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This book is not published because of any insufficiency in the number of works devoted to Art-culture, but because, notwithstanding all that has been written upon the subject, guiding principles are still unelucidated; a collection of opinions has been substituted for a code of fundamental laws, and this collection is diffused over a succession of disconnected volumes, the perusal of which leaves one under the impression that aesthetic appreciation in one department has nothing whatever to do with aesthetic appreciation in another. We are told in a recent treatise that "principles are indeed necessary," but that "they must be the servants of the decorator and not his master."¹ My object is to show that they must be not only his master, but his sole guide. In attempting the attainment of this object I have omitted my own name from the title-page, aimed at conciseness, avoided as far as possible the use of technical expressions, restricted such observations as it was necessary to make to localities and places which are generally known, abstained from trenching upon

¹ 'House Decoration,' Art at Home Series, p. 16.
the domain of private life, and, in order to show that an identical process of reasoning applies to all, brought within one view various subjects which it has hitherto been customary to consider separately.

I am aware there are inconveniences attending an endeavor to be brief; but it is requisite to caution the reader—especially the lady reader—against one only, that is, to take nothing without its context. Upon page 226, for example, the 'blue and green' suggested by M. Blanc has been deprecated "as manifesting neither harmony by contrast nor harmony by similarity." Unless this be read in connection with the remarks upon pages 219 and 224, wherein shades and hues of positive color are expressly commended, it may be held to exclude such exquisite combinations as may be observed upon the tail of a peacock; whereas my intention is to exclude only positive blue in conjunction with positive green.

The sketches have been done by myself in pen-and-ink, and transferred to print by the Typographic Company. Not being designed as patterns, but as mere illustrations, they will not, I hope, be scrutinized hypercritically; for although wood-engravings would have been much better executed, the cost of obtaining them might have placed the book beyond the reach of many for whom it is intended.
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THE SCIENCE OF TASTE.

INTRODUCTION.

Taste may be concisely defined as the capability of appreciating the Beautiful; and the Beautiful is, primarily, that which, by attracting the eye, satisfies and elevates the mind.

There exists such diversity in matters of taste, that we have accustomed ourselves to consider its amenability to laws as visionary and hopeless. But this arises chiefly from the habit of confounding what may properly be termed aesthetic appreciation with that which is mere personal predilection or individual preference. In a minor degree, the practice of regarding rules as synonymous with principles, and of confusing that which may happen to please with that which is best calculated to do so—these also are concomitant elements in those erroneous notions which retard the development of Taste as a Science. If we would permit ourselves to mark the distinction between that which may adventitiously gratify, and that which ought to do so because it is approved by reason and is in accordance with natural analogy, we would be com-
pelled to acknowledge a far greater uniformity of appreciation than we are apt to suppose from the frequent use of such phrases as that "tastes are so various as to be beyond the influence of rational discussion." It often happens that a man likes one thing before his attention is directed to another, just as he may relish one dish until he partakes of a better. Devise, however, something essentially good, something which satisfies the common yearnings of civilized humanity, and it will as surely court universal approbation as the skill of the accomplished chef will elicit general commendation.

No better illustration of popular misconception can here be adduced than that treated of in Chapter IV. A friend rejoicing in the glories of the imagination, or aiming at discovering artistic proficiency alone, triumphantly points to a ceiling embellished with sky, clouds, doves, and angels, and exultingly exclaims, "Is not this fine!" You cannot go into ecstasies over it; you feel it ought not to be there. You essay your reasons; he will not listen to reasons. He shrugs his shoulders, pities your want of appreciation, and cuts short all controversy by giving you to understand that disapproval is immaterial, because whether you like it or do not like it is entirely a question of "taste." Such decoration is radically wrong, since a house being a purely artificial thing, and a roof an absolutely necessary thing, no attempt should be made to impart to the
ceiling a semblance of intangibility, or to suggest exposure to the open air. The friend can assign no reason for his approval beyond the circumstance that he likes it, and when he tells you it is a matter of “taste,” he really means that the thing he admires suits his own predisposition.

Now Taste, as contradistinguished from predilection, is eminently a subject within the influence of rational discussion. It will not be long before principles are established in this as in every other science; and if we deduce our rules from those ascertainable laws written upon the open volume of Nature before us, we shall have no difficulty in ascertaining what is best calculated to please the eye, gratify the mind, elevate the sentiments, and conduce to that general harmony which prevails in creation around us; which the spirit of man so earnestly desires, but which the folly of man so materially impedes.

But it is idle to expect any effectual progress in popular appreciation unless we bear in mind the distinction already adverted to between rules and principles; unless we treat the subject more as a matter of judgment than of mere sentiment; unless attention be drawn to the why and wherefore of æsthetic propositions. It would be difficult to name even any book which goes beyond telling us that we ought to admire this, that, or the other, without assigning any reason for doing so; or that we ought to adopt one thing and
avoid another because some one else—some antecedent "authority"—has done so. Principles are the bases of rules; the firm foundations upon which a superstructure of attractiveness is raised; and it ought to be obvious that to propound rules without supporting them by broad, fundamental laws, is virtually but to enunciate a series of mere personal opinions.

Although, however, Taste primarily concerns itself with that which is best calculated to please the eye, there is no reason why it should not embrace more than this. By a sort of tacit understanding it has become usual among writers thus to circumscribe its signification: possibly from an apprehension that the subject might otherwise branch out into interminable ramifications. In every-day life it is common enough to applaud or stigmatize sayings and actions as manifesting good or bad taste, and it would be difficult to assign any valid reason for the exclusion from written treatises of subjects which in ordinary conversation are practically recognized as constituent elements of a science. The apprehension is at first sight well founded; yet there is no real difficulty so long as we abstain from trenching upon the province of erudition, and confine ourselves to those rudimentary propositions which are suggested by the contemplation of natural harmony. When a cantata is said to have been executed with excellent taste, it is not so much meant that a knowledge of technique has been displayed, as
that a sympathetic response has been made to intuitive aspirations. When a statesman refrains from observations which may unnecessarily irritate the susceptibilities of a foreign people, he thereby exhibits no erudition, but a commendable appreciation of what conduces to the maintenance of good-will. These are essentially matters which fall within the province of Taste; the very essence of which is harmony, not only in all that appertains to material beauty, but in all that is productive of mental gratification.
CHAPTER I.

ARTISTIC CONSTRUCTION.

Among the means best calculated to please the eye, a position of pre-eminence has by common consent been assigned to the Art of Painting. Neither with this, however, nor with Sculpture is it the purpose of these pages to deal, excepting in so far as to indicate the manner in which they may be associated with Architecture so as to afford to the spectator the maximum of gratification. For, paradoxical as it may seem, these arts ought, properly speaking, to be subordinated to Architecture; and if this position be not accepted for them, we may witness once more the renascence of that jealous obtrusiveness which but two centuries ago manifested itself in the extravagant floridity of Genoese ornament. It is a matter of no little importance that the principles of Taste should find expression in artistic construction, for unless the masses be surrounded by objects which are beautiful, we can scarcely expect the growth of that refinement which ought to distinguish a wealthy and prosperous people. Were these principles generally understood, builders would cease to build, because few would inhabit, the melancholy terraces of
gloomy dwellings which disfigure every quarter of our metropolis; the whole aspect of London might be changed; a great deal of money now lavished in foreign parts might find its way into the pockets of our own countrypeople, and thousands might be induced to abide upon their native shores who in the present condition of things migrate in search of more agreeable residence abroad. I am by no means desirous of appearing to dictate to professional gentlemen, but am simply indicating what seems to be, in my humble judgment, a desirable element in a liberal education.

Æsthetically considered, there is nothing which falls within the category of artistic construction except among people of the Caucasian race. The Coptic structures of ancient Egypt, howsoever marvellous; the Mongolian temples of China and Japan; the monoliths and pagodas of the early Hindus, present but few features worthy of imitation. It is only when we come to the Greeks, the Romans, the Saracens, and the people of Western Europe who in the fourteenth century elaborated that exquisite Pointed style commonly known as the Gothic, that we find materials for admiration at every turn.

Upon the growth of Architecture it is unnecessary in a treatise of this nature to dwell. Suffice it to say that the leading characteristics of Grecian construction are the colonnade, the sculptured frieze, and pedi-
ment; that the arch is supposed to have been unknown to them, and to have been introduced only after the Macedonian conquest,—although recent discoveries in Asia Minor somewhat militate against this hypothesis;—that it forms a distinguishing feature in Roman design; that it is a vast improvement upon the rigid lines of their predecessors, and that it is an indispensable element in successful construction at the present day. After the transfer of the capital to Byzantium oriental extravagances became engrafted upon the grand simplicity of the Roman style, and thence arose the Byzantine, a very good specimen of which, although somewhat fantastic, is afforded in the Cathedral of St. Mark’s in Venice.

The twelfth century witnessed the incipience of that most exquisite method known as the Gothic, with its pointed arch and steeple, its buttresses, its mullion windows, chamfered edges, foliations, delicate tracery, and exquisite elaborations. From its almost simultaneous adoption by those nations which had taken part in the Crusades, the germs of this style are supposed to have been borrowed from the Saracens; and certainly there is a striking resemblance in the shape of the arch, in the spires, and in other salient characteristics. In the South Kensington Museum is a photograph from an unfinished mausoleum to Ali Adil Shah, which bears a most remarkable similitude to that of a ruined abbey. Exquisite, however, as this
style is, it is adapted in its integrity to ecclesiastical edifices alone. With the spread of Protestantism and with the suppression of the monasteries by Henry VIII, it speedily fell into disuse, for so distasteful had the ascendency of the priesthood become that a mode of construction associated with Papal Supremacy and obnoxious tenets could not be expected to maintain its popularity. The diffusion of education and the increase of wealth gave rise to others more suited to seminaries of learning and to domestic habitations, and thus arose the Tudor and Elizabethan. These are admirably adapted to both the climate and landscape of Britain, and may be characterized as essentially national.

While progress was thus in one direction made among ourselves, Italy beheld the birth of the Renaissance. Surrounded as the descendants of the Romans were with noble and numerous monuments of ancient grandeur, it was natural that with the development of commercial greatness they should resuscitate rather than devise, and it was natural too that a style so admirably suited to palatial edifices should be introduced into and welcomed in England. But with its introduction set in a spirit of revivalism; revivalism led to copying, copying brought about the extinction of national inventiveness, and the land became inundated with structures as remarkable for hideous insipidity as for absolute unsuitability. The Tudor died out; the Elizabethan died out; the Renaissance died out; the
cultivation of classical learning led to the imitation of classical forms, and the result manifested itself in those gloomy memorials of the Georgian era, which have contributed so materially to damage upon the Continent our reputation for aesthetic perception. Few buildings are so unsightly as our National Gallery, London University, British Museum, and Mint; and there is, perhaps, none in the whole world so abominable as the Town Hall at Brighton.

We are now in the Victorian age, and although it is said that the Victorian age will hereafter be spoken of with eulogy, although the present generation has witnessed the erection of beautiful and costly edifices, yet, what is the actual condition of Architecture at this present moment? What proportion do those buildings which attract and rivet attention bear to those which disappoint and irritate? What institution have we where the principles of artistic construction are insisted upon? What department of the State concerns itself with the development of Taste? What assurance is there that when designs are submitted to public competition the best shall be selected? At one time there is a "Gothic" revival, at another "Queen Anne"; then "streaky-bacon" has a turn; and now the world has gone mad after red brick. There appears to be no unanimity among designers; no settled comprehension among the public. An unsymmetrical pile of confused insipidity is already occupying a chief place
among our civic edifices, and the aspect of the metropolis—always excepting some parts of the City proper—is a standing reflection upon the character of national refinement.

The chief obstacle to contend against is the influence of Fashion—that insatiable desire for novelty which precludes the retention of what is good, and creates an unceasing demand for innovation. We revive, not because we come to perceive that there are excellences in one style which are wanting in another, but because, having no settled principles to guide us, we are vacillating and capricious. It is only by disseminating a knowledge of principles, or drawing attention to what appear to be principles, and by appealing to popular judgment, that we shall be able to establish a spirit of true eclecticism as a barrier against the inroads of that capricious Goddess.

One of the first things to bear in mind is that it is eminently desirable to establish, and maintain if we can, a national mode of construction; that is, a mode thoroughly adapted to our climate and to the genius of its people. This we at one time had, but the extension of intercourse with foreign parts, the growth of cosmopolitanism, and the assumption of self-imposed "missions," appear to be undermining that proud patriotism which should impress itself upon the productions of every great people. Our neighbors, who have concerned themselves more with the prosperity of
their own country than with the "regeneration" of others, have long established such a style admirably suited to their wants. By the exercise of common sense—which, as we shall see further on, is a leading element in Taste—they have rendered their capital the most attractive in the world, and the result is a constant drain of money into their pockets, half of which, probably, comes from England itself. Might we not do likewise? Are we to perpetually borrow or revive? Borrowing is virtually the admission of an inferiority we must be compelled to accept unless we strike out a path of our own. It would not be difficult to do this, even without actual originality, provided we selected and combined with discrimination. Within the present century it was usual to set up a pagan temple for Christian worship, to back an Athenian portico with a steeple, to erect memorials copied from those in Rome, and trophies "designed" after the monoliths of Egypt. We had Algerine Pavilions, Egyptian Halls, Trajan Columns, Gothic Granaries, and Cleopatra Needles by the score (Fig. 1). Even for the very lampposts, as we may witness throughout the region of Mayfair, the brain of the Briton appeared to soar no higher than the obelisk. And this taste has not died out. Nor will it do so until we perceive and practically acknowledge the false reasoning upon which it is founded.

It has pleased the Omnipotent to give us diversity of
climate, diversity of product, diversity of race, and we can no more transfer the architectural modes of other countries without their accompanying divergence in

Fig. 1.

manners and customs than we can transplant the flora of other climes without their soil and temperature. Ignoring this, we have accustomed ourselves to con-
sider merely whether or not a thing is intrinsically worth imitating, and if it be thought so, to adopt it. It may be so—it may be even intrinsically beautiful—and yet offend against the first necessities of Taste. It is said, for instance, that the Royal Exchange is a perfect specimen of Grecian Architecture. Is it adapted to the purpose for which it was intended? Are City brokers to transact business in an open court, exposed to the pelting rain which descends upon our favored island the greater portion of the year? Do we expect to find insurance underwriters swarming forth from a Grecian Temple? Is it in any way suited to the character of surrounding architecture? It is said that the church of St. Pancras is another beautiful specimen; that it is an exact copy of the Erechtheium. What, we may ask, is an Erechtheium doing in London? It is not only out of harmony with neighboring edifices, but absolutely unadapted to northern latitudes. A few years since it was deemed desirable to erect a public monument to Captain Speke. Speke was an Englishman, and had served in our army; the monument was to be set up in the Kensington Gardens, a place peculiarly British in the character of its scenery; yet, because Speke had devoted himself to explorations in Africa, therefore his monument assumed the form of an obelisk. Does not this obelisk create in the mind a sense of incongruity as perplexing as that which arises from the contemplation of the Chinese
Page in the Kew Gardens, or the Saracenic Café over the Railway Station at Blackfriars Bridge? When the "Turkish bath" emerged into popularity, buildings were erected all over England in the Turkish Style. Why? In the first place, what is known as the Turkish Bath is not a Turkish bath at all, but a Roman bath, in common use for centuries anterior to the conquest of Byzantium. In the next place, is it not absurd to import the Turkish style when it cannot be accompanied by Turkish accessories?

Again, we are creatures of habit, powerfully influenced by association, and therefore, even if a method of construction be of native origin, it should not be used for one class of edifice when it has been ordinarily employed for another. We have lately been overwhelmed with the results of a Gothic Revival, and the advocates of that style have told us that it was not restricted in its palmy days to ecclesiastical architecture. Does this affect the question when we know that it is the characteristic of almost every church in the kingdom? We feel that it is associated with the restraints and austerities of public worship, and no man relishes the impression, when visiting an acquaintance, that he is about to enter into a house of prayer. The Midland Terminus Hotel, with its spires, turrets, and Gothic windows; does it look like an hotel? Does it harmonize with one's notions of what an hotel ought to be? Those innumerable residences on Haverstock
Hill, with their pointed-arch portals; have they that inviting, comfortable aspect which family dwellings ought to have? There is a conservatory attached to one of the mansions in Kensington Palace Gardens which bears a most striking resemblance to a chapel. What sort of "taste" do those persons display who thus ignore the natural and cherished associations of the intellect, and fail to denote the character of an edifice by an outward and visible impress?

These, then, are the first things we should bear in mind; that congruity and harmony are as essential as intrinsic beauty; that styles should not be needlessly intermingled; and that it is highly desirable to impart, if we can, a distinctive stamp to our method of construction.

The members of the Metropolitan Board of Works periodically exult in the improvements effected through their agency; the vastness of our resources is an inexhaustible subject of congratulation, and Britons are never wearied of pointing to the extent of their metropolis as an evidence of ever-increasing prosperity. Can the aspect of our capital be compared with that of Paris, or even with that of the little State of Belgium, which we have so magnanimously taken under our protection? As a centre of commerce its miles of warehouses are imposing enough; but otherwise, how insipid its architecture; how gloomy its long lines of unbeautiful terraces; how bespattered with mud its
streets; how begrimed with soot its buildings; how unprovided with requisites for the recreation and enjoyment of the people; how depressing its social atmosphere! Is Taste to concern itself with outward forms alone, and not trace defects in these forms to their source? The very magnitude of our metropolis is a reflection upon national refinement; for is not the constant increase of radius owing to the circumstance that families can not live in suites as they do abroad; and also to the fact that, in consequence of the smoke impregnating our atmosphere, and the disgraceful state of our streets and pavements, people are forced to move into more cleanly localities? It is all very well to say that the English are a singularly domestic people, and love isolation; that our systems are different from continental systems; that almost all municipal functions are vested in corporate bodies, and that corporate bodies have often proved themselves very useful in repelling the encroachments of the Crown. As a matter of fact, the annoyances we suffer are owing to an absence of system. Every vestry does what is right in its own eyes, matters of everyday concern are regulated by men of the narrowest views, and as to the love of isolation assumed to be peculiar to the people, that would soon vanish if comfortable dwellings constructed upon more advanced principles were available.

Few can have failed to be struck with the elegance
of those imposing mansions which extend from Grosvenor Gardens to the Victoria Station. They are, of course, intended for the abode of the wealthy; but there can be no reasonable doubt that, if measures were taken to purify the air, to substitute wooden or other more civilized pavement for stone, and to cleanse the footways, terrace after terrace of equal pretensions would line all the principal thoroughfares of the West End. It surely cannot be said that there is a prejudice against residing in flats when places like the Cornwall Residences, with stabling on one side and a railway station on the other, are full to overflowing; when a structural monstrosity like that at Queen Anne’s Gate, situated in one of the lowest localities, finds permanent inmates from all parts of the country. People in a position to live elsewhere cannot be expected to reside where they are not able to walk out without being bespattered with mud; where crossings are left to the mercy of erratic Bohemians, and the streets covered with slush because those entrusted with the guardianship of public thoroughfares insist upon or permit their being watered whether they require it or not.

Reform in these matters cannot be too strongly insisted upon. As already stated, Taste concerns itself quite as much with the judgment as with sentiment, and is substantially synonymous with common sense. It would be useless to offer any suggestions for the improvement of street architecture, unless we first deter-
mine whether the foul incubus of chimney smoke which has begrimed the metropolis for centuries is to continue or be removed; whether wisdom is to assert itself in the management of public ways, or they are to be permanently resigned to the eccentric stolidity of pettifogging associations. Surely a law might be passed for the substitution, except for manufacturing or locomotive purposes, of gas for coal fires. This at a stroke would do away with the smoke; for factories and such like are already compelled to consume their own. Such a measure would entail no additional expense, would be no infringement upon the liberty of the subject since no man has a right to vitiate an atmosphere which is common property, and so far from being a hardship, would be a real boon even to those of limited means. It is well known that the maintenance of gas fires is, all things considered, no more expensive than the maintenance of coal fires; the prime outlay for substitution would be more than repaid by the saving in apparel, furniture, window-curtains, &c., which are now ruined by soot, and the way would be paved for one of the most complete transformations ever witnessed in the appearance of any city. There is but little apprehension that a more extensive consumption of gas would lead to a rise in price; for the introduction of electric lighting would tend to obviate that; but even a rise in price would be more than counterbalanced by a saving effected in
other ways. What man relishes the idea of spending a hundred pounds upon the adornment of his house with a coat of paint when he knows that in six months it will be as dirty as ever? What is the use of erecting edifices in stone when before the year is out they are to assume the color of mud? With what object are costly images of national heroes set up, if, after one brief season, warriors and statesmen are transmuted to the semblance of chimney-sweeps? There is something incomprehensible in the circumstance of a people arrogating to themselves the leadership in civilization consenting day by day, month by month, and year by year, to be enveloped in a murky, depressing, artificial, and injurious atmosphere. The aspect of London is described by M. Taine as occasionally "appalling"; those who are in a position to migrate will not reside therein the greater part of the twelve months; foreigners sneer, and Englishmen grumble; yet the nuisance continues. If it is destined to be perpetuated, the few suggestions which may be offered must be restricted to form alone; but otherwise, color also, which is so indispensable an ingredient in beauty, will attract its due share of attention.

If form alone be treated of it is requisite to denote the chief points to be kept in view in forming an opinion upon artistic construction.

The first aim of the architect should be to adapt his style to the object of the structure; the next to impart
animation to his work; then one part should harmonize with another; unity of design should pervade the whole, and the eye must be satisfied by the observance of relative proportion. Let anyone say whether the Gothic is a style at all suited to a railway terminus (vide Liverpool Street Station). The iron-road is entirely a thing of modern growth, and therefore termini should be erected in some purely modern style. Few will dispute the claim of Holloway Jail to be regarded, per se, as a handsome and attractive structure; it is a sort of Windsor Castle in miniature, forcibly suggestive of all that is alluring in the pomps and vanities of this wicked world. Is this the kind of place to send criminals to? The chief argument in favour of incarceration is that it exercises a deterrent effect upon others. The erection of magnificent and inviting edifices for their reception is not a very effective method of furthering the aim of the Legislature. If it be desired to depress the feelings and induce a spirit of repentance, the most efficacious means would be a compulsory residence in the region of Bloomsbury. The architecture of that locality is restricted to a combination of vertical and horizontal lines, and this is the style most suitable to heinous offenders against the laws of their country.

There is nothing more inartistic than that wearisome succession of straight lines which is so prominent a feature in metropolitan architecture. Even our public
buildings—how flat and insipid! That most recently completed—the Foreign Office—looks like a huge penitentiary; and the Law Courts we cannot but regard as a simple disgrace to the æsthetic perception of the English nation. It is indispensable, excepting in narrow street architecture, that straight lines should be broken and formality relieved by the introduction of circles, semicircles, curved roofs, cupolas, bay-windows, statuary, and such like. The mansions in Belgravia heretofore spoken of are thus relieved, and Burlington House owes much of its beauty to the introduction of arcs, engaged columns, and rounded pinnacles. For these, however, we are indebted to our neighbors. With the exception of St. Thomas’s Hospital, the Natural History Museum, and the Houses of Parliament, what modern buildings have we to which we can point with pride? We may indeed include the Palace at Sydenham, although it be but a glass-and-iron structure, and say there is nothing like it in the whole of Europe. It is magnificent, no doubt, and may be cited in illustration of the effect produced by a judicious admixture of semicircles. Yet, those who have seen Barry’s design must always feel that an opportunity was thrown away. He had suggested, in addition to the present combination, a central cupola with side towers, and had his design been adopted we would have been provided with a far more splendid edifice than what we now have. As to the South
Kensington Museum, School of Art, &c., what are we to say of them? We might have expected from an institution expressly intended for the cultivation of Taste, some embodiment of the national progress; something worthy of admiration and imitation. The façade of the Museum is a mere copy from Venetian Renaissance, and the School of Art a top-heavy monstrosity, remarkable only for ugliness.

Circles and curves are invaluable as a means of imparting animation and elasticity. What would London be without the dome of St. Paul's; or if that beautiful civic ornament were transformed into a square tower? Nature has for centuries been suggesting their use in the circular horizon and the vaulted canopy of the heavens above; yet we have been insensible to her charms. The Saracens rounded their portals; the Moors used the horseshoe; the Romans welcomed their heroes under the triumphal arch. Modern Anglo-Saxons have contented themselves with straight sky-lines, flat window-heads, and square doors. It is not too much to say that every entrance should be arched; and generally, all windows upon a drawing-room floor. The first rule has long been acted upon in France; one of the special features in Parisian architecture being the *porte cochère*. Everyone, of course, knows the colonnade at Hyde Park Corner. Would not a vast improvement be effected by the substitution of some such thing as that suggested in Fig. 2? One of the principal
charms in the Grosvenor Place mansions lies in their arched porticoes.

But then we must never go beyond the round arch. The moment we point it we introduce what is radically inappropriate. There is in Nature a remarkable conformity between appearance and reality. The trunk of a beech tree not only is stronger than that of a palm,

Fig. 3.

but it looks so. We know without testing it that the proboscis of an elephant is more powerful than the human arm, because it is thicker; and we shall find, as a rule, that both vigor and stability are directly denoted to the eye. Every curve below the semicircle suggests compression; every curve beyond, loftiness and ultra-elasticity. One reason why the "Gothic" is so suitable
to ecclesiastical architecture is, that these qualities are generally indicated in the style. But it would be wrong to indicate, in the lower part of any building whatsoever, loftiness and elasticity. On the contrary, it should be the aim of the designer to impart an ecrasé appearance, both to that entire part of the structure, and to its component portions.

**Fig. 4.**

On comparing the preceding diagrams (Figs. 3, 4), there will, I think, be no hesitation in accepting the first as the more attractive. This is mainly because the upper story is higher than the lower. The principle pervades the Italian style, and finds expression likewise in the best Saracenic. One glance at the Taj towers (Fig. 16), and another at the Kutb Minar,
(Fig. 5), will show at once the effect of recognizing or ignoring it. It is then but carrying the principle into details to say that round arches, excepting for portals, should be excluded from a lower story (Fig. 3).

It often happens, of course, that buildings cannot be viewed from a proper distance, and that, consequently, unless enlivening effects be introduced into the lower story, they are altogether lost. Yet this is no argument for the use of the round arch; because a more depressed arc, or segment, is almost equally effective, and more appropriate; and not only more appropriate, but they ensure more window-room, which is rather a desideratum in town (Fig. 6).

One would expect to find this principle recognized in the best architecture of the day, and departed from only when excused by some obvious necessity. But it is not so. In the Carlton Club, and in the Army and
Navy, arches are properly placed over squares. In the Junior Carlton, which in other respects is a facsimile of the Carlton, the arrangement is the very reverse. They are all in the same locality, and there is no apparent reason for this topsy-turvydom. In the Geological Museum (Piccadilly side) not only are square windows placed over arched ones, but those of the first story are of larger dimensions than those of the second!

Now here is a further departure from principle, for there should always be less masonry, and not more, as we ascend.

It will be noticed that I have spoken of the arching of windows "upon the drawing-room floor." The restriction implied refers to the inadvisability of carrying round arches into the topmost story. A painter will aim at confining his most charming combinations to the centre of his picture, and in the same way the architectural draughtsman will do well to limit them to middle
stories, preserving invariably some conformity between the ground-floor and the attic-story (*vide* Figs. 3 and 7). For ordinary purposes the lozenge (Fig. 7) will indicate this restricted disposition.

Not only have curvilinear forms been hitherto neglected among us in the embellishment of façades, but we have made no use of them in roofing; whereas the French have, and in that respect have outstripped us. Cupolas, of course, are out of the question, except-

**Fig. 7.**
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ing for edifices of considerable magnitude; although even these, as we noticed when alluding to the rejection of Barry's design for the Crystal Palace, have been set aside when they might with advantage have been adopted. But it is not a little surprising that the practice of curving the roof, an expedient so simple, so inexpensive, and yet so effective, should not have become general. Where the Mansard has been introduced, there indeed we occasionally find portions arched
instead of being straight; but then, this is considered part of a specific style. We can point to very few instances where, as in the Grosvenor Hotel, it has been adopted irrespectively of style, and solely because it is beautiful. There is no reason, too, why square windows should not occasionally be replaced by circular or elliptical ones, or, at all events, why these should not be used in combination with square ones, as in the instance of the Town Hall at Hackney. It seems odd that we should "go to Hackney" for an example; yet, is there any in another part of the metropolis?

No one so thoroughly appreciates the beauty of curvilinear forms as M. Garnier, the designer of the National Opera House in Paris. There he has introduced a series of arched portals on the ground-floor. So far right, inasmuch as each affords ingress and egress, and is in no sense a window. Upon the upper floor, however, are square-headed, open apertures. Did these stand by themselves the effect would be the reverse of that which we have been advocating. But over every square aperture is a circular one, which not only imparts to the square an arched appearance, but in combination with intervening columns and other elaborations, renders the entire story much more rich and attractive than the lower. That story, moreover, is higher; there is a certain correspondency between the latter and the attic-story; the whole is surmounted by a cupola; the
entire upper portion is so ornate that the lower, although it contains a series of arched portals, and is furthermore enriched to some extent with statuary, is tame in comparison, and thus that appearance of stability by apparent compression which has already been stated to be so desirable, is effectively suggested.

