

though it may have exerted a strong influence in determining some of the architectural forms.

The Greeks were a race peculiar, in that they were in a sense without a native land. They lived in the acts of their ancestors, and wherever they settled, even after many generations, were more loyal to their ancient heroes than to the land of their birth. Their Bible was the Iliad and Odyssey. In their early ornament, the greater part is the representation of scenes in the lives of their deified heroes. In most cases the sculptured ornament refers directly to the purposes of the building. In the purely decorative portions we find the native plants, especially the palm which grew in the neighborhood. It is found throughout their architecture, and used much the same as the Egyptians used the lotus. Although the palm has religious and historical interest for the Greeks, it is not safe to say that it was used on this account alone, for we find other plants almost, if not quite, as common, such as the honeysuckle and acanthus, which appear to have had little signification.

The essential property of the Greek ornament is its national and contemporaneous character. Everything was in artistic keeping with the life and dress of the people who stood about it. There was no attempt to resort to novelty by depicting the animals or dress of other nations. It was the Greek's idea of the "eternal fitness of things" which made his architecture what it is. The ornament is much more realistic than the Egyptian's, principally by reason of the high esteem in which the art was held. Since the sculptor was equal with the architect, his work took equal part with it, and the building was as much a pedestal on which to place the ornament as the ornament was the adorning of the building.

If we take a long step and consider the Gothic, we will have before us, perhaps, the latest vital style. The Gothic has been traced by the architectural historian directly from the classic. From his point of view, this is doubtless true. But, so rapid and thorough was the eliminating process carried on, that in its best period we find them absolutely dissimilar in form and feeling. The people were a religious race—probably as intensely so as any the world has ever seen. Its pictorial ornament was its religion; its floral decoration was the nature taken from its gardens and fields. Anything capable of decorative form was thought worthy of a place on its most glorious edifices. In many cases the ornament does not appear to have had especial signification, and yet the flower language at that time was so highly developed that exhaustive study might bring out very interesting results. In some cases the application is very marked, as the use of the lily, a flower dedicated to the Virgin, in the lady chapels in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and from that time becoming a striking architectural decoration.

An interesting application of our subject is in the use of the palm in Gothic. We find it in very early work in its classical form; not existing in nature in the country. It soon disappeared and was suddenly revived when the Crusaders returned, bringing large quantities from the Holy Land.

If we study the history of painting and sculpture, we will find this same steady growth, and with architecture we will find them at a standstill in the fifteenth century. This sudden change in the artistic world must have been caused by some great power which had a direct influence on the creators. We will find it at the exact period where we should expect it. That the decline of the art began with the invention of the printing press is no mere coincidence—one is the direct result of the other. A great and sudden impetus was given literature by this acquisition. The great minds of the day pressed into the field. All the great works of antiquity were described and put into concise form. Not content with this, literature proceeded to lay down rules for their imitation. She dictated the colors to be used in painting; she insisted that the sculptor should pose his models thus and so, or copy those things done before; she laid down laws for science and forbade investigation in certain lines; she furnished a set of measurements for architects—not in general, but to the width of a line for every portion of every building.

For three hundred years all progress in the arts was stopped. Painters spent their time copying work better done before, or putting into the eye of man that which had already been done by the ear. Architects, most deluded of all, reared buildings from descriptions and covered them with decoration, the originals of which in nature they had never seen. Since that time, each young mind, full of a desire to interpret the great truths which have come to him as, in communion with her, he has drunk in the beauties of nature, has been forced to have his senses blunted, his imaginations drowned, his very talents

stunted, by a constant repetition of forms he does not understand, the originals of which in nature he has never seen, and which in maturer years he admits to himself are essentially bad. Within this century the other arts have one by one returned to the great mother, nature, for inspiration.

If space permitted, it would be interesting to follow the emancipation of the various arts from the rules and limitations so long accepted; the conflict has been very similar in each, and one will answer as an example. Early in this century the illustrators for comic and other papers, through the necessities of their vocation and through their observations of nature, showed to others something of what might be done with contemporary life. This phase of art was taken up and followed by the "Little Masters," so called, who were men without much training, and had little to lose in the then correct art. These men produced little of value, principally because of their lack of mental vigor and training. Men of ability, until Delacroix, followed the accepted canons of art. Delacroix, the leader of the Romanticists, broke away from the classic school, yet with his followers took his subjects almost entirely from literature.

David, the opponent of Delacroix, backed as he was by a great emperor, did much to delay the progress of the new school, and it was left to Millet and the men of his day to depict the life about them and show what beauty nature holds out to those who love her. Color, however, was not sought out in the same spirit. The artist recognized that in most cases pure local color produced a color scheme crude and unbalanced.

It remained for Manet to discover the subduing and harmonizing effect of atmospheric color. This, in general, was the process of evolution. The names mentioned are given to show the time, rather than the persons, to whom we are indebted, for in all evolution each one striving for truth will produce something to make up the advance. It is no longer necessary for our sculptors and painters to dress our statesmen in Roman togas nor our soldiers in coats of mail to indicate wherein they serve the people. Artists have a more subtle method of transmitting thought.

The true artist receives into his soul a feeling; if he can transmit this feeling to another, his mission has not been in vain. This is the true value of art. Without this carrying power the work is worthless from an artistic standpoint. It may be true and serve its purpose as history. How this feeling is reproduced we know not, nor shall we know until the laws of hypnotism and other psychical phenomena are understood. We do know that it cannot exist, except it first existed in the artist. No rules are of any avail. In all the arts, except architecture, these things are accepted. In them the artists have passed the debatable ground and are working together in a new and rich field. That the public is awakening, there is no longer doubt. It responds to the thrilling chords of modern music; it crowds our art galleries, it fills our libraries. That "one touch of nature which makes the whole world kin" is fast making it an intelligent, discerning and receptive one.

Let us now take up the parallel of architecture. Architectural literature has led architecture since the fifteenth century. The premises, as we have seen, were not correct, however logically may have been the course followed since; the position now arrived at is beyond comprehension. Go where you will in our country and in every city, you will find men at work cutting holes in the facades of buildings built after the best architectural textbooks; so universal is this practice, that more than one-half of the large buildings have undergone this operation and a large proportion of the remainder are tenantless. Year after year architects rear buildings, pointing out their archaeological beauties, and science follows close behind with a sledge-hammer and makes a wreck of the archaeological part of them. So evident is this that the people now demand and are receiving a logical construction. The architect recognizes the necessity, and clings to ancient construction solely that he may employ ancient ornament. This he distorts out of all proportion in order to form a compromise with a useful construction. Constantly dissatisfied with the results, flits from style to style.

Just now the Renaissance is in vogue, and the Davids of architecture are taking the bright minds from the hotbed of America and shutting them up in the refrigerator of all progress—Italy, a country which never developed a style; a country where each style, being imported, began at its best and rapidly degenerated. Nature, that great storehouse of artistic supply, never furnished nourishment for the Renaissance style; except at the first, where it appears to have taken its inspiration directly from the Greek, it is a book architecture nourished by the dogmas of Vitruvius.

For four hundred years we have choked in our efforts to suck