking, he has placed instruments of music in their hands. The decided progress indicated by this picture consists principally in the technical part, and in the colouring; which is much clearer and more transparent than it had hitherto been in the Florentine school, and especially in that of Sienna, where the shadows were more leaden in their tone, and the lights of a yellower hue."

Time will not permit me to dwell further upon the works or influence of Giotto, since it is obvious that it would be impossible to do justice to either, excepting in a paper specially devoted to the subject. And here it may be well that I should at once explain to you that, as from this time forward the history of art is but a history of the lives of an infinite number of individual artists, it is quite impossible to compress into the limits which are still left to me anything like an enumeration of all the men or of their works who have successively changed the whole constitution of art.



In future Lectures I may be able to take up certain definite schools, or transitional periods, and in describing them, to enter into details commensurate in some degree with the importance of the particular phase of art, or of art-development, selected for illustration; but at present I can only ask you to sink individualities, and to look at the subject in its great general types of change, impersonated in what have been usually designated by art critics, *Schools of Art*. Such schools of art were usually groupings of individual artists in certain localities, around the persons, and about the studios of certain leading spirits, animated with some common energy, or coalescing, even in antagonism, to produce or effect some potent change in contemporary art-practice.

Of the great Florentine school, Cimabue and Giotto must be regarded as the founders; the practice of that school being in its origin derived to a certain extent from the Siennese school, which after the death of its original founders, to whom I have alluded, was carried forward to an expression of remarkable serenity and sweetness by Simone Memmi, the great friend of Petrarch.

Of that school there are three types; the earliest, which may be said to close with Memmi; the intermediate, under Taddeo Bartolo; and the complete, or Raffaellesque, typified by Razzi, better known as Sodoma, and Beccafumi.

The Florentine school advanced to rare excellence through Orcagna, Giotto, Fra Angelico, Gozzoli, Starnina, Mazzolino, Massaccio, Botticelli, Ghirlandaio, Bronzino, Andrea del Sarto, and Fra Bartolomeo, to Michael Angelo.

Although the school of Florence unquestionably took the lead in Italy, the painter's art was practised for the service of the Church in almost every city and town. The painter, whether working in the *bottega*, or shop, as little more than a handicraftsman, or in his studio, honoured and loaded with dignities by his admiring fellow-citizens, equally found his principal employment in working for the service of the

wealthy Church. For her, works—from the meanest and most mechanical, to the loftiest and most spiritual—have been constantly executed from the year 1300 to the present date. She has been the foster-mother of art, and all the patronage put together afforded to art in Italy by corporations, nobles, and other individuals, shrinks into comparative insignificance as compared with that which she has bestowed.

Hence the great preponderance of sacred subjects in the productions of these schools, and the chastity and purity, the grace and spiritual beauty, which characterize so much of good Italian art.

I would be far from undervaluing the improvements in the types of form, in anatomical correctness, and in beauty derived by Italian artists from the study of those remains of classical antiquity in which mythological subjects have been for the most part embodied; as during the 15th century by such artists as Squarcione at Padua, and Andrea Mantegna at Mantua; but I cannot fail to recognize that those studies alone would never have led to the spirituality of their style, if the latter quality had not been summoned into being by the necessary condition that their works should minister as devotional stimulants to the members of a Christian Church.

This quality of devotional beauty found special embodiment through the Umbrian school, of which in its most highly perfected form Raffaele, in his early works, is the special exponent.

Opposed to Raffaele's original spirituality in his dependence upon nature, as interpreted to us by the ancient remains, stands the burly form of Michael Angelo, conspicuous amidst a crowd of contemporary notabilities.

If you would ever make yourselves acquainted with the greatest delights which can be derived from the study of the art of painting, you must of necessity devote yourselves to the study of the lives and works of these two immortal geniuses, as well as of certain of their contemporaries, such as

Leonardo da Vinci, Andrea del Sarto, Correggio, Fra Bartolomeo, Francia, Sebastian del Piombo, &c. In their drawings, no less than in their easel pictures and frescoes, these great masters have fortunately bequeathed to us admirable monuments of their genius, and such ample materials for enjoyment and reflection as to almost bewilder the art-critic who would fain convey to others the intense interest he may himself take in this portion of the study of the history of the art of painting. So bewildered, and under existing limits of time and space, I may therefore, and indeed I must, now pass over their individual excellences in order to generalize upon the continuation of my subject more rapidly.

The school of Venice was one in which the elegance of colour found its highest development. To the original Gothic painters who practised art as little more than tradesmen, for the supply of minor devotional paintings, succeeded great artists and colourists, such as Vivarini, Bellini, Giorgione, and ultimately Titian, Tintoretto, and Paul Veronese.

The more perfect form in which the artists of the close of the 15th century in Italy were enabled to present their pictures, was in no small degree due to the study which had been given to the theory of the art, and particularly to the laws of perspective, during that century. Artists, such as Paolo Uccello and Piero della Francesca, had devoted themselves specially to this branch of their art, and, by the labours of the former, the Florentine school had benefited, as had the Umbrian by those of the latter.

The study of anatomy, combined with perspective, had been greatly forwarded by the practice of Luca Signorelli, the master of Michael Angelo, whose command over the art of foreshortening was carried to its highest excellence by the pupil. Another painter of the beginning of the 17th century, whose admirable painting from the nude, stimulated the great Buonarrotti, was the celebrated Florentine Masac-

cio, whose pictures in the church of the Carmine at Florence were almost, to contemporary painters, like a new revelation. It was no doubt this very predilection for anatomical study (which had been thus implanted in him by his master) which determined the tendency of Michael Angelo towards sculpture, as well as painting.

The efforts of Signorelli to inaugurate a new phase in the science of Paolo Uccello and Piero della Francesca, have been ably commented upon by Messrs. Crowe and Cavalcaselle, who state that by means of them he prepared the way for the perfection of *Science* in Michael Angelo. "Signorelli, in fact," as they say, "learnt to display the structure and mechanism of the nude in immediate action with a power unattained in his day, and even went so far at last as to overstep the bounds of nature, and substitute for it unreal and conventional probabilities. We judge of his daring play with the greatest difficulties of position which art can pretend to render, not merely by his pictures, but by the remains of his original drawings from the naked model or from anatomical subjects, in which a successful effort is made to suggest the internal formation as well as to imitate the external appearance of flesh, muscle and bones."

This tendency to give almost too much prominence to the exhibition of a scientific knowledge of anatomy in painting, was carried to the utmost extravagance by those subsequent artists, who, both in painting and in sculpture, imitated *the manner* of the great Florentine, Michael Angelo, rather than his sublime command over the resources of design. The painters in their scientific movement, it must be in justice remembered, only followed in sympathy with the corresponding movement of the great schools of surgery and medicine of Pisa, Bologna, and Florence.

As it has been often said that in Shakespeare we meet with a union of the characteristics of some twenty poets, so, in the person of Raffaele do we meet with the characteristics

of at least as many painters, and those the greatest of all who had preceded him. It was not the ability and talent of his great master Perugino alone which he embodied in his works and carried to perfection, but it was all the sublime he could gather from Michael Angelo; the beautiful and correct that he could derive from Leonardo da Vinci: he unites the strength and dignity of the Florentine, with the sweetness and purity of the Umbrian, school. Upon them he engrafts much of the beautiful tone of colour and aërial perspective of the Venetian school, and he never loses sight of the classical fulness of form and distinctness of composition characteristic of the Paduan.

I do not dwell further upon the lives or works of these "Capo-maestri," who carried the art of painting, both mural and easel, to its utmost perfection; because, if I am to do any good in my teachings from this chair, we must have frequent occasions hereafter to recur to them.

Following closely on the footsteps of the great artists who added more and more grace, and more and more science, to the art of painting in Italy, there crept up into notice professors of the art in colder and more northern climes. Their point of departure, as in Italian art, was naturally the service of the Church, but there can be no doubt that their genius was also greatly fostered by the constant employment given to the painter in the illumination and adornment of books for the use of the laity as well as of the clergy.

The results and evidences of the labours of such artists as these during what are called the middle ages, have come down to us chiefly in three forms; namely, in stained glass, mural painting, and illuminated manuscripts.

It is singular, that although in Italy glass was unquestionably adopted as the vehicle for transmitting to us evidences of the painter's skill, it was so only exceptionally, and by no means was it so favourably received or so warmly admired by the Italians (although some admirable glass was

painted by them), as were pictures in tempera, or subsequently those in oil.

France was especially the country in which glass painting attained its highest excellence at an early period, that is to say, during the 13th and 14th centuries. It appears to have been almost equally excellent in England in the 13th century; but, as far as I have had opportunities of judging, the French glass of the 14th century was decidedly superior to the English work of the same age.

In the 15th century the Germans and Flemings acquired that superiority which they fully maintained during the 16th and 17th. In the last-mentioned era the Flemish and Dutch glass painters surpassed all others.

In Spain—with the exception of easel pictures preserved in the national museums and a few of the principal churches—stained glass, still glowing with the magnificent colouring of the 15th and 16th centuries (and, here and there, of an earlier date), appears to have been the only form of pictorial art susceptible of either ready destruction or removal, which has descended in any abundance to our own days. At Leon, Seville, Segovia, Toledo, and Burgos, stained glass may be found rivalling, if not in some cases surpassing, that of Bourges, Rouen, Rheims and Albi in France; Canterbury, York, Salisbury, and Lincoln in England; Brussels and other cities in Belgium, and of Gouda in Holland.

Owing to the extraordinary force of light in the transparency of the material in which pictures in stained glass are wrought, the conditions of the art are so essentially different from those of all other modes of painting as to assume an altogether different technical position from ordinary paintings. To such technical peculiarities I hope to be able to allude in my paper on *the practice* of the art of painting.

Mediæval illuminated manuscripts, of Italian origin, excellent as they are, excel contemporary works of the same

kind produced in other parts of Europe, only in subjects introducing the human figure. Both the French and English, during the 14th century, attained great excellence in drawing natural scenes and incidents; as well as a fair measure of propriety in the representation of sacred scenes, so long as the delineation of the figures was upon a small scale, and especially whilst the artist worked with the pen only.

In the loftier subjects of sacred history, however, or in designs in which the figures were upon a large scale, or in which their representation was required to reproduce truly, and with full vivacity, the light, shade and colour of nature, their inferiority to the professional painters of Italy became manifest.

The general aspect of the paintings in their manuscripts is, however, not less agreeable than that of those produced in Italy.

The great Italian schools of miniature painting were those of Sienna, Florence and Arezzo.

Want of time will not permit me to dwell upon the names and characteristics of the many artists whose works are carefully referred to by Vasari and other writers. In most cases they reflect merits corresponding with those of the principal painters of the schools to which they belong, but generally in a comparatively cramped and rather enfeebled style.

In the western countries of Europe, on the contrary, the artists engaged upon the illustration of illuminated books were really leaders and not followers of schools. In those countries the work excels the few evidences which time has spared to us of contemporary national mural and easel painting. The easel painters of those periods and countries mainly exercised their talents upon what were known as "tables," and scarcely rose socially above the level of skilful artificers.

These were sometimes single pictures, but more usually they formed the *rétables* of altars, or the leaves of diptychs

or triptychs—that is, pictures consisting of two folding “tables,” or of three “tables,” of which the centre one was stationary, and the other two hinged to the centre so as to allow of their closing upon it.

Mural painting was carried in Italy—particularly through the development of fresco, as a technical process—to a far greater pitch of perfection than in any other country in Europe.

In the Italian climate, the process employed acquired a technical perfection and attained a permanence which, even with the greatest care and skill, it has never yet assumed in more humid climates; and the realization of this fact no doubt led to the introduction of oil painting as a system in the northern countries of Europe.

From various extracts from ancient records, it is clear that an abundance of oil was used in the paintings of the Chapter-house and other contemporary buildings at Westminster; but whether as a preparation for painting in some other medium, or whether the pictures were painted by its means, and according to the method which we now understand as oil painting, is not clear.

Certain it is that the invention of painting in oil has been almost always ascribed (and until comparatively recently without challenge) to the celebrated John Van Eyck, of Bruges.

He, with his brother Hubert and his sister Margaret, painted in oil with the utmost perfection, during the first quarter of the fifteenth century, and their practice was speedily imitated in Italy; into which country it was introduced by Antonello da Messina, about the middle of the fifteenth century. Vasari's account, which the best judges believe to be substantially correct, is to the effect that Antonello happening to go to Naples on some affairs of his own art, when a celebrated picture by Giovanni of Bruges (by which name John Van Eyck was known in Italy) was



received there by King Alphonso, found that it was painted in oil in such a manner that it could be washed with safety, that its surface was in no danger from any shock, and that it was besides a very perfect work. Antonello was so struck with the vivacity of the colours, and the beauty and harmony of the painting, that, putting aside every other avocation, he at once went to Bruges, where he assiduously cultivated the friendship of Giovanni, presenting to him many drawings executed in Italy; and Giovanni, in return for these attentions, and also because he was growing old, was content that Antonello should see the method of his colouring in oil. The latter, in consequence, did not quit Flanders till he had thoroughly learnt the process to acquire a knowledge of which was the great object of his wishes. Giovanni dying soon after, Antonello left Flanders to revisit his native place, and to communicate to Italy so valuable a secret.

At Venice, where he settled, Antonello revealed his mystery to a certain Dominico, who is said to have been induced by the insidious arts of Andrea del Castagno to communicate the details of the process to him.

Vasari then recounts to us the murder of Dominico by Andrea del Castagno in the hope of the latter's remaining the sole depositary of the mystery. How futile was the commission of this crime will be at once perceived by those who reflect that it was by no means to Antonello da Messina alone that the secret of Van Eyck was known.

In whatever materials the Van Eycks were called upon to work, there can be no doubt that their wonderful ability as artists would have been vindicated; and it is singular that as in the contemporary new art of printing, the utmost perfection, not only of present aspect but of permanence, was attained in the earliest examples of each art. It would be hard to say positively whether the beautiful specimen of Van Eyck's genius we possess in the National Gallery was best as a technical illustration of all that is to be commended in the

art of painting, or a fine Fust and Schoiffer Bible as a specimen of the art of printing.

The florid description given by Vasari of Van Eyck's invention has been tested with exceeding care by Sir Charles Eastlake in his "*Materials for a History of Oil Painting.*"

The truth of that account has been sifted from a considerable amount of fiction—the natural growth of the extraordinary estimation in which Van Eyck was held in his native country.

He was buried in the church of St Donatus at Bruges; upon a column in which church is an inscription recording the fact in the following elegant, if somewhat hyperbolic, terms:

"*Hic jacet eximia virtute Joannes,  
In quo picturae gratia mira fuit,  
Spirantes formas et humum florentibus herbis  
Pinxit, et ad vivum quodlibet egit opus.  
Quippe ille Phidias et cedere debet Apelles;  
Arte illi inferior ac Polycletus [sic] erat.  
Crudeles igitur, crudeles dicite Parcas,  
Quae talem nobis eripuerunt virum.  
Actum sit lachrymis, incommutabile factum,  
Vivat ut in coelis jam deprecare Deum.*"

Oil painting was practised by the Flemish artists, followers of Van Eyck, and many among them, including Roger of Bruges, Memling, and Justus Van Ghent, very soon visited Italy, partly to study and partly to practise.

However it may have been acquired by Italian artists it is certain that the process was very generally adopted in Italy from the end of the 15th century onwards. At Venice, where it was earliest known and practised, it greatly influenced that school, and tended to the development of the system of painting in translucent colours, and of scumbling and glazing, by which the magnificent effects of light, shade and colour which distinguish the greatest works of Giorgione, Titian, Paul Veronese and Tintoretto were produced.

The Umbrian school of the 15th century, illustrious in

the person of Pietro Perrugino, was conspicuous as the soil from which sprang the greatest of all painters, the immortal Raffaele, in the flood of light surrounding whose great fame the lesser glories of many other great Umbrians, such as Lo Spagna, Pinturicchio, and Domenico and Orazio Alfani, are scarcely noticeable.

Leonardo da Vinci may be regarded as the great head of the Milanese school; and his sweetness, if not his power, may be recognized in the works of his followers, Luini, Beltraffio, and others. Raffaele's following was even more numerous and able than that of Leonardo, reflecting almost every phase of Raffaele's extraordinarily versatile genius. Thus in Julio Romano and Francesco Penni one meets with much of his command over classic form in drawing and ornament. In Timoteo della Vite his religious sentiment was perpetuated. In Perino del Vaga, Bachiacca and Giovanni da Udine, his aptitude for decorative design was well sustained. In Innocenza da Imola and Bagnacavallo we observe his beautiful rotundity and softness of modelling—while in Garofalo, Dosso Dossi, and other Ferraresi, we recognize his force of painting, fulness of chiaro-oscuro, and glow of colour. In none of his successors, however, do we trace that union of noble qualifications for a great painter which made him what he alone was, and what, with all their studious eclecticism, the leading masters of the Bolognese school could never attain to. This school, which in its earliest religious phase was led, if not created, by Franco Bolognese, possessed a formidable rival to Raffaele in the pure and beautiful artist, Francesco Francia. In its later and eclectic shape it boasted a crowd of great men—including Domenichino, the three Caracci, Albani, Guido, and the prolific and dextrous, though somewhat over-rated, Guercino. Michael Angelo's influence was rather extensive than profound—every artist whether contemporary with or posterior to him was, and has been, moved by certain magnificent evidences of power which he alone could wield

with a passionate energy always on the verge of, but never degenerating into, caricature. Sebastian del Piombo's may probably be regarded as the fittest name to associate with that of Buonarrotti, since, profound as was Giorgio Vasari's admiration of him, Giorgio's powers as an artist were not altogether of the highest order. He is rather to be regarded as the representative man of artistic literature, as Leonardo da Vinci was of artistic science.

I have had occasion to refer, in passing, to the development of science as an increment in the practice of art through the intervention of Paolo Uccello, Pietro della Francesca and Luca Signorelli. Their discoveries in perspective, in anatomy, and in the legitimate system of laying out pictures in accordance with rules of optics and reason, were perfected and systematized by Leonardo da Vinci, and by another artist north of the Alps, of no less rare natural gifts—Albert Dürer. They were, as Cardinal Wiseman justly remarks in his "Points of Contact between Science and Art,"—"worthy agents in the great advancement of art, through its union with science." Such men, indeed, united in themselves the two qualifications necessary for that purpose—proficiency in science as in art. As soon as, through their exertions, "science began to bring its resources to bear upon art, it demonstrated certain principles which came thereby to be so fixed and proved that it was impossible ever afterwards to allow deviation from them; but whenever science has thus acted in a matter of practical importance, the next step is to convert its theorems into practical rules, which are accepted for all necessary and useful purposes without further proof." The effect upon art of this dogma was "that from the moment that perspective was reduced to certain and scientific principles, and was so accepted by art, it became almost impossible to divorce them. They were soon popularized, and were adopted as an essential part of artistic education, and reduced to rules easily learnt and applied."

Such rules Albert Dürer not only helped to originate, but illustrated with the greatest energy and rare versatility, carrying forwards the application of the draughtsman's and painter's art to engraving, on steel, on copper, on pewter, and on wood, with equal ability and success. Over his contemporaries and their descendants at Nuremberg, Augsburg, Basle, and over the "petits maîtres" generally throughout Europe, this prolific genius exercised a wonderfully potent influence.

Perhaps no man better than Albert Dürer illustrates the doctrine that the intellect of the true artist is at once soil and seed.

Every particle of seed for the production of good work wafted about in his vicinity fructified, when it fell upon the congenial soil it found within the limits of his artistic intelligence. The reproduction of the seed thus sown within the soil of his brain became assimilated to his nature, and, in turn, his fructification turned into seed, which was taken up upon the wings of fame, and wafted till it in its turn found a congenial soil for fresh fructification in the brain of some other and probably far distant artist, far distant alike geographically and chronologically. As it was with Albert Dürer, so has it been with almost every great artist of strong and quickening genius, and as it was in Germany, so it unquestionably was in Spain. There can be no doubt that from Italy came those elements of design which stirred the genius of Velasquez, Juanes, Zurbaran, Murillo and El Greco, to produce the masterpieces which still adorn that country.

At the same time the seed so received was completely changed in its process of assimilation to their commanding natures, and the chief evidences of the merits of the labours of their pencils, however derived, come upon us as essentially original creations.

Of Velasquez I do not know how to speak with becoming and sufficient respect. Although his mind did not lead him to depict the perfect types of sublimity, grandeur and beauty affected by Michael Angelo, Raffaele, and Leonardo; and

although we rarely find in him the glow and fervour of a Titian, or a Tintoretto, he seems to me to have been the painter who certainly attained the power of representing all that can be seen in the subject of a picture with greater truth and greater facility than any other artist who ever lived. In the *method* of his pictures he realises perfection, and in his best works there is more solidity where solidity should appear, and more air where air should appear, than I have ever been able to find in the paintings of any other master.

Murillo, his great rival, had many noble qualities as a painter, and none more transcendent than his power of creating an impression of space and atmosphere. His figures always stand free and detached; they are fully raised and lifted from one another, and from his backgrounds; so that they appear almost as if projected in accordance with the laws of binocular vision.

Of the other leaders of the Spanish school I cannot now speak. If life and health be spared to me, I may hope to make their merits the subject of a separate discourse.

It is the same in a yet higher degree with all the European National schools; and these I shall hope to illustrate in tolerable detail, as well as British Architecture and British Sculpture, if not in my next year's course, in that of some subsequent year.

For the present I must be content to put before you only a few of the most leading facts and summary generalisations which form the basis of the comparatively recent history of the art of painting as regarded from the point of view of competing nationalities. We, as well as the French, were indebted to the foreigners who settled amongst us and amongst them for a knowledge of the progress made during the 15th and 16th centuries in Italy, Germany and Spain, in the art of painting.

Passing over the transient influence of Jean de M'Abuse, the first great artist who taught us practically the wonderful

extent to which truthful delineation from nature could be carried, was the immortal Holbein. Sir Antonio More reflected upon us the condition of pictorial art in Spain; Girolamo da Treviji, Toto dell Nunziata, Zuccherò, Bartolomeo Penne and others brought to us the traditions of the contemporary Italian schools; while the family of the Hornebands, Gervas Flick, Just Van Cleff, Lucas de Heere, Cornelius Ketel, Mytens, Mark Garrard, and subsequently Rubens and Vandyck, endowed us with masters learned and famous in the annals of the history of painting in the Low Countries.

Contemporary with these artists a National school began to arise; at first almost limited to miniature painting, of which the Coopers and Olivers were the greatest ornaments.

From the Elizabethan period until the days of Hogarth; or perhaps those of his father-in-law, Sir James Thornhill, we remained somewhat under a cloud of foreign practice of pictorial art, enlivened only by the presence of a few Englishmen of merit, principally portrait painters, such as Dobson, Walker, Jamieson, &c.

At last, after the days of Lely and Kneller, both scarcely to be called English, we arrive, in the person of the weak painter, Hudson, at the master of the immortal Reynolds. The last named, I need scarcely remind you, was the first President of our Royal Academy.

With the foundation of that Institution I must leave, for a few moments, the progress of British painting, to trace the rise to their present admirable position of the French, Belgian and German schools of painting.

An impetus, corresponding with that which had been given by Holbein and his contemporaries to English art, was conveyed to France by Primaticcio and the other artists invited by Francis I. to take up their abode in his kingdom; but it is only just to confess that its action was exercised upon artists far more ready to profit by the instruction than we could boast of in England.