We need not enter into details by showing how a round arch may be made to look depressed by putting a square moulding over it, or, conversely, how it may be elongated by an elliptical moulding; how apparent stability may further be ensured by confining rough stonework and rubble or vermiculated masonry to the lower parts, placing round columns over square columns, and elaborated capitals over plain ones, for these are but applications of the same fundamental law. I could point to innumerable instances where the order above indicated has been reversed, but have no intention of wearying the reader. There are two more points, however, to which attention may particularly be drawn. If a building is to be erected in the Italian style, by all means let every detail conform therewith; if in the Gothic style, let all be Gothic. But are we to be perpetually imitating one style and another, always copying and never progressing? If there is one thing which appears to haunt the mind of the British designer it is the vision of a modillion. There are, unfortunately, very few balconies in London; the only way in which one can obtain a whiff of refreshing air
during summer is by going out of doors. But wherever there is a balcony, it is somehow so peculiarly associated with Italian skies and Italian processions that it is regarded as an Italian thing, and supported upon Italian modillions. In fact, the modillion is used even for purely ornamental purposes. It stood on end upon Temple Bar, and was there called a "truss." I do not know what designation it assumes when placed upon its back, but thus we find it at the base of the fountain in the so-called "Gardens" of Leicester Square, a noteworthy tribute, indeed, to the fertility of native inventiveness. Now, the form of the modillion, let me submit, is essentially wrong (Fig. 8). No adjunct should look like an excrescence, but be brought into unison with the substantive structure; and the best method of accomplishing this is to connect it by concave
and not by convex lines. It is as absurd to engraft a balcony upon the main edifice by convex supports as it would be to curve the arches of a bridge downwards instead of upwards (Fig. 9). It cannot, at all events, be pretended that an oriel window is of Italian origin. That of the Thatched House Club is supported, as it ought to be, upon solid masonry, let well into the wall, gradually tapering to a point several feet below, and curved inwards (Fig. 10). The
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mind is satisfied at a glance with the stability of the thing; it at once commends itself as an integral portion of the edifice; it does not seem to have been subsequently put on, or to be in any manner an afterthought. Now turn to that recently erected "noble mansion," 134, Piccadilly. There we find, not merely one, but two ponderous bay-windows resting upon one single slender bracket not twelve inches in width, and shaped, of course, to the form of the modillion. Is this artistic construction? Is this the way to satisfy the eye? It
is possible, we know, in this age of cast-iron, to erect a massive bay-window upon a four-inch stanchion;—indeed, Truefitt has such a one in Cork Street devoid of any apparent support whatever. We expect something better from those who design "noble" edifices for the most fashionable quarters of our capital. Not only is the form of the bracket in common use wrong,

**Fig. 10.**

**ORIEL WINDOW, THATCHED HOUSE CLUB.**

but half the masonry, as may be seen from the dotted line in Fig. 8, is absolutely thrown away, affording, as it does, no support at all. The lines which might be substituted are denoted in the following sketch (Fig. 11).

Again, stability is further ensured by deep cornices, for these apparently knit together at the top, and by quoins, which seem to clamp at the sides. Now, cornices are scarcely thought of among us. Without excep-
tion almost, they are poor and meagre to a degree; and when amplitude and ornament are attempted, observe how frequently with what result. The primary object in building a house is to ensure the comfort of those who are to inhabit it. No architect would seriously maintain that that and convenience of inmates ought

![Proper Lines for Brackets](image)

in any way to be sacrificed to outward display. Yet is not this virtually averred? Look at the Grosvenor. It is an admirable specimen of generally effective exterior design. But an entire floor is rendered almost useless, because the cornice which runs just over the windows, and the bulging consoles which support it, deprive every room of its proper share of light.
ARTISTIC CONSTRUCTION.

The same defect may be noticed in the Scarborough Grand (Fig. 12), and in the entresol story of the Regent's Quadrant.

As to the matter of quoins, the effect which they ought to impart is absolutely neutralized when divided at the angle by a continuous seam in the manner shown in Fig. 12.

Fig. 12.

ORNAMENT versus COMFORT.

in Fig. 13. In the majority of cases, however, we find neither quoins nor cornices, in the true sense of the terms—not even proper mouldings or architraves round the windows to atone for the absence of those simple appendages which give so much life to domestic architecture on the Continent, viz. Venetian shutters.
In the suggestion for park gates (Fig. 2), the reader will notice a regular gradation from squares at both sides to a circle in the middle. This illustrates not alone that kind of harmony which should govern the disposition of angular and curvilinear form, but the achievement of proportion by adopting as a basis some simple geometrical figure.

The best proportioned edifices are all constructed upon a geometrical basis; the ordinary façade of the Grecian portico, for example; the triumphal arch of the Roman (Fig. 14), and the dome of the Saracen (Fig. 15), being respectively comprised within, or designed upon the simple circle. The Grecian octostyle was based upon two intersecting circles, the
Gothic cathedral upon a combination of intersecting circles; and that most exquisite structure, the Taj at

Fig. 14.

Roman Triumphant Arch.

Fig. 15.

The Saracenic Dome.

Agra, will be found to lie substantially within a rectangular isosceles triangle (Fig. 16). The last is a figure
which may be adopted with much effect in all edifices of considerable magnitude, and in the disposition of outlying structures (Fig. 17).

Fig. 16.

THE TAJ MAHUL.

An appropriate foundation once obtained, diversity of arrangement may be almost infinite; but any marked

Fig. 17.

departure from a satisfactory basis will invariably produce a disagreeable result.
In monumental construction it is almost a *sine qua non*, unless the columnar form be adopted, that all but the most trifling details should fall within a triangle projected from the base of the monument itself; otherwise an overbalanced appearance is sure to ensue, as in the case of the Albert Memorial, which, in this respect alone, compares unfavorably with Walter Scott's in Edinburgh. And the nearer we get to the apex the more careful should we be that no material portion of the fabric overlaps (Fig. 18).

Whenever practicable there might be, more especially in detached buildings, some suggestion of triangularity, or—which comes to the same thing—the salient angles of superstructures may be comprised within an arc struck, never from the ground, but always towards it. It frequently happens that extensive ranges are furnished with end or flanking towers, introduced for the purpose of rendering them imposing and of amplifying width. There can be no objection to adjuncts of this description, but if central towers or cupolas be added, it is indispensable that these should be both laterally larger and of greater altitude. In Grosvenor Place we discover the very converse of this. It cannot be said that this is part of the Mansard style, because instances to the contrary are available in that very locality; but even if it were, it is incumbent upon us to effect improvements if they can be accomplished without detriment to leading characteristics.
The principle which regulates the gradual transition from squares at the sides to the circle in the middle, as exemplified in Fig. 2, demands also that central superstructures should, as a rule, be arcuated;

and not only arcuated but, generally, more elaborated—being enriched with circular windows, statuary, and such like. Of course, it may sometimes be preferable to have the entire configuration angular, in which case,
provided the rule laid down in the last paragraph be conformed with, harmony of one kind, i.e. harmony by uniformity, is ensured. But, if curves be used in combination with angular forms, the arrangement in

Fig. 19.

SHAPES AND SIZES FOR SUPERSTRUCTURES.

Fig. 19 will be found far more beautiful than that in 20; although numerous examples of the latter have emanated from the studios of well-known draughtsmen.

Fig. 20.

SHAPES AND SIZES FOR SUPERSTRUCTURES.

In addition to the points above enumerated, it will be noticed that the gates themselves in Fig. 2 are not of the ordinary shape, but depressed at the top instead of being curved upwards. It may seem contradictory that, having written in favor of arcs struck upward from the ground, I should now advocate a deflection.
But there are reasons for this. Firstly, to ensure apparent stability by making the gate more massive at the swing than at the close; and secondly, to obtain that form in the aperture above which is not only in itself more beautiful than the usual crescent or semi-circle, but which is most associated with lightness and elasticity.

In the preceding diagrams (Fig. 21) the gate at the entrance to Constitution Hill is represented by B; that of the Marble Arch by C; and the shape which might more effectively be substituted, by D. When there is no archway over the gate it ought properly to be raised in the middle to ensure that appearance of triangularity already commended (A); otherwise, triangularity is suggested in the archway itself; and this
may with advantage be supplemented by the additional attraction of an open circle beneath.

What proportion these gates should bear to the circular aperture above, depends very much upon individual judgment. It is impossible to lay down rules. The details of proportion constitute the most embarrassing branch of architectural study; for no subject could originally have been so entirely regulated by the eye. Who can say why a column of the Parthenon should be precisely as long and broad as it is, or why plinth and abacus should assume the relative dimensions we find them? We all feel that the cupola of the National Gallery is ridiculously small, and that that of the Capitol at Washington is overpoweringly huge. Yet few can tell how large or how small these ought to be without first comparing them with one so accurately sized as that of St. Paul's. Nevertheless, the observance of proportion is a matter which demands the earnest attention of all draughtsmen, for the absence thereof is certainly a leading defect in our mode of construction.

All these observations, however—about arches and such like—are made upon the supposition that the dominant styles, or pseudo-styles, will continue to retain their place in public estimation. Much as I differ from those who commend the pointed Gothic as suitable to public buildings, business premises, and family dwellings, I have no intention of urging the
substitution, in its integrity, of any other method of construction, except for occasional blocks or edifices. At the same time I have no hesitation in declaring a predilection for the salient features of the neglected and much abused Elizabethan. Square, partially splayed, expansive windows, uniformity of surface, and long, unbroken, horizontal mouldings, are far better adapted to street architecture than either a combi-

**Fig. 22.**
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nation of columns with Italian apertures, which are florid without and exclude the proper fall of light within (Fig. 22), or a succession of mere perforations with no more pretensions to beauty than squares sliced out of a water-melon. Peaky sky-lines, gable dormers, and red brick are not indispensable concomitants.

Of course it will be said that there is no lack of genuine ability in the country; that the peculiarities of our land tenure preclude the display of artistic elabora-
tion; that if a tenement becomes the property of the landowner after the expiration of a ninety-nine year lease, the object is to run it up at the smallest possible expense; that terrace after terrace and mansion after mansion are erected by men who are not professional architects, and whose only aim is to render them habitable. To a great many of the defects already pointed out these excuses have no application. Nevertheless, there can be no question that the peculiarities of our tenure are a considerable drawback to the development of tasteful construction. But why, let it be asked, are these peculiarities permitted to stand in the way? It being nobody's business to concern himself about such matters, it cannot be expected either that the defects of tenure will be rectified, or that the best efforts of professional ability will be properly appreciated, unless the attention of the public is drawn to the principles which should govern its applause and condemnation. There is every conceivable variety of edifice in London. It is no one's duty to enforce uniformity. Nor is the advantage of uniformity recognized, for Mr. Fergusson himself, a most learned authority, tells us that the design for the Houses of Parliament ought to have contrasted with Westminster Hall and the Abbey. Contrast is all very well in a country village or seashore town; but, beyond all question, harmony by similarity should be the rule in every capital or large city.
CHAPTER II.

DETAILS AND ACCESSORIES.

It would be interesting to note the multitude of faults and failings commonly ascribed to the exigencies of trade. "We are essentially a commercial people," it is said. "Your rules for obtaining an écrasé appearance may be all very well for ornamental structures and for the abodes of the wealthy, but we require more space on the ground-floor than upon any other, and, especially in street architecture, as much window-room for the display of our wares as possible. Cast-iron is cheap, cast-iron is substantial, and if we can support three or four successive stories upon cast-iron stanchions, be they as slender as they may, so much the better for us. Beauty must succumb to the demands of utility." Now, we do not find that in Nature beauty is sacrificed to utility. On the contrary, they go hand in hand. It is not the province of Taste to impede the interests of Commerce, but rather to aid them. Howsoever lofty a ground-floor may be, the appearance of stability by compression may always be ensured by the simple expedient of grouping the first and second. And as to the matter of iron stanchions, it is very easy to satisfy
the eye and secure, at the same time, the object which
the tradesman has in view. In the following figure
(Fig. 23) are three pillars of identical width. One is
triangular, the other cylindrical, the third is flat.
Which of these is apparently capable of resisting the
greatest pressure? Undoubtedly the last, because it
presents the largest surface to the eye. Sectionally, the

**Fig. 23.**

quantity of metal in each may be the same—the last
may be merely the first reversed—yet it looks more
massive; it satisfies the spectator, and that is sufficient.

So far from the demands of Taste clashing with the re-
quirements of trade, they are of material assistance to it.
For example, one of the chief defects in our urban archi-
tecture is the comparatively large space allotted to brick
and mortar. It is better to have several windows, and
these of ample dimensions, and to temper the light admitted through them by putting up ground glass or French curtains, than to dazzle and distract by one or two windows of lesser size. In order to ensure the maximum of light, Taste would necessitate the adoption of some such thing as the chamfered edge, which not only permits its admission from the sides as well as from the front, but is more decorative than an ordinary wall or square pilaster. Indeed, there is no more beautiful window, and none is more suitable to domestic architecture, than the Elizabethan, to which, and to the Gothic, the chamfered edge has hitherto exclusively appertained. At the same time we must bear in mind what has already been said about the adaptation of style to the purposes for which a building is intended, and not import the Elizabethan in its integrity—or even Elizabethan perforations in their integrity—into the modern shop, for the two are incompatible. I have seen a building in the Gothic style devoted to the sale of hams and bacon. Few will deny that there is an incongruity in this which ought to be scrupulously avoided. But a mere detail like that above spoken of, which is really suitable to any, and offers such obvious advantages, might be adopted universally without outraging the rules of harmony. In fact, even on the ground-floor, edges which are usually left square might be beveled off, provided the width of the supports admit of this.
The necessity for satisfying the eye cannot be better illustrated than by pointing, by way of example, to those sculptured supports popularly known as Caryates, and to their companions the Atlantes. Caryates were, originally, representations of the priestesses serving in the Temple of Diana Caryatis; but, being found in certain specimens of Grecian architecture, they came to be regarded in some measure as part of the Grecian style, and so were imported into England when classic design came into fashion. What idea of support is conveyed by these things? It is all very well to say of the church of St. Pancras that it is a copy of the Erechtheium, and that therefore they are very properly there. We find the same things in a private residence in Park Lane, which, of course, is neither a copy of the Erechtheium nor of any other Athenian edifice. From the Society of Painters in Water-colors we might have expected something worthy of imitation. In their new façade, however, a massive stone balcony is supported upon the heads of four figures who all but succumb to superincumbent pressure, and give rise to a most painful sense of incongruity. The ancients represented Atlas as bearing upon his shoulders the whole weight of the terrestrial globe. But Atlas was an individual of prodigious physical power, and the earth, being represented in miniature, was not too much for him. This much cannot be said of unfortunate Caryates.

Once admit the propriety of such images, and the
transition to other animal forms excites no surprise. Indeed, there is always some latent symbolism at hand as a pretext for the introduction of the most extravagant absurdity. Eastlake, in his work on the

Fig. 24.

'The Figure Corbel.

'Gothic Revival,' eulogizes with enthusiasm such things as the above (Fig. 24), and regrets the paucity, in these degenerate days, of similar specimens of the sculptor's Art. I do not think he would have had cause for regret had he seen some of our recently-
erected edifices. The accompanying sketch is from the new church in Harrogate (Fig. 25). For those infatuated by the fascinations of legendary lore, such subjects may possibly possess some charmingly mystic significance; but to others, who look upon analogy with Nature as indispensable to harmony, it is not easy to comprehend why an angelic being should be found peering out from under the base of a column, or how any being in human form is apparently able to sustain the load of a superincumbent mass of solid masonry.

Nothing in the figure of Atlas offends the eye, or gives rise to that sensation of ludicrous incongruity which one cannot but experience on beholding a row of females standing bolt upright, and sustaining, without the slightest indication of an effort, the weight of some enormous entablature, or of pain upon discovering that a hood-moulding is apparently inserted into the cranium of an Apostle. A Religious Society in Piccadilly favors us with a balcony supported upon a series of spread-eagles; and Trübner, in Ludgate
Hill, has one propped up by elephants. I do not know what significance may attach to the following exquisite combination (Fig. 26), nor is it necessary to enquire; but if within the whole range of barbaric design anything can be discovered more absurd than a
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CANTILIVER IN GRAND HOTEL, BRIGHTON.

cat squatted upon the head of a ram, and in that posture affording structural support, the projector may credit himself with enviable ingenuity.

It is common enough to find an ægis of symbolism thrust forward as a protection against the legitimate
censure of criticism; but there can be no question that the popular taste leans towards the imitation of natural forms, and that every excuse is resorted to for their retention. This predilection is, indeed, common in all countries when art is in its infancy; the Hindu pagodas, for instance, being covered with one mass of figures. The ruthless Mahomed, probably perceiving the bent of his peoples' inclination, sternly prohibited this style of ornamentation; and, whatever may be said of his motives, the prohibition resulted in the most exquisite embellishment the world ever saw. The fountain on the next page (Fig. 27), is that of the New Steyne at Brighton. We will not dispute the propriety of delineating dolphins upon any monument by the sea-coast, or even in the ornamentation of riparian structures. Yet, both these and every other "monster of the deep" should be restricted to such places, and portrayed as accomplishing such evolutions only, as are compatible with their natural organization. On the Thames embankment they are twined round lamp-posts, and, in the example before us, are not only upon dry land, but combined together for the purpose of sustaining a huge bowl of ponderous granite upon their tails! Surely, there is no analogy with Nature in this! Dolphins might very properly be represented in the adornment of a fountain; but they should be confined to the base of the structure, and disport themselves in the water. Indeed, the utmost latitude is permissible
in monuments so purely ornamental, nevertheless, we must guard against

"O'erstepping the modesty of Nature."

We are so accustomed to borrow, and to import into this country whatever has achieved success in another,
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*VICTORIA FOUNTAIN, BRIGHTON.*

that it is necessary to note the existence of similar absurdities among some of the most celebrated designs
of our neighbors. In the *Place de la Concorde* is a pair of fountains which, as a whole, are perfectly charming. One noteworthy feature is that the water not only falls after being thrown up, but is cast upward again, so that there is an alternation of jets traveling in reverse directions. The basins are adorned with figures of Tritons and Nereids, each of whom is provided with one of the finny tribe, which spouts a jet upward. So far good; all is appropriate. The first, however, are disconnected from the water, and not sufficiently large to hold a couple of gallons. Whence, then, issue these continuous streams, excepting from pipes obviously leading through the bodies of the Tritons and Nereids!

Are we, then, it may be asked, to abolish symbolism and refuse the co-operation of the plastic arts? Far from it. Statuary is eminently decorative, and capable of producing upon the mind the most solemn and fascinating impression. But the reasonable demands of congruity must be conformed with; and these may be satisfied without detriment to the efficacy of symbolism. If it be desired to retain the eagle upon the lectern, the Sacred Volume need not rest upon its back. If fruits and flowers perpetuate the recognition of Divine beneficence, there can be no objection to grouping them within a moulding over the portal. If the presence of saints recalls the virtues of Christian fortitude, they may manifest themselves in appropriate niches.
Seraphic beings alone may soar aloft in the ceiling. Yet neither these nor the others must be made to officiate as structural supports, or appear to be engaged in that duty. Harmony is not outraged in the grouping of the ascension in the Madeleine.

In sober truth, symbolism, as already stated, is frequently a mere pretext for the introduction of such things as indicate an absence of truly artistic perception, and the disposition to take refuge therein is fostered by writers who affect to discover in abnormal coincidences significations of the most profound and mysterious character. M. Blanc, in his work upon ‘Ornament and Dress,’ fancies he recognizes in the Vitruvian scroll (Fig. 28) a striking resemblance “to a troop of maidens pursuing each other in regular cadence, as if in the sacred dance.” Lubké tells us that animals’ paws were imitated on ancient candelabra “in order to denote the movable character of these graceful articles.”

The church steeple, we are informed by Dresser, and

1 P. 5. 2 ‘Hist. of Art,’ p. 268.
the long lines of the clustered column, point heavenwards "to direct our thoughts to God."\(^1\) The undulations in the pavement of St. Mark's are said to "typify the stormy seas of life";\(^2\) and even in the circumstance of the Outram statue facing the south, and thus turning its back upon the fashionable quarters of London, is detected "a mute reminder that his greatest victories in the east were achieved without the adjuncts of modern civilization." It is not easy to comprehend that condition of mind which needs the presence of vertical lines to direct one's thoughts to the Supreme Being; but I have no hesitation in saying that, despite the "lofty mission," ascribed to sculptors and architects, their primary duty is to satisfy the eye; that the less obtrusive their efforts to "ennoble and elevate their fellow-men,"\(^3\) the more likely they will be to achieve this result; and that the purpose for which figures are introduced ought to be openly manifest.

Let us now consider the conditions under which statuary may be combined with architecture, and which should regulate its disposition when detached from surroundings. In the first place, I would deprecate entirely the representation of modern celebrities, excepting in such places wherein, in real life, one might expect the originals to have been found. In the next place, I would exclude from façade and sky-line all

---

2. Eastlake's *Gothic Revival*.
subjects which are not purely allegorical or emblematic. And finally, I would advocate, as a rule, the grouping of figures in lieu of their isolation. Let us take in illustration of the first-mentioned proposition the well-known Nelson column in Trafalgar Square. A grateful nation erected that monument, with what object? Was it to hand down to posterity a likeness of the individual, or to perpetuate the recollection of his glorious deeds? If to hand down a likeness of the man, that object is defeated by the very altitude of the eminence upon which his image is placed. If to perpetuate the recollection of his deeds, would not this object have been better attained by surmounting the column with an emblem of Victory? Would not both objects have been attained by setting up Victory on the top, and the great admiral himself within a niche at the base? Who would expect to find Nelson standing upon a column more than a hundred feet in height? His effigy ought to be set up where he himself, when living, might have been found; not in an impossible position; one, which he could not, in the ordinary course of terrestrial economy, have occupied. And the like observation applies to the statues of Chatham, Peel, Cobden, Clyde, and every celebrated person whose memory has been handed down to posterity in this manner. Would anyone look for the Iron Duke on his charger upon the top of an arch at Hyde Park Corner? The ideas which suggest themselves to the
mind upon beholding this renowned sample of British
taste are certainly perplexing. How did they get
there? How are they sustained in their place?
There is no visible support beyond the slender legs of
the quadruped, and the sensation arising from the vision
of a noble warrior perpetually pointing with out-
stretched arm in the direction of an imaginary foe, is,
to say the least of it, the contrary of agreeable. It may
be that this wretched memorial is now condemned by
the judgment of the country, although the circumstance
of its still being permitted to stand in so conspicuous
a locality somewhat militates against this surmise;
but has there been any perceptible improvement since
it was set up? A statue of Peabody was but recently
unveiled at the back of the Royal Exchange. The
noble philanthropist is represented as seated in an
arm-chair, and since nothing so unpoetic as a modern
hat could properly be introduced into a work of Art,
we discover him to be without one. Let us ask
whether Peabody himself would have sat there bare-
headed and exposed, throughout the year, to the vicis-
situdes and inclemency of the English weather? His
countenance, so far as it is discernible through an in-
crustation of soot, beams with benevolence; but this
only renders the incongruity of the whole thing more
remarkable.

Taste demands that in our representations of Nature
we should conform with the harmony of Nature. The
apotheosized heroes of antiquity; the Muses, the Fates, and other impersonifications of the poetic ages; the whole heavenly host of Saints and Angels; Britannia, Justice, Concord, Liberty, Commerce, Plenty—these may be exalted far above the level of the eye; Victory may raise on high her crowning laurels; Bellerophon scamper towards heaven astride his winged-horse, Pegasus, and the tutelary deities watch by night over the various cities they protect; but, in the name of common sense, let us set up the effigies of historic celebrities—men of flesh and blood like ourselves—in such places as they might have occupied as living beings. Mercury may ascend above the summit of a pinnacle, but a Duke of York cannot. Phœbus, with his chariot and all his fiery steeds, may greet the rising sun from the sky-line of the loftiest edifice, but the most appropriate position for Wellington on his charger would be in the vicinity of terra firma.

The achievements of historic celebrities may be as effectually commemorated by the erection of a memorial as by setting up a statue, and it cannot be too forcibly insisted that the proper place for the likeness of a human being is within doors or at the entrance of a building. In the Court of the Guildhall is a drinking-font, whereon is represented the great Law-giver striking the rock for the purpose of allaying the thirst of the multitude. As an all but supernatural being, he might have been portrayed in the most exposed situa-
tion. Nevertheless, he is placed within a recess; protected from the frequent downpours of heaven. Compare this highly suggestive monument with any similar object since executed. With all our so-called art-culture, what progress have we made in artistic construction? One languid insipidity of design characterizes all our drinking-fonts. Next to that on the north side of Hyde Park, near the Marble Arch, the best is, probably, that in Regent’s Park—adorned with a bust of Her Majesty on one side, Cowasji Ready Money on the other!

It seems to have entirely escaped our draughtsmen that the primary object in erecting a monument is to render it ornamental. For this purpose if figures are selected they should be fanciful. Suppose, in lieu of Apollo and those other highly decorative statues which impart such grace to the Opera House in Paris, M. Garnier had studded the edifice with images of renowned musicians, what would the effect have been? Is Sir Robert Peel in a frock-coat and trousers decorative? Are square blocks, such as our monumental pedestals generally are, ornamental? Are fonts like that by the Spa at Scarborough (Fig. 29) proper adornments for a “Queen of Watering-places?” Is the Duke of Wellington’s horse a proper object to be introduced within the sacred precincts of a metropolitan cathedral?

Yet it is not difficult to divine the cause of this barren insipidity. It is the disposition to treat Taste
as a matter of sentiment rather than of judgment. When the proper site for Cleopatra’s Needle was under deliberation, it was strenuously maintained that Parliament Square was the most fitting locality, on account of “its venerable associations!” When the Leicester Square “Gardens” were thrown open to the public, they were adorned with a “fountain” crowned with a statue of Shakespear! At intervals this immortal Bard was surrounded, not by graceful nymphs of the grove or other artistic subjects to captivate and delight the eye, but by busts of Newton, Hunter, Hogarth, and Reynolds; for no other reason than because they once resided in that neighborhood!
Immediately in front of the central transept of the Crystal Palace is a huge bust of Sir Joseph Paxton, upon an enormous square block of mock porphyry—we seldom appear to get beyond the square block. Everyone knows that Paxton was the architect; but what business has this idol-like image there? As a work of Art it is simply hideous; it harmonizes with nothing, and as to any similitude to the original which it might possess, the effect of that is destroyed by the chocolate hue of the material in which it is executed. Upon each side of this transept are worse things still, namely Egyptian sphinxes. It was originally proposed to line the approach with a double row of these Coptic abominations, but happily this poetic conception never developed into maturity. It was necessary, of course, to bring within the precincts of such an institution specimens of art-work from all quarters of the globe, but it was not necessary to incorporate them, as it were, and treat them as integral portions of a purely British edifice.

There is, perhaps, no institution from which we may learn so much to avoid as the South Kensington. At the very entrance one's attention is arrested by Bell's "Deer Slayer," and a statue of Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy. Probably it may be urged that these are there temporarily. But this is no excuse. Accessories should harmonize with the character of the edifice, and if statuary has no obvious
connection with the nature of the institution, it had better be relegated to some appropriate locality, and reserved for strictly exhibitional purposes.

It is difficult to discover any ruling principle either in the introduction of modern statuary or in the use made of any of the imitative arts when combined with architecture. Can anyone tell why the frieze of the Albert Hall is adorned with "subjects illustrative of the History of Man"? why Mercury, Pluto, and other heroes of pagan mythology figure upon the walls of the St. James's Hall grill-room? or for what purpose the poet Shakespear is set upon a pedestal in the table-d'hôte saloon of the Criterion Restaurant? Under the cornice which runs round the "Great Hall" of the latter place, are emblazoned the names of Chaucer, Byron, Göethe, Schiller, Purcell, Dante, Bach, Rossini, and a host of notables who have no more connection with the development of gastronomic science than the Hebrew Patriarchs. Even the venerable Homer and Pythagoras are included. The preposterousness of this will, perhaps, be at once admitted. Yet there is no perceptible difference between this kind of decoration and that of the Albert Hall.

