

ance to a full grown figure, nor is a figure sitting or stooping a companion to an upright figure.

(3) *Painting*, according to Hegel, is the *great romantic* art. Its medium is no longer, like that of Sculpture, a coarse material substrate, but the coloured plane, the spiritual play of light; it produces only the show of solid dimension. Hence, it is capable of expressing the whole scale of feelings, moods, and actions—actions full of dramatic movement.

(4) Of *Music* he speaks as the perfect sublation of space. Its material is tone (sound), the vibrations of a sonorous body. It leaves therefore the field of sensuous perception, and acts exclusively upon inner emotion. Its sphere is the breast of the sensitive soul. Music is the most subjective of arts.*

(5) But, he says, it is in *Poetry* that the tongue of art is loosed at last. Poetry is the *literary art* and has the power of universal expression. Its material is not sound, merely, but sound as speech, sound as the word, the sign of an idea, the expression of reason. But poetry does not shape this material at random, but only according to certain rhythmical and musical laws of verse. All the other arts unite in poetry—the *plastic* arts in the *epic*, representing in extended narrative the picturesque history of nations; *music* in *lyric* poetry, the expression of some inner condition of soul; the unity of both in the *drama* which exhibits the conflicts between individuals acting out of directly opposite interests.

In bringing together the subjects of literature and art, we are narrowing somewhat the provinces of both, and are thinking rather of literature as the product of thought, and art as embod-

ied in works of beauty; and the connexion which we wish to establish—or, rather, which we recognize as established and indissoluble—is one of two kinds. In the first place, we find that periods of great and earnest activity of thought precede or accompany periods of excellence in art. In the second place the principles of excellence in literature and art are substantially identical or analogical.*

It is a great error, as has been long ago remarked, to suppose that taste and genius in art have nothing to do with reason. We shall be sure to find that whenever a people is degraded in intelligence or morality, there is a corresponding deterioration in art; and that every great period of art has been preceded or accompanied by great intellectual activity, and not unfrequently by a revival in religion. One or two eras in the history of mankind may be selected in illustration of these statements

We can learn nothing on this subject from the Hebrew history, since painting and sculpture seem to have been interdicted to the Israelites; but ancient monuments of Egypt and Assyria are eminently worthy of attention, and we know that they belong to the heroic age of those great peoples.

It is, however, of Greece that we naturally think when we turn back to remote ages and seek to trace the connexion between art and the general progress of intelligence and action. The heroic age of Greece was short, but it was glorious. The period which is described roughly as the age of Pericles represents her greatest achievements in war, in literature, and in art. But we must begin somewhat earlier and go on to a later period than the actual epoch of Pericles.

And here, in the first place, it is interesting to note that the develop-

*Psychologists differ as to the order of the senses—some placing hearing, others sight in the highest place.

*The second part of the subject is not treated here.