

on a small scale—as though a man were to attempt to build a cottage of the size of Windsor Castle. Well, England took over these two features, because her commerce and intercourse were with France and with Holland; and the consequence is that the gardens of that period represent a sort of combination of those two elements; and also they run in two different lines, that is, some of them following the Holland idea, or the Dutch idea, and some of them following the French idea. Not, however, till the seventeenth century did they begin to develop some of the ideas of their own, and then during the eighteenth century they began that conflict which is continuing to this day in England and America—the conflict between the formal garden and the free garden, as they are called. This conflict comes down to the present time. Now, just a word or two about the nature of that, because that is perhaps the only practical outcome of what I have to say. The question upon which this strife turns is the question as to what the merit and use of a garden is—and here I am speaking of a garden particularly from its artistic point of view, not so much from the point of view of utilitarianism, although I cannot see any reason why you should call the production of fruits and vegetables which supply the physical and lower wants of man as any more practical than the presentation in a garden of the higher artistic features which supply, in far greater degree and in far greater prominence, the highest aspects of man. Surely that is as practical as the other; and it is that with which I wish to close in making a few general remarks. The point with the formal gardeners was this: that unless you train nature down into set and definite ways, and trim your hedges and flowers and so on, and trees, into ornamental shapes—pyramids, columns, even into the figures of animals and birds and that sort of thing—you are not really improving on nature, and you are not making nature express the highest possible amount of artistic effect of which it is capable. The free gardener, on the other hand, claims that unless you leave nature to follow her own sweet way, and simply enable her to do so to the greatest possible extent, you are not realizing the highest artistic effect. Now, it seems to me that there is a compromise, or at least meaning in this. Each one, to my mind, expresses a half truth, and it consists in this: that certainly with reference to the cultivation of flowers and trees and so on, and their arrangement, we are after the essence of natural beauty; but nature, in this as in other respects, in other forms of art, does not express to us, or turn out to us, in concrete shape, all the phases of her natural beauty altogether; and I am not such an ardent admirer of nature in the abstract as to believe that nature is always beautiful, because I have seen some things in nature that if one were confronted with them for a very long time would simply have a tendency to drive one mad. Therefore I believe that the extracting of the beauty from nature consists in taking the beautiful phases of nature and bringing these as closely and in as great variety within human ken and within human influence as possible. Now, in so far I agree perfectly with the idea of the free gardeners, that nature's principles, not man's principles of art, must lie at the basis of gardening, and that all man can do is simply to coax nature, to systematize and to arrange nature, but to give nature in the arrangement perfect freedom, and added opportunity if possible, to expand herself in color, in shape, in shade, and all that sort of thing; and from the fact that man has himself been produced, as it were, and grown up in the face of nature, so the earth shows to man, when it is cultivated wild, a natural thing and not an artificial thing; and we should therefore go to those who have lived in the presence of nature, and not to those whose ancestors had been born and brought up in cities for generations, to find what are the principles of gardening art. On the other hand, the houses and buildings about which these gardens are to be arranged are expressions of architectural art—a wholly different art, resting on natural principles of course, the natural principles of physics, of dynamics, and the conditions and the laws of gravity, and the nature of material, and so on. That is the fundamental element in architecture, and none of these must be violated without destroying all the after effects of architecture. Given these, the next range of elements that must be respected are human comfort, human convenience, the purpose for which the structure is constructed, whether it be municipal, state or domestic. Now, the last element in architecture is the ornamentation; but the ornamentation must not obliterate, contradict, or infringe upon any of these other requirements, but simply supplement them, beautify and render more perfect the fundamental elements as