Even when a device happens to be appropriate, it is too frequently employed in such a manner as to excite derision rather than approbation. Not only does the same spirit which actuated the narrow-minded designers of the Georgian epoch still seem to linger in
the British breast, but devices are repeated, and repeated ad nauseam. Even as the tobacconist of the last century denoted his calling by placing at his door the familiar image of a Highland snuff-taker, so there is scarcely a dining-hall in London wherein we do not find the head of a bull as an indication of the beefy comestibles obtainable for the asking. In the Horse-Shoe—the most recently erected of all—numerous members of the finny tribe are rendered, for the purpose of shewing that their prototypes are at hand; and in several well-known establishments the shells of defunct turtles are suspended against the wall to indicate the availability of soup. All this vulgarity is not confined to the trading community, for we have only to turn to the British Museum to discover the same display there. A succession of lions upon the outer railing obviously means that the edifice is British; and the conglomeration of articles upon the gates—the Grecian urns, Corinthian capitals, shells of the ocean, eagles’-heads, and dolphins—these certainly signify Museum. This may be an ingenious method of symbolizing the nature of an institution; but it is just as unnecessary as that adopted by the tobacconist or restaurant proprietor. Most persons know the depressing edifice when they see it, and those who do not, would never guess what it is from these exterior typifications. It would be of no avail to pretend that the lion is merely emblematic, for a multiplicity of
emblems is as ridiculous as a reduplication of realistic representations. Along the whole length of the embankment are countenances of this ferocious monarch of the forest, furnished with huge iron rings for the purpose of facilitating navigation. Whether these be simply emblematic or not, is not the eye wearied by their uninterrupted consecution? Would not the rings be better inserted into objects more ostensibly capable of holding them? In the Royal Aquarium at Westminster, in addition to the customary dolphins carved upon the façade, there are fish delineated in mosaic upon the floor. Is not this intended as an intimation that creatures of the aquatic world are visible within? An emblem, properly speaking, should be purely suggestive; it should be set up, as a rule, over the entrance, and, like the White Horse of Inner Temple or Lamb of the Middle, stand by itself.
CHAPTER III.

CHIAROSCURO AND COLOR.

Chiaroscuro is that branch of art-study which embraces, not only the effect producible by light and shade, but by the use of light and dark colors. Architecture on the Continent enjoys an advantage which that of our island home does not possess, in an almost diurnal play of sunshine. We may erect façades with southern aspects, enrich them with engaged columns, provide recesses, and cap them with ample cornices; all to little purpose, as far as Chiaroscuro is concerned, unless we supplement the baffled efforts of Nature to break through a leaden atmosphere by suggesting, artificially, the effect of sunlight. I put it to the reader whether an improvement in urban architecture would not be effected by a lavish use of paint, and also by filling in spaces between mouldings, triglyphs, pateras, quoins, and generally all interstices—even backgrounds to bas-reliefs—with rich brown or deep Venetian red. This, indeed, would be an innovation, and it might be that prejudice would prevent its adoption; but this would soon vanish when we come to perceive that the question is merely one of
utilization. There is no aversion against the use of color *per se*; on the contrary, there is a decided predilection for it. To a certain extent this innovation has been attempted in the Burlington Restaurant, Regent Street; but, unless the lead be taken in buildings of a superior type, the popular mind can scarcely be expected to follow it.

So far from there being a prejudice against the use of color, there is a prevailing rage for red brick and marone. For my own part, I think that nothing would so transform the aspect of London, notwithstanding the cloud of smoke which now envelopes it, as a copious application of creamy-white paint. But, assuming that we continue the same mode of warming and cooking which has come down to us from our early forefathers, and that the process of painting is too expensive in an atmosphere impregnated with soot, let us consider the claims of the red-brick to the favor of fashion. We have only to reflect in order to discover that the domain of Nature and that of Art are totally distinct; that in Nature there are certain pervading hues which are the very last we would use for the habitations of man, and, moreover, that there are others associated with either what is absolutely rustic or positively disagreeable. Now, no person would dream of painting his domicile green or blue, or of instructing his architect to use green or blue bricks; for these are the colors of the verdure around, and of
the sky above. Natural scenery and architecture would, so to speak, coalesce; and the law of harmony by contrast, which should govern in such matters, would give place to the law of harmony by similarity. Ought we not, for the same reason, to avoid what is commonly called red brick; that is, brick which in color is exactly similar to that of red sandstone; which would afford no contrast, as regards light and shade, with natural surroundings, and which, in addition to this, is dull and heavy? I do not condemn the use of pinkish bricks, such as those in Bailey’s Hotel, Gloucester Road, or in Mandeville Place, but of those in ordinary use, such as we find in New Oxford Street, Knightsbridge, Porchester Gate, and Cadogan Square. Pink is a tint, and so far from deprecating the use of tints, I advocate them. Light yellow, light grey, and such like, may be employed with advantage, as, indeed, they have been in Onslow Square, Marshall and Snelgrove’s, Brandon’s, and the new Turf Club.

But then the entire surface must never be covered. Whether brick be used or a wash of tint, every building should be faced with white, or creamy-white, dressings. Most architects appear to perceive this—although there are innumerable mansions, like those in Upper Berkeley Street and in the Cromwell Road, which are provided with no dressings at all—yet, how little pains is taken to effectuate their intentions! They usually provide stone dressings, which within a few
months become, of course, as dark as the red brick itself. A combination of these two objectionable features is afforded in the newly-erected Hall of Lincoln’s Inn. Were that covered with a coat of paint, like the adjoining Court of the Lord Chancellor, or were the dressings alone thus treated and the surface tinted, it would be one of the handsomest edifices in the metropolis. As it stands, it is simply as depressing as its surroundings; and that is saying a great deal.

It has already been noted how, in Nature, an appearance of stability is ensured by appropriate outline; let us now see whether this is not imparted likewise by an harmonious disposition of color. So careful is she not to irritate the eye by imparting a sense of insecurity,
that when the trunk of a tree is pithy, like the wild cotton, and yet has to sustain a considerable spread of foliage (Fig. 30), it is buttressed up. She might have made the mountains square; they might have overhung the valleys. But this is not the way she works. Affording artistic repose to the eye, she has chosen to give them a pyramidal form. It would be too much to say that there is any regular chromatic gradation according to altitude, weight, and durability. Yet we know that the mountains are capped with snow (Fig. 31); we know that the trunks of trees are darker than their foliage; we know that the darkest substances are usually the heaviest, and we know, or
have the means of knowing, that, as a rule, color is an indication of strength and ponderosity. The weight of the ancient sarcophagi of black Ethiopian marble, handed down to us from the time of the Pharaohs, is enormous, and the hieroglyphs incised thereon are as fresh as if they were the work of yesterday. And even if we look to the clouds, we shall find that those of the greatest altitude are entirely white. Surely this harmonious disposition ought to be maintained in the works of man. In so far as we no longer erect tenements whose upper stories overlap the lower, we comply with the principle of linear gradation. Our most beautiful lighthouse was designed in conformity with the trunk of a tree. But what advance have we made in chiaroscuro? One would suppose that uniformity of tone, as well as uniformity of design, would characterize every edifice of the nineteenth century, and that where gradation was desirable, the harmony of Nature would be preserved. What, however, do we find? The Albert Memorial is a very fair illustration of the progress made in Art decoration. At all events it is a national monument, erected at a great cost, and held in such precious estimation that it has even been proposed to enclose it within a glass covering. White, which, if used anywhere, should have been introduced near the summit, is introduced at the very base of the fabric! There are few who do not feel that, with all its gaud and tinsel, this national trophy is a failure; and
the reasons are not difficult to discover. Something might here be said, also, about the use of gold upon this trophy; but this will be properly reserved for the chapter on Decoration. Perhaps no people ever manifested a truer appreciation of natural harmony than those of the Saracenic race. The Taj Mahul is of pure white marble. No gradation was necessary; none was attempted. The Jumna Musjid at Lahore is an almost equally charming edifice; red and white are both introduced; but in the order of Nature. The main edifice is red; the dome is white. Other instances might be mentioned; but these are sufficient to show that our own progress in æsthetics has not been commensurate with our opportunities.

White may be an emblem of purity; it may be associated with monuments perpetuating the memories of the dead; it may even, as M. Blanc puts it, "irradiate all that comes within its range"; nevertheless, it should never be used in masses, but in dressings only, and other embellishment. That is why I have heretofore spoken of using for surfaces a creamy tint. This, in combination with white, is not only more beautiful than white by itself, but it is not so detrimental to contiguous colors. Were the figure on the summit of the Paris Opera House in white, tipped with gold, instead of being dark as it is, the effect would be much more pleasing. A mass of white simply dazzles, and, introduced even in small quantities, is detrimental,
unless in conformity with the last-mentioned rule. For instance, in the Grosvenor Gallery we may have observed plaster-casts disposed round the centre of some saloon, and interspersed, as it were, with other works of Art. Are they not simply ruination to the effect of the pictures? I mention this institution, because it is supposed to be arranged with the express

**Fig. 32.**

**Botanical Tablet.**

object of initiating us into the mystery of artistic disposition. Similar mistakes we find elsewhere; the charm of some of the most lovely scenery in England—that of the far-famed Studeley Park, for example—being completely marred by the interspersion of glaring plaster-casts. Statuary ought never to be set up out of doors at all, excepting among terraces and fountains
in the Italian style; and, when introduced within-doors, should be restricted to vestibules, staircases, and corridors, and even then placed, if possible, against dark or tinged grounds. Nor should white tablets be permitted to distract the eye, either in public gardens (Fig. 32), or upon metropolitan vehicles.

In accordance with the above principles, we might, for shop fronts, have black, or otherwise very dark,
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**THE ARRANGEMENT OF SHOP WINDOWS.**

intervening columns; since these would both impart stability, and by contrast exhibit to the best advantage the goods displayed in the windows. Provided always that a brass or gilt beading, or something similar, be run round the columns to give a finish, to connect them together, and to confer an appearance of greater width than would be suggested by leaving them plain (Fig. 33).
And now, having shown why white, although an emblem of purity, is to be avoided, let us turn to those colors which are to be dispensed with as being associated with what is disagreeable. Mud is disagreeable—there can be no question about that—yet in the fashionable locality of South Kensington, terrace after terrace of "noble and commodious mansions" is begrimed with mud-colored stucco. Rust is disagreeable; yet the balconies and railings of every house from 44 to 55, Queen's Gate are carefully painted to resemble rust. Duck-weed will be held by most people to be unpleasant; nevertheless, the church of the Primitive Methodists near the Royal Oak Station is adorned with alternate layers of black and duck-weed green. So long as human beings are influenced by association, so long as they continue to turn with aversion from the steeple in Langham Place because of its striking resemblance to an extinguisher, builders will do well to discard such incongruities, and direct their abilities to something more enlivening.

Let us, in illustration, take the Albert Hall, and see whether, by the application of the foregoing principles, it is not possible to transform the appearance of most of our edifices without structural alteration. The late Sir Charles Barry accomplished a deal in this way by such enrichments as might be described under the head of form alone. The element of color was altogether excluded from the insipid classicism of his day. It
now plays an important part in exterior embellishment, but affords, because it is not applied with discrimination, only additional material for rectification by the canons of artistic construction. In so far as the building is a vast rotunda, and answers the purpose for which it was designed, no fault can be found. But suppose, instead of being of dingy red as it is, it were painted creamy-white; suppose the dressings, in lieu of being a dampy-yellow, were of pure white; suppose all interstices were filled in with deep red; that the cornices, which at present are miserably meagre, were enlarged by several feet; that some allegorical group were placed over the façade, and even a flag hoisted over the cupola (since it would not be strong enough for a statue); that the History of Man were expunged, and in lieu thereof reliefs of geometric design were substituted; and, withal, suppose the frieze, instead of being yellow, were filled in with the same red as the interstices, would not this stately edifice be infinitely more ornamental than it is now?

An objection is commonly made against what professional gentlemen are pleased to designate the " unreality" of paint; and it is insinuated that the resort to its use is reprehensible as a deception. It is difficult to perceive the force of such insinuation. We all know that stone is a time-honored material; that it is connected in the mind with all that is great and noble in history. Nevertheless I emphatically repeat, that, so
long as people are permitted to emit into the atmosphere volumes of soot, so long even as it blackens through the action of a rigorous climate, stone possesses no real superiority over brick-and-mortar. If with paint an endeavor be made to imitate stone, not only by similitude in color, but by drawing lines to suggest the presence of successive blocks, this is reprehensible. Otherwise paint is just as much paint as stone is stone, and its employment is no more to be deprecated when it happens to assume the color of stone than when it resembles the color of wood. Where there is any apparent substitution of material; where botanical products are manufactured out of iron, for instance, as they are in the celebrated Pump-Room Hotel at Bath; where "porphyry" is rendered in stucco, and metal made to look like cane or bamboo, there is "dissimulation." But where paint is used merely for the purpose of imparting at moderate cost an appearance of completeness, finish, and cleanliness, it cannot be regarded in any other light than as a highly-effective auxiliary.
Perhaps there is no nation upon the face of the earth amongst which there exists such genuine appreciation of what is substantial and good as the English. But, then, it is confined to the cultivated few. Be the cause what it may—whether it be ascribed to the love of natural forms inherent in a people so devoted to outdoor recreation, whether it arises from a desire to countervail the gloom of our climate by perpetuating the reminiscences of "glorious summer," or whether it proceeds simply from an absence of artistic appreciation—there is, in the popular mind, a decided predilection for the representation of familiar objects, and an almost ineradicable tendency towards gaudiness in embellishment. There was a time when pattern partook of a geometric character, and colors upon the wall were sombre. Men and women dressed in the gayest attire, and stood out like figures in a picture against their mural backgrounds. But the spread of Puritanism and the development of the Louis Quatorze style of decoration appear, between them, to have overturned all this, and to have led to the introduction into archi-
tectural interiors of all the glitter which once adorned the person. We have only to look in at the most noted restaurants recently erected—such places as the Criterion, St. James’s Grill-Room, and Horse-Shoe—in order to ascertain the bent of the public taste, for these have been embellished with the especial view of satisfying a wide-spread demand. And if exception be taken to these, we need but refer to the Midland Hotel dining-saloon, and the South Kensington itself.

Now, the first principle in decoration is that the mind must be soothed by a sensation of tranquillity. And in order to produce this, attention must be paid, not only to the character of ornation, but to broad lines of construction. We will then divide this chapter into three parts; the first treating of structural lines, the second of form in ornamentation, the third of color.

It is unnecessary to reiterate the arguments in favor of arcuations which were used when treating of the exterior. Suffice it merely to repeat that they will conduce far more to that feeling of repose which is so desirable if, like those on the outside, they be struck inwards instead of outwards. Those commonly used, especially in the open way between double drawing-rooms, are of the latter description; and this is the kind recommended by Mr. Dresser. Curved lines are peculiarly appropriate in reception-rooms, wherein everything should wear an aspect of gaiety and anima-
tion. Hence, not only should we have windows with arched architraves, as already recommended, but arched, circular, or elliptical pier glasses, round ottomans, and such like. In ceilings they are invaluable, imparting, as they do, not only beauty, but expanse. This is a matter to which very little attention seems to be paid. In a fashionable church recently erected the timber-vaultings are of the above description (Fig. 34). It may be that the very acute angle was adopted for the purpose of suggesting elevation—"pointing heavenwards and directing one's thoughts to God"—but it destroys that impression of amplitude which every artistic constructor should aim at. And, not
satisfied with cramping the roof as much as possible by the shape of the ribs themselves, the architect has further narrowed it by the introduction of ornaments below the ribs, in imitation of Gothic cuspings.

The utmost expanse which can be obtained in a ceiling ought to be obtained; upon which point we cannot do better than consult the best edifices of the Middle Ages. And not only should the ceiling, where practicable, be arched or curved at the sides, but lateral lines should harmonize therewith. In the booking-office of the new terminus of the Great Eastern line is a gallery supported upon triangular cantilevers, notwithstanding that the sides of the ceiling immediately above are curvilinear (A, Fig. 35). They ought either to have exactly corresponded, or the lines below should have partaken of the character of those above (B). An arched ceiling induces, moreover, a sense of security; and that is partially imparted by curving the sides of a flat one. It is further imparted by emphasizing, as it were, the broad lines of construction.

Both in architecture and in the manufacture of furniture, prominence should be given to structural lines,
and no effort ought to be made to induce the supposition that what is really the handiwork of man has come into existence at the bidding of the magician. We like to see how a thing is put together, and that it is substantial enough to answer its purpose. This is the principle upon which the best architects and cabinet makers of the Middle Ages worked; this is probably the origin of that beautiful rib-vaulting which, besides giving finish and elegance, seems to render ceilings additionally secure; this is probably the origin of the long shaft, half imbedded in the wall, which seems to prop the ribs from the very ground; and this is probably the origin of those innumerable minor devices which kindle such confidence in the permanency of their productions. A glance at a table like that in Fig. 36 will suffice to show that it would withstand the wear and tear of generations. And this cannot be said of the flimsy, contorted things which supplanted them.

Before the days of Louis Quatorze, ornamented construction, and not "constructed ornament," was the rule. There were fan-vaultings instead of plaster images; there were geometrically-elaborated ceilings instead of painted ceilings; there was inlaid work instead of depicted work; brass instead of ormolu. Artificial graining was unknown; the art of veneering undiscovered. Fire-irons were made for use as well as for display; there were no illuminated coal-scuttles; vul-
garities in roccoco, maiolica, and Dresden china had not culminated in the introduction of *papier-mâché* and lacquer work; there was reality instead of sham, and an all-pervading desire to trust to honest workmanship rather than to extravagant and skilful deception. "The bolts, bars, and straps of these times," as Eastlake observes, "not only served a useful purpose, but were decorative features in themselves." The principle was impressed upon every detail, even down to their goblets and books (see Figs. 50 and 55).

What we are accustomed to regard as the floridity of the Louis Quatorze and Italian styles is more than floridity; for, to say nothing of a profusion of gold and bright coloring, statuary is frequently introduced into the ceiling in such a manner as to be utterly destructive of that sensation of security which it is so
desirable to evoke. The figures in the Sistine Chapel, for example, as remarked also by the learned author of 'Modern Architecture,' look as if they might at any moment fall upon the spectator. If we compare these styles with the exquisite fan-vaulting in Henry VII.'s

Fig. 37.

KEEPER'S LODGE, HYDE PARK.

Chapel in Westminster Abbey, or in St. George's, Windsor, the superiority of the latter in fulfilling the conditions above noted will be obvious.

Let us now pass to the second branch of our subject. That eminently realistic character which distinguishes
our monumental imagery pervades also the greater portion of minor ornamentation. There appears to be no medium between barren insipidity and ultra-grotesqueness, and when any deviation from familiar styles is attempted, it results in an alteration without any improvement. It may be that such things as the keepers' lodges in Hyde Park (Fig. 37) satisfied the taste of the Hanoverian epoch, but it is impossible to detect any superiority in the following designs of the present day, to be found in the Foreign Office (Fig. 38), the Midland Hotel (Fig. 39), and the Scarborough Grand respectively (Fig. 40). In fact, the inventive genius appears, even in the most fanciful designs, to be conspicuous by its absence. It would be as difficult for the individual who conceived the monstrosity exhibited upon page 89 to define its connection with a Conservative club lamp-post, as for the gentleman who introduced the circular excrescence under the arc of the ceiling in the Midland Hotel coffee-room (Fig. 39) to explain with what object he had done so.
It is all very well to bedeck a barrenness of invention in the captivating garb of pretended symbolism, and it is flattering, no doubt, to be told that in any particular group or figure there is a dash of allegory which is imperceptible only to the uncultivated multitude; but the absurdity of supporting gas-lamps upon the wings of a Griffin is as patent as that of sustaining a bowl by
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the tail of a dolphin. In the most imaginative period of Mediæval Art the best designers abstained from delineating phenomena lying without the bounds of probability; and there is no reason why we should not accept this as our own guiding principle, even in the most fantastic delineations. We may curtail the Roman galley "of fair proportion," as they did, or avail ourselves of any other truly artistic license; nevertheless,
the harmony of Nature should in so far be preserved that the galley must float upon the water. There is no figure so decorative as that of a seraph, or other emblematic personification, provided with wings. Such a being has no earthly affinity; it is the offspring purely of a beautiful, poetic conception. Yet there is nothing in its composition which militates against one's idea of congruity; for the wings emanate from that part of the body into which Nature herself would have inserted them. It is within the bounds of possibility that such a being, granting its existence, should descend; it is not within the bounds of possibility that any conceivable creature should sustain upon the tip
of its vampire wings a lamp-frame of ponderous cast iron (Fig. 41).

The representations, however, which usually play so important a part in popular ornament are absolutely devoid of idealism. They are simply the fierce countenance of some feline animal, the paw of a dog, the chubby configuration of an infant, and such like. Nor does it seem to matter where these are portrayed, so long as they are supposed to recall to the mind the vitality of surrounding Creation. Interspersed about the common at Harrogate are public seats of the description shown in Fig. 42. The designer has evidently considered that something which is usually found amongst grass would be highly appropriate for such a locality. Accordingly he has selected the serpent; copying one just as he found it, and barbing the tail in order to denote its venomous propensities; completely oblivious of the circumstance of its affording no idea whatever of support. In the same way we find massive consoles propped up upon the heads of cherubim, and Nubians with outstretched arms, holding up weighty girandoles wherever to illumine the path of the welcome visitor as
he approaches the foot of a staircase. It might be too much to say that one may knock for admittance with the head of a goat, wipe one’s “feet” upon a Newfoundland dog, approach the hostess over a carpet strewn with bouquets, converse with one foot upon a Bengal tiger, and contemplate birds of paradise upon the walls; that one may be called upon to interpose the

Bay of Naples between an elderly lady and the fireplace, to slice a pine-apple upon a humming-bird, and place one’s finger-glass upon the countenance of a Tyrolean peasant. Yet this as fairly describes the popular taste as when we say that the English people have a decided predilection for the imbibition of beer. Do we not everywhere find flowers upon floor-carpets, fruit
upon dessert-plates, insects and birds upon the walls? Are not the ladies of the family still called upon to embellish the door-panels with "subjects from life?" (Loftie). Does not Mrs. Orrinsmith recommend "figures upon painted glass?" ¹ Do not the Misses Garrett advocate leaves and flowers "as suggestive of the sweet smell which household things ought to have"? ² Are we not told by the 'Spectator' that "real decoration progresses until it culminates in a Tintoret or Michael Angelo for one's furnishing upholsterer"? ³ And has not Mr. Cross told the art students of the metropolitan schools that it is a proper thing to depict "a rose or a butterfly upon a chest of drawers"? One of the celebrated Gillow's newest designs is a bordering of flowers, peacocks, and butterflies, drawn and colored after life; and we need but look in at the chief establishments in order to ascertain what patterns predominate notwithstanding all our culture and all our opportunities for reducing taste to a science. To say nothing of the miles of shop-windows in inferior parts of London, there is in the most fashionable localities an exposition of design absolutely vulgar. Hindley has shown bouquets of flowers twenty-four inches across, and Hampton similar things three feet across. Sporting scenes are depicted upon wall-papering; episodes in the Prince's Indian tour have been commemorated, and in the most noted
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emporiums, not excepting that of Minton's agent in South Audley Street, as many animals as might have tenanted Noah's Ark are imitated in crockery, and displayed in the window to captivate the public eye. Another craze for "faithful representations" in the wrong place extends itself to the introduction of "zoological and ornithological lamps," whereby is meant lamps and candelabra held in the hands of, or otherwise sustained by, actual stuffed specimens from the zoological and ornithological world.

Now, the first objection against this style of ornation is, that since bouquets would not naturally be found upon our walls, flowers would not naturally be trampled under foot, and peacocks would not naturally manifest themselves under a cornice, such things ought not to be represented there. Houses being erected for shelter, comfort, and repose, nothing within doors should suggest that one is out of doors. Human beings, in these latitudes at all events, do not spend their evenings under the glorious canopy of heaven, hold converse in an aviary, or retire for rest among buzzing insects and screeching birds of plumage. And the second objection is, that since one representation is insufficient to cover an entire wall, carpet, or frieze, a succession of repetitions is necessary, and the effect is distracting.

These objections, in general, are practically ignored; sometimes they are virtually acknowledged. Howsoever uncognizant we may be of settled principles in
decoration, persons of refinement cannot but feel the absurdity and incongruity of the popular style, and efforts are accordingly made, in two directions, to obviate them. One is by re-introducing what is known as Mediæval decoration, wherein natural objects are indicated rather than depicted; the other is by increasing the size of delineations and covering the whole surface with a lesser number. The latter has been devised, apparently, by Mr. Whistler—at least this is his style as rendered upon the walls of a well-known mansion at Prince's Gate. There we have life-sized peacocks; two of which are in the flutter of mortal combat.

The last-mentioned style we may pass over as too ridiculous for comment. But there is an insidiousness in the arguments adopted in favor of the former which demands a few special observations. It is said that we should "typify" rather than represent; a proposition from which few will be inclined to dissent. The difficulty, however, begins when we come to enquire what is meant by typification. Of the two methods in vogue for its effectuation, one may be designated the sentimental, the other the scientific. Of the former character is that which consists in preserving the natural outline, while the coloring, instead of closely resembling that of Nature, is merely suggestive; of which description are those patterns which have made the name of Morris celebrated, and those which are recommended by the lady writers in
the 'Art at Home' series. Birds, insects, fruit, and flowers, may all appear upon the wall, provided they are not "faithful representations." There may be stalks and tendrils intertwined among trellis-work, and plants of various kinds "harmoniously intermingled;" the "lusciousness of the vine" may be suggested, and "the entire growth and sweetness of the rose plant;" the " clustering blossoms of the hawthorn" may be distinguished from the jasmine, and "dull red flowers" painted upon "a light green distemper."  

The scientific method is that advocated by Mr. Dresser. He also would typify; but since real flowers, &c., if growing upon a level with the eye—as he argues—would be seen sideways, therefore typifications should present upon the wall a "bilateral" appearance; and whereas, when seen from above, they would spread to the eye, therefore typifications thereof should assume upon a floor or carpet what he terms "a radiating character."

The first is unquestionably superior to the popular style already dilated upon. Yet, if the theory upon which it is founded be at all comprehensible, it is difficult to say why the conventional Newfoundland dog should not be delineated upon the hearth-rug in the same manner as birds and butterflies are delineated upon the wall; all that is requisite being that "dead

2 'Principles of Decorative Art,' chap. v.
tint' or "flatted color" should be substituted for the varied hues of Nature. The second style is insipid, meagre, and far too Coptical.

My own opinion is, that birds, butterflies, and other insects, should be excluded altogether; that the jasmine should be undistinguishable from the hawthorn, and that the decorator should aim at suggesting, not the "sweet scent" of flowers, or the "entire growth of the rose plant," but simply the richness and bloom of Nature. These qualities will be best attained by adhering, either to strictly geometric decoration, or to those patterns which partake of a geometrical character. For it must not be forgotten that such things as "dull red flowers on green distemper grounds" are very confusing to the eye; and this alone would render them objectionable.

It seems to be theoretically admitted that wallpapering should serve as a background against which human inmates and a great part of the furniture should stand out like figures in a picture; because for what other reason are "dead tints" and "flatted colors" adopted? Yet the theory is belied by the introduction of distracting contrasts, both in form and color. Most people are now familiar with the Saracenic style, as exemplified in the Alhambra at Grenada, a model of which may be seen in the architectural department of the South Kensington. The patterns are geometric, and the coloring rich in the extreme—pure red, pure
blue, and pure gold exclusively being used. Yet all is so interwoven, and the colors are so interblended, that the spectator is in no way distracted; the whole surface falls away from the eye, and notwithstanding the brilliancy of each component hue, the countenance stands out against it as effectually as it does against a surface of the deadest tint obtainable.

It is a mistake to imagine that brilliancy necessarily leads to gaudiness. There are far richer colors in some of the old stained-glass windows, in Turkey carpets, and even in Cashmere shawls, than there are in ordinary British decoration; in the Criterion, for example, or in St. James's Hall. The charm lies in the interblending of colors by their introduction in comparatively infinitesimal quantities, and in the avoidance of all that is patchy. And the effect of this style of decoration, while being equivalent to tint in conducing to repose, is to impart the richness of Nature without reminding us of organic Creation. In producing this effect we need not confine ourselves to designs which are strictly geometric, but adopt also such as are quasi-geometric; selecting those which are of a "radiating" character in preference to patterns of a "bilateral" character, without regard to any such theory as that propounded by Mr. Dresser, and simply because the former are more decorative than the latter. What I would imply by the term "quasi-geometric" is a combination of pattern, suggestive, it may be, of natural form, yet so amalga-
mated as to present to the eye one mass of bloom or resplendency; so unlike anything natural as to defy all attempt at distinction; so purely artificial as to fall within the category of legitimate design, and detached from surroundings by enclosure within well demarcated borders (see Fig. 48).

