

original or important in domestic architecture; it is simply the reflex of the ideas that were carried out in a larger scale and in an original degree in the social and religious architecture.

When, however, we come to the Roman we begin to note the separation, the development of a style of architecture that was more domestic and an application to it of original features, as is shown in the Pompeian remains, and that was partly due to the fact that the old Roman religion had gone to decay. The features of individualism creep in and change the character of architecture. The Roman architecture is the first, it seems to me, which shows a wantonness, which no longer expresses the purity of an aspiration. The buildings often lack high character and chastening purpose. Thus, there is the application of ornament merely as ornament. Now, that never was shown before; it was ornament subordinated to the great purpose of the temple or the structure.

The next great movement that I want to touch on in this connection, is the development of architecture through the Christian church. We come back, through the Christian church when it had dropped its individualism, and got to be a unified church, to a great organization with aspirations of a high order. Under the church the Roman Empire again took the lead of civilization, both socially and religiously. There we get a structure that calls forth once more all that is great in man; and once more it finds visible expression in architecture. The domestic habitations at the time of the building of the great cathedrals were poor things, attracting little attention; and the castles and keeps were for strength, and if strength were got, ornament or any higher aspect of architecture was largely neglected. There was indeed a secondary influence coming in afterwards from the religious side, which rendered these feudal keeps and castles more artistic and architectural. But the great cathedrals of Europe once more expressed in themselves thorough appropriateness and great human interest. There you see once more that no sacrifice, no artistic ability, no power that can be suggested, is too great for the realization of this idea; and therefore, they built as well and as nobly as ever they possibly could; but in doing so they were doing just what the primitive savage had done in setting up his council house, in ornamenting it and associating his life with it. But from the time of the great religious structures we come to a condition of things which, as soon as we strike the decay of the religious feeling—not at the Reformation, but before the Reformation—is very mixed once more. Take the Renaissance movement in Italy, and you observe the revival of an interest in art for art's sake, which in the absence of other inspiration is a very dubious standard; thus there were produced some very good things and some quite monstrous things. Again we come back to the suggestion in the decadent Roman architecture. People are ordered to put up buildings by some great civic or church authority, and they are ordered to ornament them in certain ways; not for the glory of God, but for the expression of human magnificence. In that they may run to all sorts of extremes, and thus we have the vagaries that are committed, even though they are checked and corrected by those who have a purer and larger conception of their art. Even amidst the corruption of the period there were those who began to develop standards of art for

themselves, and to look at art as a conscious spiritual expression. However, from that time down, we see all manner of vagaries and all kinds of mixtures for the reason that western civilization was breaking up into self-conscious fragments. The further down we come and the more utilitarian man becomes, the more completely does he get at sixes and sevens in his architecture. The best part of it for a time really comes to be semi-domestic, namely, the mansions of the great feudal lords, now a landed aristocracy, who took a real interest in their feudal domain, and who wished to raise these worthy structures of theirs, great domestic castles and baronial halls in England and France and other places, which would be worthy of their power, of their position in society and the state.

Thus once more we notice that these things are, if I may use the expression, owned of nature. That is largely after all what gives such a marvelous attraction to some of the great country houses in England? It is their complete unity with their setting, with the surroundings, with the character and life of the people at the time, and that is the only true standard, I think, in the end.

I shall have cause to refer to that again, because I think we are coming back to that, and it is one of the hopeful signs of the present; but what I have to notice first is the very mixed era that comes between the great cathedral-building period and the present day, when people's ideas seemed to be so much at sixes and sevens, and the utilitarian spirit prevailed, the spirit which put up a structure to serve a purpose and thought any kind of a building was good enough. Some people, however, had further ideas. They seemed to say to themselves that it would be just as well to ornament that building, to give it a more graceful form, or something of that sort. Thus they came to apply ornament in an external and dead sort of a way to a building erected, with no aspiration that demanded the ornament, or that determined that this kind of ornament can be used and the other kind cannot; or that this atmosphere and this setting demands certain things, and that situation is utterly inconsistent with certain others. And thus we get those monstrosities in architecture where you have no end of work often, and great expense, but extremely little effect, or a negative effect. Coming down to our own country and applying some of these tests, what we find is the development nowadays of the imitative, the merely imitative feature; certain things in this building are admired, and other things in that building are admired, and the party who admires them seems to think it would be a good idea to combine these things together and make a structure of some sort; and thus we get freaks. The dwelling house is frequently designed as a very costly affair, and apparently no thought is given to the situation, the climate, or anything else in the appropriateness of the parts. The result is sometimes congruous, by matter of accident; and sometimes quite incongruous both in its interior and exterior, and in its setting. That was the characteristic feature of much of the architecture of America during the past century, except for people and architects who came over from Europe, and in the first generation produced here and there things that had some feeling and setting.

I have been very much struck with that in Ontario. In going about the Province I have come across houses with grounds attached where there