The publication of good Italian and German engravings had already at the commencement of the 16th century fertilized the soil; and in artists such as Jean Cousin, as a painter, and Jean Goujon, Germain Pilon, and Philibert de L'Orme and others as sculptors and architects, men's minds were already prepared for a conversion from Gothic to Italian Renaissance practice.

In the earlier French painters, however, such as Jeannet especially, we cannot fail to recognize a distinct individuality of genius; and in subsequent artists such as Le Bourguignon, Claude, Nicolas Poussin, Gaspar Poussin, Philip de Champagne, Le Brun, Le Sœur, and Mignard, the glories of the reign of the Grand Monarque, and the advanced teaching of the Academies he maintained, find apt illustrators and apt illustrations.

In the commencement of the 18th century a certain dwindling of power had shewn itself, and perhaps in the days when Vien presided at the Academy, French modern art had reached its lowest pitch.

From that condition it was raised by the great talent of men such as Boucher, Greuze, Lancret, Watteau, Chardin and Vernet the elder, until a new vigour was given to it by the presence of the formidable republican, David, followed by Proudhon, Jouvenét, and Fragonard.

From their days, as France has risen in material prosperity and cultivation, her school of art has risen concurrently, and has at length reached, in the persons of Delaroche, Horace Vernet, Ary Scheffer, Ingres, Flandrin, Eugene Delacroix, and others who have passed away, that pinnacle of perfection at which it is now steadily sustained through the labours of many men yet living, whom it would be perhaps invidious to particularise.

In Holland and Belgium,—the Netherlands in short,—the traditions of the school of Cologne and early German art were readily taken up and improved upon; while Lucas Van Leyden, Netscher, Jordaens, Metz, Terberg, Rembrandt,



Rubens, Vandyck, the quasi-Englishmen Sir Peter Lely and Sir Godfrey Kneller, Cuyp, Paul Potter, Van Goyen, Berghem, Ruysdael, Hobbima, Karl du Jardin, Snyders, Van der Helst, Both, Teniers, Jan Steen, Pynaker, Wynants, Backhüysen, Ostade, Vandervelde, Wouvermans, Gerard Dow, and many others, bridge over the chasm connecting mediæval art with the Belgian and Dutch schools of recent and living painters of the highest distinction, such as Henri Leys, Gallait, Willems, Stevens, and Israels.

The gap between mediæval and modern art which we have spoken of as well bridged over in the Netherlands remains an awful chasm in the history of German progress. With the comparative fall of the great free cities of the empire, fell the old greatness of the German school of art, and it was not until comparatively quite recent days that any effectual attempt was made to revive it.

This movement seems to have originated in the marked ability of a few enthusiasts, who met at Rome towards the beginning of the present century, consisting mainly of Overbeck, Von Schadow and Cornelius.

The first-named of these may really be looked upon as the great reviver of spiritualism in religious painting, while Cornelius may also be looked upon as the great restorer to its proper place in connexion with architecture of the long-neglected practice of fresco-painting. Both were men of great enthusiasm and patient endurance,—both eminently original and excellent in every gift, except that of being heaven-born painters. As artists their educational position and influence has never been excelled; but their works will never, I consider, entitle them to a place by the side of the greatest masters of Italian art.

Their example and practice have been followed with more or less originality and artistic success by many able artists, such as Von Kaulbach, Von Snorr, Lessing, Achenbach, Riedel, Führich, Hess, and many others; and by a

judicious recognition and application of the conventions of painting to mural decoration, the great monuments erected throughout Germany,—and at Munich and Berlin especially,—have been adorned in a manner at once dignified, and in many cases beautiful.

The present condition of German art is in some respects not unworthy the ability of these, the main founders and leaders of its actual school.

The Italian masters of the end of the 17th and the whole of the 16th centuries gave back but miserable reflections from that sun of glory which emitted its last bright rays through Caravaggio, Salvator Rosa, and the "Naturalisti;" and ultimately dwindled into entire nonentity under Carlo Maratti, Mengs, Battoni, and the Cavaliere d'Arpino. Camuccini early in the present century revived good traditions feebly, and since his death there are many signs of new life to be recognized, particularly through the living artists of Florence, Naples, and Milan.

We left English art at that which may really be looked upon as the moment of its developement into a national school.

Hogarth, it must always be remembered, stood almost alone as vindicating the possibility, which the magnates of his time scarcely believed in, that an Englishman could be a great and original painter. The moment this became recognized in the person of Reynolds,—at all events with reference to portraiture, the only lucrative branch of the art at that time in England,—the tide of patronage turned homewards; and in answer to an almost instant demand, Gainsborough, Opie, Raeburn, Northcote, Hoppner, Romney, and ultimately Lawrence, came forward.

In historical painting we have been more slow to vindicate our power than in those branches of the art in which an almost exact transcript of nature forms the foundation of excellence in the work produced.

Benjamin West succeeded least in his most ambitious

efforts, but in those of a more simple kind, as in his pictures of the Death of General Wolfe, and the Battle of La Hogue, he vindicated his claim to the honourable position of President of the Royal Academy. Copley, also a transatlantic acquisition, was in some respects a greater artist than West, and left behind him a few very noble works. Fuseli, James Barry, and B. R. Haydon alike theorised well and practised but indifferently, while Wilkie practised admirably, theorising scarcely at all.

It is, however, in the art of landscape-painting that we have achieved our greatest triumph, in the person of James Mallard Turner. His pictures, his sketches, and everything that came from his hand, bear the imprint of unquestionable and transcendent genius. Constable, Chrome, and Bonington were rather his contemporaries than his rivals.

Wilson, his great predecessor, had a noble feeling for breadth, both of light and shade, and for colour, and a certain dignified perception of what was noble in nature; but his pictures fail to affect us with that sense of perfect truth, and at the same time extreme grandeur, which characterise all, at any rate but the latest, of Turner's works.

Upon Calcott, Collins, Stanfield, Roberts, and Creswick, in different varieties of landscape, the mantle of Wilson and Turner fell not unworthily.

In the still living Linnell and in many other aspirants for fame, we have an excellent assurance that we are not likely to degenerate in this department of art. In Stubbs, George Morland, and James Ward, we have a fine succession of animal painters, who may be said to have founded the school, at the head of which Edwin Landseer stands "facile princeps." Upon the works of living painters, however, I cannot think it right that I should venture to dilate, to an audience which can scarcely fail to be already fatigued by the length at which I have been compelled to dwell upon the glorious past of modern art. I cannot, however, quit the subject of British painting, however slight may be the

allusion I have to make to it, without noticing one especial branch of it in which we English have always been considered to stand at the head. I allude of course to the art of painting in water-colours. The names of Paul Sandby, Girtin, Havell, Bonington, Robson, Turner, Clennell, Cotman, Dewint, Copley Fielding, Barrett, Cox, Hunt, Chambers, Prout and Roberts, mark golden eras in the annals of the art. They are of the past, but happily though those great men may have gone to their rest, the golden eras still continue; and year after year old favourites, and new aspirants for favour, come forward to engage our sympathies and enlist our admiration.

My task to-day has been to speak of the past in the art of painting. Had it been instead to dwell upon its future, I might perhaps have had to add some bitter to my sweet, for it is not meet to be too jubilant, and to proclaim the citadel safe with still some enemies at the gate. Yet upon the whole the tenour of my strain could not have been otherwise than hopeful.

The ever-increasing activity of our best painters, and the great talent of those in all branches of art who, happily for us, annually adorn our exhibitions with fresh and beautiful works of art, fill us with a reasonable assurance, only now and then chequered by doubts, that our path is upward rather than downward. That it may long continue so, and that with every year, and in every exhibition, there may be manifested a just appreciation of sound theory, accompanied with a skilled and well-trained practice, is my most earnest desire, as it no doubt is yours.

Such a result is dependent almost as much upon a cultivated public, as it is upon cultivated artists; and therefore it is that I recognize teaching as I do upon the subject in this place, in a humble but earnest endeavour to inculcate just principles of criticism, to be an honourable duty, and one entailing grave responsibilities.

## LECTURE X.

### PAINTING.

---

#### *THEORY.*

IN the last two Lectures I have had the honour to address to you, the great variety and importance of the events of which it was my duty to give you some faint indication within very narrow fixed limits of time and space were so engrossing, as to have entirely prevented my making such incidental allusions to the connexion of those historical events with the theory of painting as might under other circumstances have rendered my historical narrative both more profitable and more interesting.

On the present occasion the difficulty and importance of the theory of the art, which I have to condense to-day for your information, will no less urgently require all your attention; and if I fail to connect that theory in any considerable degree with the past in art, I would ask you to take it for granted that I do so only in the hope that, in subsequent addresses, I may have an opportunity of working out some of the most interesting points of connexion between the two, in dwelling upon some of the highest efforts of the painter's art.

To rightly apprehend the theory of painting it behoves

us to contrast it in some degree with those characteristic features in the theories of the sister arts by comparison with which its own peculiarities may be set in a more lucid aspect.

Thus we shall find that in the architect's work the personality of the artist is to a considerable extent lost in the material bulk and slow mechanical elaboration of the form in which his inventions present themselves for the attention of the critic. In the art of sculpture, on the one hand, the arbitrary limitations which the laborious technical nature of his work imposes upon the sculptor, almost altogether hide his person from us. In the case of the painter, on the other hand, the veil is in a great measure withdrawn.

The image which a sculptor presents to us may possibly be revealed to him in his conception rapidly, and in a complete form; but between the date of his so conceiving his perfect work, and its embodiment in a material form, much time and a quantity of tedious labour must intervene. But for great pertinacity and sustained energy on his part (such pertinacity and such energy as are given to but few even of highly endowed artists) there is great fear that the primitive vigour of his conception may evaporate, and that the finished work may come to us but faintly reflecting the spirit of the sculptor's imagination.

In the painter's art, on the contrary, his thought is transferred, "hot from his brain," to the paper or canvas upon which he works. As his fancy moves, so does his hand, and therefore it is that his work reflects, as in a mirror, his peculiarities and idiosyncrasy; and through the intense human sympathy his work calls up, it becomes almost impossible to consider his art from so abstract a point of view as to sink for a moment even our interest in its author.

As Mr W. B. Scott admirably remarks in the preface to his *Life and Works of Albert Dürer*, there is no doubt "that the works of a born artist are as much an expression of the man, as the verse of a true poet, and that his life

properly seen is another realisation, another picture or series of pictures in unison with the painted stories that come from his hand."

If the life of the artist, as Mr Scott no doubt truly observes, is a realisation of the painted stories which come from his hand, so, yet more certainly, may it be predicated that the painted stories are really the true expression of the life and character of the individual by whom they have been executed.

It is, in fact, this very revelation of the inward life of the artist in his works, which succeeds to that occasioned by the first impression of the dignity of the subject he may have selected for representation, or the ability with which, as an artist, he may have represented it. It is, indeed, more generally this human interest which survives in our memories, rather than the loftier interest attaching to the subject of the picture, or the art it displays.

Of course the more we know and learn of the lives and works of the individuals whose works we study, the more this feeling is strengthened; until at last the man, and what he does, become inseparably blended in our minds; and we admit the artist to our friendship and esteem in the measure in which we have admitted his works into the catalogue of things to be remembered with delight.

In thus recognizing the sympathy between the painter and his outcome, or the soil and that which it yields in art, I would distinctly desire to guard you from falling into the popular error of supposing that perfection in art can come only from perfection in life and morals. It has been too much the custom in writing of things of beauty to regard the artist producing them, as though in their achievement he had effected an intentional moral good. That he may have done so is of course possible: that he must have done so is inadmissible.

What is true of the individual artist is yet more true of

the schools to which he belongs, and the existence of even high beauty in historical monuments of art, whether of architecture, sculpture, or painting, must not be accepted as necessarily proving a highly religious or moral condition of humanity at the date, or in the country, in which such works were produced. During the Middle Ages a spiritual and devotional sentiment is expressed in the pictures which so abundantly adorned the churches of those ages; but we must not infer therefrom that more true religion, or more just morality prevailed, than has existed in periods when religious painting was practised in more material and occasionally almost sensual forms.

What is true of painting, is no less true of architecture; and on this head Professor Kerr, in a recent speech at the Royal Institute of British Architects, with great propriety condemned what he characterised as the fashionable sentimental view of this question taken by a previous speaker, who had used the expressions that "the Parthenon is thought manifested in marble: York Minster is faith reflected in stone. One is the product of intellect; the other is the offspring of the moral sentiment. The first is an idea; the latter is a prayer. Artists designed the former; saints must have conceived the latter."

In reply to this Professor Kerr justly said, "What we have had so often laid before us, we have had repeated once more to-night, that in the Middle Ages, architecture (and the sister arts) flourished in consequence of the enthusiastic sentimentality in the people at large. I, for one, never could see anything but the greatest absurdity in such an idea. I believe that the merits of Gothic Architecture (sculpture and painting) often great, and often small, were, in those old times, altogether unconnected with such sentimentality in any shape. There may have been something of the kind among the clergy, and there may have been an enthusiastic religious feeling, more or less general, among some of the laity, accord-



ing to occasional circumstances ; but as for there being anything like a continuous romanticism in the art of the people at all, of such a kind and of such intensity as to exhibit itself in the details of architectural design (or in the details of other branches of art), I can only say that I think there cannot by any possibility be a greater fallacy propounded, or anything more subversive of the true principles of artistic criticism."

I must confess that I entirely concur with the critic, for I feel that this is the kind of "tall talk" which is too apt to engender false ideas of historical facts, and an entirely mistaken application of means to ends in the theory and practice of the fine arts,—and especially those of the art of painting.

In alluding to this point, I am not placing another in a *locus penitentiæ*, which I have not occupied myself, since I was some twenty years ago justly rebuked by the late Cardinal Wiseman for a similar confusion of morality with æsthetics, which I had manifested by applying terms fit only to be used in the scientific language applicable to morals in criticising works of art. I had spoken of an artistic "sham," as though it was an immoral untruth.

I have already alluded to the fact that the principle of imitation is one connected only in a remote degree with the art of architecture. In the art of sculpture it assumes the position of a *primum mobile*, or basis of action ; but owing to the material and technical nature of the art, that imitation is so hampered by necessities of conventional treatment as comparatively to tie the sculptor's hands in his attempt to embody that which his eye perceives, or his imagination conceives.

In the painter's art the case is quite otherwise ; since he is enabled to produce a sense of gratification—although not of the highest order—so soon as he has trained his hand to imitate with facility all that he can train his eye to see accurately.

This, at first sight, would appear to be an easy task, but the slightest examination of the history of painting will at once demonstrate the contrary.

Unless reason comes to the assistance of the perceptive faculties, ages must supervene before a radical improvement can take place, even in an art which finds its basis in the direct imitation of nature.

So far as we can at all trace the succession of events through the mist which time has thrown around the origin of the arts, we may gather, that the efforts at imitation in stone, wood, and plastic materials, preceded the more artificial operation of endeavouring to present upon a plane surface the material aspect of solid objects in the round.

We constantly meet with savage races whose misshapen idols gradually approximate to a semblance of humanity, before the graphic powers of the savages who produced them appear to be in anywise developed. Graphic power, in such races, is almost always, in the first instance, manifested by the simplest efforts at ornamentation. Lines, dots, zigzags, squares, circles, and rude attempts at scrolls, succeed one another; and ultimately the imitative principle of the painter's art shews itself in the rude imitation of a flower, a shell, or an animal. Then, at last, comes the human figure, drawn, as we see it drawn by a child, with a circle for the head, straight lines for the limbs—evenly balanced on both sides—with a straight line for the spine—and fan-like forms, with five separate projections, representing the hands and feet.

I do not know that I can more perfectly illustrate the perfection which a rude people may attain in ornamental drawing, while their imitative art remains in its complete infancy, than by pointing to the extraordinary Irish manuscripts, which I mentioned in my last lecture, and to the early Anglo-Saxon and some of the Carlovingian manuscripts.

In these we find a truth of hand in the drawing of orna-

ment, which has never been surpassed, from the date of their production to the present time; and yet you will find in them representations of human beings scarcely rising above the level of such sketches as fond parents from time to time preserve, as exhibiting the precocity of children between the age of three and four in the art of drawing.

The various stages indeed through which the artistic developements of children pass, present us with an epitome of what has passed in history, or in the lives of many adults whose days have been passed as it were in infancy, so far as the arts are concerned.

The mode of imitation adopted by the child corresponds strictly with that of the uncivilized adult; with the difference, that he passes slowly through that stage of artistic development, through which a child born in a highly civilized age passes rapidly. This difference of pace is due to the difference of atmosphere in which the growth takes place. Art amidst the uncivilized grows as a plant grows in a cold climate. Amidst the civilized "to-day it puts forth leaves, to-morrow blossoms."

It is at this stage of our inquiry that we may do well to trace, with Leonardo da Vinci, the gradual steps through which the human mind must accompany the human eye in arriving at that just apprehension of form which enables it to be satisfactorily portrayed.

"The organ of sight," Leonardo says, "is one of the quickest, and takes in at a single glance an infinite variety of forms; notwithstanding which it cannot perfectly comprehend more than one object at a time. For example, the reader at one look over a page of letterpress, perceives it full of different characters, but he cannot at the same moment distinguish each letter; much less can he comprehend their meaning. He must consider it word by word, and line by line, if he be desirous of forming a just notion of these characters. In like manner, if we wish to ascend to the top of

an edifice we must be content to advance step by step; otherwise we shall never be able to attain it. The young man who has a natural inclination to the study of this art (Painting), I would advise to act thus:—In order to acquire a true notion of the form of things, he must begin by studying the parts which compose them, and not pass to a second till he has well stored his memory and sufficiently practised the first. Otherwise he loses his time, and will most certainly protract his studies. And let him remember to acquire accuracy before he attempts quickness<sup>1</sup>."

This very quality of accuracy, which really lies at the bottom of all that can be valuable in draughtmanship, can only be acquired, as Leonardo da Vinci points out, by an education at once of the understanding and the organs of sight and touch.

For the perfection of excellence in art training the three branches of education must go on concurrently, and neither must be suffered to fall behind the other. Any want of balance in this training is instantly manifested in a painter's work, as we can often observe in the decrepitude of a great artist's career, the mind failing, while the powers of the eye and hand still remain perfect, or *vice versa*.

From the moment that such failure becomes perceptible, in whatever form it may assume, the painter's work immediately decreases in value; and it is frequently possible to recognize in a picture the precise point at which the attention has flagged, and to separate, as it were, the portions which are pregnant with life and interest, and those from which the soul of intellect has evaporated. Yet throughout the whole the forms may be well drawn, and the handling uniformly good.

It is singular how often this waning power on the part of the artist shews itself in one or other of two very different directions. Frequently we find it manifested in an over-

<sup>1</sup> *Treatise on Painting*, by Leonardo da Vinci. Edited by J. F. Rigaud. 8vo. 1802.

weening attention to the elaboration of trifles, an over rendering of texture in draperies which are either unskilfully or ungracefully cast, or which fail to indicate the movements of the limbs they conceal too much. Nothing appears to me more tedious and to be regretted than to see an artist of real genius wasting his time in expressing by laborious imitation objects of entirely secondary importance, or portions of a picture upon which it is far better that the attention of the spectator should not be concentrated.

It is a sure indication of a poor artist when we find the mud upon the boots of a figure in his picture so painted that one would almost be inclined to scratch upon the canvas to get it off, while the head is meaningless, and the texture of the flesh waxy, or in anywise unnatural.

The other mode in which the waning power of a painter is shown is when he only indicates in a vague and sketchy manner those parts of his picture which should be closely imitated from nature, and should bear the imprint of having occupied the most vigorous powers of the artist's trained vision and observation.

Sir Joshua Reynolds justly says, "he can recognize no occasion upon which he would recommend an undeterminable manner or vague ideas of any kind in a complete and finished picture. The notion of leaving anything to the imagination opposes a very fixed and indispensable rule in art that everything shall be carefully and distinctly expressed as if the painter knew with correctness and precision the exact form and character of whatever is introduced into the picture. This is what with us is called science and learning, which must not be sacrificed and given up for an uncertain and doubtful beauty, which not naturally belonging to our art, will probably be sought for without success."

Nothing can be more sensible than this rule of good taste; and yet unfortunately we find the course it so justly prescribes as the only safe one constantly neglected.

In common with Leonardo and Sir Joshua, all good writers on the theory of art have concurred in holding that the most essential function of the brain in connection with the practice of the art of painting is rightly to apprehend the true form, and the mechanism or source, cause and method of action, as well as the bulk and relation of parts, of objects seen and chosen for portrayal.

By the training of the understanding alone can the artist be made to know what things are. The education of the eye teaches him to know what things look like. The education of the hand enables him to delineate them.

The relative preponderance of the separate functions in this matter of the understanding and the eye, find their correspondence in graphic art in the two distinct modes of representation which it is open to the artist to adopt. What may be called intellectual drawing, or that to which the understanding contributes more than the eye, is that in which, by a conventional system of geometrical projection, the artist conveys to paper or canvas such a *transcript* of any object either seen, or thought of, as may enable the spectator to form the most accurate possible idea of the whole construction and nature of the thing represented.

This mode of drawing is that by which workmen are instructed, and through which alone they are able to realize the conceptions of the designer.

The other mode of drawing is that which, depending mainly upon the faculties of vision, is purely imitative, and consists in conveying to paper or canvas *the aspect* of something seen or thought of.

It is of course possible, supposing his hand to be fitly trained, for an artist whose powers of vision have been duly cultivated, to transfer to any material upon which he may draw, the appearance of what he may see, with greater or less success, according to his command over the resources of his art; but when he is called upon to portray that which

he thinks, but cannot see in a material form, he must have already stored his mind with a knowledge of the reality of things, as well as the aspect which they present to the eye.

By observing, accumulating and classifying the impressions he has himself received from the aspect of things, he can alone qualify himself for reproducing by his art upon the minds of others impressions corresponding with those he himself received from the realities which may have formed the subjects of his studies.

The artist can only represent what he thinks by skilful modifications of what he may have seen, and for the acquisition of power to make any such modifications he must have trained his eye to observe and his memory to retain all such varieties of external form as men have learnt by long habit and common consent to regard as typical. So it is that for an ideal picture, that is to say the embodiment of anything which cannot be seen, the artist must have all his faculties fairly trained for the particular purpose.

The kind of drawing which is specially dedicated to the definition of things, and which is almost entirely an arbitrary process, I have in a great measure described in my discourse on the practice of architecture; and that mode which serves to depict things as they appear to us, I shall enter upon under the head of the practice of painting; reminding you only *here* that, as the basis of all excellence in such representations, there must be embodied a just rendering of the light and shade and colour which affect every thing which can be seen, and subject to the laws and phenomena of which, all things present themselves to our vision.

Every variety of temperature, or greater or less rarity of atmosphere, and intercepted or obscured light, modify the intensity with which those distinguishing features which enable us to identify objects at various distances require to be expressed. An object near to us may serve to hide from us much of what may be at a distance behind it, while an object

of corresponding bulk at a considerable distance from the eye obscures but little of the rest of the scene. Although the mind may know that these two figures are of equal bulk and equal height, the eye perceives that they appear of entirely dissimilar bulk and form according to their relative distance from the eye. From long-continued observation of such phenomena of vision has arisen that recognition of the change of form in objects seen, at various distances, and at various angles of obliquity, which is due to the laws of perspective.