The imitation, and so called typification, of natural and familiar forms in a great measure results, of course, from the comparative facility with which representations are made; for it is always easier to copy than to invent. Nevertheless, false reasoning also plays an important part. The accompanying sketch (Fig. 43) represents no less than six different rail-heads

between 92 and 111, Piccadilly. Obviously, they are all taken from spears, arrows, halberds, and other weapons, as suggestive of defence; and the intervening urn, &c., are there to indicate the consequent fruits of security. They are no more effective than railings of geometric
design (Fig. 44); but the fascination lies in their supposed symbolism. In the same manner the Newfoundland dog is introduced upon the hearth-rug, and the *cave canem* into the mosaic of the vestibule, in order to denote a vigilance exercised against unwarrantable intrusion. These things are considered appropriate. It is probably expected that the watchful eyes of the canine guardian will awaken a feeling of becoming circumspection, just as vertical lines will kindle a sense of devotion, or roses upon the wall recall to the imagination the sweet and refreshing perfumes of Nature. And thus we find that vases intended to hold bouquets will have flowers painted all round them, and dessert-services will be exquisitely embellished with apricots, peaches, and other luscious products. Pheasant-pie will be denoted by an effigy of a pheasant; the handle of a butter-pot will be furnished with a Liliputian cow, and boiled eggs will be indicated by a sitting hen. This affected appropriateness is as ridiculous as the mock symbolism hereinbefore deprecated, when commenting upon the embellishment of
the British Museum gates. It is impossible to guard against intrusion by any number of cave canem \textit{s}; it is unnecessary to denote the purpose for which a vase is to be used; and an effort to recall the perfumes of Nature is made at the sacrifice of all that is gratifying to the vision.

Other designs, again, are adopted without reference to appropriateness, but simply because they represent what is intrinsically beautiful. Of this description are such things as the accompanying (Fig. 45). Of course it will be said that fictile abominations of a type so vulgar are not found in "good houses." Still, it is impossible to distinguish between ornaments of this kind and those which are exposed for sale in most of the shops in London. Goode, of South Audley Street — the agent for Minton — besides such things as peacocks, pugs, fallow-deer, bears, storks, and cockatoos, modeled and colored to Nature, has a life-sized swan in crockery, provided with an aperture in its back for the retention of such horticulture products as one may choose to put into it. It would puzzle one to discover in this any appreciable superiority over an ordinary fish-vase, or Bergmaster beer-pot.
Finally, innumerable designs are adopted in commemoration of remarkable personages or incidents, and to satisfy a craving for mere innovation. I have beheld the Shah of Persia worked into a counterpane; and it is not an uncommon thing to find Her Majesty doing duty as an anti-macassar.

The accompanying sketch is from one of Mappin and Webb’s “latest novelties” (Fig. 46). It manifests about as much capacity for artistic conception as that exhibited by the ancient people of Palestine when they portrayed “in vermillion” upon their walls “images of desirable young men.”\(^1\) There is no objection against the lion itself; but to the circumstance of the calyx

\(^1\) Ezekiel, xxiii.
being screwed into its head. The accompanying drawing shows how figures may with propriety be introduced (Fig. 47). The stem of the bowl is not sustained by the infants; but merely kept in its posi-

Fig. 47.

**Figures Properly Introduced.**

tion by them. It is supported upon a stem resting upon a solid basis.

Now a few words in reference to color, and then we shall revert to the subject of general ornament. It may be asked why I advocate its use in the interior, when I would all but exclude it from the exterior. The answer is two-fold. Firstly, because the tint of the exterior
should contrast with natural surroundings, which reasoning does not apply to the interior; and secondly, because backgrounds, which would be unnecessary out of doors, are requisite within doors. So that one arrangement is, as it were, the converse of the other. The only question then is, as to its distribution.

In Nature we find that, with the exception of green and blue, what may be termed positive and decided colors are never introduced in masses, but are reserved for flowers, for the plumage of birds, for insects, precious stones, and such like. Following the disposition thus indicated, we ought to confine ourselves to such hues as are unobtrusive, and embellish with those which are richer. For example, there may be a cream-tinted wall set off with crimson, or an amber wall enriched with blue; these colors not only appearing also in the window-curtains, and other drapery of the room, but running along in bands under the cornice, over the dado, and in the corners;—thereby emphasizing structural lines. What tints are suitable and what unsuitable is a matter with which we need not here concern ourselves. There are rules applicable to the subject, but these will be more conveniently treated of when we come to speak of Dress; and for all practical purposes the most becoming may be selected after first trying them against the complexion.

Where pictures are to be hung, no color is so appropriate as green—the background suggested by
Nature herself. It is well known that there is a predilection among artists in favor of chocolate; yet, since in most pictures reds and rich browns predominate, these are more effectively set off by contrast than by similarity. As an argument in favor of this view, I may instance the galleries of the South Kensington as compared with those of Burlington House. In the Grosvenor we find deep crimson; which not only impairs the richness of cognate hues, but, being glossy, distracts the eye instead of affording that subdued effect which is so essential. For surfaces, two or three shades of the same color are far preferable to such contrasts as "dull red" erratically introduced upon "pale green."

I would strongly recommend that all patterns should be raised; and that whether they be purely geometric, or indicate, in "the tangled maze," the contour of leaves and flowers, every constituent object should be defined by distinct lines, either of deeper tint or of gold. Embossed designs—a very good substitute for which is flock-papering—are much more effective than patterns printed upon flat surfaces, and conduce more readily to the attainment of that transparency which is all but indispensable if we would present to the mind the richness and bloom of Nature.

Now, this leads us to consider the distinction between what are technically known as Pictorial and Decorative Art. Some maintain that there is no difference between the two, and that all Art is decorative. The
latter part of this proposition is true. Nevertheless, there is, in reality, an essential distinction; and it is to the non-observance thereof that we may trace most of the vulgar errors of the day. If a landscape with distant mountains, sky, &c., be depicted upon a wall, shall that be termed a picture? If it be a picture, where does it end, and the wall begin? Let us take but two examples, and the reader will perceive that the less the two arts are confused, the more truly artistic will be the entire result. One whole side in the interior of Lincoln's Inn Hall is covered with a fresco representing the School of Legislation. To begin with, the point of sight in the perspective of this allegorical production is several yards above the level of the eye, which is in itself a monstrous defect. But putting this aside, let us ask ourselves whether, if the pavement in the foreground be intended to represent to the imagination real pavement, the temples in the middle distance real temples, and whether if it be otherwise intended to carry the eye back by successive stages, the wall upon that side of the interior is not virtually obliterated? For, if what we look upon be a vista gradually receding, how can a solid thing which cannot recede co-exist? On the other hand, if what we look upon be a wall, then there can be no recession, and the grave legislators are simply sprawling about upon a surface of brick and mortar. The second example is in the conventional humming-bird por-
trayed upon a dessert-plate. As far as possible it is drawn and colored to life, and represented as winging its flight through the atmosphere. Of course, were there any hesitation as to whether one's pine-apple was to be placed upon the bird or in the atmosphere, it would immediately be said that the whole thing is only a "picture." Yet, if it be a picture, it has no boundary. How is one to distinguish between the plate and the atmosphere? Moreover, why, let it be asked, should one be invited to slice one's dessert upon a picture at all? Is it not as ridiculous to do this as to recline against a portrait of the Queen, or cover one's-self with the Shah of Persia? There can be, in the true sense of the term, no picture without a frame—a real, raised frame, not a mock imitated one—something to keep it totally distinct from its surroundings; for that within the frame and that without represent two surfaces, one appearing to stand where it actually stands, the other receding from the eye.

Depend upon it, the wider the bridge which separates the art of the painter from that of the decorator, the more they will mutually benefit each other. We may at once perceive this in the instance of a jardinière embellished in the ordinary way with depicted flowers. Not only do these, howsoever well executed, suffer by the presence of real flowers, but the brilliancy of the latter is necessarily impaired by the proximity of painted ones; since these, if they do nothing else,
divert attention from the principal objects. A bouquet will look much better surrounded by a pattern of geometric, or quasi-geometric, design, tricked out with deep neutral tint, than with any amount of pictorial embellishment; because, both in design and color, there is a contrast. So, likewise, will a properly framed, genuine picture.

If the Italian style is not more frequently adopted, I feel pretty sure it is simply on account of a difficulty in procuring fresco-painters at moderate cost, for even as it is, Renaissance arabesques appear upon the walls when there is not the slightest occasion for them. A Renaissance arabesque is somewhat akin to bad music. As in the latter no one can guess from one note what the following will be, since there is no natural sequence, so in this “arabesque” it is impossible to divine the character of one delineation from that of another. It may be a Griffin; it may be a Mermaid; it may be a scroll; perchance it is a garland of evergreens; it is not unlikely to evolve into a bow of yellow ribbon; the only certainty connected therewith is that every principle of harmony will be set at defiance. Pictorial vulgarity culminates in the Italian style. There are mock colonnades intended to look like real colonnades; glimpses of landscape executed with such scenic effect as to deceive the eye; and, not only the vaulted canopy of heaven overhead, but angelic beings therein, clouds at various altitudes, and balconies running round
ostensible apertures in the ceiling in order to delude the mind into the belief that there is no such thing as artificial roofing. Some of the rooms in a well-known Club in Piccadilly, and most of those in Kensington House, are decorated in this manner; and, in the Grand Hotel at Brighton, the walls of the staircase are embellished with groups of musical instruments bound together with ribbon. One side of the Westminster Aquarium smoking-saloon is besmeared with a fresco intended for a vista of natural scenery, and the orchestra of the Crystal Palace is furnished with an open-air gallery, rendered with all the ingenuity of a sign-painter. Of course there are occasions when illusion is necessary, as in scenic representation; but even from scenic representation may be adduced instances of its absurdity under other conditions. Upon the drop-scene of the Court Theatre is—or was a year ago—an entrance to a castle rising from the stage as if the stage were the ground. So far good; and if the painter had chosen to depict any object beyond this line it would have been legitimately introduced. In advance of this line, however, is a halberdier on guard, apparently standing upon the stage. Now here illusion is both impossible and unnecessary; therefore it is vulgar.

In Italy it is not unusual to find, not only a vase of flowers painted upon a wall, but the niche wherein it is supposed to stand. The play of light and shadow is
regulated by surroundings, and an obvious attempt is made to deceive. Perhaps this much may not be said of the infantile members of the celestial host who condense to sustain in the air the ponderous candelabrum, or of the dove in the ceiling, from whose tender breast depends the unethereal gas-pipe. Yet, as artistic devices, there is not much to choose between them.

As might be expected, there are many who, perceiving the absurdity of illustrating the glories of heaven, endeavor merely to indicate them. Accordingly we find, in the Foreign Office, a star-bespangled corridor, and, in the Grosvenor Gallery, the moon in successive phases careering through the firmament. But it has already been pointed out that any device within doors which suggests that one is out of doors is in "bad taste." The azure hue is in itself, no doubt, extremely beautiful, and inasmuch as it recedes from the eye, may be effective in imparting apparent altitude; yet, even this should be introduced with discrimination; for it must not be forgotten that, whereas the most agreeable natural light emanates from above, so should artificial light be reflected, in a great measure, from the ceiling, and that deep tints thereon counter-vail the efficacy of this disposition. This is one reason why paintings are objectionable, excepting in very lofty saloons wherein light is admitted through apertures above the ordinary windows. Another reason, however—and perhaps a more cogent one—is that they are
absolutely thrown away. They may be pictures in the true sense of the term; they may not to all appearance expunge the ceiling, but be obviously painted thereon and surrounded by evident frames; yet one cannot help feeling that if they are genuine works of Art they ought to be placed upon a level with the eye, and that if they are not genuine works of Art they ought not to be introduced at all.

Excluding, then, such pictorial representations as are not in the true sense of the term pictures, and confining garlands and bouquets—rendered merely in white, or dead-tint,—to window-curtains and other things which are never trodden, sat upon, or reclined against, the decorator will do well to confine himself to mere indications; to avoid everything which may arrest the attention and distract the eye, and endeavor to suffuse as much resplendency as may be compatible with perfect repose. Not only was the best Mediaeval embellishment regulated upon such principles, but these are virtually expounded in those specimens of Oriental Art which we consider so worthy of admiration. It would be too much to say that the Caucasians of the East proceeded upon any scientifically established system; but they intuitively apprehended the elements of beauty, and the result is identical. What we call an "arabesque"—a heterogeneous intermixture of animals, Griffins, fruit, and flowers—was not the arabesque of the Saracens. Theirs was strictly quasi-geometric; and,
although in coloring they used most brilliant pigments, they rarely laid themselves open to the imputation of vulgarity. And the same characteristics which have been advocated above, distinguish the productions of China and Japan which are laid in such profusion before the shrine of Fashion, and seized upon with such eagerness by her worshippers. "Were a British designer," says Eastlake, "called upon to decorate a vase, he would probably depict thereon a ship in full sail firing a salute at the Port Admiral." The Chinaman would do nothing of the sort. As a draughtsman he is incomparably inferior to the European. He might cover his vase with one mass of human figures; he might portray all the fowl of the air and the fish of the sea; but the whole thing would be so badly done, the requirements of perspective would be so totally ignored, that one object would be jumbled up with another, and the effect, so far from being pictorial, would be purely and absolutely decorative. What the Chinaman may do when he is taught to draw better and conform with the rules of matured art, it is impossible to say; probably his ceramic ornament will then be as inartistic as ours, for the effects of that floral embellishment which has long distinguished the productions of Manchester have already manifested themselves upon the embroideries of India; but at present, although he cannot compete with the British artist, he is considerably in advance of the British decorator. And even the draughtsmen of
the Celestial Empire did not, in the palmy days of their art, attempt the portrayal of natural forms; for the patterns upon the best old china, like that captured from the Pekin Palace, are purely geometric; and when animal forms were resorted to—as indeed they ought to be in order to impart spirit and character to geometric embellishments—they were either typical or grotesque. And herein lies the secret of true ornamentation. Even as Victory may appear upon the summit of a monument while the gallant hero of Trafalgar occupies a position at its base, so a dragon may officiate as the handle of a vase—provided the vase be so large as not to require lifting thereby—because a dragon bears no exact similitude with anything in Creation; whereas a greyhound cannot be introduced for the same purpose. A Centaur may be burnt into a dessert-plate; but such "original" designs as "a portrait of Martinez de Campos, Captain-General of Cuba, encircled by a wreath," from whatsoever laudable motive they may be adopted, are entirely out of place.

In so far, then, as the devices of the Mediæval era conformed with these conditions, let there be a revival. Let the arms of the family be sculptured over the portal; the crest or monogram be painted where the judgment may dictate, and the region of fancy ransacked for subjects which may fascinate the imagination; let the art of the painter and that of the decorator combine for the effectuation of all that is charming and attrac-
tive; but let there be no invasion by one into the province of the other. Indeed, so distinct should the two be kept, that the picture should, where practicable, be separated from surrounding decoration by a band similar in character to that running round the
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PROPER PICTURE HANGING.

four sides of the wall (Fig. 48). Yet so combined ought the two to be, that the picture should seem to belong to the wall; forming, as it were, part and parcel thereof, a component portion of one harmonious whole. This is accomplishable, even when no bands run round the picture so as to receive it as a setting does a
jewel, by raising the moulding of the frame from the wall to the picture, instead of perpetuating the customary method of detaching it by projecting the outer rim. Nor, if they are inclined downwards, should the inclination be perceptible; for the usual arrangement (Fig. 49), besides preventing unity, savors too forcibly of temporary suspension in an auctioneer’s mart.

The lines spoken of as demarcating with precision every object delineated upon a wall constitute, or ought to constitute, a distinguishing feature in Decorative Art. They not only obviate the insipidity of flat surfaces, but impart to each portion of a pattern an appearance of convexity which is eminently artistic. Our vases, by way of illustration; the majority of these are remarkable for a glossy tawdriness of overfinish which is never even attempted upon the best China. They are too smooth; the hues with which they are tinted are too delicate, and the subjects portrayed upon them far too elaborately manipulated. The mawkishness of over-elaboration may be perceived in miniature
upon ivory, in Danish jewelery, and in Italian inlaid work; and as to delicacy of hue, it need here be said only—for the subject will be reverted to hereafter—that the tints usually introduced upon British vases are too killing for proximity with other colors. The colors used by the Chinese are subdued. Their greens are blue greens; their blues deep blues; their yellows dark; their reds, not vermilion, but crimson. And withal, the surfaces of their vases are artistically uneven, their patterns are broken by lines which have given rise to the exquisite imitation known as cloisonné, and where no patterns are used the shell is often artificially crackled. The principle of this style of decoration should be carried through every detail, for the effect is much more pleasing even in strictly Pictorial Art. This is why our best artists paint upon ribby canvas, stand at a distance from their pictures when laying on their colors, and leave in the shadows traces of the raw-umber, or Vandyke-brown, originally rubbed in to mass out the parts in shade. The rich transparency produced by this method forms a most exquisite feature in native Pictorial Art, and one, at all events, in which we are in advance of the Continentals. It may be rendered in decoration by filling in interstices with deep red or gold; in window-painting by borderings of crimson, and in attire by a lustrous, light-colored, or golden-threaded ground as a foundation in the material for darker pattern above.
In the South Kensington will be found a very fine specimen of Borghese mosaic. Excepting the central portion, whereon is a representation of the Forum, the whole consists of variegated stones arranged in gradation from dark to light. The stones themselves are of broken pattern, and the entire thing is far more decorative, and, it may be added, more intrinsically beautiful, than ordinary inlaid work of floral design.

It is a singular indication of the popular preference for pictorial representation at all costs, that what may be termed natural decoration is persistently set aside in favor of artificial, howsoever inferior, howsoever inappropriate, and howsoever unsuitable the material may be with which it is attempted. Two albums of identical design (Fig. 50) are exposed for sale in a noted shop-window. Both are of Algerine onyx, with gilt edgings; but while one has, as a central ornament, a green malachite, the other is furnished with an inlaid wreath of flowers. The price of the latter is double that of the former! The natural grain of wood is beautiful in the extreme. All it needs is a coat of French polish or common varnish; yet it is generally smeared over with paint or artificial graining. It is only within the last few years that it has become fashionable to let the natural substance alone, and produce effects in furniture by a judicious combination of different kinds of wood.

I have dwelt thus much upon the necessity of
separating Pictorial from Decorative Art, because we do not appear to have made up our minds as to whether they shall not be considered as one and the same thing.

Fig. 50.

And this view is fostered to a great extent by a class of painters lately sprung into existence, who appear to have embarked upon a crusade against everything savoring of realism, and to have determined upon manifesting that there is no such thing as a picture in
the true sense of the term. This class, which includes within its ranks such names as Spencer Stanhope, Walter Crane, and G. F. Watts, seem to have discovered that there is no poetry in Creation, and that nothing appeals to the refined imagination which is not embodied in distortion. The poetry of Shakespear, which never outraged the actuality of Nature; the poetry of the mediæval decorator, who seldom, even upon an escutcheon, indicated miraculous phenomena; the poetry of recognised artists, who seek to portray the beauties which surround in their most attractive combinations; these are as nothing to those gentlemen whose sentiments find expression within the precincts of the Grosvenor Gallery. And as, in every domain, one more eccentric than the rest may out-Herod Herod, so, upon this novel field of intellectual antagonism, we find an ultra "decorative artist" in the person of Mr. Whistler. It is not difficult to account for the birth of the new school. When the mind is thoroughly wearied with the contemplation of Beauty; with beholding color after color, and picture after picture; it longs for reaction, and betakes itself to the inspection of something which is not a color, something which is not a picture, something with which the vision has not been satiated. This reaction is not peculiar to painting. It exhibits itself in animal pleasure, in literature, and in music. For in what other way can we account for the present abandonment of melody as
gratifying only to the vulgar, and the fashionable predilection for intonations which address themselves to the intellect instead of to the heart? One has only to peruse the *brochure* which Mr. Whistler published against Mr. Ruskin, in order to perceive the bent of his abnormal temperament. There is but little in the whole seventeen pages of this pamphlet which is comprehensible to ordinary intelligence. Weird visages, attenuated limbs, pallid and expressionless countenances pilloried against flat backgrounds, dishevelled hair flowing about when there is no wind to agitate it, Arrangements in Brown, Harmonies in Amber and Black, and what ‘The World’ wittily denominates Fantasias in Soot—if these be indicative of High Art, the sooner we content ourselves with a lower sphere of sublunary delectation the better. Without going so far as to coincide with our celebrated Art Critic in the views he expressed with regard to the “pots of paint flung in the face of the public,” I cannot but protest against the claims of most of these productions to be considered either decorative or pictorial. A genuine artistic production is one which renders Nature both truly and poetically; it may be set among its surrounding even as a precious jewel in a crown, but we may take it as an axiom that the greater the divergence between the two arts the more they will reciprocally benefit one another.

Harmonies in Blue and Gold might, unquestionably,
be rendered with charming effect; but we must guard against those initiated by Mr. Whistler. In the mansion at Prince's Gate, the ground of the dado—which is a very high one—is gold; from surbase upward is blue. Where peacocks are not portrayed, peacocks' eyes are indicated—in blue upon the gold ground, in gold upon the blue ground. Now, howsoever ornamental gold may be, it should never be used in masses. It has already been pointed out how Nature herself restricts such colors as are brilliant and decided. Gold is more brilliant than any color, and therefore above all others should be used but sparingly. Of course there is "authority" for the contrary view, and in this age of Revivalism it is easy enough to point triumphantly to the interior of early churches, and to the grounds upon which ecclesiastical pictures were executed. But we should both decline to be guided by authority which is not based upon analogy with the order of Creation, and also recollect that gold was introduced in the middle ages chiefly from sentiments of devotion. True, we speak of "golden sunsets"; but the color no more partakes of genuine gold than the "blue" of the ocean assimilates itself with pure ultramarine.

The statue of the late Prince Consort in the Albert Memorial is entirely covered with gilding. The memory of the dead has hitherto been perpetuated in time-honoured marble, as being chaste and durable, as permitting of inspection, and as suggestive of that blissful
tranquillity which it is fondly hoped might be the lot of the departed. But gold—associated in the mind with all the glitter and gaiety of life; the enricher of all enrichment; gorgeous in the shade, dazzling in sunlight—to select such a material is both a startling and uncalled-for innovation, and a violation of the principles of chromatic disposition. In the South Kensington are full-length portraits, in mosaic, of Mulready and other celebrities, encircled by gold grounds. That such things should be found in an institution especially designed for the development of popular Taste, does not argue very forcibly in favor of any progress in the national apprehension of aesthetics.

The only permissible exception to the non-gilding of entire objects would be when they are ornamentally introduced at the summit of an edifice. The Globe and Cross of St. Paul's are very properly garnished with a layer of gilding; and so might any allegorical figure be if it surmount. But no object which does not surmount should be thus treated; nor should the Prince Consort's, or any realistic figure, be overlaid. In fact, natural harmony and gradation must be maintained in the application of gold as in every other matter. To encircle a massive and sombre edifice like the British Museum with gilt railings is as absurd as it is to introduce those chain-posts of polished Aberdeen granite, popularly known as "the jam-pots," at the base of a time-worn cathedral like St. Paul's. It is out of place
even in picture-frames where the whole surface is covered therewith, because it detracts from the brilliancy of proximate colors. (Compare common method with Fig. 48.)

Gold harmonizes with any color, even with white, and may be used with advantage in the enrichment of marble, or plaster-cast, statues. But it should never be brought into contiguity with surfaces which are dingy and unfinished. In the pediment of the British Museum it has been used to touch up reliefs absolutely murky with perennial soot; and at Hyde Park Corner elaborately-gilded railings appear in proximity with huge columns of common rough-hewn stone.

It is not within the scope of this treatise to point out in every particular the style of decoration and furniture suitable to each successive department of a domestic residence. It might be said that oak is best adapted to the dining-room, as everything therein should be substantial; mahogany, walnut, or inlaid ebony, to the reception-room, because all therein should be rich and luxurious, and that the lighter kinds of upholstery are more appropriate to the bed-chambers, since the prevailing air of a dormitory should be one of thorough cleanliness; yet there is no necessity to circumscribe the range of individual selection. There is such variety in the products of the "sylvan grove," the combination of different kinds of wood admits of such diversification, and the use or non-use of gilding so alters the character
of household paraphernalia, that no hard-and-fast rule can be laid down. Nor is it necessary to descant upon the superiority of chased, pierced, damaskeened, repoussé, or even granulated metal-work, over Dresden china and such *bric-à-brac* as one usually observes interspersed about private residences. There are, however, certain vexed questions which appear to call for some definite solution by the tentative application of æsthetic principles.

One is, whether there should be a dado or not. They were once common, but were superseded by plain walls during the *Louis Quatorze* period. There is no doubt that plain walls lightly papered or tinted, impart an idea of expanse which is by no means undesirable, and that the effect of dados is to cramp. At the same time, they ought to be revived for two reasons. The first is, being generally dark, they serve as a background to the complexion, hair, and dress of the inmates, and everything else in a room; and the second is, that, in conjunction with carpet-borders (which I strongly recommend), they keep the furniture well to the wall, and group it together. The mistake usually committed is, the darkening of the wall as well as the dado. Theoretically, there may be no objection to this, for we know by experience that the darker the surroundings the more the complexion stands out against it. Yet, English rooms are generally so small, and the atmosphere of most of
our cities is so dense, that no measures for increasing apparent expanse, or for the diffusion of light, should be neglected. A compromise, then, which ensures the attainment of all these objects, is effected by retaining the dado and lightening the walls. Where pictures are to be hung, of course exceptions must be made; although, if the method hereinbefore spoken of for treating them as part and parcel of mural decoration be adhered to, they are already set off by dark margins. Nevertheless, it may be observed in passing, that the pictures usually introduced into the household, especially copies from old masters, are altogether unsuited for decorative purposes. There is much widespread misconception connected with the value of works of this description. If dingy copies of old masters be acquired for speculative purposes, that is one thing. But if they be suspended against the wall in order to render the family abode additionally attractive, the result, generally speaking, is the very reverse; because whatever veneration we may entertain for antiquity, three-fourths of the efforts of Mediæval Art, when regarded as specimens of drawing, composition, or chromatic arrangement, are not so inestimably superior to the performances of modern painters as to be worth the process of reproduction so unremittingly bestowed upon them; and the copies are generally semi-concealed by a film of obscurity—produced most frequently in the back premises of a dealer's shop, but euphemisti-
cally entitled "the mellowness of age"—which renders them far less ornamental.

Another point, is whether we should have light ceilings, or colored and elaborated ceilings; and most people incline to an opinion in favor of the latter upon the ground that in Nature the sky overhead is blue; and the cerulean hue is further said to possess the property of receding from the eye, which is an advantage in imparting altitude. It must not be forgotten, however, that white also amplifies; that it is just as often the hue overhead as blue is; and that, in addition to this, it casts down a lustre from the very direction whence Nature herself diffuses it.

The third is, as to the use of ground-glass, and lace or muslin window-curtains. The Misses Garrett are of opinion that ground-glass "darkens," and in this view most of our builders seem to coincide, for they rarely introduce it except for the purpose of shrouding in mystery the unsightliness of back-premises. This is a decided misconception; for every particle attracts and reflects a ray of light, and therefore it irradiates rather than obscures. Even French window-curtains will be found to produce the same effect, although, of course, in a lesser degree. It were well this should be borne in mind, for few who have crossed the Channel will have failed to observe that, notwithstanding the comparative gloominess of our climate,

\[1\] P. 38.
there is more glare in English houses than in those of our neighbors.

Again, there is considerable diversity of opinion as to the manner in which light should be admitted. We have been told that it should fall “from one side only”; an idea evidently suggested by the beauty of “Rembrandt effects.” These effects are highly “artistic” no doubt; but we must recollect that people are not perpetually posing for photographs, or sitting for pictures; that they are rarely stationary, and continually varying their attitudes. Under these circumstances it is better to avoid the play of strong light and deep shadow. Windows upon more sides than one are preferable—provided, of course, the stream of light be properly tempered.

The fifth relates to lineal concordancy in details; most persons, for example, regarding it as perfectly immaterial whether alphabetical characters exhibited upon a façade, painted over a shop-window, or printed upon a placard, are upright or slanting. Indifference to this matter contributes, in a marked degree, to the general vulgarity of our notifications. The disuse of Old English (Ethnological Department.), the invention of Italic (Mr. Burt begs to intimate.), the introduction of Script (To the Railway Station.), and the substitution of “Arabic” numerals (3, 5, 9) for Roman numerals (v, x, cxix), inaugurated an evil day for British abecedary ornamentation. To such an extent
should this principle of concordancy be carried, that
I would recommend the exclusion, in ceramic embellishment, of every kind of picture which does not harmonize with the shape of the vase, that is, of landscapes wherein horizons are depicted, and marine pieces. Cupids and flowers are most suitable—painted, of course, upon *plaques* or medallions.

