ع 126 ٤٦

THE

HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION,

BY

AMOS DEAN, LL.D.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES

VOL. VII.

ALBANY, N. Y.
JOEL MUNSELL.

HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION.

EUROPEAN ART.

Art, in some of its phases, is wholly wedded to the beautiful; and may be expressed as thought realized in some form of beauty or sublimity. This relates more especially to the fine arts; those of architecture, sculpture, and painting; in which the forms of physical beauty are so moulded by the hand of genius as to serve a higher purpose in the production of moral beauty. The arts of a people are, however, by no means limited to those of design. The mental arts of music, poetry, and eloquence, possess as strong a claim upon the æsthetic nature of man as those of architecture, sculpture, and painting. Nor is a limit found here. There is art in dramatic representation. There is art in sieges and battles; in attack and defense. The question then arises, how are we to define art in its most extensive signification? What is the subject upon which it operates? What is the reason or final cause of its operation? And where is the limit or ultimate termination of all its action?

Let us say then that art is "an habitual power in man, of becoming the cause of some effect, according to a system of various and well approved precepts." That it is a power wielded by man for the production of some effect is obvious. The habit of its exercise is also essential to con-

stitute the artist, because no purely instinctive or impulsive action can ever be artistic. Again, its exercise must be guided. The canons of art, its rules and precepts, must be obeyed. When this habitual power is directed in its exercise according to a system of well approved rules and precepts, the result is a creation of art.

The next inquiry relates to the subject upon which it operates. And the answer here is, that "it is only on the contingent, which is within the reach of the human powers to influence." The great primal causes that lie at the foundation of all movement, the essential essences of things, the immutable and necessary in nature, that with which science is more strictly conversant, can never become the subject of art. All these can be influenced by no other than the power which has created them. But there is a lower order of existences, such as the elements and their different combinations, which are subject to interruptions, variations, and contingences, and these lie within the domain of art. Such are earth, air, water, fire, vegetables, animals, man. These may be influenced by human power, and may, therefore, become the subjects of art.

If we have found a subject upon which art can operate, and if, in its operation, it becomes the cause which, acting upon a system of rules, precepts and canons, becomes productive of some effect, it is obvious there must be something to set this machinery in motion, some reason to which this active agency may be traced, some final cause or motive adequate to set it in operation. The next inquiry naturally arising is, where shall we find this? It exists in the yearnings of our æsthetic nature after some imaginary good. But this good, although not capable of strict definition, may, nevertheless, be reduced within certain limits. It must not be of impossible attainment. To seek seriously after that which belongs to higher natures, and can minister only to their enjoyment, would mark the maniac, and not the reasonable man. Neither must it be a good that has no relation to human life, or any of its

pursuits. It may be a fancied good to fly like the eagle, or to possess the physical power of the lion, but no sane dreamer would ever expect either. Once more, it must not be a good so obvious and easy that every man in his ordinary state and condition is able to make the acquisition without labor or application. The absence of that good, which mere instinctive impulsive effort can secure, will never give origin to art. We may then define this reason, final cause, or motive, to be "the want or absence of something appearing good, relative to human life, and attainable by man; but superior to his natural and uninstructed faculties."

The only inquiry remaining, relates to the limit, or ultimate termination, of all its action, the end attained by it. This end is either an energy or a work. All art is expended either in present energy, or in a work completed. The former has a more direct application to mental arts, the latter to the fine arts. The execution of a piece of music; the strong working of poetical inspiration; the powerful appeals of eloquence; are so many exhibitions of a present acting and powerful energy. But the arts of design presenting themselves to us in the finished edifice, the perfect statue, the completed painting, afford us specimens of the work itself after the energy that produced it has ceased.

Thus bringing these various things together we would say that "art is an habitual power in man, of becoming the cause of some effect, according to a system of various and well approved precepts; that it acts only on the contingent, which is within the reach of the human powers to influence; that its final cause or motive is the absence or want of something appearing good, relative to human life, and attainable by man, but superior to his natural and uninstructed faculties; and that it will be accomplished and ended in an energy or a work."