The phenomena of these laws were naturally observed by many generations before the laws themselves could be understood or systematized. The perception of what is due to the fact of things being seen upon the same level with the eye, required ages to become duly understood and recognized; and even at the present day it is frequently misapprehended and ill expressed.

It is curious to observe, as one may do in the paintings of the Chinese and Indians, and even of the Japanese, the perfect mechanical dexterity which the hand may acquire, while the education of the eye is still comparatively in its infancy; failing at any rate to give any clear evidence that a systematic rendering of objects seen in perspective has been rightly comprehended and taught.

No one has better discriminated between the work of painters who know the nature of the things they paint, and those who know only the appearances of the things they paint, than my respected colleague at Oxford, Mr Ruskin. In the first volume of his admirable work *On Modern Painters*, he has expressed, with a truth and eloquence I can never rise to, the properties of those elements which make up *landscape*, and fit those objects for satisfactory embodiment through the painter's art. To his pages I would refer you for much information, and for much highly discriminating criticism upon the mode in which it is best that such qualities should be expressed in landscape art; requesting your attention for



the present to that other mode of painting which has been generally termed historical, in treatises on the subject.

In *historical painting* the art fulfils its first and probably most important requirement—that of providing a *record* of heroic deeds. That requirement once satisfied, the field of historical painting enlarges itself to the expression of a record of what may be exceptionally, or preternaturally, *beautiful*. There is, of course, a beauty in heroic character, as there is also a beauty in just proportion, elegance of line, beauty of light and shade, or beauty of colour, with each and all of which scarcely anything essentially heroic need be identified.

A third object of historical painting, and one which presents us with a still lower grade, although an important one, of its functions and purpose, is that of simply recording events of historical importance.

As the groundwork of these several branches of historical painting, the student must subscribe to the indispensable necessity for his acquisition of a perfect command over the expression, by means of painting of the verisimilitude of the human figure. To express that justly he must familiarise himself with the proportion of all the parts, and with the mode in which the limbs are moved by all the muscles. He must acquaint himself with "all thoughts, all passions, all delights, whatever stirs this mortal frame," and, through his mastery over the "anatomy of expression," enable us to read the faces of those he would depict for our instruction or delight, as we would a book. He must observe the changes which youth, age, care, health or disease, and other accidental influences work in the proportions, the appearance, and the movements of human beings. He must learn the kind of movements associated with all human emotions and actions; and, desiring to represent a certain action, he must be enabled to place the personage he represents in the movement which shall precisely express the action intended.

The study of movement is a very important and laborious

one to the artist, since he has always to convey to the spectator the idea of vigorous action in obedience to that other variety of instinctive muscular action which is essential to preserve the equilibrium of the body. The mind or will of the individual is only revealed to us in those movements which are extra to that muscular action so essential to preserve balance.

The ancient Egyptians and the archaic Greeks early arrived at a perception of the necessity of expressing activity and power of will (command, in fact) in vigorous action, by all those violent positions into which warriors throw themselves in the heat of combat. Where their art failed was, in accompanying that expression of movement with the preservation of equilibrium and dignity, and in modifying the contours of their figures in obedience to the laws of muscular change and foreshortening. Owing to their want of command over the resources of light and shade, they were unable to express forms in action otherwise than wholly in profile. It was reserved to a very late period in the history of art before the painter acquired the power of exhibiting accurate muscular action in vigorous movement, in cases such as those in which a figure seemed rushing from the picture to the spectator, or in which he was seen in an absolutely front view.

In the best ages of Greek art, one of these sources of imperfection—that of the want of accurate knowledge of anatomical form, was entirely removed; but in the other—an imperfect acquaintance with the laws of light and shade and perspective—they remained completely in arrear. What is to be especially remarked in their work is their manifestation of a power, without a fair mastery over which no historical painter can ever hope to succeed, viz. that of attributing to every condition of humanity those types and peculiarities of external form special to, and most expressive of, the act and condition not only of every class of humanity, but of all abnormal deviations from generic types of class.

They thoroughly understood the alterations in the proportions of the human body, as it passes from infancy to full age. All sexual characteristics they perfectly appreciated and expressed, and they learnt precisely what proportions and forms expressed beauty of the highest class, and of a more sensuous nature as well. They felt exactly what proportions and contours expressed ugliness and deformity, and the exact measure in which every deviation from perfection detracted from that perfection. Would that we, in the present day, in adding much that we now know, but which was unknown to the Greeks, could preserve in anything like the same degree in which they preserved it—a profound and full knowledge of those unerring laws which affect the expression of propriety, beauty and grace.

You will observe that I have made a distinction in using the terms beauty and grace; and I have done so because I remembered, as I trust you will do, that things which are not perfectly beautiful in themselves may be so arranged as to appear graceful as a whole. On the other hand, pure beauty is enhanced, in proportion to the development of grace in the general arrangement of all the constituent parts which make up the “thing of beauty.”

In light and shade and in colour, as I told you in my last Lecture, the Greeks attained harmony, but not full power. It is possible, and indeed probable, that their painters felt deeply this limitation of their pictorial resources, which was due to their not having at command a technical process for the execution of their paintings by means of which they could represent the relative transparency and opacity of the lights and shades they saw but could not imitate. It appears clear that in the later stages of Greek painting, by means of the use of wax, and of more or less lustrous varnish, they endeavoured to overcome the dryness and limited power of expressing strong light and shade, which was imposed upon them, by their previous habit of painting only in tempera

and fresco. Had they gone but a little step farther, so as to adopt the practice of painting in oil, the world might have anticipated, by some 1500 years, the magnificent results which were obtained in Germany and Italy after the invention, which has been ascribed to Van Eyck, had become popular in the world of art.

It may naturally excite our wonder how, with such limited technical resources as the Greeks possessed, their paintings could have excited the interest and attention which they unquestionably did, at a time when men were perhaps better judges of the real value of works of art than they are at the present day.

I think that the answer to this difficult question is to be found in the fact of the wisdom of their legislators and philosophers. The former recognized the all-important fact that in the culture of the arts, and in the persons of their artists, the country was elevated, enriched, and dignified. The philosophers added to this just perception of the value of art, a perfectly just apprehension of its scope, its ends, and, within the limits of the scientific knowledge of the period, the means by which those ends could be attained. They recognized with the utmost propriety what subjects were fitting themes for the painter's skill, and how the leading characteristics or the most important lesson proper to each subject should be emphasized and made conspicuous. The judgment of the philosophers banished from the realm of painting all that was trivial, and regarded with the highest respect the men who could fitly embody the most elevated attributes of their divinities, or the most perfect physical beauty of their most highly developed races.

In this country at the present time I need scarcely remind you how opposite our practice is. That superabundant wisdom, which the Greeks turned in the direction of the fine arts, is with us turned in the direction of science, and has been in a measure devoted to the development of in-

dustry and commerce. Thereby has been engendered that material prosperity which has filled to plethora the coffers of certain classes of manufacturers and traders in our country, but has left to be rescued only from an untimely fate, by the common sense of the country at large, the delights resulting from a systematic culture of the fine arts.

Hence it is that in a seat of learning, such as this, we *now only* inaugurate a formal study of the subject. This comparative inaptitude to perceive how intimately the arts of design are also linked with the intellectual, and therefore with the material progress of the country, which has hitherto been manifested by the Universities—the foci of the highest education—has been shared in by our Government.

We are at this juncture almost the only highly civilised nation which has not a Minister of Fine Arts to preside over that source of a nation's dignity and wealth. In the only department of our Government—the Office of her Majesty's Works and Buildings—which has a direct practical action to take in the control of such grudging commissions as Government may have to give to artists, painters, sculptors and architects, to the best of my belief, we have never had a Minister, with the honourable exception of Mr Layard, who has manifested to the world his practical study of those arts, which he might, if duly instructed, influence so greatly to his country's good.

At the present time (1870) we have notoriously in that most responsible office, a Minister, who has publicly expressed his indifference to, and comparative contempt for, those arts. It seems hard to conceive how a Premier gifted, as our Premier is unquestionably, with a veneration for all which the Greeks of old venerated, could have tolerated, far less made, so indiscriminating an appointment.

The only counteracting influence we find to this contemptuous treatment by our Government of the class of men, and their works, whom the Greeks thought themselves

honoured in honouring, is the delight which our successful artists, and particularly our successful painters, give in the present day to the intelligent upper and middle classes.

When we look to the names of recent benefactors to the country in matters of art and art education, we meet with those of men like Vernon, Sheepshanks, Bell, Townsend and Slade, and, indirectly, Whitworth; but our nobility and our rulers shew but little signs of sympathy, while royalty itself has shed but a weak and ineffectual ray upon the progress of fine art in England. In the last generation it was far otherwise. The names of Fitzwilliam and of Egremont should ever be honoured, and the founders of the British Institution did far other service to the country than those degenerate trustees of the noble funds of which they should have been good stewards, who have suffered that most excellent Institution, which in its time did rare good service to the Art of painting, to die of premature decay and atrophy.

Having glanced at the limitations which technical deficiencies imposed upon the Greeks in carrying the art of painting to perfection, it may be well to contrast, with our sketch of that limitation, the perfect freedom from any such restraints which our artists of the present day possess.

For this freedom they stand indebted to the progressive development which the art received at the hands of the great masters of Italy. From the first dawning of excellence, and the sunrise of its modern day under Cimabue, we pass on to its meridian glory under the influence of Raffaele, Titian, Leonardo and their contemporaries, ultimately arriving at the dwindling light it received at the hands of the "machinisti" and feeble academicians of the latter part of the 17th century. To that gloom rather than light, all over the world, has succeeded a new day, amongst the early hours of which we may fancy ourselves to be at the present time working. What our noontide may be, and whether we may in our day rise to the same splendour which illuminated the

great schools of Florence and of Rome at the commencement of the 16th century, who can predetermine?

Certain it is that with the precepts and example which the great masters of old have bequeathed to us, it will be our fault if we let their splendour eclipse ours. All that we have to do, I believe, is to take home to our hearts the fact that we have a journey upwards yet before us, and that the only way to arrive at its end with honour, will be to persevere, humbly, earnestly, manfully and strongly.

I need not tell you that everywhere throughout Europe, painters of the present day have acquired a fair mastery, as a rule, over the difficulties of the material imitation of nature. Their processes and pigments if rightly used are good, and the average of academical education combines a judicious study of the antique as a corrective, with the frequent habit of painting from nature. The theories of art enunciated in this country by men such as Reynolds, Fuseli, Barry, Leslie, Ruskin, Harding, Burnet, O'Neil, and many others, are within the easy reach of the student; while in France and Germany the students of pictorial art are even more carefully trained than in our own, and in so far as the best elements of study are necessary to the production of good art in painting, nothing seems wanting to the student.

What, I think, he needs more than anything else is, just appreciation on the part of the public. If the utmost admiration is lavished upon those technical tricks, in resorting to which the artist habitually oversteps the limits within which the aspect of nature can be safely imitated through pictorial art, while the nobler qualities of beauty of form and character, clearness, simplicity, elegance of composition, justness and propriety of invention, wisdom in the selection of fitting subjects for painting, true perspective, faithful, brilliant and harmonious while not exaggerated colouring, and correct lineal and aerial perspective, are allowed to pass with

comparatively inadequate recognition, there can exist but a slow progress, if any, from mediocrity to excellence.

This tendency to admire what pleases the eye rather than what satisfies the judgment, is continually offering a premium to the painter to sacrifice the true faith and to worship false gods. Nothing is more tempting to an ardent temperament than to struggle for what seems most difficult. Hence the painter's everlasting efforts "to snatch a grace beyond the reach of art." In grasping, or attempting to grasp it, he finds it crumble under his hand; and in aiming at effects which are beyond the scope of his art to produce, he destroys himself without benefiting the art he would advance.

One of the great duties of every painter is to endeavour early in life to recognize what, with due perseverance is, or may be, within his reach, and not to aim at qualities which his natural gifts do not fit him to realize.

In the art of painting, more perhaps than in any other branch of study, the old Italian maxim that "*chi va piano va sano*" holds good; and we may quite agree with Leonardo da Vinci's sonnet, which declares that:

"Che non può quel vuol, quel che può voglia,  
Che quel che non si può folle è volere.  
Adunque saggio è l'uomo da tenere,  
Che da quel che non può suo voler toglia."

Or, as it has been translated:

"The man who cannot what he would attain,  
Within his power his wishes should restrain.  
The wish of folly o'er that bound aspires,  
The wise man by it limits his desires."

The "wise man" in Art will certainly be the man who recurs most frequently to nature as a corrective to its unsatisfactory and an aid to its satisfactory representation,—the man who in thus recurring to nature identifies himself with that branch of it for which he finds himself to possess the greatest affection, and for the imitation of which he finds



in himself the greatest aptitude. What a man does easily, it is probable he will do well ; and there is no safer maxim in painting, than that his work will be most successful in which the easy is first overcome, and the difficult last. Difficulties which, if suddenly assailed seem to be insuperable, are overcome with comparative facility when the intellect, the eye and the hand have been led up to them by successive struggles and victories over stages of progressive difficulty in the art.

Hence the student may be greatly aided by a judicious order and succession of tasks set him by his professor ; and he will pass upwards to the higher departments of his profession as it were instinctively. Supposing him to have passed through his student life in the acquisition of mechanical dexterity, in the training of the eye, in the study of perspective, in watching the play of every human passion, in acquiring a fundamental knowledge of the forms and properties of the objects he will have to introduce into his pictures, when called upon to vindicate the efficiency of his education in complete works, he will find himself under the necessity of making his choice between two distinct branches of practice.

He may aim at what painters have called the *grand style*, or he may be content to pursue the *ornamental*. By following the one branch of art he will become a historical painter ; by the other more or less a painter of *genre*.

This is of course supposing he intends to take the characteristics of human life as the main subjects upon which to employ his pencil. If his predilection be towards landscape, he will still have two corresponding phases of that delightful art opening themselves before him. Landscape has its epic character, and its ordinary Idyllic character, corresponding to historical and *genre* painting in the other branch of the art.

If he should determine to limit himself to the practice of portrait painting he will still find before him two methods in

which that branch of art may be practised. The one will be the comparatively ideal impersonation of his subject, and the other will be the natural transcript of it.

Some common principles will be found to pervade the three highest forms of these varieties, inasmuch as it is obvious that certain subjects only, and subjects from their very sublimity of comparative rarity, are fitted to be treated in a grand, epic, or ideal style.

Those incidents which are associated with our highest sense of veneration, or our most powerful views of dramatic action and sequence in the events of life, through which man's nature is warring with some impersonated divinities, who are but rods "to check the erring and reprove," or those in which the fortunes of great empires hang trembling in the scale before some conqueror or lawgiver—or those in which the highest types of all but divine beauty are powerfully contrasted for the illustration of that *beau idéal* of the human race which philosophers have dreamt of and poets foreshadowed—alone furnish fit elements for the grand style in painting history.

Nature viewed upon some vast scale, or under one of those conditions in which she seems all convulsion, or all ineffable repose, is the only goddess whose charms are worthy of being unveiled for the delectation of mankind as the epic in landscape.

The man in whose general aspect wisdom and benevolence hold sway, whose countenance beams with command and intelligence, whose form is vigorous, and whose movements noble; or the woman whose face and form are instinct with dignity and beauty, without a dash of impurity, constitute alone fit elements for the grand style in ideal portraiture.

The painter who treads on lower grounds finds ample scope, and an infinitely greater variety of subjects, worthy of his pencil. In all that he does in all three branches of his art, he will generally please in proportion to the closeness

with which he is able to render what is agreeable in nature. He may aim at far more direct imitation of minor graces than would be becoming in one who practises the grander style of art. The ordinary pages of history, the writings of our poets and novelists, the legends of our country, and even its popular songs and literature, its everyday life and incidents, all furnish abundant themes to the painter of *genre*.

Yet the very abundance which presents itself necessitates from him an increased vigilance to avoid dropping into the vulgar or the trivial. He has to be on the constant watch not to allow the present to thrust out the noble memories of the past. In what affects him with pleasure because it is near, he should never lose sight of the more enduring pleasure to be obtained from painting what may be distant. Incidents which have survived in story or tradition while others have been forgotten are evidently those for which men's minds have possessed some special affection or affinity; and although trivial subjects selected from times present affect powerfully a large class now, it by no means follows that they will similarly affect any large circle of admirers in a subsequent age. Let the painter of *genre* take care in recording the present to record only what is worthy of being remembered. Nothing can be more delightful than the recognition of such preservation, and nothing more unsatisfactory than feeling that a painter has thrown away his genius in recording what it might have been better to forget.

In landscape, to the uninitiated all fine nature is pleasing, but nothing beautiful; to the initiated beauty has every possible shade and degree of intensity, from that which may be beheld with supreme delight, to that which may be beheld with supine indifference. Here again the painter of ordinary landscapes is bound to one of two courses in the selection of his subjects; either to present under its ordinary aspect something exceptionally beautiful in nature, or to represent that which in itself may be comparatively mean

under some exceptionally beautiful aspect of light and shade, or colour.

It is to their command over this power of gilding over with the pure gold of circumambient light the baser metal of our common nature, that the masters of the Dutch school owe their enduring celebrity and consideration. To paint a village barber operating upon a grinning rustic would appear to be an utterly unworthy employment of a painter's talent, but to so represent the scene as to invest it with an absolute truthfulness of impersonation, a justness of light and of reflection, a truth of colouring, and a perfect roundness of modelling, given, not by mechanical labour, but by a succession of brilliant and intelligent touches of the pencil, is to ennoble what would otherwise be mean, and to raise into the world of *genre* painting that which, less beautifully presented to us, would be fitting only for the province of caricature.

In ordinary portraiture, as Shakspeare says, "*Painting is welcome ; the painting is almost the natural man.*" We want him as he is, not as we would fain have him. How infinitely more valuable to us are those obviously truthful transcripts of burly nobles of the age of our burly monarch which Holbein has preserved for us, and the more courtly lordlings of the more courtly rule of his friend Francis I., as revealed to us through the works of Janet, than they would have been if treated in a more artificial manner than they have been. And yet truth alone is not sufficient in ordinary portraiture ; otherwise the photographic representation would be infinitely more valuable than any portrait painting. That it is not so cannot, I think, be denied, and there must be some reason for its failure to present us generally with what we rejoice in accepting as the true and lively semblances of living men. The something wanting comes to us, I believe, not so much from defects in the finished work, as from our knowledge of the mode by which it is produced. In the

photograph we lose that human interest which always accompanies our recognition of the labour of men's hands, working in subordination to the universal laws of art. We cannot quite sympathize with the all but supernatural mode of production, and we long, as it were, to have some interpreter of our own species to stand between us and nature.

In the proportion in which the painter truly understands and can speak the language of nature, so is he to us her fittest and most valued interpreter. He must obey in his mute diction the laws of grammar, he must arrange upon his canvas what he may have to say to us, as the philosopher, or as the poet ; he is bound, as master of that language of perfect moral and physical beauty which can so deeply touch our hearts, to study every grace that can enhance the purity of his eloquence, or give it force and strength ; yet he should remember that he stands to us but as an interpreter, and that what he has to reveal to us is only what nature herself would say to us. He is her priest, and she to him should be the goddess. His high and noble function is to deliver her oracles to mankind with comely grace and fitting dignity.

## LECTURE XI.

### PAINTING.

---

#### *PRACTICE.*

THERE is a danger, against which I would earnestly warn you, almost inseparable from the necessary subdivision, under heads admitting of separate treatment, of any great subject such as that of the fine arts. It is not because I am obliged to group, for the sake of perspicuity, certain considerations and trains of reasoning, under the respective heads of the history, theory, and practice of an art, that you should consider there is an actual barrier of separation possible to be established between those three sections of my discourses.

I need scarcely tell you that they form but one subject, and that so intimately linked together are these elements of analysis, that it is extremely difficult to separate them without separating tangled skeins of thought and reasoning, the tendency of which is instantly to reunite into what is too apt to be confusion, at the very instant almost that the hand of the sorter is taken off them. Thus, *obviously*, the theory of any art is only the heaping up of experiences, tried and re-tried by many with greater or less success, and ultimately adopted as rules which may have attended the practice of that art at its principal points of development or declination. The history of an art is but the history of the circumstances attendant upon the establishment of those dogmas which

build up the complete theory of the art. Any worthy practice of the art must obviously be based upon hourly recurrence to its theory, and to constant recollection of the works of artists, whose triumphs or failures have established theory while they have constituted the most tangible elements of history; and thus I would desire to have you constantly blending in your memories what, for the sake of distinctness, I have arbitrarily separated under three heads of classification.

In none of the arts of which we have as yet treated is this absolute intermixture of history, theory and practice more complete and indispensable to a right appreciation of the art, and to the settlement of a right basis for the criticism and cultivation of it, than it is in the art of painting.

When the painter stands before a virgin canvas he is hampered by no material conditions as to the image he shall depict thereon, and from this absolute freedom to embody in his picture anything which may occur to him, he stands almost like a traveller in the midst of some pathless wilderness, with "all the world before him where to choose."

In such a position, what can he do but fall back upon the history and theory of his art, to send him forward in the same direction by which others have reached the goal which he would fain aspire to reach; and so it is, that in his practice he can never afford to forget for a moment the lessons acquired in his study of the theory and history of his art. He is, in fact, the very child and representative of the contemporaneous development of history and theory. In the orbit which fate prepares for him he must rotate; and however eccentric that orbit may be, the most powerful will, the greatest strength, and the most indomitable energy he can possibly hope to exercise, will go but a short distance towards remedying such eccentricity, or towards the effecting of such a change in the orbit in which he has to rotate, as to enable those who may follow him to pursue a more brilliant or more easy course than has fallen to his lot.

I have endeavoured to point out to you, under the head of the History of Painting, some few attempts to change and so to gradually improve the theory of the art, and its concurrent practice, and to draw your attention to the action of certain great minds upon those changes; but still the most important of such changes will be found, on strict investigation, to have resulted from the consentaneous action of many minds rather than from the vigorous efforts of any individual.

The practice of to-day is in an entirely concrete state,—a practice made up of the experience of all the centuries that have elapsed since the first dab of ochre was applied to the decoration of some fetish idol at the first issue of primæval man from a state of utter barbarism.

All this mass of practice, tending to the one end of embodying for our delight pictorially scenes calculated to delight the cultivated taste, has, as far as one can imagine, pretty nearly exhausted every possible graphic phase a picture can be made to assume.

The earliest form of picture which the ancients seem to have created was probably that of a dark shadow cast by strong illumination upon a light coloured ground or backing.

The old story of the maiden tracing the shadow of her lover previous to his departure for the battle-field, if it does not serve to establish the fact as an historical one, at least proves the reasonableness of regarding the silhouette, or primitive picture presented by the shadow on the wall, as furnishing us with the earliest phase of portrait painting.

I do not know that I can give you any clearer idea of what is involved in the practice of the painter's art than by tracing all the various forms which a picture has been or may be made to assume, ranging from this primæval type of silhouette to the absolutely free transcript of nature, such as we meet with at the present day in the majority of the pictures which decorate the walls of the Royal Academy.