Then there is a prejudice against the introduction of what has now come to be regarded as secular decoration into the interior of ecclesiastical edifices. Those who consider an innovation in this respect as a possible prelude to latitudinarianism in the doctrines of theology may look with apprehension upon any proposal in this direction. At the same time we must not overlook the fact of there existing between sentiment and color a deep sympathetic correspondency, and that the unfinished condition of most of our churches is calculated to damp the ardor of an enthusiasm which depends so very much upon impulse. Where anything of the kind is attempted, I would recommend grey, sage-green, or some other cool hue for the body,—set off, of course, with gilding,—and warm colors for the windows. The contrary of this arrangement as regards windows, we may frequently observe; just as we may observe that a green light is shown upon the *starboard* side of a steamer, which ought to exhibit a red light, and a red light on the *port* side, which ought to exhibit green.
And finally, there exists a conflict of sentiment between those who look with favor upon a rational indulgence in the pleasures of life and those who would omit no opportunity for obtruding the inculcation of Christian austerity. To the latter class belong those who cannot treat their fellow-creatures with a gratuitous drink of water without proclaiming the loftiness of the motives by which they have been actuated; those who have devised the delectable plan of embellishing encaustic tiles with mottoes from the Scripture, and, to all appearance, that uncompromising Revivalist, the author of 'A Plea for Art in the House,' who, at page 39, recommends, not only a cheerless grey papering for the drawing-room, but its adornment with such aphorisms from the book of Job as that "Man is born unto travail as the sparks fly upward," painted in diagonal lines, and in letters of black. It is almost superfluous to say that there is, as an old adage reminds us, a time and place for all things; and no better illustration can be given of the influence of Taste in matters not immediately affecting the visual organs than in the observance or non-observance of this maxim in the ordinary routine of everyday life. Had this precept been acted upon at the Paris Exhibition, England would have abstained from wounding the susceptibilities of the French by the distribution of Protestant declamations at the very doors of the Trocadéro!
CHAPTER V.

COMMON SENSE.

The reader will not have arrived thus far without perceiving that the tendency to regard Taste as a matter of sentiment rather than of judgment is the incubus which impedes its systematic development. One writer tells us that “salmon,” which, as combining an admixture of yellow, must necessarily be warm, “is a cold, cheerless color,” because he finds it so; another insists upon backgrounds of yellow, because it is a “beautiful color.” The Misses Garrett recommended floral designs as suggestive of “sweet smell”; Mrs. Orrinsmith advocates patterns which “wisely combine the slender boughs of the willow with the amber branches and dark-green of the gadding-vine”; and Mrs. Haweis calls upon young ladies to go about in Gainsborough hats, because, from a certain point of view, they present an agreeable contrast to the complexion. Nor is this sentimentalism confined to writers of the fair sex, for M. Blanc speaks of the hennin—which is in every respect similar to a fool’s-cap—as imparting an air of “queen-like dignity”; and Mr. Dresser exults in botanical combinations which
embody, to the satisfaction of his own imagination, such qualities as Truth, Beauty, and Power. In the name of Common Sense let us adopt reasoning more practical. What business have the boughs of the willow or the branches of an amber vine upon the inner walls of a domestic residence? How is it possible to "suggest" a perfume, howsoever delicious; to discover in a long sugar-loaf hat, which in no way conforms with the configuration of the human head, an air of queen-like "dignity"; or to detect in a Vitruvian scroll the least semblance to "a troop of maidens pursuing each other in the sacred dance?"

It really seems as if the object of most authors is to mystify rather than elucidate. Look at the "cosy little corner" depicted upon page 52 of Mrs. Orrin-smith's work on 'The Drawing-room.' "Evident and richly-colored boards suit the quaint beauty of the twisted Stewart chair;" the cushions of this are "richly embroidered"; there is a "Chinese table," a "Japanese scroll," an "Eastern carpet," a painting from Yokohama suspended against the wall, and a representation of a cockatoo upon the window-curtain. Can anyone make head or tail of this kind of garniture? That Mr. Ruskin's high-flown dissertations have produced a vast amount of good no one will deny. But take the more pretentious works recently translated. One extract from 'Art in Ornament and Dress'

1 Vide Frontispiece to 'Principle of Decorative Art.'
will suffice to show the character of this disquisition. "If symmetrical animals" says page 38, "are superior to radiating animals; if symmetry corresponds to what is most elevated, grand, and noble—thought—we must acknowledge that radiation, by the very fact that it characterises the rudimentary works of creation anterior to the appearance of man upon our planet, belongs to epochs when the world presented nothing but spectacles of sublimity." Is this the way to advance the Science of Taste? As to the volume just issued, entitled 'Æsthetics' (by Eugène Véron), it appears to be devoted entirely to mystification; and there are not wanting indications that the writer himself does not apprehend the signification of his subject, for he treats Taste as synonymous with what we have already pointed out is merely individual predilection. "What is it," he demands, "but the capability to feel æsthetic pleasure? We may say that taste, as thus defined, is possessed by all men. Some like music, some like painting," and more to this effect.¹ It may be asked in return, What is meant by "the capability to feel æsthetic pleasure?" For if it signifies the capacity for experiencing pleasurable sensations from the contemplation of Beauty only, then it is certainly not "possessed by all men." If it were, there would be no need for Eugène Véron's book. Most men derive pleasure from the contemplation of what they are accustomed to; and

¹ P. 65.
very few can distinguish the difference between that which happens to afford them gratification, and that which is better calculated to do so. It in no way aids the comprehension of Taste to define it as that which derives "aesthetic pleasure;" for aesthetic pleasure itself must be defined. I myself would like it to mean that pleasure which arises from the contemplation of the Beautiful only. But the capacity for thus deriving pleasure is nothing more or less than Taste itself; so that, after expounding in a circle, we revert to the original expression. An English writer of the Eugène Véron school tells us that it "may be provisionally defined as the subjective concomitant of the normal amount of activity not directly connected with the life-preserving function in the peripheral end-organs of the cerebro-spinal nervous system."¹ This definition is certainly elaborate, and may be the outcome of very profound research. It affords, however, only an additional sample of the style of writing already deprecating. It is no more intelligible than the definition of Jurisprudence by Professor Amos, "which deals," says this learned gentleman, "with the facts brought to light through the operation of the fact of Law (considered as such, and as neither good nor bad) upon all other facts whatsoever, including among these other facts, the facts resulting in the creation, and expressing the historical and logical vicissitudes of Law itself."²

¹ 'Physiological Æsthetics,' by Grant Allen, p. 34. ² 'Jurisprudence,' p. 18.
Grandiloquent phraseology, metaphysical disquisition, the enunciation of mere opinions, and the perpetual appeal to "authority"—these are not the means by which the Science of Taste will be brought within the reach of popular comprehension. Depend upon it our best authority will be Common Sense, and that principles are the only guide we can trust to. What does it matter, for instance, whether Eastlake tells us that, in incised-work, the perforations should exhibit the pattern? Does not intuitive percipience point out that every representation should be rendered in a tangible medium, and that vacuity is incapable of indicating the modulations of form? We may not have flowers upon a carpet—why? Because flowers ought not to be trampled upon. But we may have leaves; for leaves are trampled upon. Not such leaves indeed as we find in the Folkestone Pavilion Hotel, or in Brandon's new show-rooms—immense, vegetating, tropical things, which, to all appearance, afford a resting-place for one foot upon the tip while the other presses upon the stalk—but small leaves, several of which are embraceable at the same time.

Not many years ago it was fashionable to avoid correspondency upon both sides of a mantel-shelf, and so forth; and to such an extent was this carried that people drove out with horses which did not match. Now, how are freaks of this character to be rectified but by appealing to the order observed upon the wings
of a butterfly, whereupon we have embellishment of a most gorgeous description, yet perfect correspondency? No amount of learning will help us with an argument. All we can do is to point to Nature and say that, since the Creator Himself understands what Beauty is far better than we do, the safest course is to be guided by Him. In the Opera House, Covent

Garden, is, upon each side of the proscenium, a spiral column of the above description (Fig. 51). The circumvolutions in so far correspond that they take precisely the same direction; still, they do not exactly correspond, otherwise they would both evolve from the same point in the middle of the stage (Fig. 52). Anyone can see that the latter method is right and the former wrong; yet we can deduce no argument ex-
cepting from organic Creation. The sketch shown upon page 135 is from the church of St. Jude in South Kensington. The architect might tell us that the square, white block was very properly introduced, because it satisfies the eye by affording a broad basis of pressure against the brickwork beneath, which might divide were a wedge-shaped bracket alone inserted. If this be so, what was the object in cutting out a tri-

Fig. 52.

angular "corbel"? The object manifestly was to impart a finish; for every projection should be provided with a support, and every support should gradually taper towards the wall. Is not the effect of this destroyed by permitting the rectangularity of the block to be visible?

No doubt, when we come to consider what Common Sense demands, we shall be compelled occasionally to
descend to matters which are apparently very trivial. At the same time, when we reflect upon the influence which trifles exercise upon felicity, we shall not affect to discard them. It is a small matter, intrinsically, whether a man shows a shirt-collar or not; but it makes every difference in his appearance. It seems a trifling matter whether the bifurcations of a door-strap curve inwards or outwards (Fig. 54); nevertheless, if there are two ways of doing a thing, there is no reason why the right one should not be insisted upon. To curve them outwards is to manifest the same non-appreciation of harmony as in the instance of the convex modillion, and to destroy, at the same time, the prehensile character of the strap. It is a matter of no vital consequence whether the handle of a dressing-room water-jug
is to be placed at the top instead of at the side (Fig. 55). Yet there is no reason why it should not be; or why, whenever it is occasionally placed at the top, it should be attached by what is made to resemble blue or pink ribbon. Whether a claret-jug is to be adorned with bas-reliefs illustrating the process of wine-pressing, or merely with grapes and vine leaves; whether those of Mediæval design (Fig. 56) are not preferable to

"latest novelties" by Mappin and Webb—these are questions of apparent insignificance; yet they are all, in their various ways, exponents of the principles we are contending for. There are many who may regard the shape of a chair, the form of a mattress, or the arrangement of a bed-chamber, with indifference; yet these are everything to our comfort. Very few of the former afford proper support to the small of the back;
and most of them seem to be manufactured for the express purpose of rounding the shoulders. As to spring-mattresses, instead of being inclined downwards, they are usually made perfectly level; so that the upper part of the body, being heavier than the lower, sinks into a posture utterly subversive of tranquil repose. The two diagrams upon page 139 are intended to indicate what every upholsterer should aim at. The whole of the back may repose against Fig. a, and a slight inclination in the seat prevents any tendency to slide forward. The back in Fig. b, being on a pivot, adjusts itself.

Fig. 58 is introduced with the view of suggesting the disposition of bedroom furniture, especially in hotels. To begin with, the lavatory arrangements are partitioned off, as in the best establishments abroad (c); and this is no small convenience, since the cabinet is provided with pegs, and every-
thing unsightly is screened off. Then the bed is placed across the chamber, so that one's eyes are not dazzled by light from the windows (A). There are two windows instead of one, and the dressing-table is between them (B). The ordinary plan of having only one when there is ample space for more, and putting the mirror immediately in front of it, is most ridiculous; for where light is admitted through a single aperture, the rays are necessarily concentrated; and no countenance in the world appears to advantage with a stream of light full upon it. (H) is a mirrored wardrobe, placed so as to afford the most effective aid in the toilette; (G) is an ottoman, with a lid which opens for the reception of dresses; (D) is an aperture, with flat muslin curtain; (E) is the wash-stand, and (F) another article of domestic utility, provided with doors opening into both compartments.

Let us instance but three well-known edifices as illustrating the co-existence of the two qualities we are treating of. In order to take in at a glance the whole beauty of the Opera House in Paris, one is
obliged to take his stand at some distance in front. The moment, however, he finds himself in the best position, the stage portion rises up like a huge, unsightly pyramid, and mars the effect. The second specimen is nearer our own doors. Were a draughtsman delineating, by mere measurement, the whole façade of the British Museum, the railings which surround it would bear but a trifling proportion to the total height. Yet, it has been apparently overlooked, that when thrown forward they would tend to shut out the view; and the consequence is, that, to a spectator in the street, the building is all but invisible. The third is the famous Aquarium at Brighton. When a fabric was required for the Great Exhibition, Paxton designed one which, although but an adaptation from the Chatsworth Conservatory, admirably suited its purpose, and exhibited, at the same time, unquestionable artistic pre-
tension. An opportunity was afforded for the display of similar originality in the construction of an Aquarium. But it was thrown away. The Abode of Fish had to be rendered; the Home of the Mermaid presented to the imagination. The monsters and marvels of the deep should have been visible through cavities and grottoes apparently subaqueous; a sea-green tone should have pervaded the whole, and the place might have been illumined by warm, subdued lights from above. Instead of this, we are favored with an unlimited manifestation of “Streaky-bacon”; there is glitter and bewilderment instead of repose; there are Gothic arches to impart loftiness and elasticity where loftiness and elasticity are entirely out of place; there are unconcealed iron stanchions in the fernery;—it is a place where one would least expect to find fish.
It is of the utmost consequence that we should regard the cultivation of Common Sense with serious concern, for not only is Taste unable to progress without it, but owing to its non-cultivation, material prosperity is impeded. One great drawback to its development is, no doubt, the insularity of our position; depriving us, as it does, of a stimulus from ready comparison. But independently of this, there are others more immediately remediable; namely, the tendency to rely upon learning and authority, rather than upon the dictates of intuition, and an inordinate reverence for the institutions of our forefathers. We refuse to march with the times, and the result is, the most advanced Continental nations leave us behind. Our laws are a labyrinthical fabric of artificial and incomprehensible complexity. In the apportionment of legal sanctions, a virtual immunity is accorded to those vipers of society, the perpetrators of wholesale fraud. In Ethics we concern ourselves more with the reprobation of venial transgressions than with the suppression of offences involving absolute moral turpitude. In Politics we stand alone in evincing an antagonism against the evolution of national unification. In Diplomacy we generally offend all round, without creating a single advantageous alliance. In the conduct of hostilities we sacrifice the precious lives of our countrymen in expeditions against Africans, while we bring over Indians to fight against Europeans. We open our eyes with astonishment at
the very reasonable expedient of exacting the costs of a campaign from a defeated aggressor; terminate a successful invasion of our own by subsidizing a vanquished foe; and, when we make war upon Cetewayo, do not employ Sepoys accustomed to live upon farinaceous food, to drink water, and sleep upon the ground; but soldiers who are twice as valuable to the country, who live upon beef and mutton, drink beer, repose upon mattresses, and are just as dependent upon commissariat organization as upon a proper supply of rifles and ammunition. In Public Worship we set up, in place of a lesser number of majestic edifices with grand and impressive services, a series of comparatively insignificant ones with tame and common-place ministrations. In the treatment of invalids we are only just beginning to perceive the perniciousness of theory when opposed to the promptings of natural inclination, and to substitute, for nauseating drugs, medicinal waters known to the Romans eighteen centuries ago. In Navigation we nominally lay down a "rule of the road," but permit any commander to disregard it whenever it suits his purpose to do so. In Architecture we are slaves to archaeological orthodoxy on the one hand; mere conventionality on the other. In the Fine Arts we repudiate the notion of State encouragement; and in Social Science, neglect the most palpable measures for ensuring our own contentment.

I have written in favor of residence in flats; why?
Because the majority of us, who have not the means for dwelling in large houses, would be all the happier for it. I do not mean flats like the Victoria and Albert mansions—gloomy, and situated in a noisy thoroughfare—but those similar to the new suites in Paris, with an ascensor attached to each, double windows in front, and, as a matter of course, other modern appliances. We have gone on extending the area of London until a considerable portion of the days allotted to man, and a vast deal of vital energy also, are wasted in the mere operation of going backwards, forwards, upstairs, and down. And the greater numbers have been forced into this, owing to the absence of Common Sense in municipal regulations. The favored localities of the early part of the century are more convenient, lie higher, and must be better drained, than the present resorts of the beau monde. There is no reason why they should not be re-occupied. But it is impossible this desirable result can be attained without the coadjuvancy of the State, or of corporations invested with authority by the State; unless approaches be first properly paved, properly lighted, and properly cleansed. And I mean by proper paving, that wood or asphalte alone should be laid down. The latter is by far the more easy and durable of the two; and were it not considered too slippery, would never have been superseded. It is too slippery, however, only for iron horseshoes, which there is no reason for carrying down to posterity, since India-rubber ones,—
or shoes made of some similar substance and covering the entire hoof so as to sit firm,—would afford a better hold, and be noiseless as well.

There is no place in the whole world better known than Regent Street. It is spoken of with affection in all our Colonies; it is one of the sights which foreigners (who have not seen it) wish to behold; it possesses a decided advantage in an alternation of sun-light and shade upon each side; its situation is unrivalled, and, notwithstanding all drawbacks, it still holds its own. Nevertheless, how long will it continue to hold its own unless measures be taken to render it worthy of its renown? Is it not a reflection upon English legislation that the obstinacy, or shortsightedness, of individual ratepayers should be allowed to nullify all attempts at improvement in this notorious Avenue of Fashion? If a strip on one side, even four yards in width, were bought up by the Board of Works, and the Board itself were to build one handsome block, with shop-fronts beneath and suites above; if a bye-law were made enforcing façadal uniformity in other blocks; if the street were paved with asphalte or wood, and well lighted; and withal, if a sloping, glass covered-way were erected over the pavement running the whole length thereof upon each side, would there be very much opposition on the part of tradesmen who must eventually benefit by this? And if there were opposition, would it not be justifiable to over-
whelm it for the sake of the national good? Indeed, towards the expenses of a covered-way, tradesmen might contribute, since it would both protect their goods from the sun’s rays and bring customers as well. It may be argued that idlers would congregate under the covered-way as they did under the Quadrant Colonnade. They did so under the Colonnade because the entire length thereof did not exceed three hundred yards, and this limitation of space naturally eventuated in crowded gatherings. It may be said there are no funds for the purpose. Yet there were funds for freeing the bridges; a matter of secondary importance compared with the beautifying of the capital. And it may be that the Board does not possess the necessary powers. This, however, is just the point we are dealing with. If the Board does not possess the necessary powers, is it not because we suffer our veneration for antiquated institutions to over-ride the monitions of practical wisdom? Were a member to rise from his seat in Parliament to propose an alteration demanded by the requirements of Taste, he would, in the present immaturity of popular appreciation, most probably, be laughed down; because Beauty is commonly held to be “a thing of naught”; and Taste, so far from being regarded as a Science, or anything approaching to a Science, is looked upon as a manifestation of unaccountable fancies.

This Science, however, does not concern itself with such things alone. The widest field is open to its
application. Are we to spend millions in erecting extensive public edifices, in widening streets, and effecting other improvements, and yet suffer the whole face of the metropolis to be disfigured by advertisements? Are we to provide no rational entertainment for the people? to make no effort to elevate and refine the great mass of our fellow-countrymen? Are we to be the sole "champions of the Decalogue, eternally raising fleets and armies to make all others good and happy," while the majority of our own compatriots have no ideas beyond those imbibed in the pot-house, and are ill able to express themselves in their very mother tongue? Does not Taste concern itself with the repression of vulgarity in all its phases? It is all very well to say that we are "a business people," and that the exigencies of commerce demand the utmost latitude in the spread of advertisements. The exigencies of trade would not suffer by the imposition of reasonable restriction upon their dimensions and character. On the contrary, the present system must entail an expenditure which few can afford. If Jones announces the virtues of his commodities upon a flaming placard a dozen feet in width, Robinson in self-defence is compelled to do the same; and when Jones multiplies his announcements, there is no limit to the expense which the ardor of competition will entail. So likewise, if the omnibuses of one company be allowed to ply through the streets with gigantic, wabbling, red umbrellas as
badges of distinction, and the shopmen of one street be permitted to exhibit distracting window-tickets, similar privileges cannot be withheld from others. It is surely not a matter of paramount importance that the superiority of MRS. ALLEN'S HAIR DYE, MRS. WINSLOW'S SOOTHING SYRUP, THORLEY'S FOOD FOR CATTLE, OKEY'S KNIFE POLISH, and ENO'S FRUIT SALT, should be proclaimed upon the house-tops! Nor is the spirit of man to be irritated by glaring and distracting appeals more in keeping with bankrupt precipitancy than with the stability of vigorous and legitimate trade. If the owners of a periodical which enjoys "the largest circulation in the world" be not content with their good fortune; if the insatiable Singer, having already disposed of "1,300,000" sewing-machines, be desirous of selling a few hundred thousands more, cannot they make their wishes known upon tablets not exceeding eighteen inches in width? If Du Barry has really effected "90,000 cures" by means of Revalenta Arabica, are not the daily newspapers at hand for the communication of this astounding intelligence? Are we to be perpetually bewildered by perambulating proletarians pacing to and fro with panegyrics of every conceivable description printed upon boards of garish color, and incessantly pursued by the vision of SMITH'S CELEBRATED HATS? (Fig. 59). If no restriction be imposed, it is impossible to foretell where all this will end, for the ingenuity of
contractors has already devised a shower of hand-bills from toy balloons, and a delectable method of startling the pedestrian by suddenly casting before his path a quivering, magic picture.

There is scarcely a locality free from these vulgar proclamations; and during the season, when above all times an effort should be made to render the Capital attractive, they are not only multiplied to an indefinite extent, but supplemented by an additional corps of sandwich-men. One cannot visit the Royal Aquarium without being told at the entrance that there are some BLUE WRASS to be seen inside; nor a Restaurant without finding the availability of NATIVE OYSTERS, PORTER-HOUSE STEAKS, and ICED SPIDERS, obtrusively placarded against the wall, or printed upon strips of paper pasted across magnificent pier-glasses. If one betakes himself to the gardens of the parks to refresh his soul with the contemplation of Nature, the information will be thrust upon him, whether he desires it or not, that one shrub is a CYDONIA JAPONICA, another
the Taxus Hybernica, a third the Philadelphus Coronarius; and should he run down to Brighton to escape from all this, he will discover that the very band-stand upon the pier is encircled by a series of self-laudatory encomiums, the chief of which, concerning the qualities of Pears' Soap—an immense thing in fiery red—is discernible from the very Downs.

Now, I do not think any one will dispute that the most fitting vehicle for commercial announcements is a periodical. At the same time, if any additional medium be desired, it should be subjected to such regulations as may prevent its being a nuisance, and a disfigurement to the metropolis. Perpetuate the existing system, and the reproach attaching to us, in appearing to be "a nation of shop-keepers," will never be removed.

Not only do we unwittingly obtrude the purely mercantile proclivities for which we are stigmatized, but we are singularly indifferent to the dissemination of refinement except among the upper ten. There are picture-galleries in London; which are closed upon the only day when the masses would be able to visit them. There are military bands; which perform at fashionable fêtes only. There are parks; but these are provided with about one seat for every thousand visitors. The laboring classes reside in dirty, neglected localities; they have no Schools of Cookery where they can learn the art of making a savory, nourishing, and economical
meal; they have little entertainment beyond that to be found within the precincts of a gin-palace. And the consequence is, both in intellectual enlightenment and physical development, they are inferior, on an average, to most of the distant races whom we so assiduously regenerate, pamper, and protect. They do not know how to dress; they scarcely know how to behave. When they turn out on general holidays the upper classes are almost compelled to seclude themselves; and thus no opportunity occurs for the acquisition of refinement. Funds for evangelization; for the support of so-called "converts"; for Indian famines, which result only from defective transport; for China famines, and famines in Morocco; for Negroes, Polynesians, Russians, Servians, Turks, Bulgarians, the people of Hungary and the people of Zanzibar—funds for such things are ever forthcoming; but the moment a proposition is made for the amelioration of our own country-people, we appear to consider that enough has been done for them. By a bungling policy we squander away three millions of money in satisfying Alabama claims; we boast that this is but a "drop" in the ocean of finance, and yet withhold State encouragement from an institution like the Crystal Palace, and neglect to establish proper Schools of Design to enable British handicraftsmen to hold their own against foreign competition. And not content with doing nothing for the people, we make war upon them. A spirit of hostility is displayed in almost
every notification. The public abroad is "invited to protect its own property"; here the populace is warned that if they do this, that, or the other, they "will be prosecuted." All along the Thames Embankment are notices to the effect that persons damaging it will be dealt with according to law. Of course they will. Of course if they smash lamps, or walk off with blocks of granite, they will be handed over to the police. But why tell them this? Why perpetually trumpet their liability? Why treat them as natural enemies, and irritate them? The terminal stones in Lincoln's Inn Square are provided with long spikes, inserted for the obvious purpose of preventing the small fry from indulging in flying leaps over them. What harm if they leap? What harm if a wearied wayfarer sit down upon the low pedestal of a column; yet many of these also are furnished with spikes. There seems to be a mortal antipathy against persons who sit down. Almost the whole south side of Piccadilly might be furnished with benches; yet there are five only, capable of accommodating twenty people. The proportion of seats in the park to the number of visitors is infinitesi-
mally small; nevertheless, half of these are of cast-iron. Thomas has a railing round his establishment in Bond Street of the following description, and not three feet from the ground (Fig. 61). What is this—especially in winter—but a source of possible danger? Nor is Thomas the only one who is permitted to set up these emblems of barbarity. Do not both Taste and Common Sense demand that such things shall cease?

In every department we shall find the behests of practical wisdom and the dictates of Taste identical; so that those who look upon Utility as one thing and Beauty as another are in error. Take the character of furniture, more particularly of bed-room furniture. The common method is to leave square edges and angular corners; and there are few among us who have not suffered therefrom. Natural Sense tells us to round them. So does Taste; for both rounded and beveled edges are more beautiful than square (A B, Fig. 62). It tells us likewise that slenderly turned
legs of the usual description (d c) injure the carpet, and are, furthermore, not sufficiently deep to allow of proper sweeping underneath. Taste, too, points out the superiority of higher and more substantial ones (b). Take the case of illumination. The ordinary plan is to arrange the lamps nearly on a level with the eye, and treat them as part of the general decoration. Mere observation shows how dazzling this is; and Taste also,

Fig. 62.

THE CHAMFERED EDGE IN FURNITURE.

following the disposition of sun-light, suggests that they ought to be placed as far above as possible. Both teach us that, even as the luminosity of the sun is tempered by suffusion, so should the light from a gas-jet be tempered by ground, or opal, glass; yet the ordinary plan is to grind the upper part only, and leave the lower plain (Fig. 63).

In ventilating without creating draughts; in pre-
serving an equable temperature between bed-chambers and reception-rooms; in abstaining from the practice of sitting for hours before a blazing fire, and then going directly into passages as cold as the arctic regions; in warming these passages at the proper season of the year; in providing windows for our dwellings which may be thrown open during summer (Fig. 3), instead of retaining those sliding relics of a bygone age which impede the circulation of fresh air, and are continually getting out of order (Fig. 4); in furnishing with comfort, as well as with an eye to "artistic" effect; in using glass as it has been used at the back of St. James's Hall, instead of trusting to the effects of carbolic
acid; and, generally, in adopting the agreeable precautions suggested by Nature, in lieu of resorting to disgusting medicaments compounded by the Chemist;— in all such things the requirements of Common Sense and Taste are coincident.

Even in Literature, Music, and the selection and arrangement of ordinary words in the intercommunication of ideas, the same rules will be found to apply whether they emanate from one or the other. When Eroll, in ‘Strathmore,’ grasps a springing tigress by the throat, and “holds her to the ground by main force, while she tears and gores him in the struggle,”¹ we turn from such description as we ought to turn from the representation of a peacock upon the wall, because it is unnatural. When Eliza, in ‘Cherry Ripe,’ exclaims “in an exculpatory tone, ‘I thought he was the gardener’s son,’”² the plainest understanding perceives that the “exculpatory tone” is necessarily understood; and Taste precludes the introduction of what is necessarily understood. We may overlook, in a novel, exaggerations in expression howsoever far-fetched. We may take it as we read, that “Flora came dashing in,” and that “Augustus split his sides with laughter.” But what are we to say when one who goes out to India on purpose to chronicle the doings of the Prince of Wales informs his readers that at a certain Durbar, which it is in etiquette to conduct with dignity and decorum,

¹ Vol. i. ch. 2. ² Vol. ii. p. 137.
“His Royal Highness jumped up and seized Scindia by the hand,” and that Scindia in turn, “jumped up and spoke to Sir Richard Strachey”? This is not information, for neither Scindia nor His Royal Highness would jump upon such an occasion; and if it be intended for pleasantry, the witticism is no more appreciable than that of Professor Smith who, in his work upon ‘Art Education,’ describes the Religious Picture as “a sort of triangular mixture of the Apostles’ Creed, the Thirty-nine Articles, and a daily newspaper.”

In Music we possess, as all will acknowledge, the most suitable medium for the expression of human emotion. As a vehicle for the outpouring of lofty and varied aspirations it is the one link which binds the spirit to the Unseen World, and seems to forecast the joys which await the soul in its Future State. Yet an attempt is now made to withdraw it from the influence of sentiment, and, by the cultivation of technical proficiency alone, to appeal to the intellect instead of to the heart; to excuse the prolongation of wearisome monotony by urging a necessity for kindling what are called the negative emotions, and setting up this as the standard of High Art. If we remember the subsidiary importance of technical excellence, and the influence which the active emotions exercise over our happiness, we shall no more permit the “Music of the Future” to over-ride the productions of recognized masters than

1 ‘From Pall Mall to the Punjab,’ p. 375-376.  
2 P. 299.
we shall allow what may be termed Mr. Whistler’s Decoration of the Future to thrust aside that which is approved by natural percipience.