Having thus defined art, its subject, final cause, and end, we proceed next to its classification. The topics we shall

include among the arts have a three-fold division. They are arranged according to the following plan:

1. Objective { Architecture. / Sculpture. / Painting.
2. Subjective { Music. / Poetry. / Eloquence.
3 Mixed.... { Art Dramatic. / Art Military.

The principle involved in this classification answers the inquiry where we may find that indefinable something, whether it be the beautiful, the sublime, or a hidden harmony, that reveals the true spirit and essence of art. In all those included in the first class it is to be found in the object. Whether it be the well proportioned structure, the faultless statue, or the splendid painting, it is from the object that the soul of art looks forth, to awaken in our æsthetic nature the love of itself. Hence we term this the objective. It includes the arts of design. It is intended to embrace all those cases in which genius seeks the realization of its high ideal, through the objective realities of the material world.

The second class embraces arts of a very different character. Genius is not here found going to external nature, transforming it into its own creations, and bringing it back to mind as the umpire of its success. It does not leave the place of its birth. It subjects the mind itself to its own dominion. Through the operation of powers that are purely mental, it breathes forth in tones of harmony and melody; embodies its bright conceptions of the ideal in the seraphic strains and harmonious numbers of poesy; and quickens thought, arouses passion, stirs the secret depths of the soul, and prompts to all life's activities,

through its insinuating, seductive and irresistible eloquence. It is, therefore, that we term this the subjective, the embodiment by the mind of its own powers for the accomplishment of its own purposes.

There is a third class of cases that do not appear to come exclusively under either the objective or subjective. The dramatic art derives from the subjective, or mind, the drama; while the pleasure experienced by the hearer arises wholly from its objective exhibition upon the stage. So also the military art is indebted to the subjective for its system of tactics, while their actual working in the siege and on the battle-field is wholly objective. We have, therefore, denominated this class mixed, as partaking both of the objective and subjective.

These are the principal arts excluding the merely useful, such as agriculture, gardening, the various manufacturing processes, and mechanic arts, which belong more appropriately to the element of industry.

OBJECTIVE ARTS.

ARCHITECTURE.

One of the first wants of man is a home; a place of residence for himself and family; a single spot on earth that he can call his own; one that he can flee to for protection against the elements; one that he can make a frowning castle in time of war and a paradise of joy and loveliness in time of peace. So in proportion as civilization advances, and new wants are developed, other homes, or residences,or public buildings are required. He must have palaces, or public houses for his kings or rulers; structures sometimes on a large scale, for the education of the rising generation; and splendid temples for the residence or worship of his god or gods.

All these wants and demands have given origin to the architectural art, and the various exhibitions of which it has been productive. It is obvious that the developments of this art cannot have been of a purely arbitrary character. It must have been in subjection to certain laws, and had reference to certain facts, or states and conditions of things, which have influenced, and to a great degree, controlled it in its various exhibitions. Thus it must have had reference:

1. To the material which was the most readily accessible, and the most proper to be employed in the construction of its edifices. From the mud wall and the log cabin, to the lofty mansion, in which birch and beech, and pine, fir and cedar displayed their different qualities, and from the humble brick or stone dwelling to the magnificent palace, temple, or church, the antiquity of forests, quarries,

and brick-making materials and facilities, have never been without their due weight and consideration.

2. The face of the country has no doubt had its influence upon the nature of its architecture.[1] In a hill country it is the position of the architectural structure that gives it importance: while in a level country it is the bulk that is more regarded. Amid mountain scenery it were vain to attempt by size of edifice to rival nature. But by position or location, thus cooperating with nature, an edifice having nothing imposing in its structure may acquire importance. On the contrary, in a flat, level country, like Egypt, human efforts have been combined in the erection of immensely massive structures, which may be seen looming up above the line of the horizon at great distances in every direction. It is their bulk, and not position, that gives importance.