The first form of silhouette was that of a dark image upon a light ground—in fact, a shadow. This of course presented only an indication of definite form on its contour. The field within that contour remained without form, and void. The head, in profile, would appear without an eye and without an ear; a hand might appear to be growing out of the chest, and another out of the abdomen. The two feet might appear to be growing together out of a misshapen mass, nearly corresponding with the bulk of the body.

To give his picture distinctness, then, the artist would naturally aim at rudely indicating more than the simple silhouette would define. With a piece of white chalk, or anything else that would make a light line on his black silhouette, he would attempt to supply a rude representation of an eye and an ear, or perhaps the opening of the mouth and the meeting of the lips. His next effort would be to indicate the position of the arms and legs, connecting probably by almost parallel white lines the former with the shoulders, and the latter with the trunk.

He would concurrently aim at such a position of the figure of which he hoped to trace the silhouette as to save him the trouble and confusion attendant upon this rude drawing of distinctive features. He would make his model stand, as we constantly see the early Egyptian figures stand, displayed as the heralds term such a position, with the arms as far as possible protruded beyond the general mass of the body, and the legs and thighs distinctly separated one from the other.

The next and most important stage would be to reverse the operation of dark upon light, and to make the silhouette light upon dark. The distinguishing lines drawn upon the field would then become dark outlines, and the artist would learn by means of such dark outlines to carry his record of what existed in the model very much farther than he possibly could by white upon a black ground.

As soon as he had thus arrived at a rude representation

of the individual, he would aim at identifying him by adding either the attributes of his office or the peculiarities of his dress. He would make him holding his sceptre, or his key, or his sword, or whatever might indicate his condition. He would add the robe of office he might wear, or the shield he might have carried to victory; and at this stage we may imagine the addition of flat colour to mark the different parts of the dress or any peculiarities of complexion.

The next stage would be to arrive at drawing in plain outline upon an even coloured ground without necessarily relieving the figure against the ground, either as black against white, or white against black; and in adding sufficient colour to the figures so drawn, to distinguish the individuality of the actors, and to establish sufficient differences in costume, to enable the spectator to recognize the condition, or class of persons, intended to be represented.

All this of course would be done in a formal or conventional manner, and it is at this stage that we arrive at the primitive Egyptian pictures. The gradual changes effected in these pictures were owing to fortuitous circumstances among the Egyptians, of exceedingly tardy growth. These circumstances were the different degrees of despotism acquired by the priests, under more or less fanatic rulers, who procured the enactment of penal laws, preventing the painters from changing, or departing from, the primitive types in which gods, kings, priests and men had been at first portrayed.

In spite, however, of all such laws, as has ever been, and must be, the fate of all laws enacted to arrest the development of man's nature, gradual alterations were effected in Egyptian art.

These alterations consisted mainly in the addition of distinguishing traits of costume, physical conformation, and dominant expression. There is, in fact, an approximation towards individual impersonation. This individuality of impersonation was carried to a yet closer approach to nature

by the Assyrians, who succeeded in combining with it, especially in the heads of their animals, certain indications of emotion. Countenances of human beings were made to faintly express anger and suffering, whereas in contemporary Egyptian art the victim and his executioner bore exactly the same type of utter indifference to the tortures inflicted.

To this power over the record of transient emotion, the early Greeks added many new elements; beginning at the same time to express freedom of violent action, in obedience to the laws of equilibrium. Figures, fighting, leaping, dancing, pursuing and pursued, began to be represented as with naturally lively movements.

The first approach to beauty in such pictures was shown in the artistic arrangement, in contrasted geometrical or sinuous lines, of far from beautiful figures, and, as we see in the early Greek vases, considerable progress was made in the symmetrical arrangement of the parts of a picture, before any corresponding symmetry was exhibited in the figures themselves.

A great step was achieved when the usually lanky and occasionally stumpy proportions of the archaic Greek figures were reduced to the average standard of proportions as they exist in the human race; and a minor, but almost equally great improvement, was effected when natural joints and natural muscles were depicted, instead of conventional and often impossible joints and simple lumps which had previously done duty for the well-knit structural and changeful muscular forms which characterize vigorous manhood.

At this stage we recognize the distinct representation of a model, with that model before the painter's eye, as superseding the conventional representation of a model not present to him at the time of the execution of the picture. We now find the artist brought face to face with nature, and direct imitation; a platform from which it is obvious that a vast spring forwards could be made.

This result we recognize in the attempt to give a picture the appearance of a man, instead of expressing only the idea of a man; and to present this appearance, it is obvious that light and shade and colour must be employed. This was the reformation, doubtless, that extorted from the Greeks those clamours of approbation which greeted the works of men like Zeuxis and Parasias.

Polygnotus had apparently reached a high perfection in the beauty of the forms he portrayed, in the elegance of his arrangement of them, and in the lively manner in which he had arrived at telling his story; but, as far as we can conceive at the present time, only in an entirely conventional manner.

It was reserved for the painters of the middle or second period—the school of Alexander the Great—to paint men as they were, and heroes as they should be. All the legends of the tricks played upon birds, insects, and even men, by the apparent reality of the pictures of these later Greek artists, serve to attest the probability of their having arrived in their practice at a considerably advanced stage of verisimilitude; and so far as we can judge of the works, which have unfortunately perished, of men who laboured so long ago as 300 years B.C., there seems to have been at that period a great effort made to improve the technical resources of the painter, as well as the theory of the direct representation of nature.

Even before that period—if we can trust the terms in which Pliny speaks of the art—we may believe that the principal painters had arrived at the discovery of methods of painting by which considerable brilliancy had been obtained; although they had been unable permanently to fix the brilliancy they had attained. This, in all probability, was due to their use of either oil, honey, or some glutinous material which remained sticky, and could neither be washed nor cleansed from the impurities with which it became loaded.

This defect appears to have been remedied by a discovery made by one of the master minds of the period.

It is alleged that Apelles arrived at the composition of a certain varnish, which he applied to his paintings in order to preserve them, during a long series of ages, in all their freshness, strength and spirit.

The mention of this improvement necessarily leads us to a brief description of the conclusions to which the learned have arrived, upon the subject of the materials by which the paintings of the ancients are believed to have been produced, and to which their practice of the art of painting appears to have been limited.

The paintings of the ancients were no doubt of two kinds—mural, that is, attached permanently to the walls upon which they were painted—or, moveable and executed upon wood.

I have already stated that colour was freely applied to Egyptian monuments of the remotest antiquity, as the architectural remains amply prove. We cannot therefore be surprised to find that the architecture of the Greeks was almost similarly decorated.

The pigments appear in both countries to have been very various from the earliest ages, and to have consisted principally of earths and oxides; the use of pigments also in India and China ascending to the remotest ages of antiquity.

Substances of a mucilaginous nature, or of a gluey kind, or even of a saccharine nature, were used constantly to bind together the particles dissolved, or held in fine suspension, in water or other fluids. They were hence, no doubt, applied as the earliest media for forming what the Germans call a "*binde mittel*," or means of union between the microscopic particles of colouring matter.

The simple mixture of such an ordinary glue as would be obtained from boiling down the skins of animals, or bones of

fish, or melting gums or farinaceous substances exhibiting gluten in abundance, with water, would supply ready vehicles for causing the attachment of the colour to any dry and slightly porous substances.

The colour so applied was generally known under the title of *tempera painting*. At a late period the Italians of the revival of the art of painting discovered that by using albumen, or white of egg, a substance liquid in itself, but insoluble in water, they obtained a basis for tempera painting less liable to be affected by humidity than by the use of materials dissolved in water.

As, however, the albumen would naturally allow of the finishing of the picture only by painting with albumen instead of water, it became necessary to obtain a certain porosity in the ground of the picture, which would give a mechanical key for the absorption and retention of such additions as they might wish to make by means of colours ground in water, and with gums, or other gluten.

This the early Italian artists effected by mixing plaster of Paris with their albumen. The plaster set with a slightly open grain, and gave just that amount of absorbency which formed an admirable key for finishing, with whatever medium, either albuminous or aqueous, the painter might prefer to adopt for finishing.

I believe, however, that the earliest tempera paintings were executed in vehicles readily soluble only in hot water.

The varnish, or *atramentum*, alluded to by Pliny as the peculiar feature in the method of painting adopted by Apelles, was probably a resinous varnish; that is, one dissolved in oil or spirit, applied to the surface of a tempera picture to protect it from the action of moisture, and to allow it to be washed.

A corresponding kind of varnish, but one less lustrous, of which wax probably formed the chief ingredient, was also introduced at a very early period to protect tempera paintings.

The general process also of fresco painting was no doubt known to the ancients from a very early period.

The custom of the Egyptians and the Greeks to cover over monuments carved in stone and occasionally in marble, with very fine plaster, necessarily led to their discovering that any colouring matter mixed with the plaster, and applied with it whilst in a moist state, would be firmly retained when the plaster came to set.

In order to economize pigment, much of which would of course be wasted if mixed throughout the bulk of the plaster, they would apply it only to the surface of the plaster while moist; that is, before the setting was completed; and they would similarly find by experiment that the colour was retained.

This property of certain metallic oxides especially, to ally themselves with lime, and with it on its setting to be permanently retained, would give the ancients a power of preparing pigments with lime only; trusting to the action of the lime for the permanent adhesion of the metallic colouring oxides to the surfaces on which they were applied.

They would thus arrive at a knowledge of the two processes ultimately known to the Italians as *fresco buono* and *fresco secco*.

The moveable pictures of the ancients were no doubt executed for the most part in tempera; but there was another process which attained the greatest popularity amongst them, and which we may believe to have been principally used for moveable pictures; viz., the process known as encaustic.

Whether this consisted in melting oil with turpentine or any thinning medium, and then mixing it with the powder colours, and so using it; or whether it consisted in using powder colours with water, and then rubbing them over with wax and applying heat to liquefy the wax, and so to fix the powder colours applied to the wall, or wooden surface, is somewhat indeterminate.

Wiegmann, in his *Essay on the Malerei der Alten in ihrer Anwendung und Technik, insbesondere als Decorationsmalerei*, has gone deeply into all the varieties of process likely to have been used by the ancient Greeks, with equal learning and attentive examination of the monuments of antique art; and to his writings I would refer you for ample information upon the subject.

I may, however, allude to an important conclusion arrived at by Faraday, and apparently unknown to Wiegmann; viz. that all the colouring matters which appear to have been used in the decoration of the principal Athenian monuments are found to be allied with wax.

Whether this wax was applied to surfaces painted with water-colours, by way of preserving, coating, or varnishing, as Wiegmann appears to think was the common practice at Pompeii, or whether actually mixed with the colours previous to their application, is a question which we are now never likely to solve.

I think it most probable, however, that in genuine encaustic, the former process was the usual one; as the application of heat would cause an intimate union of the wax with the coloured particles; and it would not have been necessary to apply heat to their pictures, as we know was done by the ancients, if their colours had been mixed by chemical union previously to their application.

The very word *encaustic*, expressing the necessary application of heat, as the basis of the meaning of the term, would lead us to believe that it was only as a fixer or varnish, and not as a medium, that wax was used by the ancients.

Thus, as I have already stated, the ancients had at their command every process now used by the painter, with the exception perhaps of painting in oil. That they were unacquainted with that process we gather from the silence, rather than from the evidence, of ancient writers.

Sir Charles Eastlake, in his *Materials for a History of*



*Oil Painting*, justly remarks, that this is the chief and only a negative evidence against the antiquity of oil painting.

It is by no means certain, however, that the materials necessary for the process were undiscovered even at that remote period, when the early artists of Greece flourished. On the contrary, it would appear that oils, which are called *drying* (and the manufacture of which must have preceded the practice of oil painting, even in the warmest climates), were known certainly before the Christian era, and probably in times of remote antiquity.

The numerous references given by Sir Charles Eastlake serve to show, as he expresses it, that the principal materials employed in modern oil painting, were at least ready for the artist, and waited only for a Van Eyck in the days of Ludius, and the painters of Pompeii.

In speaking of the History of Art, I have recognized this city and Herculaneum as the neutral ground upon which the ancient Greek and ancient Roman painting became, as it were, fused together.

Such a discourse as the present does not afford us a favourable opportunity for entering into questions resting for solution upon the minute comparison and collation of scattered notices of the processes of art, by ancient authors, although literature abounds with careful investigations of such subjects, from the Treatises *De Pictura* <sup>et</sup> *eterum* of Junius, to the admirable little Essay on *Ancient and Modern Colours, from the earliest periods to the present time*, by William Linton, and the still later completion of Sir Charles Eastlake's *Materials for a History of Oil Painting*.

From a comparison of many of these writers, the general conclusion I have arrived at, is, that as far as technical processes were concerned, there was scarcely anything to prevent the painters of Greece and Rome from imitating nature with as much completeness as the painters of the present day. A good deal of confusion on the subject has doubtless arisen

from the inaccuracy with which Pliny appears to have used the technical terms in which he describes the practice of the ancient painters. On this head an excellent passage occurs in Mr Linton's Treatise, as follows: "Is it not probable that the old naturalist merely intended his statement as a hasty and incomplete sketch of the pictorial process, leaving to others better acquainted with the usages of the atelier to detail the varied vehicles employed by the artists? If such a chronicler of all things as Pliny were to arise in the present day, he would doubtless designate the ordinary artistic practice, *painting in oils*, without troubling himself about the solutions of hard resins, balsams, soft resins, essential oils, drying oils, boiled oils, magilps and glazings now in vogue, and consider that he had effectually fulfilled his task; whilst his imperfect statement, if the lapse of another nineteen centuries should sweep away all other records, would run the same risk of being quoted as an incontrovertible proof that the Europeans of former ages employed no other vehicles than mere oil with their colours."

Mr Linton goes even farther than Sir Charles Eastlake in the expression of his belief that the ancients were acquainted with the use both of the oils and resins, and that in fact the *atramentum* of Apelles was nothing else than an oil or spirit varnish.

Sir Joshua Reynolds, whose opinion as an artist is of course most important, and who had himself made a most careful practical study of all the materials and vehicles at the painter's command, goes yet further still in the interpretation he puts upon Pliny's description of the effect of the varnish used by Apelles, in the following words: "Quod absoluta opera atramento illinebat ita tenui, ut id ipsum percussu claritates colorum excitaret; et cum ratione magna, ne colorum claritas oculorum aciem offenderet."

Sir Joshua gives his judgment respecting the artistic practice of the period of Apelles in these words: "The

passage quoted, though it may probably perplex the critics, is a true and artist-like description, of the effect of glazing or scumbling, such as it was practised by Titian, and the rest of the Venetian painters. This custom, or mode of operation, implies, at least, a true test of that in which the excellence of colouring consists, which does not proceed from fine colours, but true colours, from breaking down those fine colours which would appear too new, to a deep-toned brightness. Perhaps the manner in which Correggio practised the art of glazing, was still more like that of Apelles, which was only perceptible to those who looked close to the picture :

*‘ Ad manum intuenti demum apparet ;’*

whereas in Titian, and still more in Bassano and others his imitators, it was apparent on the slightest inspection.”

If Sir Joshua’s impression be correct, we may thus clearly recognize that the artists of antiquity were fairly in possession, some centuries before the birth of Christ, of all the pictorial resources requisite for the execution of a perfect picture ; and, in continuing our enumeration of the various forms which pictures may be made to assume, it will be apparent that all, or any of these, may have been (although I do not for a moment believe that all of them were) comprehended within the practice of the ancients.

Before adverting to their technical processes, we arrived in our inquiry into their practice at the stage at which we considered that the essential importance of light and shade, and colour, as modified by light and shade, must have dawned upon the perceptions of the artists of antiquity ; but it will be apparent on reflection, that there are several modes of expressing light and shade, as there are several modes of expressing colour pictorially.

The simplest mode of expressing light and shade is, of course, in monochrome or one colour only ; and, as it is at once perceptible that shade varies almost from black to

white, so is it necessary, to obtain a correct representation of it, that shade should be infinitely graduated.

This may be done of course by any one of three ways :

If an artist is working in a colour of even intensity throughout, it must be done by allowing large intervals of white to occur between black strokes in those parts of the shadow which are light, owing to reflection from adjacent illuminated surfaces, or on account of the lights falling through a partially transparent medium ; while, to represent deep shadows, or those which are scarcely affected by reflection from adjacent illuminated surfaces, or which are cast on materials of deep local colour, the black strokes must be made almost close to one another, so as to largely preponderate over the proportion of white exhibited on the portion of the picture representing shade or shadow.

A second mode by which gradation may be obtained in monochrome is by diluting the pigment in proportion to its relative lightness. This is applicable, of course, only in cases where the pigment admits of dilution without coagulation or other deterioration.

A third mode, which is applicable when the pigment is of an opaque nature, consists in adding sufficient of an opaque white pigment to lessen the intensity of the original black, so as to make it agree with the half-tint, or approach to light, of the shadowed portion of the subject depicted.

By either of these three methods a monochrome picture, expressing the just light and shade of any subject represented, may be arrived at.

It will be obvious that while any element is wanting to produce complete verisimilitude, the art of painting must remain in a highly conventional position ; since the want of any necessary concomitant to perfect effect cannot but reveal the artificiality of the process. Thus, so long as the background of a picture remains flat, as it usually did in the practice of the early Greeks, no approach to complete defi-

dition in the personages represented could create any idea of illusion in the mind of the spectator. Thus, however far a picture in *chiaro-oscuro* may be carried, so long as the element of colour is wanting, the eye refuses to accept it as a complete picture, and can regard it only as a conventional mode of representation.

This sense of conventionality is increased when, as is often the case, the scale of the *chiaro-oscuro* in which the picture is executed in black and white, is kept below the ordinary scale of the light and shade affecting the model delineated. This is seen particularly on contrasting engravings, such as those by Toschi, Folio, Morghen, Marc Antonio, and others of the great masters of the Italian Renaissance, with etchings executed in tones, none of which exceed half-tint.

From fresco paintings, by artists who habitually worked in a lighter scale of light and shade, and colour, such as Giotto, Memmi, Fra Angelico, and others, to those by men such as Carlo Crivelli, Raffaello, Pinturicchio, and Luini, which occasionally present us with figures fully modelled and painted up with full intensity, although relieved against flat, or comparatively flat backgrounds, there is a great advance, but one not so important as the next in succession.

From the picture, complete in forcible colour, light, and shade, but in which the personages depicted, all of nearly equal size, are relieved against a flat ground, such as that frequently used by the Byzantine painters and those of early mediæval times, the next stage was to arrive at the insertion of a background, with an approximation to complete pictorial effect in perspective, and with figures properly proportioned, as to bulk, to the planes upon which they are marshalled.

At Pompeii and Herculaneum we find the painters about equally divided in their practice between the habits of drawing their subjects on completely flat backgrounds, and representing them in the open air, or in interiors, or in land-

scapes, the leading features of which were painted from nature, with an obvious desire, at least, to produce a satisfactory and complete definition of the scene selected to form the background.

It is at this stage that we have arrived at the perfect picture. This perfect picture will retain and only show its conventionality in proportion to the degree to which it may fall short in its rendering of the full intensity of the light, shade, and reflection, with complete fulness of colour, and the true lineal and aerial perspective which we meet with in nature. If any of these elements be either wanting, subdued, or incompletely rendered, the illusion will break down, and the artist's efficiency as an imitative painter will be recognized as defective.

If his aim therefore be limited to imitation, and if perfect imitation is to be the main source of delight he is to convey to the spectator of his picture, he must achieve as perfect completeness under all these heads as possible: but, if his aim is higher, and his desire be to impress the spectator with an idea connected with any circumstance he may portray, rather than with its material aspect, it will be incumbent upon him to make a judicious selection from the various modes of conventional painting which lie open for his choice, and to work out his ideal conception in strict obedience to that conventional method.

That aspect of complete and simple imitation which constitutes perfection in *genre* painting, is not suitable for ideal painting. There is, however, a form of convention which is superior to nature, as other forms are inferior to nature. Of this type of absolute superiority the greatest works of the greatest masters furnish us with fair specimens. In pictures such as that of "The Assumption of the Virgin" by Titian, in the Academy at Venice, and "The Madonna di San Sisto" at Dresden, by Raffaele; or even in "The Last Supper," by Leonardo at Milan, a mode of conventional

representation is obtained, rising above instead of falling beneath nature. Celestial beauty, where that is present, redeems any amount of simplicity in the method by which it may be represented; and so it is that to a few chosen spirits only is it given to rise above ordinary productions while yet working by ordinary means.

Those rules of art which are the very stay and backbone of the practice of artists, have occasionally been disregarded by masters of transcendent genius, but it has only been in cases where their genius has conferred the heavenly stamp of grandeur, sublimity, and beauty upon their work, that these deviations from ordinary rule have been crowned with success.

From all the preceding observations, the great importance to the maintenance of excellence in practice of a sound education of all artists, and the establishment of correct principles of criticism in the minds of amateurs must be obvious.

I propose to address myself very briefly to a consideration of the subject under these two heads.

The education of the artist must, of course, go on *pari passu* with his practice; since eye, mind, and hand must, as I have already observed, be trained simultaneously.

The first operation of the artist will be to learn to draw, first of all by copying from the drawings of others, so as to master the mechanical means by which imitation is effected; and secondly, by drawing from objects, and applying to the offspring of his own imagination the modes of imitation used by others. This practice will strengthen his memory of form, and increase his power of observation. It is at this stage that his mind must be actively employed in learning the nature of the things which he is likely to be called upon to draw.

Without such study he may arrive at a reasonable perfection of drawing while the model still stands before him, but let him be called upon to draw a model he has seen for a short time only, but which is removed from him, and he will find his entire inability to do so without falling back upon

his knowledge of all the parts usually met with in similar objects.

Thus, for instance, no artist could draw a pansy unless either the pansy were before him or unless he knew precisely how a pansy grew, and what shape, size, and colour each part of that pansy consisted of.

The painter who has to depict men and women must know every proportion of the human frame. He must be acquainted with its structure, the mechanical action of all the joints, the connection of all the bones and all the muscles; the changes assumed by those muscles in different actions,—which of them become prominent and which obliterated at different ages or under different conditions of health, debility, &c. He must learn what draperies are usually worn by all classes of persons, how draperies are supported by figures in repose, and how influenced by motion, either of the person who wears them, or as affected by wind, or contact with surrounding objects.

Although, as a draughtsman only, we may suppose the student to be relieved from the necessity of that study of colour to which he must give full attention when he enters upon painting, he must yet observe very carefully the relative effect upon *chiaro-oscuro* of all kinds of local colour. In drawing the portrait of a man from life, it is not enough to render the effect as though the man was only a marble statue. The light and dark of the several parts of the drawing ought to vary upon the whole surface of the drawing, if properly executed, no less owing to the accident of the man's wearing a dark dress or a light dress, or having dark hair or light hair, a dark complexion or a pale one, than it should from any condition of light and shade to which the subject portrayed can be exposed.

It is this question of how much dark to assign to varying colours which constitutes one of the greatest difficulties of the artist in dealing with the *chiaro-oscuro* of any drawing.



Of course, the draughtsman's great aim should be to acquire accuracy rather than speed in his work. He who once learns to draw correctly may speedily learn to draw rapidly, and his rapid drawings will be valuable. The student who only learns to draw rapidly, without drawing correctly, let him work to the end of time, and his drawings will be worthless.

The earliest stages of the picture are naturally, for the most part, executed by means of drawing, either with the charcoal, the pencil, or the brush in monochrome. While the thoughts of the painter are fixed upon his composition, the simpler the media by which he can draw that composition the better for him.

