

yielding, and indicative of a tender, clinging disposition. So in a picture. If the purpose be to render something harsh or unpleasant, have as many straight lines as possible; but if it be some tale of love, or happiness, or deep feeling, let the curved lines predominate. But remember that in life no one feeling predominates:

"There's not a note attuned to mirth
But has its chord in melancholy;"

and, on the other hand,

"Every cloud has its silver lining."

And so, while the leading lines in a picture may be straight or curved, according to the sentiment, some of the minor lines should be of an opposite character.

The question of light and shade now commands our attention. And at the very outset I want to say that photographers seem to be ignorant of the term light and *shade*. It is my fortune to see photographs from all parts of the country, and I must say that almost without exception they simply revel in light and are absolutely devoid of shadow. When will photographers learn that brilliant sunshine is not invariably essential to picture making, and that, when the source of light is behind the camera, the lighting is at its very worst? In the first stage of my own photographic career, I photographed only in bright sunshine, and with the sun at my back. Then I could not get enough light, now I cannot get enough shadow. And so I want to impress upon you to-night the necessity of having shadow in a picture.

To treat the subject of lighting is not so simple a question as dealing with that of composition, for the distribution of light and shade depends very largely upon the latter. But still a few general principles may be laid down.

In the first place, there must be both light and shade, and he who grasps

that fact is a long way on the road to pictorial effect. Secondly, the lights and shadows must not be scattered, for nothing is more irritating to the eye than a number of scattered lights of equal value. Therefore, if possible, arrange the light and shadow in a mass, then the result will be breadth, a very essential principle in a picture. Again, there is no reason at all why light should predominate. In some subjects the reverse should be the case. I have in my mind's eye at the present moment a picture of Joseph Israels, which made a strong impression on me, an effect that still remains. The subject was a sad one, a woman weeping by a coffin, with a little one crying at her feet. At first glance the picture showed nothing but the bent figure of the woman who showed in strong relief against a dense black background, but as the eye looked the shade became luminous, and the outline, and at last the details of the coffin became visible, telling the whole story. The lighting suited the subject, and certainly at least three-fourths was filled with dark mass of shadow. In the average picture this is a fair proportion, three-fourths being either light or shadow, according to the idea to be portrayed. But here again there comes in one of the exceptions that are so important in pictorial work. While the lights and shadows should be in masses, these must be relieved by something of the opposite—that is to say, we must have some light in the mass of shadow and a shadow in the mass of light. This fact can often be utilised to great advantage, as by placing the most important figure of the composition, if light, against the deepest shadow, or if dark, against the highest light, we give it additional emphasis and enhance its value in the composition. But I must warn you