3. The domestic architecture is influenced, and more or less controlled in its character, by the form of government, and prevailing habits of the people in reference to peace and war. The reign of feudalism substituted the baronial castle with its moat and drawbridge, in the place of the Roman villa, with its fine situation, tasty adornments and delightful grounds. So in the north of England, from the early part of the fourteenth century down the union of the two crowns of England and Scotland under one monarch, where a border warfare was almost incessantly carried on, no residence was deemed safe unless it had the means of defense, and hence towers, or castellated dwellings, were scattered all along the English and Scottish border.

4. The state of the country in relation to its wealth or poverty, and if wealthy the manner in which the wealth is controlled, has no small influence upon the character of its architecture. Wherever poverty prevails, neither the homes of the people, nor their public edifices, will exhibit any elegance in design, or beauty in execution. To subserve the mere necessities, or, at most, conveniences of life

[1] *London Quarterly*, 1844,-1847, p. 7.

and of business, is all they seek. But where wealth is at command, and especially where immense amounts are wielded by a single power, or a single mind, as has been at times the case with the Roman pontiff, the king of France, and the Russian emperor, we have seen structures of surpassing splendor rising at their command, developing many of the hidden beauties and grandeur that belong to architecture as an art.

5. The climate of the country; its greater or less subjection to cold or heat, its exposure to winds and storms, to snows and tempests, to earthquakes and tornadoes, to light and darkness, largely influences its style of architecture. The pointed roof and immense strength of the Gothic, has been referred by many to the storms and tempests that assail it; and more especially, to the heavy weight of descending snow that might endanger the safety of a building, the roof of which was flatter, and less protected. So in northern countries, and those obscured by fogs and clouds, larger provision must be made for the admission of light than in those, like Italy, where an ever cloudless sky interposes no obstacle to the full blaze of the solar luminary.

6. The architecture of a country is also influenced and controlled by the advance which its people have made in the development of all the other elements of humanity. The æsthetic nature, it is true, in which everything belonging to art receives its due appreciation, is not necessarily developed in proportion to the other natures with which it is associated in the individual, and yet by a law which is operative through an entire community, all the elements conducive to general civilization have nearly a coequal and harmonious development.

7. Not only are architectural structures, by their difference in form, proportion, structure, and general style, made to reflect the different degrees of civilization, under the influence of which they were reared; but a difference equally as great and striking is proclaimed in those architectural remains, which owe their origin to difference of race among mankind. Architecture is ethnographical. "It is thus,"

says a writer, "that looking on an ancient building, we can not only tell in what state of civilization its builders lived, or how far they were advanced in the arts; but we can almost certainly say also to what race they belonged, and what their affinities were with the other races or tribes of mankind. So far as my knowledge extends, I do not know a single exception to this rule;[1] and, as far as I can judge, I believe that architecture is in all instances as correct a test of race as language, and one far more easily applied and understood." This fact gives to every monument, coming under architectural criticism, a greater degree of interest and importance.

It should here be remarked that mere construction alone can present no claims for consideration as an embodiment of architectural art. So far as that is concerned it is properly the work of the engineer. He selects and arranges his materials, with a view to the production of an economical result in the most scientific manner. The laws that govern mere construction are very different from those that preside over the development of man's æsthetic nature. It is only when construction is wrested from its simple utilitarian purpose, and made to gratify a higher want, one deriving its origin from the ideal, that architecture can present any claim for consideration as an art. And then it does present such claim. The architect begins his work just where the engineer left it. He works upon the materials of the engineer, but the forms into which he moulds them, have no express reference to economy or utility. His arrangement of these materials is with reference to artistic effect, and by disposition of light and shade; by his harmony and contrast of form; by his variety of outline; he seeks the production of a result that shall awake the ideal to a sense of permanent beauty. All this he seeks merely by arrangement of material. And when to this he superadds such variety and depth of ornament as the nature of

[1] *Ferguson's Illustrated Hand Book*, i, lii.

his structure admits, and the suggestions of a refined taste sanction, his work may be considered complete.