The practice of using charcoal for the purpose of making the first rude sketch upon the canvas, is a very excellent one, since the more generally and rapidly the whole of the leading lines and parts can be got in, so as to well express their relation to one another, the less difficulty will the artist find in applying the powers of his mind unhampered by technical difficulties to the propriety of his conceptions.

The practice of experienced artists differs much as to their mode of commencing a picture.

One man will begin with a little sketch, which he will correct, and alter, and correct, until at last he has got what he considers to be a satisfactory embryo. This he will expand into a large drawing, completed in outline, light and shade and colour. From this he will, what is called, "*square up*" his subject to the full size upon which he intends to paint it upon his canvas. The operation of squaring up, I need scarcely tell you, is done by covering over his sketch with regular reticulations, like the divisions of a chessboard, and then forming corresponding reticulations upon a larger scale upon the surface of his canvas. He then draws in, upon each square on the canvas, the dominant lines enclosed within the corresponding squares in the small draw-

ing. Having thus obtained the outline of his composition, the next operation will be for the artist to indicate the general effect of *chiaro-oscuro*, under which he desires his picture to appear.

This is usually done by painting in the shades in transparent colours, and loading the canvas with opaque pigments, in those portions intended to ultimately remain, as they are called, high lights.

He will then proceed to, what is termed, "build up his lights," so as to obtain a firm *impasto*, that is, a good preparation for subsequent painting. This *impasto* is of great importance, to give a basis, upon which all the parts which are intended to reproduce the textures of various substances, especially garments of different materials, such as silks, satins, velvets, &c., require to be wrought. It is of great value also as a preparation for the glazing, or "scumbling," or what is called *thin painting*, where the under-painting is to affect the colours laid upon it.

In this operation great care will require to be taken to keep the media, with which the pigments are mixed, transparent. For the most part the half lights, or portions of the picture upon which the eye is not intended to rest, require to be laid in in masses of opaque colour.

In these operations the artist must learn to work upon a definite system; because anything like what is called in the language of the studio, "messaging about" his tints, would give a confused and dirty appearance to his work. He must take the greatest care to paint in transparent tints, where the appearance of transparency is demanded. In graduating from light to darkness, or from an apex of colour in light to a depth of the same colour—as affected by the absence of light—the artist may often satisfactorily block in the whole surface to be coloured in an opaque luminous mass of tint, and then add glaze over glaze, in the shaded or more deeply-coloured parts, until his focus of depth is obtained by the accumu-

lation of a number of transparent washes, which, though dark by comparison with the solid luminous opaque high light, is still light through the translucency of the transparent tints which deepen or darken it.

The student of painting must habituate himself to observe the respective tints in nature which are best expressed by opaque and by transparent pigments. There are, for instance, tints of crimsons and greens, and of yellows, which can never be obtained, either by the use of colours opaque in themselves, or by the union of transparent colours with opaque white lead, differing altogether from the final effect desired to be obtained.

Thus, for instance, there are tints of green which require to be underlaid with blue, and glazed with transparent yellow; tints of purple which require to be under-painted with blue, and glazed with lakes; tints of orange, which may require to be under-painted in opaque reds and glazed with transparent yellow; and so on, *ad infinitum*; and great experience and constant practice can alone teach these subtleties to the painter. It was their refined knowledge of them, which conferred upon the Venetian painters much of that extraordinary ability which they unquestionably possessed in rendering colour with perfect vivacity and truth.

The student must also constantly observe the tints assumed by different substances in full light, in shade, and as influenced by cast shadows. Silk, he will find to reflect light in one way; velvet in another; linen in a third, and satin in a fourth.

He will at first find the greatest difficulty in expressing himself truthfully. He will paint in black and white, and will not be able to preserve intensity of colour in his extreme darkness. By learning how to "glaze" and "scumble" satisfactorily, he will at last acquire a power of preserving light in the midst of darkness, without materially diminishing the force of his darkness; and he will learn how to express

darkness, as affecting coloured materials, without losing the power of constantly expressing local colour.

But his last and greatest difficulty will be to satisfactorily model and retain light and colour in his high lights. In fact, almost any amount of darkness may be satisfactorily painted, but the artist will speedily find the point at which sun-light beats him.

The painter will very soon discover that there is no light without colour; yet he will find that the moment he qualifies his white, he verges towards darkness.

Knowing the difficulty of thus dealing with high light, some artists adopt the practice of leaving the portions of the picture they destine for their high lights unpainted upon, until all the rest of the picture is worked up to an approximation to final intensity. They have thus a virgin surface upon which to calculate precisely the amount of colour which those surfaces will bear.

Those who adopt the other practice—of commencing, by painting in the most highly illuminated parts of their picture—will often find, either that the resources of their palette will not give them tints deep enough to make their high lights appear luminous by contrast, or they will find that the intensity of the lower tones of dark colour will take out of their high lights all the modelling they had carefully given to them at first, and the measure of colour they had preserved in them.

Such difficulties, and the dilemmas to which he may find himself exposed, will force upon the painter the necessity of both learning the theory and observing the effects of that law which has been called the simultaneous contrast of colours; a law so complex, and yet so important, as to preclude our entering upon its peculiarities now; although, at some future time, I may hope to dwell in detail upon the subject.

An intimate practical acquaintance with his paint-box,

and the oils and varnishes most useful in the practice of his art, will at last prescribe to the student the limits of force beyond which it would be imprudent for him to range, in the endeavour to give vigour to his painting.

He will find that the preservation of what is called *scale* in the rendering of tones becomes an imperative necessity. Thus, in the analysis of an excellent Venetian or Dutch picture, if we test a cheek in the picture against a cheek in reality, or a piece of red drapery in the picture against a piece of red drapery from which the painter may be supposed to have actually painted, we shall find that neither at all corresponds with the original; and yet, in the picture, the blush upon the cheek may appear as true, and the colour of the red drapery as luminous, as it is within the power of mortal painter to make either representation appear.

Supposing the painter to have brought his picture to the stage of general correspondence with his original sketch, or the conception of what his picture should be, to the inexperienced eye, his work might appear to be completed; but it is usually at this stage that the most severe tax is put upon the artist's ability. He must himself prove his sternest critic. He must look for imperfections of every kind, and patiently remedy them. Often, at this stage, the artist will "paint out," as it is called, weeks of patient labour; finding, that in the changes through which his picture has gone, he may have neglected the proportion of a head or a foot, or altered the situation of a knee, or brought a hand into imperfect perspective; or he may find that some piece of original black, which he has painted over and thought he had "killed," will still work itself through, and show in the middle of what he may desire to appear as a luminous half-tint. He may have to scrape off all that he laid on the surface of his canvas, until he can get down to the peccant colour, which he will have actually to cut away, and then gradually under-paint the defective portion, and at last glaze

or scumble over it, until it comes to its right place in the scale of relative transparency and opacity of the adjoining portions of his picture.

It is at this stage of his picture also, that the painter will have to make up his mind as to the degree of finish he will give to his work. If he finds that, in the process of painting, he has given to one part an amount of minute definition, while in others his work is broad and generalized only, he will usually have to make his election between removing the evidence of labour from the overwrought part, or adding the appearance of labour to the underwrought part, so as to give an even expression of work to the whole of his picture. His great object, in finish, should be to make himself disappear, and testing his work by the effect he sees it produce on others, he may observe, that if he shall succeed in making them forget him in the interest or beauty of his subject, he may hope that he has succeeded in his work far better than he is likely to have done if he observes them occupied with him only, and with the methods by which he has obtained his effect.

Such being a general outline of some few directions in which the painter's education in the practice of his art must be carried, I would desire to supplement my sketch by some observations upon the principles, in accordance with which, correct judgment upon the artist's work should alone be pronounced; since it is obvious that his work will be modified according to the prevalence of criticism, be it good or be it bad. No doubt for a time a good and zealous artist might make a firm, and to a certain extent satisfactory resistance to such an influence, but such men are really martyrs to their art; and it is more than can be expected from the professors of any art, to frequently, and with pertinacity, sustain so difficult a rôle as that which involves practical martyrdom.

It is not, I think, necessary, nor is it at all desirable, that such of you as may never desire to exercise an art, should

make yourselves too closely acquainted with its practice. The danger, if you do so, may be that you may elevate the overcoming of technical difficulties into the greatest excellences, and give an admiration to the means which should only be awarded to the end of art.

The first thing for the critic to do who would be just in his estimation of paintings, is to clearly and correctly decide upon the class of qualities in pictures which justify his condemnation of them.

His second duty should be, to recognize those qualities in pictures which will justify his admiration of them.

I propose to give a few instances of both classes, illustrative of the merits and demerits of pictures.

It is a sure demerit, when a painter adopts a subject for his picture which excites disgust rather than pleasure. It is a certain demerit, if, upon looking at a picture, your attention is drawn to points of secondary importance, and nothing leads you to that which is either most beautiful in it, or which best tells the story which it is the painter's duty to convey to you. It is a certain demerit, when a scene which in nature is full of deep and varied colour, is presented to you in strong black and white, and with scarcely any colour at all. Pictures may of course be painted where light and shade and colour are conventionally lightened and diminished, and an agreeable effect produced by them: or a picture may present a full scale of local colour, and the light and shade may be so arranged, that the former shall almost entirely predominate over the latter, and an agreeable effect may still be produced. Where, however, an obvious endeavour has been made to represent nature as it appears, and the result is that colour is hidden in violent light and shade, the critic may fairly condemn the picture. If he finds that one portion of the same picture is painted up in true verisimilitude, and another portion is painted in a conventional style, that is, in a lowered expression of nature, that picture must be con-

demned. If harmony of colour is not exhibited, or if truth of colour is not represented, the work is obviously bad.

I need scarcely say that faults in perspective, or faults in proportion, are at once condemnatory of the artist.

Another frequent demerit which may be seen in pictures, is the adoption of those modes and scales of conventional painting which are fit only for the themes of ideal art, for the expression of trivialities only. Occasionally, but very rarely, great artists have successfully practised the converse of this demerit, namely, representing that which should be painted only in the grand style and on a large scale, in a laboured and over-elaborated miniature form.

An artist will always fail to please who exhibits himself and his own dexterity too conspicuously. What is called *tricky handling* in painting always lowers the value of the work produced, and though it may occasionally aid the sale of a poor painter's work, it becomes a drawback to the value of many pictures by otherwise very excellent painters.

The merits of a picture, on the other hand, are to be found, mainly, in a fitting selection of subject; in a straightforward mode of telling a story; in a just selection of personages as actors in the scene, and of a background to harmonize with those actors; in justness of proportion; good selection of type of humanity as to race, age, sex, and typical form of all kinds; easy arrangement in fairly symmetrical balance, without any appearance of artificiality; a judicious allotment of relative prominence to each actor in the story, in perspective, and in concentration and vigour of light and shade, and colour; in graceful arrangements of line, without any appearance of coaxing nature into what may appear unnatural, or not to be readily accounted for; in true lineal and aerial perspective; in harmonious colouring—more or less vivid in proportion to the gravity or the reverse, of the subject selected for representation—in a complete merging of black and white in the full scale of tints given to the picture;



the quality known as *keeping*,—that is, that balance of parts which gives the eye a sensation of repose ; in firmness of touch, and the greatest amount of freedom of execution consistent with the truthful rendering of every portion of the picture, as it habitually presents itself to the spectator's eye ; the utmost dramatic energy of expression consistent with probability and restrained by good taste ; in dignity where dignity is necessary ; vigour where vigour should be accentuated ; an artful heightening of beauty by contrast with objects less beautiful,—as of youth with age, purity with impurity, or woman with the lower types of man ;—all these, and many more concomitants, serve to stamp paintings with the quality of excellence.

Where they are united, as we frequently find them, in the works of truly great masters, the utmost perfection of his art is attained by the painter. He, no less than his works, excites our veneration and affection. Who that has once fully and properly enjoyed the *Stanze*, or the cartoons of Raffaele, fails to recognize in that painter one of the heroes of the past ? Who that has studied the ineffable sweetness and beauty of Corregio's head of our Saviour in our National Gallery can do otherwise than honour its immortal author ? The warmth of Titian still glows about us, and the luminous atmosphere he created in his master-pieces forms an eternal *aureole*, in the midst of which we scarcely recognize the mortal whose work was so divine.

## LECTURE XII.

### FINE ART APPLIED TO INDUSTRY.

---

#### *ANCIENT.*

I TRUST that we have not arrived at this stage of our inquiry into the main characteristics of Fine Art without having clearly established the extent to which we are indebted to the sensation of delight, as the great producing cause of all that may be properly regarded as Fine Art.

It would be taking but a very narrow view of the nature of real utilitarianism to suppose that because that which might seem merely sensual constituted the fundamental principle and source of Fine Art, its existence and cultivation were not useful and beneficial to mankind in the highest degree.

If not indispensable to the body, works of Fine Art must clearly be considered as necessary to the mind ; and one can conceive as readily of a body corporate in an advanced state of civilization existing unwarmed by the cheering rays of such sources of delight, as of a world deprived of the reviving and renewing influences of the glorious sun itself.

Such being, as I believe, the state of the case, I would earnestly protest against what I have occasionally heard stated with much gravity—that ornament is waste : or, in other words, that the narrowest possible view of utility should

be the measure of all excellence or design. In such a direction it may only be conceded that it is the function of industrial art primarily to minister to man's necessities, although, as I believe, secondarily, and not less imperatively, to his aspirations.

The only form of the Fine Arts which directly ministers to man's necessities is Architecture, and that art only in the degree in which it supplies protection from the inclemencies of the weather in the first instance.

In the mode in which it supplies others of his necessities, such as that of providing a place of meeting for worship, the administration of justice, the theatre, the senate-house,—in all such cases it ministers primarily to one of the first wants of his nature—that of shelter; but shelter in such a form as to allow of an aggregation of human units for effecting some common purpose, or for sharing some common enjoyment.

While we must thus look to this ministration to man's necessities as but in a remote degree connected with any of his Fine Art developments, the case is entirely different when we come to examine what are now usually called the Industrial Arts.

In all those arts which various writers have somewhat indifferently described as Technical Arts, Anthropological Arts, Arts of Domesticity or Arts of Necessity, the complex wants of man's nature have gradually called those arts into being, and shaped them to their ends by an almost spontaneous self-development. Born of man's first necessities, they increase and multiply as population increases, and they become refined and perfect as civilization and general education carry him onwards in the scale of being.

As human art can only be created by human means, so it is obvious that there can be no art without industry, which is in fact trained human labour; but, on the other hand, there may be industry without art. The industry is the

supply of the bodily necessity, and in proportion to the addition to that industry of a percentage of art, so is the ministration which the technical art affords to man of a more or less elevated character, and so it becomes more or less conducive to man's intellectual delight.

Thus when we look to those primitive objects which supply man's first necessities,—such as the seat, the table, the blanket, the weapon, the plate, the cup, and the bed, we find that the whole conception of those objects has been bounded by the necessity of giving man the means of sitting for rest; of spreading out his food before him, so that he can conveniently eat it while resting; to give him a covering for decency and warmth, and to provide him with comfortable means of eating, drinking, and sleeping, and gradually living more and more like a civilized being.

I do not know how I can better illustrate what art does to industry, than by calling your attention from the simplest forms in which those several objects may have been shaped by uncivilized man, to the most perfect forms in which those very same objects have been elaborated in the course of ages; and when man's cumulative intelligence had ultimately given him command over the technical arts.

The seat, which at first was but a block of stone, part of the trunk of a tree, or even an earthen bank, finds its climax in the regal throne. The throne has naturally attained its most complete development under despotic governments. Of these it has served as a symbol, and in that capacity no wealth nor splendour could purchase more pomp and luxury than that with which it was occasionally adorned. The celebrated Peacock Throne of the Emperors of Delhi has lived in men's memories as a mass of gold, of priceless jewels, and of dazzling enamels.

If this may be conceived as the richest of all thrones, that on which the Greeks placed their Olympian Jove at Elis was unquestionably the most beautiful. Upon this the

greatest masters lavished the triumphs of their art, and it shared in celebrity, and in the impression it produced, the fame which has accompanied every record of the greatness of that most celebrated of all chryselephantine statues.

The ivory throne of the Greeks has been transmitted to us by tradition through those of the Byzantine Emperors, the type of which we may probably recognize in the celebrated Ivory Chair of the Exarchate at Ravenna.

Even in our own days the carved ivory thrones of antiquity find their continuation in works of art, recognized as symbols of all but despotic sovereignty, such as the Indian Throne presented to her Majesty by the Rajah of Travancore, which formed probably the most beautiful object in the barbaric splendour of the many triumphs of Industrial Art, assembled in the Exhibition of 1851.

The table—which, in its primitive form was probably but a block of wood, and only gradually came to be constructed as a piece of carpentry—at last attained to a marvellous execution in Florentine mosaic, a style of technical production in which the lapidary's art shaped the hardest and most precious minerals into forms of beauty with endless labour and with infinite skill, to minister to the luxury of the Medici.

What I have called the blanket—that is, man's first rude covering, probably a binding together of feathers, a plaiting together of leaves, or even the dressed skin of an animal—may be accepted as the great source of the origination of textile art,—an art which has ever given employment to millions, and which at the present day we recognize as one of the most important tributaries which swell the current of national wealth.

This very textile art, of which the blanket is to be accepted as the primitive symbol, has reached its utmost complication of manufacture in the Cashmere shawl. In admiring a perfect specimen of this costly fabric, it seems

almost inconceivable that human patience and human fingers could ever have produced a thing so complicated, so minute, and yet so entirely harmonious and graceful.

Before the primæval man could have risen to the possession of the skin of an animal, he must have provided himself with the weapon by which that animal could be killed, or at any rate its skin separated from its body after a violent or natural death. The wooden club, or the wooden staff, with a piece of hard stone or flint attached to it, would provide him with the simplest of all striking or cutting weapons, and one which his ingenuity would long continue to find sufficient for the supply of his first necessities.

From the date of his discovery of metal a complete change was unquestionably exercised over his condition of being, and he no doubt sought with avidity the means of increasing, his dominion not only over the beasts of the field, but over those savage races against whom his hand might have to be raised from time to time, either in self-defence, or in aggression.

I need scarcely remind you to how early a date the primitive bronze weapon carries back the imagination; or at how early a date we find men striving to decorate that weapon with inlays of other metals, or by casting it into ornamental shapes. There is scarcely a statue of an armed warrior, which has come down to us from the classical ages, which does not bear testimony to the exquisite art lavished upon the perfected form of weapon, and ultimately upon the armour for defence from the action of weapons, by the Greeks, the Etrurians, and the Romans. Who can forget, while war is thundering around us, the extent to which in the present day the scientific resources of metal-workers are taxed in the supply of those monstrous pieces of ordnance upon whose accuracy and perfection the fate of nations hangs? In every recent Exhibition of Industry weapons have been contributed from almost every part of the world, in which the utmost

perfection of every decorative process which can be applied to metal working has been admirably illustrated.

The plate and cup, which at an early period supplemented the human hand, are profoundly interesting to us, as lying at the base at once of the ceramic and the vitreous arts, and of that form of metal-work which has ever been largely devoted to the service of the table.

The earliest references in the Bible to the potter's wheel, to the manufacture of glass, and to the art of Tubal-Cain, carry us back to the patriarchal ages; and in each of those arts at a subsequent date we shall find that the ancient Greeks attained the acmé of perfection. Nothing can be more beautiful than the Nolan and Capuan vases, than such specimens of glass-working as the Portland vase, or than the silver embossing and working such as has been found at Herculaneum and Pompeii, and quite recently at Hildesheim.

Man's primitive bed was, of course, the soil of the spot which gave him birth. Instinct would lead him to seek shelter, and to heap up mosses, leaves, and soft materials upon which to take his rest with ease. Another stage of the same instinct would counsel him to raise himself from the dews and moisture of the ground, and at last provide him with a comfortable bed. The idea of a comfortable bed naturally involves a sense of safety when watchfulness must be relaxed. Thus the bed was placed within a structure which might be closed at night; and man may have gradually learned to fit up his residence for his comfort, from the example of the birds, whose nests he would find so sedulously prepared to ensure the repose of the occupants, and lined with everything tending to warmth and protection.

To trace the history of Industrial Art is simply to trace the history of civilization. That history, I need scarcely remind you, is ever repeating itself by the recurrence of almost correspondent cycles.

Starting from regions dimly illuminated by the glimmer-

ings of instinct, man passes through dawning reason to the noontide of delight. Seemingly exhausted by the effort, or seduced to forget the purity of reason in the plenitude of delight, he seems scarcely able to reach the goal without sinking with fatigue; and from the moment the culminating point is reached his path is downwards, until at length he falls back nearly upon his primitive condition, oblivious of the past triumphs of his reason, or the perfection of his delights.

After a while his step is again upwards until some fresh culminating point is reached, and so the waves of life roll on to that unknown shore against which they can but beat unceasingly until the end of time.

It will be my pleasure and duty to-day to trace the leading characteristics of Industrial Art from their origin, through their gradual development and their culmination under the highest condition of ancient civilization, to the state of collapse to which they reverted under the decay of all the ancient systems of that glorious condition of intellectual life.

In my next Lecture I shall hope to pursue the subject from the subsequent revival of those arts under Christian influence to the present time.

I shall not attempt, as we have done with the Fine Arts, to separate the history of the Industrial Arts from their theory and practice. Limits of time will necessarily preclude me from doing so at present; and if I rightly apprehend the intentions of the founder of this Chair, he had in view rather your instruction in the æsthetics of the Fine, than in the practice of the Industrial Arts. No one would have been more ready, however, than Mr Slade to recognize how impossible it is to draw the precise line of demarcation between Fine and Useful Art. He would have held, as I certainly do, that Industrial Art is to be respected in precise proportion to the extent in which its manifestations exhibit an intimate dependence upon kindred principles with those which make Fine Art delightful.



Before commencing our necessarily hasty sketch of the history, theory and practice combined of the Industrial Arts it seems to me necessary to say a few words of preface as to the relation in which Industrial Art has stood and must always stand to manufacture, trade, and commerce.

Man's first technical condition was that of working to supply his own necessities in all ways. His second condition would be to learn to supply by his labour the wants of others as well as his own. This naturally gave a fresh value to his labour, and made the acquisition of the fruits of it an object of desire to others. Hence came the idea of paying for labour either by corresponding labour at some other date, or by barter, or by something which represented the value of a given amount of labour. The third condition, no doubt, was to limit a man's work to that which he could do for the service of others with most facility; and he would thus be enabled to exchange a portion of his superfluous skilled labour for what he would himself stand in need of from the unskilled, or less skilled labour of others; and according to the facility with which he himself could labour, and to the demand which existed for his labour, he gradually obtained a greater or less ascendancy over his fellows and an accumulation of whatever medium of exchange represented the value of labour.

At this stage then, no doubt, began to be recognized the price of a day's labour, and the primitive form of trade, which consisted in paying for things wanted, by more or less labour. Originally, no doubt, labour was only undertaken to answer immediate demand, and no idea was entertained of storing up labour so as to supply prospective demand. As soon, however, as that idea gained force in men's minds, the principle of manufacture was established. One man, or many men, set themselves to work to produce with as little labour as possible, and consequently at as little cost as possible, what they considered others would be most likely to pay well for.

