

But in making it harmonious with nature, it will not do simply to imitate the past. There is no use in our imitating the temple of the Greek, or the temple of the Egyptian or the Assyrian. Why? Because we have not their point of view; we have not their special aspirations, we have passed that stage long ago, and we might as well say that the cathedral-building Christians should have taken the Egyptian type, or that the Egyptians should have developed the Christian type. No. Both these things are perfectly splendid in their way, because they properly express the aspirations and feelings of the people at the time; and there is no architecture that will stand, it seems to me, that does not do that. We have, to-day, surely enough life and vigor and high aspiration to find their own appropriate clothing and setting so that they will, on the one hand, be the expression of civic and social interest, and on the other hand, be owned of nature. I know of no direction in which our wealthy men, our millionaires and so on, can more wisely spend their money, if they have to spend it on themselves, than in building fine mansions. That is what redeems Britain from being a very commonplace country in many ways, with a horrible climate nearly half the year, and yet great men putting their wealth into the state-ly, beautiful country houses, with their surrounding parks, have redeemed the country and educated the people. The mansion of the wealthy man is not merely for him; it may educate the people, it may raise their standards. It may ameliorate the ideas of life in a thousand ways, for all the community as well as for the owner; even as regards the interior of it, for there our English relatives set us an example, too, because they have freely opened their treasures and their interiors to the public; that is, to people who can appreciate them and derive benefit from them. And it seems to me that it is the duty as well as the privilege of our modern architects to direct the architectural movement in America, and to give us something that will be at once social and the embodiment of aspirations, and hence educative as well. And so it is proper that architecture should once more associate with itself in a perfectly normal and natural way all the other arts that were so long divorced from it; mural decoration, and statuary, and all these things shall come in once more and be harmoniously developed. (Applause).

DISCUSSION.

Mr. Symons: Mr. President and Gentlemen,—It was only from my desire to hear some discussion on Professor Shortt's able lecture that I could be prevailed upon to say a few words this afternoon. Prof. Shortt has taken us back to the time when art was an unconscious element, a mere protoplasm, a microbe. I do wish that there was something that could not be traced back to that blessed microbe; we are always face to face with these fearsome quantities, and now, if you please, our beloved calling has been traced back to such weird ancestry! Some of you may remember the words of Sir Joshua Reynolds—"the end of all art is to make an impression on the feelings and imaginations." There is no doubt that the first call upon architecture, its first duty, was simply to house the body; simply to form such a protection for the services of life, or as might provide for bare necessity. These requirements were met, and during the process other necessities became apparent, those which Prof. Shortt has mentioned,

namely the natural instinct for the beautiful, the true, the awful and the sublime; these had likewise to be satisfied; and it is in the development and satisfying of these nobler attributes of our nature that architecture finds its outlet. And as he said, as soon as a man has amassed wealth he endeavors to build himself a home that shall not only be the home of a wealthy man, but shall express his feelings and aspirations; and the means he has acquired enable him to satisfy his taste for what is beautiful and true. And the same thing may be said of a city. As soon as a city becomes prosperous the citizens endeavor to see how they can make it beautiful. We hear very little about beautifying our city, opening up squares, avenues or parks in hard times or in times of growth; but in prosperity, when we begin to feel that it can be afforded, we commence to look beyond the mere animal and gratify the desires of our higher nature. Have we not a perfect example of that growth without intense individualism, which Prof. Shortt so rightly upholds—and which was referred to by our President this morning when he said that we do not want the intensely individual in architecture—have we not that spirit beautifully shown in the history of Venice? In Mrs. Oliphant's book, "The Makers of Venice," she writes: "Where are her authors? Where are her sculptors? Where are her great men? Where are her poets? You cannot find them; you meet them nowhere. Instead of the man who made her what she is, we find everywhere the great Venice herself, the center of all their aspirations, the mistress of their affections; enacing themselves, thinking of nothing but her glory." It seems to me that what is so degrading in our own profession is the absurd endeavor to be intensely individual—individual in design, individual in attacking the great problems of the age, individual in every portion of our calling. How seldom it is that we call in the aid of a sculptor, of a decorator, or the aid of a landscape gardener when we are endeavoring to plan large schemes. No, we think so much of our individual power; we can do it all ourselves; and are we in consequence very far on in the life that Prof. Shortt has outlined to us? I am afraid we are not. We should aim to lose our individuality in the love of our profession, of our city and of our country. We have in our midst monuments that are grotesque in themselves and exemplify what I am speaking of; we have beautiful bits of sculpturing with badly designed bases; we have interiors designed without any relation whatever to intended decoration. I think the note that I would take from both Prof. Shortt's lecture and the remarks of our own President to-day, is this: To endeavor as architects and as a professional body to lose ourselves in the endeavor to benefit the city, the country, architecture and art. How can we best accomplish this? Sir Joshua Reynolds was looked upon as a great painter, as a great worker, perhaps more than as a great aesthetic in his art, and he sums up the cause of all his greatness in his last lecture before the Institute in saying: "If we are determined to excel as individuals or collectively, men must go to their work whether willing or unwilling, morning, noon and night, and they will find it to be no play, but on the contrary, very hard labor." I know we have a problem ahead of us to benefit ourselves and others by this losing of ourselves, and it is not play, it is hard work. I have much pleasure, Mr. President, in moving a hearty vote of thanks