The annoyance arising from outrage against harmony is far greater in Music than in the less obtrusive Arts, and therefore it behoves us more particularly to see that in this department of delectation the dictates of Common Sense are conformed with. In any secular vocal entertainment, it would be in extreme bad taste for one of the audience to join in, howsoever faintly. In Public Worship the congregation is “invited to assist”; and many a pious Christian feels himself called upon to raise his voice, howsoever discordant his notes, howsoever disagreeable his articulation. Which of us, when entranced by the melodious strains of an efficient choir, has not been irritated by the shrill vociferations of feminine sanctimoniousness on one side, and the discordant moans of masculine devotion on the other? Have we not, over and over again, been excruciated by the execution, upon an instrument constructed for the performance of dulcet and mellifluous compositions only, of such *staccato* pieces as Mendelssohn’s ‘Wedding March’? Indeed, the potency of Music as an effective auxiliary in the conduct of Public Worship appears to be, in most cases, entirely overlooked. There is no reason why, when we invoke, the Legions of the Heavenly Host should not come down, as it were, and mingle their voices with ours; or why, after we have
chanted a Song of Praise, the gentle strains of the organ should not *gradually* die away in soft cadence as the incense of adoration ascends. It would be very easy to render the former by a running accompaniment during the supplications; modulating the tone, of course, and drawing out the reed-stops when the instrument is provided with such mechanism. We should neglect no legitimate means for impressing upon the mind the solemnity of Divine Service, and the reality of Celestial Felicity; but it is difficult to do this without the concurrence of symphonic effects. Nor should the aid even of artistic effects be disdained. In most Temples of Worship the organist is visible when he ought to be concealed; and, in many parish churches, not only this individual, but the frugal swain who manipulates the bellows.

It is not a little singular, however, that, although the efficacy of music as an ingredient in Divine Worship be insufficiently appreciated, yet it is far from uncommon to find an undue prominence accorded to what is intended for rhythmical intonation. There is no subject so perplexing to earnest minds as the comprehension of our Faith, and, therefore, it is the more incumbent upon spiritual guides that they should not only abstain from unnecessarily embarrassing the thoughtful members of their flock, but that they should impress congregations with the conviction that they themselves apprehend the purport of what they under-
take to expound. When a familiar voice exclaims, "I am so glad to see you!" we know what is meant: one's friend is so glad to see one. But when the Omnipotent is implored "to save all Christian Kings and Governors," we do not know what is meant; for possibly the pastor thinks, in common with many of his order, that it would be useless to pray for the salvation of non-Christians. "Granting us in this world knowledge of thy truth," implies the existence of two kinds of truth. "When two or three are gathered together in thy Name thou will grant their request," signifies, by implication, the futility of more than three supplicating. "O God, make speed to save us; Give us this day our daily bread; Lead us not into temptation; Six days shalt thou labour; Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife without a cause?"—such sentences, culled at random from the oratory of the pulpit, will serve to exhibit the necessity for proper attention to judicious emphasis.

Lastly, let us instance the carelessness shown in the communication of ideas; both in literature and in conversation. It is not, of course, to be expected that each individual should express his sentiments with elegance; nor is it desirable that we should import into the interchange of opinions the pomposity of a pedagogue or the frigid preciseness of a mere grammarian. But it is one's duty, by the exercise of natural sagacity, to convey one's meaning with reasonable perspicuity. We are
already sufficiently bewildered by the anomalies of our language. While deriding the “lower” classes for dropping the $h$ in some words, we ourselves drop it in others; we double the $t$ in *forgetting*, because the accent falls upon the last syllable of the verb, and yet do the same in “libelling” or “travelling,” although the accent does not fall upon the last syllable. Notwithstanding a correspondendency between orthography and articulation in *drought*, draught is pronounced like *draft*, plough like *plow*, tough like *tuff*. We call Cirencester *Cirster*, Knollys *Knowls*, Cholmondeley *Chumley*, Beauchamp *Beechum*; and when we speak collectively, we cannot use one noun to express aggregation, but must say, a *multitude* of men, a *mob* of horses, a *herd* of cattle, a *dove* of sheep, a *flock* of geese, a *bevy* of quails, a *covey* of partridges, a *shoal* of fish, a *school* of whales, a *swarm* of bees, a *nest* of ants, and so on. Beyond all question a great deal of time, which otherwise might be devoted to the acquisition of information, is wasted in learning mere forms of expression. Surely, then, there is no occasion for additional obfuscation in supplementing an all but irremediable profusion of inconsistencies by imposing upon hearers and readers the duty of unraveling the meaning of the simplest phraseology when, by the exercise of a little reflection, it might be divested of ambiguity. In daily *parlance* we are told about “*these* sort of people,” and “*these* kind of things.” Yet we can scarcely blame
ordinary conversationalists when habitual inaccuracy is apparently sanctioned by the practice of those who are looked up to as authorities. "These sort of publications," writes Sydney Smith. "These kind of forfeitures," says Lord Chancellor Macclesfield. Even a writer on English Composition (Barnes, Professor of Logic, Aberdeen) discourses about "the right of each person to dispose of their labour in their own way."

"Each of the designs is beautiful in their way."

"A vast variety of examples are to be found."

These few additional instances will show that such errors are not due to oversights in printing.

It may be that such phraseology as the following is mere inelegance of diction: "Than was Donatello"; "As was generally the case"; "As does music"; "As has already been asserted"; "As is already known." And that "Yet still," "Still however," are only pardonable tautology. But what are we to say to such modes of expressions as these: "I should have known you anywhere;" "I shall try and forget what has happened."

"Should" imports an obligation; nevertheless it is constantly used to express an impulse of volition. And it needs no discussion to show that "try and come" is simply absurd. "I should have liked to have made her acquaintance," exclaims one; meaning he would have liked to make her acquaintance (or would

1 P. 178.  
2 Eastlake, p. 170.  
3 Gwilt, p. 861.  
4 'Vanity Fair,' p. 637.  
5 'Fashion and Passion,' iii. p. 107.
like to have made her acquaintance). "I should have liked to have been with you," says another; not in the least meaning he felt it his duty to manifest a preference, but only that it would have afforded him pleasure. "It might have been impossible," writes Hallam, "to have made the abdication."  

"Tom Brown," says the author of his 'Schooldays,' "would have liked to have stopped at the Belle Sauvage."  

"Of which I should have liked exceedingly to have taken a sketch"—here is a most involved sentence from a well-known 'Journal of Our Life in the Highlands.'

A informs us that he "only gave" so much, when he intends to convey that he gave only so much; B that he "only saw" X yesterday, when he means that he saw him only yesterday; and C that he "only admires" French Marqueterie, when he wishes one to understand that his admiration for marquetry is confined to that made by the French. "It may be only true in the East," says Russell's 'Diary,' "but still, it has its influence." It would be useless to multiply examples. Let us ask, in passing, what is meant by a person "only dying in 1874"; and then note the language in which public notifications are frequently couched. At Queen's Gate is one to this effect: "Hackney Carriages may only proceed along the direct road to Victoria Gate." We know that it is

---

2 P. 100.  
3 P. 193.  
4 P. 325.  
5 'Fortnightly Review,' 1877, p. 676.
as ridiculous to speak of carriages only proceeding as it is to talk about men only dying, and that the intention of the authorities is, that carriages may proceed to the Victoria Gate, but by the direct road only. Is it not as easy to say one thing as the other?

When we read of an oath being “duly administered,” a deponent being “duly sworn,” and testimony “duly considered,” we treat this as technical prolixity which has become interwoven with the language of the forum. Is there any need to import this prolixity into the communication of ordinary intelligence? What is the meaning of a Protocol being “duly signed,” except that it was signed after the observance of formalities which are presumed? “The conditions of peace were definitively settled”; the document “was signed in 1848, anno Domini”; a “juvenile offender, 15 years old, was then placed in the dock”;—such verbosity is not only provoking, but perplexing; almost as perplexing as Taylor’s “Conclusive proof.”¹ Of course, when the editor of a newspaper is obliged to fill so many columns a day, verbiage is to be expected. But no such necessity can be pleaded in ordinary composition.

The fact is, we are indoctrinated from infancy with the charms of redundancy. Here is an extract from a “carefully revised” edition of Markham’s ‘History of England,’ expressly intended for the young. “I think I can tell you a story which will convince you that they

¹ ‘Evidence,’ vol. i. p. 122.
were not all equally bloodthirsty. I heard it many years ago in conversation. I believe it was pretty nearly as follows. A young Englishwoman was sent to France to be educated at a Huguenot school in Paris. A few evenings before the fatal massacre, she and some of her young companions were taking a walk in some part of the town where there were sentinels placed, perhaps on the walls; and you know that, when a soldier is on guard, he must not leave his place until he is relieved. One of the soldiers, as the young ladies passed him, besought them to have the charity to bring him some water; adding that he was very ill, and that it would be as much as his life was worth to go and fetch it himself.”

Here we have, italicized, in half the number of lines, no less than twenty-four superfluous words; and here we have the germ of that diffuseness which characterizes popular literature. No wonder we read about the “value and importance” of Sunday teaching, the “dire and dreadful” calamity which, according to the Lord Mayor’s appeal, befell the people of Madras; the “fearful and devastating floods” which lately overwhelmed the town of Szegedin.

And the outcome of all this ambiguity is the prevalence of indefinite ideas. One gentleman “paints himself”; another “shoots himself”; a third “eats himself.” Arabella “composes herself”; Angelina “nurses herself”; Elizabeth “drives herself”; Ethel “cooks her-

1 1869, p. 269.
And we constantly hear of persons who "think to themselves," although no living soul would maintain that there is any such process as thinking to another. We speak of a dam as a "mother"; a sire as a "father"; a filly as a "daughter." One mare is "own sister" to another mare; the young of a huge, wallowing brute, is a "baby hippopotamus." An Indian nautch-girl is a "fair performer"; the leader of nautch-girls a "première danseuse." A Durbar is called a "Court," a Dewan a "Prime Minister"; a Talukdar is a "Baron." A Khansama is a "Chamberlain of the Household"; a Nazir a "Sheriff"; the Munsiff a "Judge"; and the Pundit, whose acquirements do not extend beyond a certain familiarity with his Shastras, is "a learned man." There is, in reality, as much difference between the individuals designated by Eastern terms and those described in Western terms as there is between a Chinese junk and a British ship-of-war; yet this is not the impression conveyed by the resort to European terms for a description of Oriental things. It is as ridiculous to speak of Babu Kessub Chunder Sen as "Kissub Chunder Sen, Esquire," or of Raja Ram Bullub as "Prince Ram Bullub," as it would be to describe Reginald Turner as Babu Reginald Turner, Pontus Maximus as Pontus Maximus, Esquire, or the Marquis of Hertford as Raja Francis George Seymour. The result is most confusing; for, putting aside minor absurdities, the pensioned descendant of an ex-Subadar,
(or Governor), is dubbed with the prefix of "His Highness," whereby he takes precedence over magnates of the West, and a *Zemindar* (or farmer of revenue), is transformed into a "landowner," in consequence of which he enters into possession of what he never was entitled to.

We read of Somerset, and discover him to have been a fugitive slave; we hear of Gordon, and find he was a negro. The *Kaiser-i-Hind* turns out to be an English steamer; the *Shah* and *Sultan* are both liners in the British navy. Montgomery is a black cook on board a mail-packet; Harry and Bob are aborigines of Australia. So that we designate one thing by a term which carries with it a train of associations applicable only to another; repudiate those distinctions of race, habits, manners, and costumes which it has evidently been intended should prevail, and endeavor to nullify the charms of diversity by reducing everything to a dead level of dull monotony.

We have not even come to an understanding upon the signification of such words as Beautiful, Artistic, and Picturesque. A natural divergence of opinion which existed with respect to Beauty, so puzzled the philosophers, that Hume reluctantly denied its abstract existence; and Sir Joshua Reynolds hinted in his 'Discourses' that it should be idealized with diffidence, because its conception so varied among different races.

1 'Permanent Settlement,' Bengal, Behar, and Orissa.
"I have no doubt," he wrote, "that were an Ethiopian to depict the goddess of Beauty, he would represent her with a black skin, thick lips, and woolly hair. And I do not know by what standard we could dispute the propriety of his idea." Now, in the first place, as I shall show further on, these are not the ideas of an "Ethiopian," for he really admires the fair; in the next place, we have nothing to do, in questions of Taste, with the notions of any Ethiopian; and finally, if the above did represent his conception, we could controvert it from the open Volume of Nature, wherein is written, as legibly as possible, that Beauty in the animal Creation represents a combination of the highest physical and intellectual development, and in inorganic Creation, an amalgamation, as it may be styled, of grace, parvitude, and undulation or flexibility. In a limited sense, every natural production is beautiful, since it is admirably adapted to the fulfilment of its purpose; but not in an artistic sense—as gratifying to the eye. Were this distinction observed, we would probably rest contented with the loveliness of our own native scenery, and not seize with avidity upon every exotic imported under the capricious auspices of Fashion. No one would dispute that carrot-tops are infinitely more beautiful than rhubarb leaves. Why is this, but because the integrant portions are diminutive; the stalks are more yielding; there is a tendency to vibrate upon the slightest agitation, and the whole is,
therefore, more graceful? The same reasoning applies to landscape-gardening; ferns being more beautiful than India-rubber plants (Fig. 64), and the foliage of northern latitudes preferable to any number of banana-trees, figs, aloes, and the *caqui*, whose leaves are rigid, and of Cyclopean dimensions. The importance of comparative parvitude, even in individual objects, is uni-

**Fig. 64.**
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versally perceptible; there being no large leaf which is not coarse; no large bird, or huge quadruped, which is so pleasant to look upon as a smaller animal. Even in the heavens, the "mackerel sky" and filamentous *cirri* are incomparably more charming than the massive *cumuli*. Stiff simplicity, rigidity, and formality—excepting in buildings—are inimical to Beauty; and this we may
further notice by comparing a mangoe-tree (Fig. 65) with an elm (Fig. 66). Were this well known, Pater-familias would not lay out his miniature "grounds" in the form of spades, hearts, clubs, and diamonds; nor would trees be clipped to the shape of cones, cubes, and umbrellas.

Perhaps nothing has so materially contributed to the unsettlement of æsthetic minds than the mis-comprehension of those very elastic adjectives Picturesque and Artistic. The latter term is constantly used to signify what an Artist would sanction, instead of what the principles of Art demand; and the two have become so intermixed as to practically mean one and the same thing. One writer recommends "picturesque effects" in a cornice; another would abolish
plate-glass windows, because “a painter would not introduce them into his picture.”

The number of advocates for “picturesque” effects in civic architecture is legion, and to the confusion arising from the indiscriminate use of these expressions may be ascribed

the resuscitation in its entirety of the “Early English” style of ornamentation.

Now, the very essence of picturesqueness is irregularity, disorder, apparent incompleteness, and unfinish; and these are, surely, not desirable elements in the embellishment either of public edifices or private

---

1 'The Drawing-room,' p. 65.
dwellings. *A fortiori*, they are far from desirable in general exterior architecture. We should aim rather at rendering our buildings, both outwardly and inwardly, beautiful. I know that the two qualities are commonly regarded as synonymous—"Whoever travels over the Festiniog line of rail," says a notice to that

Fig. 67.

**THE FISHING-SMACK.**

effect, will "traverse a rugged, but picturesque, country"—nevertheless they are not synonymous. Amsterdam is picturesque, whilst Paris is beautiful. An old oak side-board, bossed, twisted, and clumsily carved, is far more picturesque than imitations of modern manufacture; but on that very account they are less in keeping with the times. A common fishing-smack (Fig. 67) is
absolutely picturesque without being in the least beautiful; a gentleman’s yacht is absolutely beautiful—let the reader now say whether he would describe it as “picturesque.” It was with this distinction in view that I advocated uniformity in civic architecture. Not that one building should be a stereotyped facsimile of another, but that general uniformity should prevail, in contradistinguishment with the principle of contrariety. It would be too much to ascribe the presence of those multifarious styles we see around us to any settled plan of action, for patriotic cohesion among British people appears to be limited to occasional combination for fighting purposes. At the same time there can be no doubt that there is a widespread desire to effect petty contrasts, and the result is a general absence of statelessness and splendor. The Pavilion for the Prince of Wales at the Paris Exhibition was furnished by an eminent firm of upholsterers in the most recently approved Mediæval style. There were the darkest of backgrounds to every article of furniture; the nocturnal effect was unquestionably “artistic”; but the result was an impression produced upon the mind more in keeping with a visit to the region of Erebus than to the domicile of an enlightened European potentate. The votaries for “picturesqueness” will have no hesitation in selecting the first of the accompanying sketches (Fig. 68) as decidedly the prettiest. And so it is;

1 Ch. i.
especially on paper. It is taken from the Midland Hotel, wherein the deeply-shaded parts are of red brick, and the lightly-shaded of dingy yellow. Yet it is not so effective as the second would be—which is
only slightly altered in outline to admit the introduction of what is generally left out, viz. a ventilator (Fig. 69).

It would be well to bear in mind that many artists themselves, who attire their persons in the garb of picturesque disorder, offend against the rudimentary requirements of Taste; and that half the monstrosities which were rampant during the early part of the century originated in the endeavor to import into real life things which looked well when represented upon canvas. Even at the present day our more impressionable neighbors are oftentimes misled by submitting to the fascinations of these illusory expressions; the ladies affecting wide, open collars, and the gentlemen loose, *négligé* ties (Fig. 70), out of all harmony with modern civilized costume. It should be the aim of the British people to render their homes bright and *cheerful*, and the metropolis of their kingdom cleanly and *beautiful*.

Will anyone doubt that the misuse of terms and phrases exercises a pernicious influence both upon the dissemination of refinement and the development of character? What man of culture will engage himself in the embellishment of habitations so long as his voca-
tion is denoted by a derogatory designation? There is no reason why ladies of education should not devote their attention to the business of costume-making, or why persons of superior training should not dress for the table the sustenance provided by the Almighty. Yet they cannot be expected to do either unless their functions are described by appellations more euphonious than those furnished by the nomenclature of ruder ages. A Decorator now-a-days is more than a "decorator"; a Dressmaker more than a "dressmaker"; a Cook more than a "cook"; and as to our Domestics, if they occupy no higher position in the household than that of mere "servants," we cannot but deplore the absence of a sympathy which, in all the concerns of life, is a most effective stimulus. The prevalence of general refinement among our neighbors, and of that spirit of genuine independence which permits no man to be ashamed of his calling, is beyond question in a great measure due to the grace of their language. Monsieur and Madame, being of universal application, no social distinction is unnecessarily implied by their use. With us, both animosity and ridicule are created by variable prefixes, and designations conferred in conformity with status and gradation. If a Laundress be never styled a "lady," she is offended; yet when she is, one is struck with the incongruity. Nor is this all; for the universal fatuity to be treated as "ladies" and "gentlemen" is the principal cause of that ruinous
prodigality so singularly characteristic of our race. *Monsieur* and *Madame* are in themselves more elegant than "Mister" and "Mistress"; *Chef, Blanchisseuse*, and *La fille de Cuisine* far choicer appellations than "Head-cook," "Washer-woman," or "Kitchen-maid"; *Dossier* does not by implication suggest the unctuosity of an "Anti-macassar"; and the words *Buffet, Brasserie, Café, Restaurant*, import altogether a different condition of things from that subsisting under the régime of the "Chop-house," "Eating-house," "Coffee-shop," and "Gin-palace." Compound words, to say the least, are inelegant, being but one step in advance of Mongolian agglutinations; but, in addition to this, they seldom convey the meaning they are intended to express. A "Chair-back," granting it to be a more elegant expression than "Anti-macassar," is ostensibly the back of a chair; a "Lady-help," while giving herself the airs of a superior being, is regarded by domestics only as a housekeeper; and a "Coffee-palace" is far from being a fitting designation for a room, or series of rooms, wherein members of the working classes assemble for the purpose of imbibing "coffee." It is customary to applaud the terse simplicity of the Anglo-Saxon tongue, but we shall have little chance of imbuing the popular mind with the temper of refinement unless, following in the footsteps of our neighbors, we aim at Classicizing our language. Were the Universities under State control, it would be part of
their duty to rectify our vocabulary; or even if we had a Department of Taste, we might be furnished, through its intercession, with substitutions as welcome as Telegram was in lieu of "Telegraphic-message." We have not yet, however, arrived at that enviable state of advancement. Everything being left to the conscientiousness of Corporations and the energy of private enterprise, we derive but little benefit from so-called "public" institutions, and are placed at a disadvantage in coping with the requirements of the age.

Our talented Prime Minister tells us that men are governed by words and phrases. There can be no doubt they are misled by them. Ever since the "children of the East and the children of the West" have been "united under one just and gentle sceptre"¹ there has been a constant endeavor to fasten upon "the Mother Country" the pecuniary responsibilities of her vast "dependency"; and this is only one of the numerous ways in which "the generous British public" has manifested an inclination to saddle itself with the burdens of other people. We are now informed that India—whose merchants, bankers, and landowners are in the receipt of incomes larger than our own—is a "poor" country,² and it is intended to lend her 2,000,000l. free of interest. I am not going to discuss political questions. It may be regarded as "a contri-

¹ Lord Lytton's Address.
² A native gentleman was suing in January last, according to the Privy Council Reports, for possession of "an estate comprising 7000 villages!"
bution towards the expenses of the Afghan war," just as the 6,000,000l. spent in bringing over Sepoys to Cyprus was regarded as a contribution towards the maintenance of our "Prestige." It is not easy to understand why, if British rule be a benefit to the people of India—as, without the slightest doubt, it is—and the invasion of Afghanistan was necessary to the stability of that rule, the people of India should not pay for it. But this much may be said, that if half the interest upon two millions at four per cent., or one third upon that given for the Sepoys, were spent upon the cultivation of Taste in this country, British Prestige would stand higher than it ever will with all our nervous intermeddlement in continental affairs, and all those successful expeditions against semi-barbarians from which we derive no substantial advantage.
CHAPTER VI.

PERSONAL ADORNMENT.

MALE ATTIRE.

It is not a little remarkable that, although decoration in general is characterized by floridity, yet, in personal adornment, the lively costumes of past centuries have been supplanted by the gloom of funereal apparel, and black has come to be regarded as an emblem of "respectability." M. Blanc, with that imaginative-ness which distinguishes his race, discovers in this a fanciful association with the progress of civilization, which, he says, "whenever it develops, causes man to abandon colour to woman, and nations to proclaim their brotherhood by similarity in garb." ¹

It is scarcely necessary to say that there is no rational connection between civilization and sombre apparel. Existing attire is a revolutionary and puritanical legacy; and many a "good" man, even at the present day, deems it desirable to manifest his contempt for mundane pleasures by investing his person in the dismal habiliments of a mute. There is no reason why enlightenment itself should not aid us in setting off to
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advantage such figures as it has pleased the Almighty to give us, and in stamping out the shiny broadcloth which still retains its hold upon the middle classes. The merchant will work as well in any other material, and as to color, "if a man cannot get to heaven," as Sydney Smith says, "in a green coat, he will not go there in a grey one."

The principle of modern attire appears to centre in the frock-coat. The chimney-pot hat is supremely ridiculous; it in no way conforms with the shape of the head; in a breeze it has to be held on; the least sprinkling of rain necessitates a visit to the ironers; it must be carefully and continually brushed in one particular direction; it cannot be packed into a small compass; and, lastly, when it blows off, some one has to run after it (Fig. 71). It is of all things the most unsuited to a windy and rainy climate like ours; yet it suits the frock-coat. And the same argument is used in reference to trousers. Except in fine weather, they have
to be turned up to prevent them soiling (Fig. 72); after sitting, they bag at the knee; and while sitting,

Fig. 72.

THE CONVENIENCE OF MODERN TROUSERS.

Fig. 73.

THE BEAUTY OF MODERN TROUSERS.

present to the spectator some such spectacle as the above (Fig. 73). Nothing, however, is considered
to "go" better with the frock-coat. Were all this true, it would be well to urge the abolition of the frock-coat. But it is not true. The huntsman's cap would harmonize just as well as the stove-pipe, and be ever so much more convenient; knee-breeches and gaiters would be quite as becoming as trousers. And, if the latter garments savor too much of the turnip-field, some modification of the costume worn a century ago would admirably adapt itself to our requirements (Fig. 74). The cardinal rule in all attire—male and female—is that it should harmonize, as far as possible, with the figure, and, certainly, trousers do not do so, more especially such trousers as are cut upon Parisian patterns (Fig. 75).

Many of the anomalies in costume owe their origin to preposterous attempts at improving upon Nature. The chimney-pot hat is supposed to impart height; and so is the ridiculous bear-skin which an unfortunate foot-guard is compelled to wear. In the same way flanging trousers are introduced with the object of
making the feet look small. Both these desirable characteristics will be developed in reality by a little

Fig. 75.

attention to healthy exercise, proper ventilation, and such like; but their simulation is nonsensical. Notwithstanding their gigantic head-gear, foot-guards look no taller than metropolitan constables; and nothing is more ridiculous than to conceal all but the tip of the foot.

So exigent is the rule just laid down, that, even if a helmet (which, in so far as it is rounded at the top, is preferable to the stove-pipe) be unnecessarily high, it will simply excite ridicule (Fig. 76), and a field-marshall's cocked-hat,—bedecked as it is with plumes, "To fright the souls of fearful adversaries,"
must set one pondering upon the mysteriousness of human comprehension. The huntsman's cap, or something like it, would conform with the requirements of this rule, and afford protection to the eyes without the introduction of an all-round brim, for which there is not the least necessity.

A striking instance of unconformity with the rule is afforded in our ordinary maritime garniture. Were poor Jack's "board ship" gear made for any other animal it could not be more ill-adapted to the human form (Fig. 77). It is tight where it ought to be loose, loose where it ought to be tight; the legs assume a pyramidal form; the deep, full collar narrows the shoulders, and the open front is a standing invitation to attacks of pneumonia.

Nor is our own costume, although in fit it is superior, a whit more sensible; for, although we may envelope ourselves in warm, thick waistcoats and double-breasted coats, we perambulate at all hours with nothing but a vest and shirt-front between the most delicate part of
the chest and a temperature ranging from 45° to zero. A scarf, indeed, is usually worn by the upper classes, and some protection, although far from sufficient, is thus afforded; but this is not sported by the generality. Is there any reason why scarves should not be considered part and parcel of the dress? or why a winter coat, to say the least, should not button up to the throat? Of course, if the latter plan were adopted, we would do away with the scarf-pin, which is a set-off to the sombreness of the whole costume. But then there might be a gold thread, or facing, round the collar; and brass buttons might be revived. Especially for evening dress would I advocate the revival of brass (or gilt) buttons; for the effect of these would be to impart a finish which is wanting to existing attire.

These are not fundamental changes. Nevertheless, if they be not desired, let us, at all events, have our vestments properly cut, so that they present some similitude with the lines of the human figure. I do not see, in the first place, why we should not plead on behalf of those who are unable to speak for themselves. Are our military defenders and municipal custodians to be for ever put
into garments such as that in Fig. 78? They do not make guys of their soldiers and policemen across the Channel; but if the surtout of one, and frock-coat of the other, be considered unbecoming to men in this country, let the skirts of their coats, at all events, fall to the figure, and not "radiate" from the waist like that in the preceding sketch.

This falling to the figure is a sine qua non in good dressing. Not only do the skirts turned out from the Army Clothing Department, and those provided for the police brigade, project in a ridiculous manner, but, in a minor degree, do those also which the majority of private tailors furnish to their customers. Especially is this so in the case of a morning coat. This may easily be avoided by lifting the skirt in front, and "drawing" the braid along the edge. It has already been suggested that the dimensions of trousers should assimilate themselves to the circumference of the leg. Let us see whether the caprices of Fashion cannot be controlled in the lines of the waist. Two years ago the body of the coat terminated fully two inches above the bend of the natural body; a year ago it condescended to elongate itself to within one inch, and now it hovers with varying humor between that and the limit it ought never to have forsaken. I would that we no longer submitted to the whimsicalities of tailors, but that we dress as Nature herself tells us we ought to dress. More will be said upon this point when we come to speak of
feminine attire, and therefore we will proceed to the one or two remaining matters.

When a tailor arranges one's buttons he generally starts from the top; so that it is quite a matter of chance whether or not one of them coincides with the inflexion of the body. He should commence with the line of inflexion. When he cuts out a waistcoat he will invariably scoop it at the armhole, to allow, as he will explain it, a sufficient "play" (Fig. 79). It in no way interferes with the freedom of an arm to let the top of the waistcoat lie upon the shoulder, even to the extent indicated by the dotted lines above, and it improves materially the set of the coat to do so. Details of this sort are not mere trivialities; they conduce to comfort, and obviate that sensation of being encased, which cannot but arise when apparel does not conform with natural flexibility. Nor is it advisable to discard trivialities; although, of
course, it does not do to pay too much attention to them. Philosophers would smile at any observation concerning the spots or stripes on a tie; yet, as already remarked when speaking of the bifurcations of a door-
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strap, there is no reason why they should be arranged the wrong way when it is just as easy to arrange them in the right way. Almost every scarf we see, even in the most expensive shops, is put together in utter de-
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fiance of the pattern. Is it very difficult to present them to the eye with some regard to symmetry, as in Fig. 80, instead of stitching them together anyhow? (Fig. 81.) Why, again, should they be cut either straight across (A), or with a curve upwards (B), when,
by the simple expedient of sloping them downwards, they might be made to harmonize with the rest of the costume? (c, d.) To treat such matters with lofty disdain is not to manifest superior intelligence, but to display an absence of accurate discernment. What is it which led to the retention of the stick-up collar after its relegation to the region beneath the chin, but a contemptuous indifference to the lines of harmony in minutiae? (a, Fig. 82.) Wherein lies the super-excellence of a properly-cut coat, but in a concatenation of differences in themselves inconsiderable? (Compare B with A.)