Thus came the manufacture of commodities and the elements of trade, that is, originally barter, and ultimately sale. With continued sale and the realization of profit came accumulation of capital, and with accumulation of capital came such continuous production as exceeded the immediate limits of demand. Communities began to do what individuals had originally done, namely, to barter away what they could easily and cheaply produce for that which would be either costly, or difficult for them to create. Men of enterprise at once began to seek out those with whom, originally within the narrow limits of the petty state, and subsequently beyond those limits, they had been accustomed to traffic; and with that spirit of enterprise the spirit of commerce grew. Thus men gradually came to minister to one another's necessities; and as such ministration could only be effected by one race in amity with another race, the arts of production came to be recognized as "arts of peace."

So long as the user of any article was brought into immediate communication with the maker of it, the thing produced was sure to correspond precisely with the condition of civilization common to the maker and the buyer, and over the operation of making it would preside whatever measure of intelligence, or aptitude for the perception of beauty in Industrial Art, might belong to either of the two.

When objects came to be manufactured the immediate link between the maker and the user was broken, since the very operation of making for a purpose instead of specially for the user, and of contemplating storeage instead of immediate use, stamped the object made with the character of generalisation instead of particular adaptation. Thus it is that all objects in Industrial Art which are manufactured are apt to lose that perfect propriety which characterizes them when they are specially made by the hand of a maker for the use of an individual who delights in them only if made in ac-

cordance with his special enjoyment of beauty in technical design.

Of course things beautiful may be manufactured, but it is very hard to manufacture upon any great scale, and retain freshness and beauty in Industrial Art. Hence, arises that which is too common now-a-days; viz.—that while objects of exceptional use and demand are carefully designed and executed, things which are always haunting everyone, in their paths through life, are left for their artistic appearance to the chapter of accidents, and the caprice of a too often heedless or ignorant workman. This system requires an entire change. Things which are of most common use should be most carefully designed, and in obedience to the purest systems of Industrial Art, so that by their inherent excellence they may fit the taste of every educated buyer.

To produce this perfect understanding between maker and buyer both must recognize common principles,—the one as guiding and presiding over manufacture, and the other as ruling selection and purchase.

I have ventured to detain you by these few observations, which you may possibly fancy to be somewhat removed from the simple æsthetics of Industrial Art, because I recognize in the demands of the present day an urgent necessity for cultivated persons to understand not only what is desirable but what is practicable. Every one of you, from day to day, must be called upon to exercise a choice in what you buy. All that you buy of any permanent nature which has been produced by Industrial Art must have more or less of excellence from the art point of view or the reverse. It is your duty to select only what is excellent, and if you do that with consistency you will very soon find that manufacturers will never supply you with anything else than what is excellent. Defective supply only follows defective demand. The user has no right to complain of the manufacturer; for the remedy against imperfect production is almost always

in his own hands. Supply will always follow demand; and it is a sure sign of ignorance, or unwholesome apathy, on the part of the buyer, when supply dictates to demand.

Those branches of Industrial Art into which design has in all ages most conspicuously entered may be classified as follows, viz. :—

(1) *Constructive Arts*. Those in which an aggregation of parts, in themselves useless or inexpressive, is made to constitute a combined result. These arts obviously fulfil all the demands of primitive structure, including thus the work of the mason, bricklayer, carpenter, and joiner, and the bulk of all furniture.

(2) *Sculptured Industry*; that is, any application of sculpture to industry, either by working in hard or plastic substances.

(3) *Ceramic Art*, including all forms of hardening clays by fire for man's use, and ultimately of decorating them and fixing the decoration also by means of fire.

(4) *Vitreous Art*, including the formation and decoration of glass in all ways, and the adaptation of the principle of glass-making as a covering or decoration to other materials.

(5) *Metallic Art*; that is, all the processes of the extraction and manipulation of metals, whether taken alone or in combination with other materials.

(6) *Textile Art*, comprehending everything worked in the loom, or formed or decorated by the needle.

(7) *Pictorial Industry*, including surface-decoration generally, in whatever way or by whatever means applied.

Under the head of Architecture I have noticed so much of what I have here designated as the Constructive Arts as appertains to the art of Building, and this is the chief and almost solitary ground which is common as a basis to Fine and Industrial Art. All the other branches of the Fine Arts may be considered to have an independent existence, except in so far as the processes employed in Fine and Industrial

Art may be considered as the means by which both work their ends.

What the French call "*assemblage*" in carpentry and joinery, generally expresses the bringing together of parts prepared for union so as to produce a whole. Of course, the ark of Noah may be looked upon as already exhibiting a considerable advance in the principle of so connecting pieces of prepared wood as to form a structure capable of resisting very considerable efforts at derangement.

Among the Egyptians the earliest paintings furnish us with illustrations of rude furniture, apparently very simply wrought, but always in very graceful lines, and with the parts arranged in a judicious and workmanlike way ; nor are there wanting in various museums examples showing the skill of the Egyptians in all the handicrafts essential to the elaboration of the constructive arts. The earliest painted sculptures and the earliest papyri exhibit to us the boat as a large and complete specimen of constructive skill. Their earliest gods are seated upon rectangular or folding-up seats or thrones, put together much as similar seats or thrones might be executed in the present day. The beds or couches appear to be at once simple, elegant, and useful ; evidencing a complete acquaintance with the arts of carving, of framing together pieces of wood, of hingeing, and mortising and tenoning, and of inlaying with ivory and other materials for the purposes of decoration.

The Assyrian seats and footstools, portable altars, beds, and other furniture as represented in their sculptures, are no less complete and well suited to their purposes than similar objects among the Egyptians.

In all these archaic specimens of furniture there is a simplicity of style which is thoroughly satisfactory to the eye. There is never any question as to the functions performed by the piece of furniture. A chair is never to be mistaken for a couch, a couch for a bed, or a bed for a stool.

All are ornamented, where ornament can be satisfactorily introduced, so as not to interfere with the use, or appearance of use of the object; and it is always added by a process analogous to that by which the object has been wrought. Superadded, or inlaid ornament is never obtrusive, and the eye never desires its removal. If not positively essential to construction it always harmonizes with construction, and never runs counter to it. It is never omitted where it seems to be wanted, nor added where it can be dispensed with. In fact, so far as we can now judge, the common sense of the ancient Egyptians carried them far further towards excellence in the domestic arts, which escaped the rigid supervision of the priesthood, than it appears to have done in the more important manifestations of the principles, as they understood them, of the Fine Arts.

We have already recognized, under the heading of Architecture, that the earliest stone and marble monuments of Greece, and of Asia Minor particularly, appear to have been founded upon wooden constructions.

In the earliest Greek vases we meet with types of the most elegant furniture; and I do not know that any set of objects has ever been brought within the range of Industrial Art more graceful and elegant than appear to have been some of the early chariots, couches and moveable altars which we find delineated upon these beautiful productions.

I have already observed that progress in Ornamental Art was more rapid than in purely Fine Art. This is of course accounted for by man's natural affinity for what is gratifying to the eye, rather than for that which addresses itself to his reason, memory, or imagination. A savage perceives the beauty of ornament long before he associates the idea of expression with any representation of the human form. With his perception of ornament is invariably associated his aptitude to appreciate simple elegance of outline and form. Instinct and repeated experiment teach the uneducated

workman to apportion precisely for every part of any work he may have to construct, the substance of each material essential for strength, and therefore consistent with a sense of strict propriety.

As in the human figure we recognize the height of beauty in the perfect adaptation of the Creator's work to the ends he has proposed to himself to effect, so do we recognize in man's work, from the very infancy of his practice of the Industrial Arts, the perfection of technical excellence in the apportionment of neither too much nor too little of material to every purpose.

A simple form is always more beautiful than a complex one, and that which best does what is wanted will always look best.

Happily time has spared to us abundance of illustrations of the skill of the ancients in their Constructive Arts, and if there was any one particular set of objects to which I would recur, as furnishing perfect illustrations of elegance, it would be to the musical instruments of the classical ages. Even in the present day we find that the forms of such instruments preserved by tradition are of extreme elegance, and throughout the East, and even in modern Egypt, such instruments leave little to be desired on the score of beauty.

The museums of Naples, Rome, Turin, Paris, London, and Vienna, all possess more or less striking illustrations of the perfection attained by the ancient Greeks and Romans in every branch of the Arts of Construction.

In turning to our second head, that of *Sculptured Industry*, our thoughts are no less forcibly carried back to the infancy of the human race, since (as I have observed in tracing the History of Sculpture) the earliest monuments of that art we find to have been executed at once upon the largest scale, and in the least tractable materials which could have been selected for the sculptor's purpose.

Man probably originally acquired his power of cutting

away rocks in endeavouring to shape for himself durable and permanent shelter and refuge.

The operation of cutting away the living rock to enlarge an accidental cavity, would follow upon man's seizure of a rude cave, for the purpose of occupation as a tenement, and the removal of the drift by which it might possibly, in the ages of the deluge or deluges of long past centuries, have been nearly choked up.

So soon as the technical process of cutting materials into shapes at human will was acquired, a ready means of ornamenting both structure and furniture was of course available.

In applying sculpture, men no doubt followed a simple natural instinct, and succeeded at once in so fashioning their works as to stamp upon them beauty and story. By means of sculpture, not only was furniture made more beautiful, but it became so marked as to identify it with its possessor, with his legends, with his faith, and with his works. The conqueror's couch was adorned with representations of his victories, or with symbols of the deities under whose tutelage he had achieved them. Upon the record of such heroic aspirations supervened that of the domestic inclinations, and ultimately that of the triumphs of the loves and graces, and the legends and poetry associated therewith.

Upon articles of daily use were thus wrought the stories constantly present to the classic mind. The priest's traditions, and the poet's lays, nurtured from his infancy the imagination of the Greek. His fancy was fed by myth and symbol, revealed to him alike through the songs of the national bards, and the works of the painter and the sculptor.

If the Greek was unable to live without sculpture, the Roman was but little less so. What the one craved for as an intellectual enjoyment, the other demanded as the attribute and symbol of his wealth and magnificence. In nothing more was this constant craving after the union of patient



labour with intrinsic value for the formation of articles of personal adornment displayed, than in the constant fondness manifested by the ancients, both Greeks and Romans, for *gems*—precious from their material, and still more precious from the art with which they were decorated.

There is probably no department of ancient industry in which the genius of the art-workman is exhibited in a more concentrated form, than in the gems, camei, and intaglii, which, from the enormous quantity which have descended to our days, must have once existed in an almost incredible profusion.

The “glyptic” art, I need scarcely remind you, was of the most remote antiquity. From the ephod of Aaron to the symbols of magistracy of the remotest Chinese mandarin, the engraved gem was the universal token of dominion—priestly or civil.

The cylinders of the Babylonians and Assyrians, and the tablets of the Egyptians, carry us on to the earliest incised stones of the archaic races of Greece. The Pelasgic and Etruscan races delighted in such symbols, and we find them advancing in spirituality and beauty, with the rapid progress of Greek art, through the Phidian acmé of vigour to the Alexandrian acmé of grace.

Since the two terms principally used to characterize ancient gems have been adopted generally into art-language, as expressive of the two kinds of sculpture in which they were executed, it may be well to remind you of the difference which separates the *intaglio* from the *cameo*.

In the former the image is sunk into the material. In the latter the ground is cut away from about the image; so as to leave it in, more or less, high relief.

Until comparatively recently our national collection was,—by comparison with the museums of Paris and Vienna—but imperfectly supplied with specimens of either of these varieties of minute sculpture; but thanks to our acquisition

of the Blaccas collection, the means for studying every variety of excellence, in this branch of art, are now at the disposal of the student.

Our third head, that of *Ceramic Art*, would be alone of quite sufficient importance to occupy us during the time allotted to such a discourse as the present; and even within those limits it would be difficult to convey any adequate idea of the various changes the art has assumed in different ages, with the discovery of fresh materials, fresh chemical combinations and processes of fabrication and decoration, characteristic of the various races and ages in which the successive improvements have been effected.

To this art I may hope to recur hereafter, contenting myself for the present with the broadest possible outline of the general features of the subject.

I need scarcely remind you that in the exhumation of the remains of the primitive denizens of the earth, relics are found, proving that the ceramic arts were generally known to man, even before the metallic arts. The rude British terra-cotta urn, is found with the equally rude implements of war and of the chase in flint, in bone, in stone, and in shell.

Such urns frequently exhibit indented ornamentation of a very graceful kind, wrought with an exactitude and taste seemingly inconsistent with the obviously savage condition of those by whom they were fabricated.

The mud of the Nile peculiarly lends itself to plastic reproduction. Much elegant pottery is made from it even in the present day, and at the earliest period of their history the Egyptians seem to have been acquainted not only with its use for brickmaking and for the formation of vessels to contain fluids, but to have understood how to overcome its porosity, and to harden and decorate it by covering it with vitreous glazes. They seem early to have found that the purification of the clay, and the addition to it of certain more or less silicious substances assisted in giving it hardness

and perfection, and many of their small idols leave nothing to be desired in the excellence of their technical production.

Whether the Phœnicians, or the Egyptians, or the Assyrians, or the inhabitants of certain Greek islands originated the process of painting upon earthenware bases, and fixing those paintings by the operation of baking in a kiln, we shall probably never now discover; but it is impossible to recommend to those who would study the archaics of this subject a more excellent work than is offered to the student in Mr Birch's admirable Essay on *The Pottery of the Ancients*.

It is probable, I think, that this art of vase decoration was rather developed than invented; since, as far as one can judge from the earliest Greek vases, the original differences of colour appear to be produced by painting vessels formed of one coloured clay with pigments formed of other clays of different colours.

From a knowledge of the clays requisite for giving different colours, the potter would naturally arrive at a recognition of the various metallic oxides which served to give the clays he used the chromatic aspects they assumed on leaving the kiln.

Once master of the chromatic value of these oxides in combination with different proportions of siliceous matter, a great step in development was made by the master-potter, and when the progress of vitreous art provided him with a *frit*, or vitreous agent which, dissolving in the fire would serve to bind together the metallic particles he desired to fix upon the surface of the earthenware vessel, he would have arrived at a complete command over the processes of enamel painting, as applied to this day in the decoration of earthenware and China of all descriptions.

So far as can now be judged, the limitation of the decoration of Greek vases to so few colours appears to have been a matter of choice rather than of necessity with the Greeks;

since there can be no doubt, from the contemporary practice of the Phœnicians, the Egyptians and the Assyrians, that if he had wished to use it, the Greek painter must have had ready to his hand a considerably enlarged palette.

It would take too long now to enter upon an examination of the various forms in which the Greeks were accustomed to manufacture their vases, and it must suffice to note here that it was their practice to regard certain prescribed and typical forms only, as fitting for vessels destined for particular uses. So far as research has gone at present we have no reason to believe that the ancients were ever acquainted with that branch of ceramic art which we recognize as the manufacture of porcelain. The point at which they stopped appears to have been at the purification of carefully selected clays, and the addition to them of certain ingredients which were calculated to improve their action on the potter's wheel, while under the fire, and especially during the act of cooling—the most difficult and perilous to a happy result of all the stages of earthenware manufacture.

And here I would desire to notice the extraordinary skill in design which the constant practice of working at his wheel gives to the potter. Many of you have no doubt watched the operation of what is called "throwing" the clay upon the potter's wheel; and you must have observed the extraordinary facility acquired by the hand of the craftsman in giving graceful curves to the objects which are growing under its pressure. It seems almost as though the thumb gained a preternatural dexterity, and while the form of the vessel is constantly changing as the wheel revolves, one often longs to have the same vessel in a dozen different forms; each one, as it changes towards the form ultimately to be reached, seeming to be already perfect.

It is always fortunate for any branch of industrial art when the principal means by which works are produced are simple and peculiar to that art; since, while they give it

a marked unity of aspect which can be attained in no other way, they prescribe for it, almost imperatively, the most satisfactory shapes into which the designer can cast his work.

The potter's art, then, is essentially one in which the hand and eye of the artizan do almost everything. Formality is thus escaped in the measure in which beauty is attained; and the hand seems instinctively to give those complex curves, corresponding with the most beautiful sections of the cone, which, so far as we can now ascertain, were attained only by infinite labour in the architectural monuments of Grecian art which required to be hewn out of an originally shapeless solid.

The Romans maintained a high level in ceramics, and in their so-called Samian ware much of the beautiful manipulation of earlier periods prevailed. I need scarcely recall that celebrated ware to your recollection as being of a fine lustrous red colour, and almost invariably decorated with exceedingly graceful arabesque and other ornament in more or less high relief. As we approach the later days of Roman ceramic manufacture, we meet with a tendency to superadd cast enrichments to the vases, and so obtain the aspect of the sculptor's work by mechanical means. As the handwork diminishes, so does the beauty; and segmental and oval curves frequently take the place of those parabolic, hyperbolic, and conchoidal forms of section in earlier use. The painting is rich rather than beautiful, and here and there we find indications that gold was added with more profusion than good taste.

Still, throughout the majority of the specimens of the pottery of the Romans found upon every soil to which they carried their victorious arms, we cannot but recognize the prevalence of good principles of manufacture and exceedingly elegant design.

An amazing illustration of the abundance of earthenware

vessels in the latter days of the Empire at Rome is furnished to us in the fact that out of the fragments of such vessels alone, what is almost equivalent to an eighth hill of Rome has been formed in the shape of the well-known Monte Testaccio. Great as our use of ceramic manufacture is in the present day, there is little doubt that the Romans were at least as partial to that class of art manufacture as we the citizens of the nineteenth century world now are.

Of all the branches of Industrial Art we have to consider to-day, the ceramic appears to me the only one which the moderns have carried considerably farther towards technical perfection than the ancients. I say this advisedly, because at first sight it might naturally be observed that the textile art of the nineteenth century is infinitely superior to anything of the kind which existed before the Advent of our Lord. To this it may of course be replied that although the facilities for the mechanical production of textiles, which in ancient times could only have been produced by years of patient hand-labour, have attained a wonderful development, still the products of those remote ages—that is, the manufactured articles which really supply the test of the perfection of industry in its art alliance—were fully equal in beauty of texture, as well as in generally beautiful aspect, to anything now executed, if we except some of the laborious productions of the Indian loom. That this was the case we are enabled to judge by pictures and certain fragments, in which the art of at least the later classical ages is preserved.

In the next branch of Industrial Art which we have to consider, the learned have long doubted whether the old processes of vitreous painting and the production of enamels were fully known to the Greeks and Romans.

There can be no manner of question that all the great nations of classical antiquity were fully acquainted with the processes of making white and coloured glass of all sorts; and they also thoroughly understood how to make vitreous

glazes—in other words, thin enamels. The point upon which the principal doubt has arisen is as to the full command they may or may not have possessed over, firstly, the means of causing enamels to adhere to metals by the preparation of hollows to form mechanical recipients for them; and, secondly, over the operations of covering a metal or other base with enamel, and then painting upon the surface of that enamel with other enamel colours mixed with fluxes and fused together by successive firings, so as to obtain a gradual enhancement of brilliantly transparent depth of colour.

No one in this country has contributed more to advance our knowledge of the processes connected with glass manufacture, both in ancient and modern times, than the founder of this Chair; and, through his munificence, any visitor to the British Museum will have an ample opportunity of judging of the correctness of my assertion, that while the ancients appear to have produced specimens of glass which the most skilful manufacturers of the present day would be unable to reproduce, there is scarcely any operation of modern practice of which evidence of ancient origin is not given by some one or other of the objects in the Slade Collection<sup>1</sup>.

As far as one can tell, the moderns have a slight advantage over the ancients in the perfection of their crystal glass, and in the large size of the plates in which it can be manufactured. For these improvements, however, we are indebted to mechanical science, and not to any art-instinct or art-cultivation.

There is another form in which glass has been converted by the moderns to uses apparently never dreamt of by the ancients, viz., in the formation of transparent pictures; but the means by which these pictures are made can scarcely be

<sup>1</sup> I have reason to believe that Mr Alexander Nesbitt's learned notice of the history of the manufacture of glass, which will form the introduction to the forthcoming Catalogue *raisonné* of the Slade Collection, will fully corroborate the above expression of opinion.

regarded as coming within the immediate scope of vitreous manufacture, since it is a beautiful and ingenious application of the manufactured article rather than an improvement in the manufacture itself.

Under the head of Painting, I have already alluded to one of the most important applications of vitreous art by both the ancients and the moderns, viz, the art of mosaic.

In the origin of that manufacture, the pictures embodied in it appear to have been entirely formed of variously coloured natural materials.

The original mosaic pavements are noticed by Pliny and other writers as *lithostrati*; and the *vitree parietes* alluded to by the same writers were of subsequent introduction, after the art of the glassworker had been called in to supply artificially-coloured materials to take the place of those rare and costly minerals which had previously limited the extent of the palette of the mosaic-worker. From the date of the introduction of these variously-coloured glasses into the art, the mosaic-worker's picture became more complete than it had previously been, and the truth with which Nature was imitated by its means was a frequent source of delight and admiration to the ancient Romans.

I need hardly remind you of the pretty description which Pliny gives of the mosaic picture of "Doves Drinking from a Basin." Nothing can be more interesting than to find this very picture still in existence, and preserved in the museum of the Capitol of Rome. It is no small testimony to the value of the evidence given by that writer respecting the arts of the ancients, to find how minutely this object answers to the description he has given of it, and how completely it justifies his expressions of praise.

The most celebrated painting of this kind executed by the ancients, or at any rate the most celebrated one which has been preserved to our days, is the great picture of the "Battle of Issus at Pompeii." Time warns me, however, not



to dwell longer on this fascinating art, which may fitly constitute the subject of some future discourse.

I return therefore to Vitreous Art in its ordinary form, and the application of glass to the formation of vessels for the table.

In the elaboration of such vessels the ancients manifested their complete acquaintance with the method of building up glasses of various colours, and then reducing them by heat to a ductile or plastic form. By extending them in that state, and then recombining them, and again extending and twisting them, they succeeded in giving every variety of that filamentous intricacy which forms so leading a characteristic of the Venetian glass of the sixteenth century.

The processes by which the Portland and Auldjo Vases, and many others were executed is exceedingly interesting; consisting, as they did, of a combination of the art of the gem-cutter with the artificial formation of the gem on which he worked. A lump of blue glass, for instance, having been taken on the end of the glass-blower's pipe was immersed in a molten mass of white glass, and the two gradually distended by blowing through the pipe; the twirling of the pipe, and the touching of the partially blown mass of glass at its end gradually shaping the vessel into its perfect vase-like form. Having been allowed to cool, the glass-maker's art had provided a vase in two thicknesses of differently-coloured materials, which, being exposed to the action of the glass-cutter's wheel, allowed of the removal of so much of the external white coating as left only a comparatively small portion of the white, to show as a cameo upon the blue. A further series of operations analagous to those of the gem-cutter reduced the white silhouette to a perfectly-modelled bassissimo rilievo; this later operation being precisely similar to the gem-cutter's usual dealing with a striated onyx, or other similarly laminated mineral.

It is curious to find an exactly similar process of glass-working and cutting in use from the earliest ages in the East,

particularly in China; and the elaboration with which the Chinese occasionally worked (and still work) through three or four layers of differently-coloured glasses is quite extraordinary. In their practice, however, much more seems to have been left to chance than in the practice of the Greeks and Romans, since we usually find in old Chinese works of these kinds that the glass-worker has made up his vessel originally of pieces of differently-coloured glasses, sometimes overlying one another, and sometimes going completely through the whole thickness of the vessel. The ingenious Chinese glass-cutter took advantage of all these accidental thicknesses and crossings of differently-coloured materials to detach one from the other by extraordinary undercuttings, finishing the irregularly-shaped projections into any fantastic form which they suggested to his lively imagination.

