

RELATION OF THE ARCHITECT AND THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT.*

We have been considering the beginning and growth of landscape architecture. Let us now so far forget these facts, both historical and present, that we may conceive of the profession as having attained a recognized membership in the sisterhood of the arts. The reason for thus taxing your imagination is that I may discuss, in a general way, the probable or ideal relation of the architect and the landscape architect. It will be recalled that the last of the 17th century found the architect supreme over house and grounds, but that the beginning of the 18th century found the architect confined to the house, while the grounds fell to the independent charge of the landscape architect. On the one hand, the architect felt that his domain had been usurped by a people unsympathetic in their feelings and incapable in their lack of training to govern that field which he had been compelled to evacuate; while on the other hand, the usurpers no doubt felt, at least to a degree, the justice of this reproach and were therefore stimulated the more to differentiate their value, first by ridiculing the traditional style of designing grounds, and second, by creating a taste for a new style that in every way diverged from the traditional. Hence, there was little success in harmonizing the two interests which had heretofore been one, for the simple reason that there were two heads for the two distinct departments, working not only independently but even antagonistically. The extent to which this spirit of antagonism still lingers between the architect and the landscape architect is somewhat uncertain. Opinions will vary according to experiences. It is certainly less than it was, but more than it ought to be. It is a question which though easily solved theoretically, must in practice be worked out by the sum of individual experiences. This question has been mooted from the very inception of landscape architecture, and as long as it remains unsettled the related work of the architect and the landscape architect will be inharmonious. There can be no doubt as to the true cause for the continual inhospitality of the architects, for as a class, they represent a thoroughly trained capacity for design, while the landscape architects, as a class, represent quite the reverse. In other words, it is the friction which must inevitably arise when scientific training is pitted against knowledge which is purely empirical. This difficulty, however, is obviously the result of imperfect growth, and will be solved by the gradual specialization of a trained class of men.

But let us return to the main question of the relation between the architect and the landscape architect. Repton, the father of landscape architecture, fully realized the importance of this question. "Where buildings are introduced," he says, "art declares herself openly, and should, therefore, be very careful, lest she have cause to blush at her interference. It is this circumstance that renders it absolutely necessary for the landscape gardener to have a complete knowledge of architecture. This remark proceeds from the frequent instances I see continually of good houses built without any taste, and attempts to embellish scenery by ornamental buildings, that are totally incongruous to their respective situations." The vital

importance of selecting the best site and of fixing the grade of the first floor level is seldom appreciated. Upon it depends all consequent arrangement of details, such as the driveway approach, the house garden, forecourt and so on. And as these details in their turn affect and determine all the outlying arrangements of lawn grades, plantations and other units of the whole scheme, the importance of fixing the house grade and site is still more emphasized. Thus while all questions involving the immediate vicinity of the house should be settled in conference, yet such points as these should tend to subserve the interests of the whole arrangement of the grounds; hence Repton's position is, that while the landscape architect should have no official voice in the actual designing of the house, the style and general arrangement, location and disposition of the house and grounds should be officially determined by the necessities of the landscape architect's general plan; for as he says further, "to my profession belongs chiefly the external part of architecture, or a knowledge of the effect of buildings on the surrounding landscape."

A similar problem, or rather a part of the same problem, points to the logical ultimate of this question. The time was when the architect was also the engineer, the painter, the sculptor, and the landscape architect. But now the architect employs the expert engineer to determine upon the necessities of construction, and to a certain extent, co-operates with the painter and the sculptor—that is, in his building he allots the spaces and positions for the mural decorator and the sculptor, and even determines the spaces and positions for the pictures. In other words, the architect confines himself to the general lines and forms and externalities of the building, while the surface and details are filled in by the specialist. Having decided these questions so as to secure an harmonious division of his general scheme, the sculptor and the painter are independent of further limitations, save that of their own genius.

Now there can be no doubt as to the soundness of this position, of the generalship and supervision which the architect has over the building which he designs. It not only provides for a perfect and harmonious whole, but it secures expert skill for each division of the whole. It needs but the extension of this principle, now universally accepted, to recognize the logical answer of the question under discussion. Here there is the added problem of the grounds. When it is a matter of large tracts of land, such as Central Park, it is no longer a question as to who shall design it. It falls naturally to the landscape architect. In designing such tracts of land, the position and sites for public buildings, statuary, and other objects of allied arts are determined and regulated by the general design. It could not well be otherwise; and it is obvious that the position here indicated applies of necessity to much smaller tracts of ground. Therefore, the logical answer to the question seems to be solved thus: the landscape architect shall decide upon the design for the whole property. For example—the units of treatment both in large and small private grounds are generally the sites for the house, stable and out-houses, and sometimes for the sculptural work; the kitchen and flower gardens, the drives and walks, and the regulations for the grades and levels of the buildings, the planting and drainage systems, and such architectural features as

*Abstract of a Paper by Mr. Geo. F. Pentecost, of New York, presented before the Architectural League of America, Toronto, May, 1902.