Although in male attire we are accustomed to precedency, yet in most other departments we complacently regard the elegance of Parisian "taste" as the offspring of an intuitive discrimination transcending the limits of Anglo-Saxon attainment. As a matter of fact, the secret of Parisian success lies chiefly in a scrupulous attention devoted to trifes. Especially will this be noted in the making-up of ladies' costume. The
Parisian dressmaker will take more pains than an English dressmaker. Even among tailors it is, notwithstanding the simplicity of masculine garb, most difficult to obtain a satisfactory fit. During the process of trying-on, a series of hieroglyphics is chalked upon one's vestments, but not a single exact denotation; and every direction will be entrusted to the fallibility of individual memory.

I trust the reader is under no impression, from my allusion to Sydney Smith's humorous observation about the "green coat," that any radical change is contemplated in regard to color,—although a certain relaxation in this respect would not be unwelcome. At the same time there is what may be termed a national aspect to the subject-matter of these pages, in which tint and hue occupy a conspicuous position. Vast as the vaunted wealth of England may be, there is not a capital in Christendom which presents such a neglected, bedraggled appearance as the metropolis of this Empire. Whether the streets need it or not, water-carts are sent out to deluge them with slush; holes are made in macadamized roads by senseless successive sweepings; there is no regulation about the cleansing of foot-pavements; the crossings, instead of being raised above the surrounding level, are almost invariably hollowed into grooves by the birch-broom of the scavenger; and their guardianship, as before-said, is entrusted to the capriciousness of mendicant Bohemians. All this is disgust-
ing enough. But when, in addition, the thousands engaged in ministering to the necessities of society are permitted to pursue their various avocations in habiliments of the most unkempt and slovenly description, it becomes a matter for serious consideration whether the force of enlightened opinion should not assert itself in bringing about a general adoption of livery. Is there any reason why drivers and conductors of public conveyances, skippers and crews of river steamboats, and even the sweepers of crossings, should not be compelled to wear some kind of uniform? It cannot be pretended that these men, who, if not, strictly speaking, public servants, are quasi-public servants, occupy a higher position in the social scale than troopers, railway officials, policemen, and the corps of Commissionaires. And as to crossing-sweepers, a fraction of the money spent in furnishing tracts and blankets to alien aborigines would provide these unfortunates with comfortable clothing.

The fact is, suggestions for the amelioration of this condition of things, if occasionally brought upon the tapis at all, relapse into oblivion because it is no one's duty to bring them forward; and because the cultivation of Taste is practically regarded as unessential to the progress of substantial prosperity. The foregoing pages have been written in vain if it has not been rendered clear that the development of aesthetic perception does not result in the production of things which are merely
pleasing to the eye, but of things which are serviceable. Will it be maintained that beaver and felt are suitable materials for cabmen's hats? There is no place in the world where glazed ones are so necessary as in London—black for winter wear, and light grey, or fawn, for summer—yet it is left for Paris to take the initiative. There is no place in the world wherein shelter from rain is so requisite; yet we have very few porticoes, and only one Arcade. There is no spot on earth wherein cleanliness is so essential to personal comfort and to the preservation of apparel; notwithstanding which, our roads are not unlike quagmires, our pavements are besmeared with mud.
CHAPTER VII.

PERSONAL ADORNMENT.

FEMININE ATTIRE.

Among the many recently-published treatises upon the subject of feminine attire is an excellently-written work from the pen of Mrs. Oliphant, which appeared last year in 'Art at Home' series. Putting aside the historical portion, however, the sum and substance of this little book is nothing more or less than a recommendation for the retention of the Princesse costume, minus the bandages and ligatures which impede locomotion. In this entreaty for the retention of the Princesse the male sex, certainly, will earnestly join. The ladies themselves, however, will want to know something more. They will naturally enquire the reasons for the preference shown, and whether or not they are to be debarred the fascination of ever-recurring "variety." I will endeavor now to satisfy these demands.

In the first place, we should retain the Princesse because, after chopping and changing about for centuries, we have at last got something which conforms with the contour of the human frame; and this con-

1 P. 70-75.
formity has already been laid down as the cardinal rule in the Art of Dress. We have only to glance back at what has been worn, in order to be convinced that this rule has played no part at all in the costumes of bygone ages. Mrs. Oliphant rails at the "lords of Creation" for the monstrosities they have worn under the designation of apparel. But the truth is that, notwithstanding the absurdities of which they have been guilty, there have been times when male attire was tasteful to a degree, whereas at no period but the present has the garb of the fair sex harmonized with the natural form; and the improvements effected within the last few years are in a great measure owing to the declamation of the men, to the advice tendered by men, to the designs furnished by men, and to the efforts of that arrogant male "arbiter of women's destinies" whose laws, according to the gentle authoress herself, the female members of the community "obey like slaves."¹ In the next place, we have in the Princesse an example of the beauty of artistic simplicity. Hitherto, simplicity has been associated with shapelessness and inelegance; so that the mind turned in disgust from the term, and everything connected with it. Thirdly, it serves as a foundation for the contrivance of other tasteful designs.

We cannot be too particular in insisting upon conformity with the human figure, both because the history of costume shows that the passion for novelty leads to
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frequent eccentricity, and because attempts are even now made, as exemplified in M. Worth's revival of panniers, to break away from the trammels of artistic simplicity. But, lest the rule may be appealed to in favor of any such absurdity as the Bloomer costume, let it be borne in mind, as we said when speaking of male attire, that dress should harmonize "as far as possible" with the figure; the meaning of which in the present instance would be, that the flowing skirt, notwithstanding that, strictly speaking, it does not conform, should be retained from considerations peculiar to the sex.

It is commonly supposed that a flowing skirt is an advantage in imparting "height"; but it is difficult to perceive the desirability of imparting this quality to the gentler sex. Of course a small woman may not come up to the northern standard of beauty; but in speaking generally we are bound to abstain from expressions which confound the attributes of the male with those of the female. Height, beyond a certain standard, which for these latitudes we may fix at 5 feet 6 inches, is not so much to be aimed at as sinuosity and flexibility; for these qualities are not only graceful in themselves, but associated with characteristics peculiarly feminine. As we should always express in Art those features which distinguish the genus homo from the order of Creation immediately beneath, so we should carefully bring into prominence such peculiarities as are essentially fascinating in the fair companions of our
toil. The chief of these is pliancy of disposition; and this is indicated by flexibility in the person. We may talk as we please about ignoring, eradicating, or mortifying the sensuous element in human nature; yet the impulses implanted by the hand of Beneficence will assert themselves despite the loftiness of theory, and impel us to recognize the virtues of the matured presence, swelling hips, and yielding waist. Moreover, they will prompt us, notwithstanding the charms of stature, to retain in the vocabulary of the affections such terms as import diminutiveness. There is something more in the phrase, "dear little thing," than that which, according to Mr. Knight, arises from reminiscences of childhood. It implies the presence of all those captivating qualities which distinguish persons we like from those whom, with certain reservations, we "admire." Now, a short skirt, which "just clears the ground," may be more convenient than a long one; but it sways with the figure, and therefore, so far from conducing to the impression of flexibility, destroys it.

I do not know that the writings of Mrs. Haweis will exercise any influence in precipitating the annihilation of small waists; nevertheless, since she has some authority for the observations she makes upon them, it will be well here to record an emphatic dissent from her opinions. She says, in her work on 'Art and Beauty,'¹ that the
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natural figure is "much more like an H than a V," and therefore objects to any artificial contraction which draws it out of similitude with an H; supplementing her protestations by physiological diagrams, extracted from some medical work, exhibiting the terrible consequences of tight lacing. That many women do possess figures more like an H than a V no one will deny; but to the ideal figure, such as that which is based upon an intimate knowledge of the human frame, and which should serve as a guide in all suggestions, the very converse of this description applies. Whenever exercise is taken which develops every part of the body, the waist naturally becomes slim. And, not only slim, but so pliant as to succumb to pressure, and need it, for "keeping one together." All people habituated to athletic discipline both wear, and have occasion for, cinctures of some kind. The use of corsets, then, to which the lady in question objects in toto, is dictated by physical requirements, and does not, moreover, necessarily lead to tight lacing. Extremes of all kinds are objectionable; but an occasional indulgence in them is no argument for the abandonment of those fundamental rules from which they are offshoots. Indeed, we have already advocated the advisability of never, in any matter, departing from "the modesty of Nature."

The authoress above mentioned makes an onslaught likewise against low bodices, both as "hideous and unmeaning," and because their effect is "to diminish
height.”¹ If the charms of the sex can be suggested without transcending the bounds of decorum, one object, at any rate, of the artistic dressmaker is gained, although at the sacrifice of height. But we never meet with persons who are sensible of any diminution in apparent stature when a lady is attired in a low-necked dress; for, when these are worn, the trains are longer than ever, and the eye takes in at a glance the whole spectacle, from the summit of the head to the bottom of the skirt. And so far from their being hideous and unmeaning, I express at least the sentiments of my own sex in regretting that they have fallen into desuetude.

It has been said of Fashion that it is “designed to help those who want help, to cover deficiencies, to conceal the evils wrought by time, and to make those look their best to whom no special charm has been given.” These virtues may, with greater accuracy, be ascribed to the Art of Dressing; for so capricious a mistress is Fashion, that she enforces the adaptation of costume even to the periodical exigencies and chronic infirmities of Royal personages. The first duty of a dressmaker is, of course, to follow implicitly the contour of the perfect figure; but her second decidedly is to emphasize the beauties and physical characteristics of her sex. With this object in view she will abstain from introducing anything which widens the waist and
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neck, or narrows the shoulders, bust, or hips. The days of "the sloping shoulder" have happily gone by, together with "Swan necks," and those stiff British corsets which encased the body and contracted the chest; yet an attempt is still made to confine the hips, as if it were a duty to conceal every attraction essentially feminine. Walker, in his 'Analysis of Beauty,' divides womankind into three primary classes; that in which the nutritive system is principally developed, as exemplified in the Venus de' Medici; that in which the organs of locomotion predominate, as in the Diana; and that wherein all seems sacrificed to the presence of intellect, as in the long-robed goddess of Wisdom, Minerva. Most English ladies would appear to worship at the shrine of Diana; for they are very partial to jackets which are pretty nearly of the same dimensions all the way down, and particularly tight below the waist. Indeed, one might suppose the aim of the fair ones was to bring about a transmutation of the sexes; because these up-and-down jackets, which enlarge the waist and narrow the haunches, are frequently accompanied by the wearing of felt hats, which are about as becoming to women as flowers and feathers are to men. How far we are justified in helping those who need help by emphasizing, must be left very much to individual judgment. A shoulder may be "lifted" and a little addition made in front; but all beyond this savors of attempted deception.
Let us now enter into detail and see what is meant by harmony with the figure. The accompanying diagram (Fig. 83) represents three kinds of jackets worn within the last two years. The first is the cut of an ordinary velvet or sealskin, trimmed with fur. The reader will observe no conformity whatever with the human shape; and therefore, be the material ever so rich, be the trimming of beaver, sable, otter, or skunk, this is a jacket to be avoided. The second is better, inasmuch as it does not so much break the continuity of the line from the nape of the neck downwards. But the best is the third, which came into favor in the autumn of 1877. I know nothing more hideous than a thing like the following (Fig. 84), which M. Blanc introduces, at page 158 of his book,
without one condemnatory remark; still, it is no more an outrage against principle than many a jacket or paletôt worn by ladies of fashion. It is impossible to walk a hundred paces in Regent Street without encountering one standing out from the skirt (A, Fig. 85) instead of falling with it, as in B.

Even in trimming, we should be careful to conform with the figure. What is the object of carrying down a series of parallel lines, either on a body or a cloak (Fig. 86)? Many of us have noticed objects of this description, even at Madame White's; and their presence in her window show that it is not against the humbler classes alone that the imputation of "bad taste" may be urged. All lines, whether they be those of trimmings or of mere seams, should converge towards the waist; for this, as the centre of pliancy, is the chief feature which denotes the charm of woman's disposition. Of the two sketches shown in Fig. 87, the first shows how trimmings ought to be applied; and the second, the management of seams. The usual plan is to cut the top of the sleeve in a line sloping from A to B; and many good dressmakers consider that there ought
to be a *scoop* at its insertion at the back (see dotted line). The shoulder-seam, moreover, is brought down from the neck to the middle of the armhole (c, d). Now, these are wrong. There is absolutely no object in the latter arrangement, except to keep alive reminiscences of the defunct "sloping shoulder" theory; and the freedom of the arm is in no way impeded by prolonging the line from the waist upward, to the top of the shoulder, as in x, y. (I would commend these remarks to the consideration of gentlemen also.)

Not many months ago it was the fashion to have a broad, flat pleat behind; from the waist to the bottom of the skirt, and as wide above as below. This ought never to have been permitted, for lines should always *diverge* from the waist.

Again, not only should harmony with contour be vertically observed, but horizontally also. Bands in
the skirt, for example, should, in general, be equally distant all round from the end thereof; the bottom of
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a jacket, likewise, lying straight across, as in the first of the figures shown in Fig. 88. And if any declivity be desired, the slope ought to take a downward direc-

**Fig. 87.**
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tion from the front (x), and not from the back (y); excepting there be a combination of slopes, in which
case, of course, the first necessarily takes a downward direction (z).

Perhaps rules of this kind, concisely stated, will meet with ready assent. Yet, where do we ever find them generally observed? If trimmings take a certain direction one year, they are pretty sure to take the opposite direction the following year; and if things happen to come right, it is more by chance than design. The

Fig. 88.

ARRANGEMENT OF LATERAL LINES.

fact is, we have no code of rules, and are dependent entirely upon the caprices of those whose interest it is to maintain a continuous succession of changes.

Two sketches appear upon the opposite page for the purpose of showing the effect of trimming injudiciously introduced (Fig. 89). Per se, there is no objection to either, for the first converges towards the waist, and the second harmonizes laterally with the neck. Yet they
both narrow the shoulders; and the second is an infringement of a rule we shall now lay down, to the effect that no trimming should so project as to interfere with the broad outline of configuration. On the same ground, frills and ruffles, unless so devised as to sit close to the neck, are to be deprecated.

In fact, the main principles to be kept in view are the emphasizing of natural beauties when emphasis is necessary, and the avoidance of everything tending to enlarge the apparent circumference of the waist, neck, wrist, and ankles. At one time it was the fashion to wear bows attached to the back of the waist band; and, even now, such a thing is not uncommon (see A, Fig. 90). This is a mistake; for bows ought to depend, as shown in diagram B. And this principle may be carried into the minutest details. There are very few of us who will not at once acknowledge the absurdity of anklets in producing a clumsy, draggle-down appear-
ance (Fig. 91). Wherein, however, do such ungraceful ornaments differ, excepting in degree, from the massive bracelets, and projecting rings, worn by half the ladies in the land? These equally enlarge dimensions which ought to be narrow; which Nature herself has designedly constricted by anatomical ligatures. Properly speaking, bracelets ought to be so constructed as to keep their place upon the swell of the arm; but if they continue to be worn upon the wrist, both these
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SASHES AND BOWS.

and finger rings ought to be as flat as possible, and sit close. I myself am very much in favor of armlets; since the upper part of the arm is naturally larger than the lower. One can understand that it is expedient occasionally to display the size or rotundity of a precious stone; but neither the finger nor the wrist is the best place for any jewel which does not lie low. And when we descend to the feet, what do we usually discover but the same disregard of physical contour which has characterized costume in other matters? We
find, not only one projecting rosette in the narrow part of the foot, at the bottom of the instep, but, occasionally, a succession of projecting rosettes up to the ankles. If rosettes be worn at all—and there is no objection against them—they should sit flat, like a bow, and never project. The mistake commonly made is that such things are selected from a top view, and not after a side view. In the same manner combs are very often selected, because, intrinsically, they are becoming.

The three represented in Fig. 92 by the letters A, B, C are all good in their way; yet, none of them should be worn at all unless in accordance with the shape of the head. If A or C are to be inserted near the top (E, G), and B below, as in F, they had better be dispensed with altogether. The proper way is indicated in the lower diagrams. Then again, collars must not project very much behind, as shown in P, Fig. 93; nor bands worn round the neck, as in R, but just where the shoulders begin (s). We ought not to treat such matters with indifference, because, as already insinuated, if a thing be worth doing at all, it is worth doing well; and it is surely no moral transgression to set off to advantage the crowning
handiwork of Creation. In diagram B, Fig. 85, it will be observed that the waist-seam of the jacket is below the natural concavity, and that the buttons are brought down also. This is in accordance with the present "style"; although the buttons in the sketch are designedly not placed so low as they are required to be worn by the rigor of fashion. It would be too much to attribute this change to any desire for the permanent improvement of jackets; nevertheless, it happens to be an improvement, inasmuch as buttons were formerly placed at the bend of the waist, and may be instanced as a step in the right direction, which might be followed even in male attire.

Nor should utility be left out of the question in the cut and arrangement of costume. It is usual to look upon Taste as one thing; Common Sense as another. "Taste is not everything," Mrs. Oliphant writes; "there
must be good sense, and there must be use." "Let the student bear in mind," says Barry, "that, in addition to good taste, he requires the exercise of sound judgment." It has already been shown that one is a component part of the other, and that, if any contrivance be not adapted to the purpose for which it is primarily designed, it does not satisfy the demands of Taste. There are few matters in which the dictates of ordinary intelligence have been so utterly set at naught as the shape and size of head-gear. The crinoline had its use,—at least for those who started the fashion,—and even hoops are said to have lightened the drag of the skirt; but monstrosities in head-gear have afforded no counterbalancing advantages. Mrs. Haweis, indeed, tells her readers that the Gainsborough hat "forms a distinct background" to the complexion, and recommends it accordingly;¹ but this is only another instance of the confusion arising from the misuse of that hackneyed expression "Artistic." The said hat is all very well in Gainsborough's picture, because the Duchess of
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Devonshire faces the spectator; but what becomes of the background when the pretty living soul who sports a Gainsborough presents a side view, or when she turns round? In the latter case, background and countenance both disappear together, and all that meets the wondering gaze is something resembling the contour of a mushroom. The purpose of a hat is primarily to afford protection to the head; and it may be said of those at present worn that they fully answer this purpose, especially the exquisitely pretty Dame Trots and Langtries. But there is no telling by what absurdities they may not be supplanted. The fair reader’s first exclamation upon beholding the head-dress upon page 211 will doubtless be, “What a vulgar thing!” (Fig. 94.) I would that girls of the humbler classes could be prevailed upon to abstain from flaunting about in vulgar things; yet we must recollect that the humbler classes have no fashion of their own, and that they imitate, as closely as they are able, those fashions set by the wealthy. There is nothing essentially objectionable in the hat itself, or in the feather. The vulgarity lies in the way they are put on; the feather lying too much off the hat, and the hat too much off the head. Have not the fashionables themselves transgressed in both these respects? Are not they on the verge of doing so at the present moment? We have accustomed ourselves to follow the style of the Parisians; and the Parisians now cover but half
the head; the brims of their hats being turned up perpendicularly, so as to form, in the language of Mrs. Haweis, "a distinct background."

Alas, alas! when will the ladies of England unshackle themselves from foreign domination, and rise superior to the dictates of Parisian modistes and couturières! It would be too much to say that Taste in

Fig. 94.

THE "COMMON" HAT.

France is somewhat on the wane, still there are not wanting evidences to show it is not what it was under the Empire. Nor is this surprising if such writers as M. Blanc exercise any control over popular predilections. His judgement appears to be overpowered by the most inconceivable puerility. Fancy a Director of the Fine Arts commending the following abomination as imparting "an expression of independence and
To his mind, a felt hat worn by a damsel in a masculine manner "recalls the Sedition of the Fronde"; and imitation cherries in the bonnet "look as if they had fallen from a tree from which the naïve Rousseau had thrown them." No wonder, if rhodomontade of this description captivates the fancy of the lesser oracles, that such designs as those shewn in Fig. 96 make their appearance in the 'Journal des Demoiselles.' To the imagination of those who detect characteristics which have no existence, there is "piquancy" enough in the second drawing to satisfy the whole of M. Blanc's school.

The woodcut on the left, besides illustrating the absurdity of straining after effects, has been introduced for the purpose of exhibiting another objectionable feature. The feather in the hat will be noticed to curve upwards from the front. This is wrong; for all ornaments of the kind should first rise, then curve, and gradually fall away towards the back; because thus only can they harmonize with the shape of the head (see diagrams, Fig. 99). Nor is it right to point even a goose-quill forward (Fig. 97). Fig. 98, copied from the 'Salon de Mode,
presents a further disfigurement which we would do well to avoid. The hair should never be gathered up over the nape of the neck, for the natural outline sweeps *inwards* at that part. The rule I would lay down in regard to the position of hats and bonnets is, that they should never be worn beyond the line where the hair usually joins on to the forehead; the brim being turned downward or upward according to the age of the wearer (see Fig. 99). It is not "backgrounds" which are necessary, or anything at all at the back, introduced with the view of throwing out the countenance, but some simple bordering which contrasts with the complexion, and thereby enhances its beauty without impairing the flow of natural outline.

I have said "where the hair usually joins," because
the position of the scalp varies. Not many years since it was considered a fine thing to display as much of the forehead as possible, a high one evidencing, it was thought, a superabundance of intellectual capacity. As a matter of fact, however, the size of a forehead depends rather upon the growth of the hair than upon cranio-logical development, and the discriminative faculties, the possession of which pre-eminently distinguishes mankind from its Darwinian progenitors—the faculties of form, color, rationalistic perception, and such like—lie more immediately over the eyes; so that, if anything, a square, projecting forehead is to be aimed at. The Greeks, comprehending this, brought the hair down over the forehead; and this is done likewise by many of the fair sex of our own time, although with the object only of making themselves look pretty. My own humble vote is for a continuance of this custom (see Figs. 99 and 104).

One declamation against the modern boot, and my remarks upon Form are concluded. There would be no exaggeration in saying that nineteen women out of twenty have pinched their feet out of all proper shape by encasing them in tight boots. Nevertheless, not satisfied with this, the heel is now so raised that the toes are
thrust into a wedge and made to do duty as supports to the body. All from the insane desire of making the feet appear "small." Would it not be well to remember that the length of the foot bears a certain proportion to the body, and that to apparently decrease that proportion is, not to aid Nature, but to attempt an alteration? Small feet, with arched insteps and ankles to match, unquestionably denote a high development of essentially human characteristics; but they must not be dwarfed, or otherwise put out of shape. Our countrywomen, in general, do not pay sufficient attention to the quality of their boots, and that is the chief cause of their appearing to disadvantage. The same thing happened before the introduction of French corsets. They then seemed—erroneously, as it now turns out—to have inherited thick waists. Perhaps indeed the slush of London streets affords some excuse for the purchase of indifferently-made, hard-leathered, and inexpensive things. But then again, what necessity is there for slush? Why should we not insist upon the cleansing of foot-pavements and the immediate laying down of
proper crossings? Mrs. Haweis recommends the use of clogs; I recommend that ratepayers compel the vestries to do their duty.

In all questions of proportion it is impossible to lay down positive rules. I would counsel the relinquishment of Louis Quinze absurdities (x, Fig. 100); a limit upon height in the heel, not exceeding an inch and a half; a widening thereof at the bottom, in order to obviate twists and sprains to the ankle; its advancement somewhat towards the tip of the foot, and an arching
under the instep, to prevent one's weight pressing upon the toes (see y). The differences suggested may appear very trivial; but this will be found to be the case with most of the modifications necessitated by æsthetic requirements. Were these palpably obvious, there would be little occasion for written treatises.
Color.

It would be well, before entering into detail upon the application of color, to set forth the distinctions between Primaries, Secondaries, Tertiaries, Neutrals, Complementaries, Hues, Shades, and Tints; for the non-apprehension of these distinctions is the cause of a good many blunders in the selection of costume.

There are only three Primaries; viz. yellow, red, and blue.

By the combination of these, in equal portions, are produced the Secondaries;

Yellow and red giving us orange,
Yellow and blue " green,
Red and blue " purple.

By the intermixture of these are obtained Tertiaries;

Orange and green resulting in citrine,
Orange and purple " russet,
Green and purple " olive.

And thus we go on, by regular succession, to those various gradations commonly known as "Neutral," or "Mediæval, Tints."

These latter, however, are not, strictly speaking, tints, but colors. A Tint is that which is produced by an admixture of white, or by dilution.

A Complementary color is that which, in combination with what adjoins it, presents to the eye the three primaries. For instance, red is the complement
of green, because green itself combining two primaries, the red presents us with the remaining one.

A **Hue** is that which is created by the addition, in more than an equal part, of any component color. Thus, blue-green is a hue of green, since it contains more blue than yellow; and yellow-green is likewise a hue, because the yellow predominates over blue.

Finally, a **Shade** is that variation which results from the introduction of black.

We cannot pay a higher compliment to the discrimination of our forefathers than by designating such colors as are sombre and subdued by the appellation of Medæval tints. A lady may dress in colors if she pleases, but if those colors start forward to meet the eye, and furthermore, kill the complexion, she does not attire herself with taste. It is no easy task to lay down one broad, invariable rule; still, a pretty safe one to start with would be, the adoption of sober colors, hues, shades, or tints for the entire costume, and the restriction of such as are bright, or positive, to trimmings.

Of course, it is perfectly allowable to dress in one uniform color, varying the trimmings to the extent only of a shade or hue. Nevertheless, it is not a little remarkable that Nature herself appears to insist upon the presence, in some form or another, of the three primaries, and this is, perhaps, a circumstance which should be taken into account, both in the decoration of a room, and in the completion of attire. If we look
steadfastly upon vivid green, and then suddenly glance in another direction, a red spot, in size identical with the object we have been looking at, will, for several moments, follow the eye. Conversely, after regarding red window-blinds for some time, the surrounding wall, though it be really colorless, will assume a greenish tinge. In like manner, a golden sunset will cast upon distant intervening mountains a purple haze. Applying this suggestion, we would not have everything of one color, or even be satisfied with shades and hues thereof, but introduce occasional contrasts. A wall, for example, may be of olive-green, bordered with raised margins of yellow-green (set off with beadings of gold); or these margins may be black. So far good; yet this is not sufficient. There ought to be a picture or two, or some other article of furniture against the wall containing red; or the ottoman, table-cover, and such like, must, in some manner, indicate the presence of that color. I do not say that it is imperative upon one to introduce a complementary color into costume, because two shades of green would amply suffice for an entire dress; but, unless there be two shades or hues, the green might properly be relieved by a soupçon of red somewhere, either in the shape of a deep coral locket, a cherry tuft, a piping, or as interwoven with the stuff.

Although, however, we may trim with bright and positive colors, we must still further restrict the
application of such as are *gaudy*. It is very difficult to describe what a gaudy color is; yet, since it is incumbent upon one to attempt some kind of definition, I would say that that is a gaudy color which kills the complexion. Red is the brightest and most positive color we have, even as white is the least so. "Though thy sins," exclaims the Psalmist, "be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." Still, red is not necessarily a gaudy color. If, however, it be mixed with yellow, it becomes gaudy—that is, trying to the complexion, and otherwise overpowering. And the greater the quantity of yellow the more gaudy it is, until we come from scarlet to yellow-orange. On the other hand, the more blue we add to pure red the more sombre the hue, until we arrive at violet, the very antithesis of yellow-orange. Now, before reaching violet we pass in gradation through purple. This is by no means a bright color; nevertheless, it is gaudy, inasmuch as it kills; whereas violet itself, or blue-purple—that is to say, true violet, produced from the best pigments—does not.

A great many *tints* likewise kill, and should not be introduced except with the greatest discrimination; pink, light blue, light green, and so forth being becoming exclusively to very fair people; and light yellow suiting only brunettes. *Medieval* tints, however, may be worn with advantage by all; although care should
be taken to prevent any tint, of whatsoever description, from being juxtaposed in immediate proximity with the complexion. They ought invariably to be separated by bands or frillings of black, or white.

It has become fashionable of late to wear black next the skin, and there can be no doubt that theoretically—according to the law of contrast—the practice is justifiable. It is suitable, however, only to very fair complexions. Otherwise, so far from enhancing beauty, it creates an appearance of uncleanliness. As to the introduction of black patches upon the countenance, which the authoress of 'Art and Beauty' holds to be so "harmless and effective an aid,"¹ no argument is needed against the folly of resorting to meretricious devices of all descriptions whatsoever.