The principal difference between the practice of the fifth branch of Industrial Art—*Metallic Art*—by the ancients and by the moderns consists in the far greater use of bronze by the former, and of iron by the latter.

The ancients perfectly well understood the value and uses of the various alloys, and were enabled to make their bronze either tough, brittle, hard, or soft, at will. They early acquired a command over the processes of casting and beating, which enabled them to shape metals to their use with rapidity.

I have already frequently alluded to the instinctive propensity of finite mortals to embody their conceptions in materials of infinite durability. Such a material they pre-eminently found in bronze, and especially through its plasticity at one temperature, and its hardness and rigidity at another. Through this property of convertibility the ancient artist was enabled to embody his record (for such, as I have already explained, the earliest works of art unquestionably were) in a form as durable as if it had been cut in granite or porphyry, with one-tenth or even one-hundredth of the

expenditure of time and money which would have been involved had he not acquired the power of rendering the metals industrially subservient to his will by fusion.

No wonder is it then that names such as those of Tubal-Cain, Dædalus, Hephæstion, and Hiram have come down to us as those of benefactors of mankind.

Nothing, for instance, can be more interesting than the description which the Bible contains of the characteristics of the last-named art-workman. He was a man, we are told, "skilful to work in gold, and in silver, in brass, in iron, in stone, in timber, in purple, in blue, in fine linen and in crimson; also to grave any manner of graving, and to find out every device which shall be put to him."

If ancient industry was, in the age of Solomon, endowed with such a master of all crafts, we may readily conceive the perfection to which, even at that early age, metal-working must have been carried; and every relic which time has spared to us of that art, as practised amongst the principal peoples of classical antiquity, bears testimony to their perfect command over the manipulation of metals of all kinds, and their allotment to every object they manufactured of design appropriate at once to the purpose, the subject, and the nature of the metal in which it was to be wrought, and the technical processes by which it was to be fashioned.

The subject of Metallic Art-Industry is so large—(as indeed is the next branch of the Industrial Arts upon which we shall enter, the Textile)—that it is necessary to postpone to some future occasions anything more than the scanty reference above made to the perfection to which it was carried in the palmy days of Grecian civilization.

Constant allusions by ancient authors to transparent garments, as well as to highly decorated ones, force upon us the conclusion that the earliest barbaric splendour of attire corresponded very fairly with the Indian magnificence of the present day.

By patient labour the finest fabrics were woven, and, for the most part, the coloured decorations were superadded by the labour of the embroiderer. Silk has always been regarded as having been procured by the Babylonians from China, and through the Babylonians communicated to the Persians, to India, to Greece, to Rome, and finally to Constantinople, where silken garments were accounted of extraordinary value. Many writers have identified in the transparent garments of Cos, and in those so much worn by the Roman ladies, fabrics analogous to the muslins of the East.

In Egypt, no doubt, cotton was early used for the manufacture of articles of apparel, and the oldest bas reliefs exhibit such dresses as were apparently more or less transparent. Beautiful as much of the Egyptian decoration of textile fabrics unquestionably must have been, it appears to have been excelled in richness, if not in beauty, by the skilful weavers and embroiderers of Assyria.

The Bible bears many testimonies to the great and general estimation in which fine linen and embroidery were held in patriarchal ages, and the description of the hangings of the Tabernacle takes us back to a fully-developed condition of textile industry, even in those remote ages. The very names of the workers, Aholiab and Bezaleel, are preserved to us, together with the interesting record of the mode in which they produced fabrics rivalling the kincobs of Benares at the present day. These artists we are told in the description of the formation of the ephod of Aaron, "did beat the gold into thin plates, and cut it into wires, to work it in the blue, and in the purple, and in the scarlet, and in the fine linen, with cunning work."

These fine drawn wires were probably at a very early period flattened, and wound round threads, in the manner of modern gold lace, and exactly in the same way that the "*badla*" of the Indians is wrought at the present time.

Important as the weaver's and embroiderer's art was to

the enrichment of costume, there can be very little doubt that it exercised an even still more important influence upon the earliest architectural decoration. In permanent mural embellishments the architect only repeated the earliest types of suspended textile decorations, such as those so minutely described to us in connection with the Tabernacle. Pictures were no doubt wrought by the embroiderer's art, and suspended against walls, thus forming some of the first pictorial embellishments of apartments, and in this application of textile art we have the very foundation of all modern upholstery.

It was not alone in their manufacture of textile fabrics for exhibition as pictures that the ancients excelled; since a fully equal degree of propriety is to be noticed in the forms of the garments which served as the ordinary articles of costume, and especially in the choice of the portions of those garments selected for decoration by the embroiderer. We never find the costume of the Greek, or even of the Roman, so arranged as to hide what it would be well to reveal, or to leave apparent what it would be well to conceal. The principle they seem to have adopted was to leave the bulk of any garment, as the Indians do, either in plain fabric or decorated with an even and quiet diaper. The luxury of pattern and enrichment was limited for the most part to the edges and borders of the garments which hung free, or fluttered in the wind. They especially understood the art in dress of preparing grounds of deep colour and tranquil pattern, to set off the arms or jewellery by the frequent and prodigal use of which they expressed their highest magnificence.

Turning from this most interesting subject, it remains for us now only to glance at that branch of industry the decorative effect of which is dependent upon its alliance with *Pictorial Art*.

In every age the Painter has been a ready helper to the manufacturer, and to him, in Industrial Art, we are no less

indebted for delight than we are to him in his more lofty and proper realm of Fine Art. The decorative painting of the ancients is happily still well defined for our information and admiration, and this is due to their excellent selection of pigments and vehicles. The monuments of Egypt, great and small, have been alike enriched by the labours of the decorative painter.

There is not one of the several branches of industry at which I have glanced, to which the painter has not contributed his quota of decoration. He is the general embellisher, the peacemaker and harmonizer. It is his function to soften asperities, to correct deformities, to create beauties, and the usefulness of his work in such capacities is enormously enhanced by the facility with which his help can be rendered. The extent to which he assisted the sculptor in the best ages of Grecian art, it is difficult now to ascertain. So much has been written upon the subject, and it is one of such interest that we may possibly hereafter discuss it in some detail. We can now only recognize the fact that the ancients obviously considered it, within certain limits, and in certain cases, indispensable. The important question to be ascertained, both historically and æsthetically, is the extent to which that assistance was rendered, and the form which it took. In whatever they did we can scarcely assume that the Greeks would err against sound principles of good taste, and the extent and nature of the "*Circumlitio*" of Nicias is one of the most important *cruces* bequeathed to us from antiquity.

Whether we may or may not arrive at a satisfactory solution of it, there is no doubt that the inquiry can never be "Love's Labour Lost," as inquiry by others has already led to many important æsthetic conclusions.

The decorative painting of the Greeks during the best ages of their art, apparently consisted only in supporting and framing the really historical or religious pictures which covered the walls of their edifices. Their patterns and

borders for the most part appear to have been limited to conventional ornamentation of the most beautiful kind. Why and how they used such conventional ornament only, I may hereafter explain to you. But I would now only advert to the fact that the conventional ornament of the Greeks became rapidly converted by the Romans into ornament, the basis of which rested upon direct imitation. As to a great extent the latter lost a just conception of the nature of ideal painting as a Fine Art, so did they lose the sense of the value of convention as the leading element in ornamental art; and, clever as is the execution of much of their pictorial ornament, it is occasionally impertinent; and instead of being handmaid to a higher order of beauty, it pushes its mistress from her seat and places itself there in her stead.

Art by no means gained by this operation. At the same time it is but fair to confess that there is a rare charm about that class of painting which is generally recognized under the term of arabesque.

To leave such classic ground is tearing one's self away from the soil ever dearest to the art-student. Antiquity is still the artist's mine of wealth; and, next to the study of nature, and corrected by the constant observation of nature's laws, I know no section of Artistic education more likely to lead the Artist to pure and successful practice in every art, or to guide the critic to a more just apprehension of the true and proper conditions of every art, than the study of the invaluable remains which have been bequeathed to us from the classic ages.

The students of this University who will allow their readings of classic authors to be accompanied by a legitimate interest in and inquiry into the contemporary arts which tended to make the lives of those authors peaceful and happy, will read their writings under new lights, and regard the subjects upon which they wrote with an all but living

interest. In proportion to the extent to which such students may be enabled to supply their imaginations with the materials for realizing in their minutest details the aspect of the portico, the agora, the forum, the bath, the temple, and the basilica, in the past, will they imbue themselves with the true spirit of the historic scenes to which such structures served as fitting and inseparable backgrounds.



## LECTURE XIII.

### FINE ART APPLIED TO INDUSTRY.

---

#### *MODERN.*

I HAD the pleasure, in the latter portion of my last discourse, of directing your thoughts to the general characteristics of Industrial Art, as it existed in various branches, previous to the Christian era.

To-day I must ask your attention to a consideration of the various characteristics assumed by those same branches of Industrial Art at periods subsequent to that date, concluding my Lecture by a few words having special reference to the present condition and future prospects of that general scheme of industrial dependence on Fine Art of which they constitute the leading sections.

You will remember that the respective branches to which your notice was directed were:

- i. The Arts of Construction.
- ii. Those involved in the application of Sculpture to Industry.
- iii. Ceramic Art.
- iv. Vitreous Art.
- v. Metallic Art.

- vi. Textile Art ; and
- vii. Those Arts of Industry which owe their leading embellishment to the painter's skill.

Before entering upon these consecutively, I would recall to you the reference I made in the early part of the preceding discourse to the cycle of change which seems to have affected the realm of art, as certain writers have regarded it as having affected the recurrence of various historical events.

I could not forbear in my last Lecture—although it professed to deal only with matters as they stood previously to the Christian Era—from hinting at the decline and fall of the arts of antiquity which accompanied the decline and fall of ancient Rome. The main and earliest feature of that decline, which spread like a canker or fungus, with extraordinary rapidity, over all that was once so full of life and beauty, was that tendency to redundancy and overgrowth, which we recognize in flowers before the shedding of their petals. The brilliancy goes from us, and there remains but the seed-pod.

So it was with the arts of ancient Rome. Where that seed was scattered spontaneously from the withered flowers upon fitting soil, it took root and fructified ; but where it fell, as it too often did, upon soil which refused assimilation to its nature, that total destruction which was foreshadowed by the withering of the flower was succeeded by the extinction of vitality in the seed.

This curious dispersion of Latin seed over every land through which the Romans carried their victorious arms should never be forgotten by the student of the history of Industrial Art, since he will find the recollection of the existence of such seed accounting, to a great extent, for singular changes and developments in various localities between which little or no communication subsisted, and which, but for that recollection, would appear to him almost inexplicable.

The tendency during the reigns of the later Emperors had been to attract to and accumulate in Rome, the spoils and

riches of the world, and every cunning artist and artificer who could minister to luxury, or even pander to imagination.

Over-stimulated in its youth by an effeminate life and dissipation, the manhood of Rome with all its original power of thought, justice of reflection, and strength of invention, became emasculated and unproductive. As the employer lost the power of demanding from the artist and artificer that which was really excellent in their arts or branches of industry, the artist and artificer lost excellence in their arts and crafts. Trivialities took the place of beauties, and elaboration was esteemed beyond design. The material overcame the work, and the simplicity of bronze was changed for the glitter of gold. The magnificence of the East was adopted and imitated by the Romans, but, like new patches upon an old garment, the assimilation was incomplete; and, attired in such "motley," the patrician the more conspicuously decked himself in the many-coloured garment of the buffoon.

Slow as the upward path of progress is, descent has been proverbially rapid, and in the history of the prosperity of nations, as in that of individuals, the ordinary law holds good. Rome in its arts as in its history, "made haste unto its setting," and while in recording progress we seem to pass over years to discover new excellences, almost as it were from day to day the clouds thicken around declension until total obscurity is arrived at.

Rome itself, depopulated of its artists and art-workmen, whom instinct led to seek both safety and continued employment at the court of Byzantium, on the removal by Constantine of the seat of empire to that city, sank into entire anarchy and desolation; and shortly after that date we find the monuments of art, from time to time called into being upon its soil, to be characterized by an almost unprecedented barbarism.

When, for instance, we contrast the early Christian mosaics at Rome—the earliest dating from the age of Constan-

tine—with the average of the enormous quantity which had been spread over every city of Italy, of Gaul, of Spain, of Africa, and even of far-distant Britain, it seems inconceivable that little more than a century should appear to separate excellence from barbarism.

The same contrast is presented if we compare the ivory carvings of consular periods, with those of the early popes and Lombard sovereigns.

The illuminated books, such as the Vienna *Genesis* and the Vatican *Virgil*, offer us still the methods of ancient Roman painting, but in absolute decrepitude. The highest effort of the painter of the fifth century is lower and more contemptible than the work of the commonest house-painter who laboured at Pompeii before it was engulfed in the fiery waves of Vesuvius.

From the transfer of the seat of empire to Byzantium may be dated three several influences, exercised from that period onwards, over the revival of art of all kinds.

These influences were respectively:

1. The traditions of ancient skill left in Rome, long subsisting but gradually obliterated by contact with barbarians.
2. The traditions of ancient skill transported to Constantinople, and modified by contact with contemporary Eastern art; ultimately assuming their most complete forms in the arts of Arabia and Spain.
3. The transmission of certain fragments of Roman tradition into Christian art, and especially as modified by contact with the original art of the north and west of Europe.

Those features in art generally, which had given the greatest interest to its classical form, speedily, under the Christian dispensation, ceased to exercise any influence over, or possess any attraction for, those who either held scarcely any faith at all, or a faith entirely diverse from that of the ancients. The original, and noble, and heroic ideas which the Greeks long

clung to as embodying the leading characteristics of their divinities had dwindled amongst the Romans to a collection of legendary myths, rather sensual than philosophical. Such myths, however beautifully embodied by ancient artists, and used for the adornment of every article, whether of domestic or of sacred use, became rather abhorrent than agreeable to the early Christian, whose detestation of the externals of antiquity had naturally been aggravated by the ages during which he had had either to seek shelter in the catacombs, or to run the risks of relentless persecution. Who can wonder that the relatives and descendants of those who had bled upon the Flavian amphitheatre should hate the arts of those who had reared it?

Thus, in every respect—so far at least as the subject and form upon and in which art had to be exercised are concerned—the Christian artist was led to start, as it were, *de novo*, and to originate something which, essentially different from all that had before excited men's admiration and engaged their affection in material forms, should offer to them new attractions and win them to a renewed effort to create that which should afford them fresh delight.

The starting-point, therefore, from which our survey of the respective branches of Christian Industrial Art may take its departure, was one of absolute negation, so far as the elements of design at least were involved. All that was left as a basis upon which to work was the handing down from father to son, among poor artizans, of certain technical processes, perhaps imperfectly remembered, although guarded with a certain amount of mystery.

It would be too long here to dwell upon the writings of authors such as Heraclius, who wrote at an early period *De Artibus Romanorum*. It must suffice to say, that there are still extant manuscripts, such as the one preserved at Lucca, quoted at length by Muratori and referred to and commented upon by Raspe and other writers, down to the

days of Theophilus, and the *Mappæ Clavicula*, in which, in the form of what were called *secreta*, the mediæval art-workman still treasured glimmerings of classical experience; but such treatises we invariably find to be limited to empirical rules; and they can be supposed but in a remote degree to have influenced the character of the design of the arts, which they assisted to teach men to practise.

As may naturally be supposed, from the ever recurring urgency with which they called forth the ministrations of the workman to supply one of men's first great necessities—shelter—the arts of construction were the earliest to revive.

In districts in which neither stone nor wood greatly abounded, the builder was thrown back upon the manufacture of brick; and in such districts, all over Europe, brick became the characteristic of structure. Nor is it only in structure that what may be called the localization of materials, greatly assists in determining the specific types of Industrial Art in any given locality. Where certain materials predominate, there also naturally will the manufacture of those materials predominate also, and their conversion into every form in which they can be made to minister to man's necessities.

In their broadest aspects I have already endeavoured to describe the progress of the Constructive Arts, so far as they have assumed the shape of architecture, but it is always to be remembered, that the same arts which minister to architecture, minister also to a number of branches of technical art. These advance or recede with the advancement or retrogression of the art of architecture, from which they issued; and furniture, alike in design and execution, varies with structure.

There is, however, as men's lives become artificial, a constant tendency to adopt different processes for the decoration of things in little, from those which are fitting when things are great; and there is also a tendency to execute small

things in more and more precious materials as they diminish in bulk. This tendency induces refinement, and ultimately leads to *petitesse*. On its road, however, it undergoes many agreeable metamorphoses, such as the inlay of one material with another, contrasting with it in colour and texture, or the association, in complicated aggregation of a number of valuable materials.

Such are some of the main processes which have been adopted for the decoration of furniture; and even in mediæval times we may observe the introduction of that kind of ornamentation in woodwork, which ultimately, as *marquetry*, has played so important and conspicuous a part in the enrichment of all modern furniture.

So long as gothic architecture prevailed, so long throughout Europe did furniture exhibit decorative forms, analogous to those used in structural woodwork. When the introduction of Renaissance architecture changed the forms of mouldings and general ornamental details, the structure of furniture changed its character; but it was far easier to change the surface than to alter the forms to which men had been accustomed. A transitional period accordingly supervened, in which the constructive idea remained mediæval while the clothing of that idea appeared to be Renaissance.

This transitional period led men to a sort of compromise, such as we meet with in our own Elizabethan furniture, and in the extravagance of what the Italians denominate their *rococo*.

The *rococo* style, born of greater facility in drawing than in designing upon a just recognition of the proper principles of construction, gave birth to all the eccentricities of the Louis Quatorze work.

In much of the furniture that was made for the Grand Monarque, particularly in that designed by Berain and manufactured by Buhl, we may observe frequently an elegance of form, combined with propriety for use, and beautiful

surface decoration ; but at the same time in much that was even executed by those artists, and still more in that which was executed through their less skilful contemporaries, all idea of structure is lost sight of, and masses of furniture, produced with infinite labour and at enormous cost, present us with nothing but a most inadequate return for the waste of human life and energy expended in their production.

The present condition of our own Constructive Arts is altogether an eclectic one. Our architecture and our furniture all bear this character. With great dexterity, and an ample command of all the resources of the past, we seem yet constantly hankering after something we cannot define.

The remedy for this state of uncertainty, this indulgence of reminiscences here, and of reminiscences there, is, I believe, to be found only in a return to a more objective treatment of furniture ; one in which the designer shall allow the form and decoration of all that he may design to be, as it were, dictated to him by the purpose for which he desires to have it manufactured, by the material of which it is to be made, and by the processes by which it is to be constructed and decorated. So long as he applies a cultivated eye and hand to the elaboration of the best he can produce in conformity with simple conditions, and with a reasonable modesty and self-restraint, he will be far more likely to give pleasure in his work than to offend. It may not be given to every art-designer or art-workman to be able to confer delight through his works, but it is always in the power of every one to avoid giving offence.

It is believed that in the basilicas of the ancients the early Christian found a type of building suitable for his worship ready to hand. Be that as it may, there is no doubt that the earliest churches he himself built for his own use differ materially from any ancient buildings with which we are acquainted. On Italian soil the workmen, called upon to erect what should be specially fitting for the service of the church, fell back for the leading materials of their new struc-



tures upon the fragments of those ancient ones which had been thrown down by Goth and Vandal.

Yet still, even at a very early period, we find evidence that the arts of quarrying and masonry were maintained in full vigour. The mere dimensions and form of that gigantic stone, which, in a single piece, forms the covering of the tomb of the Emperor Theodoric at Ravenna, is a testimony that those arts were still perfectly within the resources of the builders of the period.

Where ancient materials proved insufficient in quantity to supply an entire structure, the contemporary craftsmen fabricated rude imitations of the ancient examples; and from the very imperfection of his imitation, the type first of all degenerated and then changed; and thus we are still enabled to see, particularly in the early Christian churches built upon foreign soil—as that of France, and on the banks of the Rhine—the degenerate features imitated from Roman construction assuming new and individual shapes.

Misery after misery seem to have followed one another so rapidly upon the soil of Italy, and so small was the attention paid to the arts of construction, that the education of the craftsman on his native soil became almost entirely neglected.

Under these circumstances it became the practice to recruit for additional art-workmen from the kingdom of the East, and, when the Iconoclastic troubles commenced in that empire, many monks and artizans, learned in the arts of construction, sought shelter on the soil of Italy. Through their labours no doubt it was that peculiar types of form were introduced to the industry of that country, which cannot be traced to any classical source of derivation; such for instance are the cushion and basket-formed capitals of quasi-Corinthian columns, probably derived indirectly from Persia. Such are many of the surface-worked ornaments which, spread over plane surfaces, are distinguished in point of design from ancient ornaments of the same kind by the fact of their

exhibiting the Oriental principle of growth in conventional foliage; that is, of a main stem with branches of foliage spreading from it, and continuous from root to flower<sup>1</sup>.

In the actual handicraft of all this kind of work we observe the predominant mechanical execution of late Roman sculpture in the great and often unnecessary use of the drill instead of the chisel.

The empire gained by the Lombards in the north of Italy gave an almost final blow to Roman tradition, and while we still see in the edifices which they raised, an abundant use of ancient mouldings, ornaments, and fragments of ancient structures, we cannot but observe that in everything which the Lombard architect designed or the Lombard potentate caused to be made, a persistent effort was manifested to depart from the ancient types and to substitute something which should be distinctly characteristic.

Thus, in furniture, although the same necessities to which the Greeks and Romans ministered had to be supplied by the Lombard workmen, and subsequently by the labourers on the banks of the Rhine, and the servants of the Carlovingian and Merovingian kings, and indeed of our own Saxon sovereigns, we everywhere observe that the shapes and types of the couch, the chair, and even the footstool, are no longer the couch, chair, and footstool of the ancients.

Almost every combination of material is different, and almost every pattern which decorates that new combination of materials differs from any corresponding pattern which would have ornamented ancient work.

At the periods when Roman arms planted the victorious eagles upon barbaric coasts, the natives of the lands subjugated had apparently made considerable progress in ornamental art. They had certainly not arrived at any advanced state in the culture of the arts of imagination, but in the

<sup>1</sup> A distinction first, I believe, observed and pointed out by Mr Owen Jones.

technical arts it is clear that they had attained considerable excellence. The moment collapse at the heart made languid the circulation of Roman blood in the extremities, the signs of incipient mortality revealed themselves to the natives of the countries colonized. A reassertion took place of the native arts, and the interrupted tide of organic development resumed its previous course. The inhabitants of those countries recurred to the primitive forms of furniture and of decoration which had been used and delighted in by their ancestors prior to the date of Roman invasion; and thus the way was paved for an assertion of national individuality in the types of national art.

From this stage each country, especially in the arts of construction, began to manifest its peculiar idiosyncrasy. According to the facilities for structure, the abundance or otherwise of certain materials, and the predilections of the inhabitants of the countries for certain classes of work or ornament, which existed in each country, the constructive arts assumed the types most locally favoured.