White itself I would not recommend, excepting in very partial combination with other colors. What has been said about its "irradiating all that comes within its range" is simple nonsense. Used in masses it takes the color out of everything; as we may notice when the ground is covered with snow. The most delicate complexions then suffer by contrast. If very light, cool-looking dresses be desired—and such things are often desirable—let them be of cream, or écru. Écru was once fashionable, but it fell into disfavor; one does not know why, excepting either that it was injudiciously worn next the skin without an intervening rim of white, or that it

¹ P. 155.
became "common." The reader will recollect what has before been said about creamy-white, the use of unobtrusive colors in masses, and the restriction of those which are positive and decided in conformity with natural distribution. Not only may the latter be introduced with advantage into bands and trimmings—subject of course to exceptions already specified—but they may be introduced in two shades or hues. A creamy-white "fish-wife" costume, for example, furnished with broad bands of dark blue, may further have these set off with narrow ones of light blue. And in this manner, even such colors as, when used in quantities, kill, may suggest themselves with effect. A winter dress of navy blue, adorned with bands of crimson, may have these tricked out with borders or pipings of scarlet. Lilac may appear upon, or otherwise be used in juxtaposition with, violet; yellow upon citrine; salmon upon framboise, and so on; for a mere soupçon of color cannot possibly have the same detrimental effect as its presence in masses. In this way gold also, which, as already stated, should be used but sparingly, may be applied to the embellishment of costume; as, indeed, it has been in its day. Nor is orange itself amiss, or yellow unbecoming, especially in conjunction with black, and used for the adornment of brunettes; although both these colors, in common with others which fall within the category of "gaudy" ones, notwithstanding the favor accorded to them by the authoresses of 'House Decoration,'
should be excluded from mural embellishment. Combinations of this kind are suggested by Nature herself; for a ruby will glitter with vermillion in the lights, an emerald with light green, an amethyst with lilac, and so on. That is to say, although the lighter parts would partake of the character of shades rather than of hues, yet, were an artist representing them upon canvas, he would render the effect better by laying on vermillion and then dragging it with a transparent glaze of crimson, and, similarly, by laying on yellow or lilac and toning these with a film of Prussian blue, than by mixing crimson, pure green, and violet, respectively, with white.

Gold harmonizes with any color, and next to it in the scale comes red. There are very few colors which will not bear the application of red; and, being warm and enlivening, none other is so well adapted to cold seasons of the year. Nor, indeed, is it amiss in summer; for cream and Cardinal are an excellent combination. A generation ago no one would have dreamt of juxtaposing cream with Cardinal, since harmony by contrast was all that was aimed at. We have now, happily, harmony by assimilation; and I hope we shall keep to it. Red, of course, harmonizes with olive; nevertheless, if used in quantities, the contrast is too violent. Yellow-green harmonizes equally; but then, the harmony being by similarity, larger proportions of this color may be used.
Alas, however, for the fickleness of Fashion! We no sooner arrive at one kind of harmony than an attempt is made to supplant it by another. For a few successive years ladies have worn all to match, from head-dress to shoes. We are now threatened with a revival of dissimilarities. The dress must be of one kind, the bonnet of another. Perhaps when it is recognized that the effect of this is apparently to diminish stature, the efforts in this direction of those "veiled prophets" of the Gay City, "who invent and modify at pleasure," will prove unavailing. I would call upon the fair ones to maintain uniformity, because uniformity imparts "breadth," and breadth conduces to height. If the dress be of olive-green, let the hat, or the greater portion thereof—the feather, for instance—be of olive-green also; and if the trimming be of yellow-green, let there be a tuft of this color in the hat too, or have the feather tipped with yellow-green. Even stockings should, as far as practicable, correspond; black or deep red being the best general color.

It would be useless to enter into further particulars, because the principles above enunciated apply to every variety of costume. If only some of those which are generally becoming be indicated, we can then pass on to other matters. For winter wear there is nothing better than navy-blue, blue-green, olive, slate, bronze, chocolate, puce, deep grey, brown, or black, trimmed with brighter colors; and for summer wear, tints of
the same, sage-green, écru, or cream, set off with bands, bows, and sashes of darker hue, or positive color. Such combinations as that approved by M. Blanc, namely, "blue and green,"\(^1\) or that in vogue during the past season, i.e. cerulean and Cardinal, should be studiously avoided as manifesting neither harmony by contrast nor harmony by similarity; and, furthermore, we must subordinate every question of sentiment, whether spurious or real, to the canons of chromatic disposition. Notwithstanding the dicta of impressionable French writers, a lady will "dream" as well in neutral tint as in the hue of the empyrean, and "weep" as effectually in "pink" as in black;\(^2\) we may take it for granted that white will not adapt itself to brunettes "by throwing out a light which irradiates all that comes within its reach,"\(^3\) and rest assured that all attempts to force upon the mind the potentiality of impalpable virtues, to impress the imagination with the fictitious presence of "piquancy, queen-like dignity, originality," or "independence" (vide M. Blanc), and generally to parade the romance of affectation, will invariably be made at the sacrifice of visual gratification. If I may be permitted to intimate my own predilections, they are in favor of deep crimson for autumn and winter wear, for écru and Cardinal in brighter weather, for silver ornaments upon black dresses, for gold trimmings, for the retention of flowing skirts, and

\(^1\) P. 186. \(^2\) P. 187. \(^3\) P. 69.
for the perpetuation of capes—not capes coming right down the back, concealing the waist and pinning the arms to the sides (A, Fig. 101) or standing out like the skirt of a dancing dervais (B), but capes properly cut, and falling to the figure, as in c. Red is our national color; and besides being admirably suited to

![Fig. 101. Differences in Capes.](image)

a sunless climate, its general adoption would denote the prevalence of a patriotic spirit. There unfortunately exists among ladies a deep-rooted aversion against being "copied" by the humbler classes; an aversion to which the sterner sex is a stranger. Let me put it to them whether they would not prefer, in
lieu of Continental derision, that a tribute of applause should be paid to the taste of their countrywomen? Social distinctions are not so inappreciable as to be bridged over by mere similarity in attire. Constituted as we are, physically affected by the character of companionship and influenced by the culture of patrician endowments, there must always be perceptible differences among various grades; and if aesthetic appreciation be manifested by those of a lower sphere of life, are ladies in more fortunate positions any the worse for this? Compare figures A and B in the accompanying drawing (Fig. 102). The vast superiority in the sit of the skirt B is obvious when pointed out; for herein prominence is given to natural beauty, while in
the other diagram it is destroyed. A nice discrimination alone will enable one to perceive such things without their being pointed out; and surely this is not a quality the possession of which we ought to begrudge!

Red—that is, deep red—is perhaps the only positive and decided color which may be introduced in masses, even to the extent of an entire confection, toned down with a combination of black.

But then there are those who cannot afford to have many dresses, and to vary their costume with the temperature of the seasons. To such I would say, that a higher aesthetic feeling is manifested in a good-fitting attire of unpretentious material, than in the richest stuffs cut and put on without regard to the dictates of Taste. Wealth does not eradicate intuitive vulgarity, nor poverty subvert the instincts of refinement. Many a humble damsel, attired in simple blue serge, stitched together, probably, with her own hands, is better dressed than women of fortune in silk and satins. Indeed, serge itself is not a material to be despised. In speaking of the character of British decoration it was pointed out that we frequently failed in truly artistic effects from the practice of imparting too much smoothness and sheen to surfaces. The same reasoning applies to attire. For ordinary wear, rough, “undressed” material—even workhouse sheeting—is far preferable to glossy material; and, in this view, a costume entirely

1 Ch. iv.
of satin, so far from being a thing to be proud of, is a thing to be avoided. Smooth material should be used for trimmings only. And this rule holds good with reference to articles of furniture, and also to male attire. Everyone knows the disagreeable effect of a coat or pair of trousers of shiny black; and we shall likewise find hangings of rep, artistically considered, superior to the most elaborately wrought damask. Moreover, when smooth or glossy material is used conjointly with rough material, the former should be laid upon the latter, and not vice versa; bands of satin, for example, being applied over Cashmere, never Cashmere over satin.

But whatever be worn, care must be taken to keep something dark immediately around the countenance; because, howsoever otherwise becoming tints of certain descriptions may be, they will detract from the complexion unless separated by intervening white, as already stated, or dark color. And whereas white by itself affords no contrast if the whole dress be light; therefore, in that case it ought properly to be coupled with, or superseded by, a rim of dark material (Fig. 103). The same argument holds good with regard to the hat or bonnet. It is in etiquette to wear, for fêtes and matinées, bonnets entirely of white. The sooner this custom is abandoned the better; since no complexion can stand a mass of unrelieved white. Even a white camellia is not always becoming.

White possesses also another property which must
not be lost sight of. It expands by filling the eye; wherefore, neither this nor anything approaching to it is suitable to persons of portly proportions. Black, on the contrary, receding from the eye, apparently contracts. It is no easy matter to clothe those who are inordinately stout; but this much may well be borne in mind, that very few need become stout if they eschew habits of indolence. We see fishwomen and applewomen, who

Fig. 103.

sit quiescently at their stalls the greater part of the twenty-four hours, of "homely" dimensions; but seldom find laborers, and others taking regular exercise, stout; so that if a lady becomes so—except in especial cases—she deserves very little consideration from those whose avocation it is "to make people look their best." In fact, white must be introduced with as much judgment as any of the recognized colors. Some years ago, portly gentlemen took to exhibiting a portion of their
well-blanced waistcoats over that part of the person to which Sancho Panza devoted such tender and unremitting solicitude. They were found to amplify the figure and were dropped. Singularly enough, the ladies have now taken them up; and with what effect but to make them appear large where there is no necessity to be large? Perhaps the white will gradually work round upon the waist itself; and then we shall witness the same result as that produced upon our unfortunate soldiers of the line, whose pipe-clayed belts render their by no means naturally slender forms thicker and clumsier than ever. White stockings enlarge the feet and ankles, and when the gaiters which gentlemen occasionally wear under dark trousers be of the same color, these likewise impart a heavy, hypertrophied appearance, by no means creditable to the perception of the wearers.

The illustrations in Fig. 104 will sufficiently exemplify what has been said about the relative effects of tints and colors in proximity with the complexion. As in other matters hereinbefore treated of, the partiality shown for delicate hues takes its origin in false reasoning. A fair damsel appears with a light blue tuft, a lilac bow, or a pink rose, because these are "beautiful colors," not considering whether or not they injure her complexion; and a damsel who is not fair will do the same thing because she finds that many people have expressed an admiration for the fair one,
notwithstanding that she has worn what did not become her. The like ratiocination leads to the introduction of all kinds of imitation flowers, coral ornaments, and such like. Nor is sophistry of this sort confined to the gentler sex, for although materfamilias will go through the world with a picture in mosaic of the Tomb of Noor Mahomed, because the Tomb of Noor Mahomed is an exquisite specimen of architecture, or will, to exhibit the constancy of her affection, adorn her brooch with a photograph of her husband, yet Nimrod himself—a paragon of all the manly virtues—will not scruple to carry about a representation of his favorite terrier as a scarf-pin, although he wears it where he cannot possibly see it. Perhaps our vivacious neighbors are constituted differently from ourselves; nevertheless, since we are very much influenced by their opinions, it would be well to caution the reader against the admonitions suggested in the following rhapsody. "What fertility of invention!" exclaims the author of 'Art in Ornament and Dress.' "A pair of ear-rings made of enamelled violets; enhancing wonderfully the beauty of golden hair! Another pair will represent cherries. Here a peacock spreads its emerald tail. There brilliants and sapphires unite in the wings of a dragon-fly about to settle on a lovely head!" Let us hope that fertility of invention may be displayed among our own country people in other directions than that indicated

1 P. 254.
in this exhortation. There may be "ingenuity" manifested in handiwork of this character; but about as much Taste as that evinced by the ancients who set up the Colossus of Rhodes and the Wooden Horse at Troy.

Are we to denude our walls of bouquets; our friezes of peacocks; our tables of dogs' heads; our vases of butterflies; and yet retain them upon the person? What is the meaning of a parrot upon a cage suspended from the ear, a mouse upon a finger-ring, or a diamond lizard upon the breast? One sees now, even flies disposed for sale in Paris, and perhaps ere long we may be treated with spiders. Let us hope, though, that, among English ladies, the introduction of such things will be postponed to that blissful period when it will be an ordinary and natural incident for a dragonfly to settle upon a lovely head. We have had enough of vulgar imitation, and would do well to eschew representation of every description upon the person; wearing only such patterns as are either geometric or quasi-geometric; that is to say not "suggestive" of anything we find around us, but simply ornamental. This advice is the more necessary since on the other side of the Channel an inundation of floral design has already set in; threatening to supplant, with sprigs, leaves and flowers, the beautiful brochés and Chenilles which but two years ago gave such promise of artistic supremacy. The forms and hues of Nature have reappeared upon fabrics, and the display upon spring
bonnets of horticultural products is gaudy to a degree. I here repeat what has already been said when speaking of decoration, that we may suggest the *outline* of natural *forms*—even retaining the "wreathes of primroses and daffodils" to which one writer objects—but are bound, by every principle of Taste, to abstain from indicating natural *hues*.

Let us, furthermore, eschew all attempts at the "Picturesque." The day has happily gone by when artists and authors, with supercilious disregard for social conventionalities, arrayed themselves in the garb of disorder by disheveling their hair, slouching their hats, and rumpling their shirt-fronts. Nevertheless, there are not wanting indications, even at the present moment, of a lingering association between "genius" and eccentricity. The revival of Mediæval colors has been accompanied by a partial resuscitation of Mediæval forms, and we have been threatened successively with the Grecian chytón, the Indian *sári*, and "the quaintly-beautiful dress of Japan." Depend upon it we shall cease to dress with Taste the moment we abandon individuality and ignore the requirements of climate; and we cease to dress with Taste when we import into attire details which do not conform with the characteristic of our own race. The illusory allurements of cosmopolitanism have already insinuated themselves into sciences affecting our relations with foreign countries. Let us at least exhibit a modicum of
the *amor patriae* in personal adornment. And since intuitive intelligence, and the dictates of "sound judgment," both demand the maintenance of harmony and congruity in every detail, we would do well to abstain from the adoption of *négligé* folds, open collars, projecting *fichus*, and everything else that interferes with the flow of natural contour; we would do well to set our faces against clumsy "Eucalyptus-handled" parasols, and the revival of flanging sleeves, which are unbecoming and highly inconvenient, especially at the dinner-table (Fig. 105); and we would do well to decline the introduction of animals upon the person. If a Parisian chooses to wear a fly in her ear, or to wipe her pen upon the petticoat of a Sister of Charity, that is no reason whatever why Englishwomen should do the same. There are materials around us for the contrivance of every legitimate adornment, and patterns are designable by the ingenuity of man far more effective than imitative "suggestions." One has only to twirl a kaleidoscope, or close one's eyes and concentrate attention, in order to discover an inexhaustible mine of rich suggestions. And if the reader be desirous of ascertaining the effect of what has here-
inbefore been described as quasi-geometric ornament, she
has but to procure a few pieces of glass, shaped to the
similitude of sprigs, leaves and flowers, and furnish a
kaleidoscope with these. If occupation be desired for
the young ladies of a family, they cannot do better than
embroider designs of this description, instead of vainly
attempting to "suggest" in crewel-work "the entire
growth and sweetness of the rose-plant," or the delicious
perfumes of Nature. The only exception at all allow-
able is in the case of imitation flowers; for since real
ones fade, which from time immemorial have been
associated with youth, innocence, and beauty; since
real ones themselves are highly ornamental when worn
with discrimination, their representation in personal
adornment is a most reasonable indulgence. To such
perfection has the art of imitating them been brought,
that one can scarcely discern any difference from their
originals; whereas no embroidery, howsoever exquisitely
executed, can delude the mind into the belief that it
is anything but a pretentious attempt to portray, in
unsuitable material, what cannot possibly be rendered,
excepting by the richest pigments manipulated with the
brush.

By wearing artificial flowers "with discrimination"
is meant, that they must be selected with regard to the
season of the year, suit the complexion, not to be too
large, and kept well away from the face. There should
be no violets in autumn, or snow-drops in winter;
very delicate tints, if introduced at all, should be introduced in combination with positive and decided color; affected appropriateness should be discarded altogether, and only those chosen which are artistically beautiful. That is to say, the coarser kinds, such as poppies and sun-flowers, ought to be entirely dispensed with. It is commonly considered a becoming thing to send young ladies into the fields and country lanes with their hats covered with poppies and corn-flowers. There is a simulated appropriateness in this as objectionable as that displayed by the designer of the serpent seat sketched upon page 90. As to the introduction of fruit; that is simply abominable. No strictly globular form is ornamental; there is no "broken pattern" in fruit (see page 114); there is no sentiment connected therewith; nor is there any reason why, if one bonnet be adorned with cherries or lemons, another should not be trimmed with asparagus.

There is no extravagance too preposterous for the votaries of Fashion. Last year we had apricots upon the top of parasols; this year squirrels and mice appear upon the head-gear. Now, there is no harm in pressing into the service of apparel such ornamental parts of an animal as are not suggestive of slaughter and mortality; in wearing, for example, the brush of a fox, or the wing of a kingfisher. When a humming-bird is introduced that is quite a different matter; for, as one mere diminutive mass of resplendent coloring, it may
reasonably be treated as an exception. And, of course, none of these remarks are directed against feathers; for these suggest nothing disagreeable, and are highly ornamental. But to introduce entire animals, which are not in themselves purely decorative, is to manifest at least an absence of delicate feeling. Many of the fair ones embellish their ears with tiger-claw pendants. There is no perceptible difference between this practice and that of the African who bedecks his person with the teeth and tusks of a wild boar. Indeed, it is difficult to understand why ladies wear ear-rings at all; for they add no lustre to pulchritude, drag down the lobe of the ear, and are no more becoming than the nose-ring of an Eastern nautch-girl. So lovely are the best specimens of the human countenance, that they require no addition from the hand of man; and those who are not blessed with lovely countenances in no way enhance their charms by wearing such barbarous appendages.

I hope it will not be inferred, from the commendation bestowed upon the Princesse costume, that there is any intention to limit the range of selection, for it was merely instanced at the beginning of this article as an example fulfilling the requirements of Taste. Can we look around upon the works of Creation and say that there is not sufficient variety to satisfy the most ardent votary at the shrine of Novelty? There is individual diversity in every department; yet general uniformity. There are about thirty-eight million inhabitants in
these islands, having eyes, nose, mouth, and chin, relatively in the same position; yet no two countenances are alike. One voice is seldom mistaken for another; every tree or shrub possesses some distinctive feature; and no monstrosity is created for the purpose of exhibiting a pleasing innovation. Has human ingenuity descended to so low an ebb that successive alterations cannot be made upon one substantial basis? Must the laws of harmony, and conformity with contour, be overturned in order to gratify a craving for mere change? There is something supremely ridiculous in such an announcement as that "this year waists will be worn high," or that next season they will be "worn low." If any individual waist be naturally high, an endeavor should be made to aid the figure by so arranging attire as to make it appear lower. But to attempt a generic alteration is not only preposterous, but little short of profanity; for if mortal man were to devote his whole energy to the task, he could conceive nothing which in every single detail is so fascinating as the form the Almighty has created. It has pleased Him to confer upon the Anglo-Saxon race fair complexions and golden hair. Are the ladies of England to manifest their gratitude by raising up in their imagination an ideal standard of Beauty in the "dark-eyed maiden of the East"? Is naturally-light color to be darkened because it distinguishes also what we are pleased to designate the "common people"? We know that
white, red, and gold are associated with all that is pure, rich, and enticing; and we have but to take cognizance in order to ascertain that, despite the supposed predilection of an Ethiopian for black, both he and the members of every swarthy tribe look upon delicate and bright colors as indispensable to beauty. While the African bedecks his person in the gaudiest of hues, the Hindu besmears his favorite deities with pale yellow and vermilion, and the Mussulman portrays his ideal quintessence in unmistakable "lilies and roses." Indeed, the pink rose is regarded throughout Southern Asia, just as it is among Europeans, as the loveliest of floral productions. There is no beauty more bewitching than that within the British Isles. Our countrywomen lack only the art of making the most of themselves. Young ladies are brought up with the notion that there is something "frivolous" in Dress, so they devote no energy to its real study; social isolation renders them shy; and a national habit of residing in a series of petty, detached residences, deprives them of all opportunity for acquiring grace and flexibility. It is no easy matter in dealing with the subject before us to avoid the wounding of susceptibilities, or to draw distinctions exactly where they ought to be drawn. The above animadversions do not, of course, apply to all young ladies, or to all who reside in petty, detached residences. But I put it to the reader herself, whether we are not, as a people,
uncouth and ill-dressed, compared with corresponding classes in France, or even in America; whether we would not be all the better for a little more social intercourse, a little more indulgence in dancing and other enlightened recreations; whether we would not benefit by generally dwelling in flats, and opening our eyes to the advantages of combination under favorable restrictions.
CONCLUSION.

Will it be maintained that no material benefit will accrue from the cultivation and diffusion of Taste? What is it which for generations has caused the coin of other realms to flow into the coffers of France, but the solicitude manifested by the State for the encouragement of discrimination in the people? There is an especial Department for the Fine Arts, there are gratuitous lectures, there are judicious subventions; and the result is, they not only furnish the design of every new pattern, but manufacture the material. And no sooner do the looms of Manchester enter into competition with those of France, than the people of France change the character of material, and start afresh. Mechanical ingenuity and solid workmanship are not everything. What is it that constitutes the difference between the French capital and the English capital, but attention to these apparently unessential matters which both spring from, and create, a spirit of refinement? Perhaps one is as well drained as the other; perhaps the average duration of life is greater in London than it is in Paris; no doubt the miles of warehouses in our own city indicate the substantial
resources of an "Empire upon which the sun never sets"; and beyond question, this metropolis is more "vast" than the other. But where do the wealthy spend their money? Naturally, in a place wherein regard is had to all that is calculated to fascinate the eye and render life pleasant. Naturally, in a place wherein everything is presented with an air of order, regularity, and system; where the streets are not puddled and the flags are kept clean; where the rumble of carriage-wheels over pavement laid down in the days of the Hackney-coach do not distract by day and disturb one's slumber by night; where there is no pushing and shoving at public entertainments, but one place for ingress and another for egress; where one can sit down if he is tired, and refresh himself without going to his Club, or partaking of strong drink at a Bodega; where there are no gin-palaces for the sale of intoxicating liquors, although there is no stint in beverages which never inebriate; where one can reside in a flat and dine at a restaurant; where the strains of martial music are not restricted to the fashionable resorts of the beau monde; where the thoroughfares are properly lighted, and all wears an aspect of gaiety, and animation; and finally, in a city which is not perpetually enveloped in smoke. That is where the affluent from all parts of the world flock; that is where thousands of British, who are well able to live with comfort at home, reside; that is where thousands more
who cannot live with comfort at home, squander their surplus cash; that is the spot from which the whole of Christendom procures, at least, its fashionable apparel. It is all very well to say that London is spread over so vast an area that it cannot be properly paved, or that some vestries are more neglectful than others. The magnitude of London is owing, not so much to the density of population, as to the circumstance that at least one-fifth of its area is taken up by staircases—which would not be if the majority of people resided in flats,—and also to the circumstance that, since residence in flats is not customary, each acre of ground embraces about one-fourth the number it might otherwise embrace. And as to the negligence and shortcomings of vestries, it is not to be expected of such antiquated institutions that they should fulfil with satisfaction the duties assigned to them. The people of this country need to be awakened from the lethargy incidental to our isolated situation; to perceive the impossibility of maintaining a commercial supremacy unless we advance with the progress of international emulation; unless we devote more attention to the necessities of the multitude within these shores; unless we recognize the utility of aesthetic appreciation, and relinquish that bastard magnanimity which impels us to interfere without cessation in the concerns of others while neglecting our own, to actively contend against the principle of unification among kindred
races, to throw open the doors of our colonies to foreign competition without deriving fiscal advantages therefrom, and to impose an import duty upon our own manufactures, in order to increase the revenues of a dependency overflowing with riches.

That a general compliance with the requirements of Taste would exercise a salutary effect in elevating the character and improving physique, cannot be denied; for in domestic attendants alone we have an example of its influence upon mental and physiological development; and few, I think, will question the potency of refinement, both in ameliorating the disposition and in eventually impressing itself upon the very lineaments of the countenance.

Let us, then, trust that the day is not distant when, by reducing the straggling elements of Taste to a scientific system, its principles will assert themselves in the active sphere of existence; when we shall know how to use the things which Nature has placed within our reach, and set off to advantage the forms the Almighty has given us; when 'Arry will no longer violate the simplest rules of syntax; when Sarah will attire herself in apparel which is "neat, not gaudy," and the offspring of William, emerging from the miseries of the back-slum, will develop into beings at least as remarkable for manly proportion as the barbarous Zulu. For, say what we will about "the justice of our rule" kindling, in the breasts of alien
races under British protection, sentiments of gratitude, loyalty, and devotion, we shall be compelled, sooner or later, to rely upon the hardihood of honest William and his compatriots for the preservation of that Empire upon which the sun never sets; because the tendency of enlightenment is not, as commonly supposed, to unite humanity in the bond of "universal brotherhood," but to bring into action those innate yearnings for national cohesion which render intolerable the thraldom of foreign domination. One object in writing these pages has been to exhibit the consequences of not following the paths indicated by Nature. If we do so in the matter of dress alone, we shall revert to none of those follies which have distinguished the attire of bygone generations; we shall retain what is becoming, notwithstanding that it may become common among less wealthy classes, and refuse to be guided by those whose interest it is to bring about a ceaseless succession of mere innovations.

Nor are we able to console ourselves with the reflection that our neighbors excel us in gew-gaws and finery alone; for it is a matter of notoriety that we are gradually being eclipsed in the manufacture of more durable and substantial productions also. The causes of this check—be it temporary or permanent—there is no difficulty in ascertaining; the remedy is entirely in our own hands. If we abandon the practice of regarding ourselves as entrusted with "Missions,"
and adopt the more straightforward policy of retaining or extending our possessions *primarily* for our own benefit, and *secondarily* for the advantage of others;¹ if we aid the efforts of capitalists by modifying the restrictions imposed upon the hours of labor, and legalize vigorous measures for suppressing sudden strikes; if, when we discover that Free Trade does not pay, we discuss the advisability of substituting Reciprocity, without being influenced by the "nobleness" of disinterested motives; if we protect honest traders and foreign purchasers by a determined stand against fraud and adulteration; we shall then be in a position to consider whether it would not be desirable to crown these achievements by the establishment of a special Department for advocating and maintaining the necessities of Taste. Of what avail is a solitary institution like the South Kensington, or the promise of the City Guilds to devote, out of the enormous funds entrusted to their keeping, a paltry 20,000l. a year towards the promotion of technical education? The requirements of the country demand something far more ample and

¹ Let me not be misunderstood. Our intercourse with less energetic people *necessarily* results in material advantage to them, and that alone is a sufficient justification for looking more immediately to our own interests. From 1865 to 1875, for example, the exports from India exceeded her imports by 116,000,000l. Does not this mean that although we received raw material or produce to that value, she received the Cash? We conquered part of this dependency, portions were ceded to us by treaty, and for the right of governing the rest we paid. Do we chiefly gain, or those who, having contributed nothing, are nevertheless entitled by the rules of free trade *to the use of her ports*?
systematic than this. If the peculiarities of our land tenure really militate against the display of artistic construction, it ought to be some person's duty to propose favourable modifications; if resources intended for the encouragement of technical proficiency be squandered in civic entertainments, it ought to be the business of somebody uninfluenced by the fear of future non-election to invoke the interference of Parliament; if uniformity in metropolitan architecture be decidedly preferable to heterogeneous diversification, some one ought to initiate a scheme for its enforcement. In fact it would be impossible to anticipate the useful measures which might be inaugurated through the intervention of such a Department. Nor would its creation involve the recognition of any novel principle, since the license to do as one pleases, even in the erection of a private dwelling, is already curtailed by material restrictions.

If in the above observations I be thought to be wanting in "patriotism," let me explain that I do not understand patriotism to consist in the indulgence of oratorical acclamation, but in doing all in one's power to push his countrymen to the front. If we can truthfully say that we are not, by one nation or another, excelled in most of the higher branches of enlightened culture; in diplomacy; in the science of strategical warfare; in the administration of systematic law; in organization and methodical arrangement; in artistic construction; in figure painting; in the composition of
music; in the execution of music, both vocal and instrumental; in the art of making life pleasant; in politeness; in the preparation of palatable food; in elegance and expressiveness of language, and even in the distinct articulation of our own vernacular; if, in relying upon the power of private enterprise alone, disregarding the efficaciousness of State coadjuvancy, and reposing entirely upon the virtues of substantial workmanship, we have been the victims of circumstances over which we had no control, then let us indulge in self-adulation, and declare the fruitlessness of inciting emulation. But if we are excelled, let us gird our loins and buckle to the task of associating the British name with all that is honorable and truly great; remembering that he who "provides not for his own, and especially for those of his own house," has been pronounced by the most authoritative of Apostles to be "worse than an infidel"; and bearing in mind, at the same time, that it is our interest to do this. It cost the country many millions to recognize the value of scientific Jurisprudence; let us hope that the losses experienced during the past few years will rouse us to the necessity of systematizing and cultivating the principles of Taste.