Thus, in districts in which (such as the South of France) abundant stone was at the builder's command, the mason's art predominated in the forms of construction. In the North of Europe, where the extensive forests provided a fitting material for structure in the shape of wood, and at the same time offered such difficulties to the transport of stone as made it, even where existing, hard to come by, the carpenter rose in the scale of art-workmen far above the mason. Hence much of that Scandinavian propriety in woodwork which characterizes the simple, natural furniture of woodland countries to the present day.

In England we seem to have occupied a position in which the two branches of constructive skill were fairly balanced. In early Saxon ages, and until our great forests were partially cleared, no doubt we were mainly a wood-working people; but as soon as the clearance of certain forests and the forma-

tion and multiplication of roads had given us the opportunity of developing our natural wealth in building-stones, our arts of construction fell much more, for all important structures, into the hands of the mason than into those of the carpenter.

In turning to Christian sculptured industry, I would remind you that sculpture as applied to structure declined after the fall of the Roman empire to absolute puerility. The men and women imaged in buildings associated with the names of Honorius and Theodoric are simply barbarous; and, with the exception of the cutting of elaborate knots and ornaments in the North of Europe, there is nothing to be met with in structural sculpture throughout Europe but an imitation of poor, late Roman work.

Although here and there, we encounter indications of some little skill having been retained in the ornamentation of minor objects with carving—as particularly in those ivories which, from their small intrinsic value, have escaped, while objects in the precious metals have disappeared—it was scarcely until after the date of our Norman conquest that the art of sculpture can be considered to have decidedly revived in Europe.

You will find in the excellent series of illustrations of the revival of Christian sculpture and the concurrent development of types of Christian art, in the form of painting given in d'Agincourt's great work, indications from age to age of the steps by which new life was given to that art. It is singular, however, how much it appears to have halted behind the progress made in the constructive arts; in this respect reversing somewhat the order of things which appears to have prevailed in the history of the ancient arts.

When we look at our own most beautiful illustrations of the mediæval art of the thirteenth century—such, for instance, as the cathedrals of Wells, Lincoln, and Salisbury—we find a perfection of architectural beauty, unaccompanied by a corresponding development of excellence in Christian

sculpture. It is true that the spirit seems to be willing, but the flesh is weak, throughout what is left to us of the sculpture of that period. Whether applied in its larger form of architectural sculpture, or in its minor, of industrial sculpture, I cannot but feel it to be alike unworthy of the architecture or ornament to which it can be regarded as a decoration only from its intention to tell an interesting story or from its agreeable conventional disposition.

This, I am aware, may be to some extent heterodox; but when I remember the concurrent development which obtained between the most perfect Greek sculpture, and the most perfect Greek structure, and when I feel that perfect mediæval structure is in no wise inferior to perfect Greek structure, I feel also that mediæval sculpture is removed, *toto cælo*, from the perfection of ancient Greek sculpture.

At the same time, no one can value more highly than I do the beauty of *intention* to be constantly recognized in such mediæval sculpture. It may be allowed that it is far better for an artist to aim, out of the depth of his heart, at only beautiful and spiritual things, and to hold on the right way, even while unable to realise the high order of beauty he may aim at, rather than yield to the temptation of copying what may be technically more excellent but spiritually far inferior. It by no means follows however that because a work of art shows a sublime intention it should therefore and necessarily be a good work of art.

In the technical execution of sculpture, particularly in its minor form, as applied to furniture and minute objects for personal use, such as mirror cases, ivory devotional tablets, sceptres, images for the oratory, &c., great excellence was attained in the last centuries of mediæval art, even after the spirit of purely beautiful mediæval structure had all but passed away. So it is that improvement in great things produces almost invariably improvement in small things; but decay is shown in the falling away of excellence in great

monuments, long before it is manifested in the minor arts of a country.

Some thirty years back only we stood lamentably in arrear in our possession of art-workmen in this country fit to apply carving to industry upon any large scale. The want once felt, we have laboured to supply it with an energy such as I believe will find no parallel in the history of the arts of any country in the world. At present there is scarcely a village throughout our kingdom, in which, of recent years, more or less very tolerable sculpture has not been executed. We are, day by day, getting to look for it more and more, in the household objects, our penates, by which we surround ourselves. It behoves us to take care that abundance does not degenerate into inferiority, and tend to nauseate us with what should give us unqualified pleasure.

The best way to guard against any such result will be to take care to keep such applied sculpture down, and prevent it from showing itself off at the expense of simplicity, elegance of form, and propriety of use in the object it may be chosen to enrich. Wrongly used it disfigures as much as rightly used it adorns.

That cycle of progress of relative arts which I have brought before you in connection with the ancient part of the subject, does not hold good in connection with our third branch of industrial art—the Ceramic variety.

In ancient art, the work of the potter ministered from the earliest period of art industry to the development both of beautiful form and beautiful decoration.

In Christian art this was by no means the case. With scarcely any exceptions the pottery of the mediæval period was comparatively rude and inferior. In the shape of terracotta for structural purposes, it appears to have first manifested characteristic features of design ; and in its application in the shape of encaustic tiles, we early find it supplying a substitute for the more expensive mosaic pavement.

In this branch of the art we meet with the union of beautiful design and an extremely ingenious process of manufacture. The early examples which have been found in abbeys and cathedrals, such as Romsey, Chertsey, Westminster, Salisbury, &c., consist of tiles formed of clays generally buff and red, and made by an inlay of one upon the other to present a coloured pattern, relieved upon a ground of one or other of those tints, and occasionally of black or some contrasting colour.

It would take me too long to describe to you the ingenious mode by which this effect was produced. For our present purpose it will be sufficient simply to note that it long remained the most satisfactory form in which ceramic art was used by the mediæval designer, and that we have happily revived its manufacture in the utmost perfection in the present day.

So far as it is possible now to tell, the first considerable improvement that took place in the ceramic art in comparatively modern days came to us through the East—from either Persia or India. The Arabians acquired a knowledge of the application of transparent and opaque-coloured glazes to earthenware bodies, together with the use of vitreous pigments, probably from their early contact with Orientals.

Whatever may have been its derivation, this great improvement appears to have made its appearance in the hands of the Moors, and in the islands adjacent to the Spanish Continent, at a date apparently coæval with some of the earliest specimens now to be met with of what is called Persian faience.

The most perfect specimen of this Arabian production is unquestionably the celebrated *jarra* of the Alhambra. This is a large vase of the most elegant form and perfectly beautiful decoration, with but little tender colour and a good deal of gold.

The contemporary tiles which correspond with the azu-

lejos of the Spaniards are of no less ingenious manufacture and elegance than the *jarra*; although not, of course, each in itself of equal importance in a manufacturing point of view. These tiles were and still are formed by squeezing the clay into moulds in which indented lines have been cut so as to form incised patterns. On the tile, as withdrawn from the mould, ridges stand up, corresponding with the incised pattern; and these ridges enclose, as by so many small walls, various flat surfaces which they circumscribe. Into each of these flat surfaces the workman pours a liquid vitreous glaze until it reaches a level rising in a convex form, slightly above the little walls which keep it in and separate it from the other corresponding little pools of differently-coloured vitreous glazes. The tile is then dried and placed in the kiln and, after burning, remains with the vitreous glazes converted into permanent enamels of different hues, and thus an everlasting pattern in vivid and unchangeable colours is burnt in upon the face of the tile.

These and other improvements in the manufacture of earthenware, as probably originally learnt by the Arabians from the Persians, having been matured in Spain spread thence along the shores of the Mediterranean, apparently through the Mahometans, until they found a fitting field for development in Sicily.

The Saracens there, as the Moors had in southern Spain and Majorca, freely manufactured those beautiful dishes highly decorated with iridescent gold and tender colours, on the same principle as the decoration applied to the *jarra* of the Alhambra, many specimens of which yet remain for our gratification. When the Normans overcame the Saracens, and succeeded to the island of Sicily, no doubt many of the Saracenic workmen found refuge in Pisa and adjacent cities of the main land.

Certain it is, at all events, that we find still adopted as ornaments on the façades of some of the Pisan churches the



earliest specimens of these variously coloured vitreous glazes applied to earthenware, which are to be met with at a distance from the spots upon which we may believe them to have been originally manufactured.

This it was, no doubt, which gave the original stimulus to the manufacture of that which the Italians subsequently knew as *majolica*.

Whether or not Luca Della Robbia was stimulated to his application of the opaque white glaze, which he acquired the power of giving to terra-cotta, by any observation of Oriental or Saracenic produce, we cannot now be quite sure. The invention, so far as history is concerned, has always been attributed to him as an original one. At all events it seems to have been unquestionably his idea to adopt stanniferous glazes as a protection to terra-cotta sculpture. The works he executed in that way have proved, by their extraordinary durability, the excellence of his method; and the bas relief of Our Lady which he executed over one of the lateral doors of Santa Maria dell' Fiore at Florence still remains to attest at once his skill as a sculptor, and his ingenuity as a ceramic artist.

Both he and his followers ultimately adopted the practice of glazing certain portions of their work with enamel colours of various hues; sometimes so as only to form a coloured ground upon which to relieve white figures, and at other times to exhibit the colours of objects represented after the fashion which heralds know as "proper." His method, however, owes much of its reputation to his excellence as an artist.

It was in the form of *majolica* that the old Italian potters and ceramic artists achieved their greatest triumphs. The best draughtsmen of the period did not disdain to design for this ware, and even occasionally to paint it. The potters of Urbino, Faenza, Gubbio, and Castel Durante, vied with one another in the production of original and beautiful

services and vases wrought in earthenware, covered usually with a white glaze and then painted with beautiful designs and in the richest colours by admirable artists.

The wares of the celebrated Maestro Giorgio Andreoli were particularly celebrated at the commencement of the sixteenth century for an iridescence which even surpassed in luminosity and variety of colour that which had been obtained by the Saracenic potters. It appears that he possessed the power of so burning his wares as to obtain this beautiful effect by a final process, applied to an otherwise finished object, and that artists occasionally sent the plates which they had decorated to his furnace to receive this extraordinary and much-admired embellishment.

This art found its most conspicuous patrons in the Dukes of Urbino, and the ware very speedily acquired a value and celebrity which has rather increased than diminished from the date of its origination to the present time. I need scarcely tell you how earnestly connoisseurs struggle for the possession of any excellent specimens of this art even at the present day, and of the almost fabulous prices which good specimens of the manufacture continue to realize. All the principal museums of Europe exhibit large collections of the principal varieties of the ware; and every writer upon ceramics directs with propriety the attention of the student to the decoration of leading objects executed in *majolica* as presenting the most beautiful types which have yet been invented for the decoration of similar articles for domestic use.

Although this manufacture has been continued in Italy interjectionally even to the present time, in which it has been revived with considerable ability and popularity, *majolica* was destined to be greatly interfered with, and ultimately lost sight of in the taste engendered in Europe for porcelain, by the opening of the trade with the East through the Portuguese, and subsequently through the Dutch and English.

Through these channels the real porcelain of China reached Europe, and although at first rare, and to be met with only occasionally in the collections of princes, in which it was held to be of singular price and curiosity, it speedily spread over the whole face of Europe.

In the interval, however, between the climax of the popularity acquired by *majolica* in the 16th century, and the still greater popularity of the China wares brought to Europe by the fleets of the merchant adventurers from the East, imitations of *majolica*, in the shape of artistic faïences were originated and satisfactorily developed in France.

Probably the original stimulus in this direction was given to the French potters through the master-mind of Bernard de Palissy, a potter who was not only an artist, but a man of science. He unquestionably discovered and worked out for himself to perfection, many processes for the formation of beautiful vitreous glazes, which, if known to, were scarcely used by, the Italian *majolica*-workers. His genius adorned the court of Francis I., and there are an originality and beauty about many of the specimens of his handicraft preserved in the Louvre, and Hotel Cluny, which arrest attention, and were no doubt calculated to invite imitation. This both Palissy ware and *majolica* found first in the faïence of Nevers, and ultimately in that of Rouen. The artistic faïences of France included also those of Strasbourg, Niort, Moustier, &c.<sup>1</sup> In all of these we have to admire a very elegant arrangement of ornament, and much clever and characteristic design. In Germany a special encouragement had been given to the manufacture of glazed terra-cotta for the manufacture of the large stoves which served to heat the principal apartments of the Imperial and noble residences.

Shortly after the year 1500 we notice in Germany a great

<sup>1</sup> The student's attention is earnestly directed to the beautiful collection of French "faïences of Art" recently added to the South Kensington Museum.

improvement in the ordinary earthenware of the country, and in the coloured glazes which protected its surface.

Concurrent with the improvement in its earthenware the common stone ware of that country also improved; and upon many of the German *krüge* we still find impressed, admirable designs in the style of Albert Dürer and Holbein, and of the Behams and Hopferrs, and other of the German *petit-maitres*.

The admiration excited by the specimens of Chinese ceramic art, which were multiplied throughout Germany by means of the Dutch importations, at length excited the emulation of certain ingenious German chemists, who, stimulated by the Elector of Saxony, Frederick Augustus I., gave a new and entirely original direction to European ceramic art.

These distinguished men were Ehrenfried Walter von Tschirnhaus, and Johann Friedrich Böttcher; and between them it was that clay was discovered upon the soil of Europe possessed of corresponding characteristics to the *kaolin*, to the possession of which the Chinese had been indebted for their supremacy in the manufacture of porcelain.

The clay of which Böttcher's primitive China was made, was of a deep red colour; but a short time only elapsed before the accidental discovery of an almost impalpable white powder on the territory of Aue, near Schneeberg, in Germany, provided the original material adopted by Böttcher, and used by him in the establishment of Meissen, and subsequently of Dresden.

It was not until the year 1709 that entire success was obtained in imitating with European *kaolin* the porcelain of China. Previous to that date, in 1695, the French chemists had so compounded various mineral substances as to render them fitting, under the action of the kiln, to constitute an excellent imitation of Oriental porcelain; and this they effected at St Cloud.

These efforts laid the foundation of that important manufacture subsequently removed to Sevres, and known as that of *porcelaine tendre*. It may be distinguished by the rich and almost unctuous depth of tint obtained by means of the largely vitreous character of the body upon which the pigments, with their frits, were applied. This was necessarily costly to manufacture, owing to the difficulty of preparing the materials, and the small scale upon which it was able to be worked. Its original value has gone on still increasing, and many a specimen of *porcelaine tendre* has, I have no doubt, been sold for much more than its weight in gold.

To their manufacture of *porcelaine tendre* the French added in 1768 the manufacture of *porcelaine dure*, or hard porcelain; through the discovery of the excellent China clays of the Limoges district.

The soft paste of St Cloud finds its parallel in this country in our contemporary manufacture of Chelsea ware.

The *Chelsea* manufactory was transferred to *Derby*; and its productions constitute the variety known originally as "Chelsea-Derby," and subsequently as "Derby" ware only.

Cookworthy's discovery of China clay at *Plymouth* laid the foundation of our hard China manufacture, which was carried to perfection at *Worcester*.

The limits of this discourse forbid my entering into the succession either of these factories, or of others, such as those at Swansea, Bristol, Nantgarw, Stoke-upon-Trent, Coalport, &c.

There are two individuals, however, whose influence upon the progress of British ceramic art was so exceptional that I must for a moment dwell upon them. I allude to the immortal Wedgwood and the late Herbert Minton. To the former we are indebted for the introduction to commerce of many varieties of earthenware, greatly improved, and of Jasper ware; together with an extraordinary appreciation, in a comparatively uncultivated artist, of the value of purity and beauty of the highest class in design. His life is one full of

instruction for all who would know how a conscientious leader of industry may benefit and do honour to his country. It was his delight to work hand in hand with the best artists, and (far in advance of his time) he recognized the commercial value of design as an assistant to industry. He clearly saw that public interest would be excited by excellence, that cultivation was necessary for the development of taste, and that artists could only properly design for manufacturers, who identified themselves with the operations and specialities of the branches of industry in connection with which they exercised their art.

Herbert Minton, no less than Wedgwood, spent a long and laborious life in raising the character of the branch of manufacture to which he devoted himself. Almost all the great improvements which have taken place within the last fifty years in British ceramic art group themselves around his memory. He it was who revived the manufacture of encaustic and *majolica* tiles; and provided the materials which have mainly led to the revival of the art of mosaic amongst us.

I need scarcely remind you how worthily upon all occasions, in the highest manifestations of ceramic art, he upheld the position of England in competition with all foreign countries.

I must leave this interesting subject to pass on much more rapidly over the theme of *Vitreous Art*.

I have already observed that, during the Middle Ages, the most interesting form in which this art was exercised was in that of the stained glass window. To that subject I shall, I hope, hereafter devote a separate discourse; and may therefore do no more here now than note that it was an art which played a most important part in the embellishment of most of the ecclesiastical structures of Europe, certainly from the 11th century to the present time.

Another form in which glass was made subservient to the

representation of a picture, was through its association, in the form of enamel, with metallic bases. The original mode in which the art of enamelling was practised appears to have been that still used by the Chinese, in which recipients are formed for enamel pastes by twisting filagree wire into patterns forming compartments, and then soldering those wires to the face of metal sheets. The enamel pastes being filled into the compartments and fired, permanently held in their embrace the wires which received them, and prevented any displacement of either enamel or metal; making the whole, in fact, so strong as to admit of grinding, or rubbing down, to an uniform or even polished face.

An approximation to this process had previously been made both by the ancient Egyptians, and by the ancient Irish, but in both cases the metal base was dispensed with. The enamel was prepared in the form of a small slab, and was then probably cut at a gem-engraver's wheel, in such wise as to have cavities incised in its surface, which, being filled up by other and differently coloured enamels, and fired, presented a chequered appearance, produced by the contrast of the inserted enamel with that which formed the surface of the little slab.

The Gauls made both false and real enamels; the false being simply pieces of glass cut into small sizes, and set in thin metal wires soldered upon a metal backing and burnished down upon the glass. The real Gaulish enamels were made by cutting incisions into metal work, and then filling up those incisions with different coloured enamel pastes.

This last-mentioned process formed what was known as *Champlevé Enamel*, and was the variety of manufacture adopted at Limoges, and the products of which were known throughout the Middle Ages as constituting the *Opus Limovicum* so often alluded to in ancient inventories. This was deservedly popular in France and in England, and I need scarcely remind you of the monument of Aymer de Valence

in Westminster Abbey, which you will still find adorned by this interesting process.

In Italy, mainly by the use of *Translucent Enamel*, different varieties of the art were practised, which I may hereafter have an opportunity of detailing to you.

But the great change in its nature was effected in France in the time of Francis I., in the shape of a revival of the old skill of the enamel workers of Limoges. This improvement took the form of completely covering the metal slab with a sheet of enamel, transparent or opaque, or partially the one and partially the other; upon which, in many subsequent operations, additional colours were added, until the whole was made to present the semblance of a vitrified picture.

This variety of the art, and many other varieties, have been revived in France in the present day with the greatest success. We, as yet, remain much behind them; although in the commercial application of enamel, particularly to the covering of large surfaces of iron, we have laid the foundation of a trade destined, I believe, to have hereafter a most important influence upon the ornamental aspect of structure, and probably of furniture, in this country.

The great revival of glass-working, as known to and practised by the ancients, took place at Venice; but the original stimulus was no doubt communicated to that favoured city from the East through Byzantium.

The beautiful lamps placed as early as the year 1300 in some of the Mosques of Damascus and Mossoul bear testimony to the preservation of the traditions of the ancient manufactures amongst the Arabians of the Caliphate.

We find the earliest Venetian white glass decorated with colours not altogether dissimilar to those used upon these Arabian lamps; and whether the Venetian workers in that material arrived at the peculiar processes they carried to such perfection, through the study of remains of ancient



Roman glass, or whether the gradual development of the manufacture suggested the processes, and the processes engendered of themselves the specialities of design, must always remain a matter of doubt. I am inclined to believe that both influences had their share in the determination of the special form which Venetian glass assumed. The great estimation in which the Venetian manufacture was held throughout Europe, led to the establishment, in other countries, of extensive glass works; and the progress of science gradually removed the impurities which had interfered with the perfect clearness of the manufactured article.

With improvement in the manufacture, although not in the decorative use of the material, improvements were effected in cutting the facets, and brilliant prismatic effects were speedily obtained; leading to the general adoption of those forms for the substance, which transmitted the colours of the prism with the greatest brilliancy and effect.

Of late years in Venice, what was once supposed to be a lost trade has been entirely revived, and through the energy and ability of Signor Salviati, we once more see the fires of Murano alight, and the Venetian art-workman of the nineteenth century no less skilful than his ancestor of the sixteenth.

The branch of Industrial Art which may be comprehended under the term *Metallic*, is one upon which from the impossibility of so summarising its leading features within the limits of time which are still before us as to give you the faintest idea of their importance and interest, I dare not enter. It must be reserved for a future discourse, and I can only assure you that it will require the exercise of any powers of condensation I may possess, to give you within those limits even a faint idea of the peculiarities it assumed at various historical periods. It is but recently, that an able art critic (Mr J. M. Capes) found six evenings not too long in which to convey an idea to a body of art-workmen at

South Kensington, of the theory and practice of wrought iron-work alone; and this I cite only as an illustration of the all but impossibility of condensing, what could be in the slightest degree interesting to you, upon such a subject, within the space which I have yet left me.

The same may also be said of Textile Art, the importance of which at the present date is greater probably to the economist than to the lover of art. Both these branches of production form staples in which we have nationally long held a first-rate place in the world of industry. It is of course of the utmost importance that excellence in them should be maintained, but it is rather, I believe, through instruction to be given in institutions such as that noble one at South Kensington which I have just mentioned, than in this Lecture Room, that encouragement and correctives should be applied to those who have to labour to produce the desired result.

In metal work the necessity for instruction to you is far greater than in the theory for the production or decoration of Textiles, since almost every form of metal work allies itself, at every stage of its progress, with design; and according to your knowledge of what is good and what is bad in that branch of Industrial Art, will be the beauty and propriety of the metal work with which you will supply yourselves; and you, in that matter, can be looked upon only as a type of the general public. It is quite certain that it is not by chance that excellence in this or any branch of Industrial Art can be attained and kept up. Whether in Metallic Art, in Textile, or in that seventh and last form of Industrial Art which it is incumbent upon me to notice for a moment, *Pictorial Industry*, you can never hope to have the means of supplying yourselves with what is beautiful, unless you will take pains to aid in the production of that beauty. The colour which the decorative painter may cast around you, is neither more nor less than an atmosphere in which your

eye will either be strengthened or debilitated. If you accustom your eye only, or mainly, to contemplate what is satisfactory in colour to the highest taste, it will gradually become attuned to such delicacy of organization, as to instinctively reject what is repugnant to good taste. This education may be intuitive certainly, but the sensibility I speak of will never come to you without such education. Those who are born without natural gifts, in judging of colour, and indeed of beauty in all the Fine and Industrial Arts, should only the more zealously study the principles upon which excellence and beauty depend. Unless excellence and beauty become the characteristics of our national productions, we can never either assume or retain that supremacy in the arts of peace, which every true lover of his country should desire to secure for it.

Such problems are only to be worked out by those who possess an accurate knowledge of the elements upon which the solution of the greatest difficulties depends; and that accurate knowledge is only to be attained, I believe, by studying deeply the Fine Arts first, and subsequently the phenomena and laws connected with their application to *industry*.