Although what may be called the styles of architecture have considerable variety, yet they all are derived from, and are modifications of, two great principles of mechanical construction. The widest and the most thorough generalization presents the entablature and the arch, as the two great original contructive forms, out of which grow all the vast varieties of architectural designs. To realize the necessity of employing one of these two in every architectural work, we need only perceive the necessity in its completion, of doing something more than simply raising uprights, whether they be piers, posts, pillars or walls. These alone could never form a structure. Some kind of union of these at the top must be effected before any edifice can be constructed. It is in the different modes of effecting this union that we find the point from which diverge the two lines out of which grow all the varieties of architectural style. The one is by simply placing on the top of the two uprights,[1] which are at such distances from each other as to avoid all breakage from mere weight; a third, or horizontal mass, which is held together by mere cohesion. This may be done wholly independent of material, as it is obvious that beams of wood or blocks of stone will equally well accomplish it. This is the union effected by the entablature, the definition of which is, "the superstructure which lies horizontally upon the columns in classic architecture."

In the other an union is also effected, but by different means and upon a different principle. It is not by a single block, or mass, kept together by cohesion, but by a series of such blocks, or other similar substances, bound together without any visible support, and sustained by a curious and wonderful law of the mechanical powers. It is by the structure of the arch, which is defined to be "a construction of bricks, or stones, over an opening, so arranged as by mutual pressure to support each other,

[1] *Freeman*, 20.

and to become capable of sustaining a superincumbent weight."

All structures of every description come under one of these two principles, and hence the two leading styles of architecture proceeding directly from them, develop them the more fully as time and opportunity are afforded for that purpose. Every definite style of architecture proceeds from the entablature or the arch, and adapts its forms and details to this construction. The one or the other constitutes the animating principle in obedience to which, not only the structure is reared, but also the various decorations and ornamental embellishments are selected and used.

The style which adopts the entablature may be called the horizontal style. Its structures are generally less lofty, but cover large areas. They creep along the earth with little or nothing of upward aspiration. The upright pillar or wall, with the superincumbent mass that binds them together, present the only principle that controls their structures. Into the capitals of their pillars, and the divisions of their entablatures might be introduced ornament and decoration. So the elegant proportions of different parts of the edifice may be such as to produce a pleasing effect.

The style which adopts the arch is very appropriately termed vertical. It has an upward, and not a horizontal development. This is accomplished by means of piers and arches, which may be made to rise successively over each other; at least the arches may shoot off in succession one above another from different or the same continuous piers or columns. This, also, as we shall see, has its peculiar species of decoration and ornament.

Of these two styles, the horizontal was the earliest developed. Although the arch was certainly known in Egypt, and probably in Greece, yet it did not enter into the architecture of either of those people. So, also, in the early Pelasgian or Cyclopean monuments, the ruins of which are still found in Greece and Italy, there appears to be a dim foreshadowing of the arch principle and a striv-

ing to arrive at it, but without ever actually reaching it, at least so as to embody it in a style of architecture. The earliest structures among a rude people are always after the horizontal mode. The Celtic remains of north-western Europe, those wonderful Druidical structures of Stonehenge, Avebury and Carnac, are all of this character. They all consist of stones piled together upon the principle of the entablature, and adhering together by force of gravitation.

It was the Greek who gave to this form of art a grace and loveliness before unknown. Among them it found its complete development. Its structures were faultless in proportion, beautiful in outline, and when its three orders of architecture, Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian, arrived at their full completion, forms of perfection were produced that seemed unsurpassed by human skill. Grecian architecture was productive of one form of the most perfect beauty,[1] but that seemed to be all it was capable of producing. Every structure followed the same general type, presenting the same outline, and the same features both constructive and decorative. No variety was attainable except by diversities of detail, and of proportion. This is, perhaps, a difficulty inherent in the horizontal style. If it had not been, Grecian genius would most certainly have surmounted it.

One great cycle in the history of architecture reaches its furthest limit in Greece. That cycle was designed, and actually did accomplish the entire development of the entablature. From the roughest specimens to the most perfect productions, from the Druidical circle to the portico of the Parthenon, we witness a regular series in advancement until the refined taste of the Greek left nothing wanting to the full and perfect completion of this style. All there was in it was thus brought out, and the age of Pericles was the final consummation of everything it had in its power to offer.

[1] *Freeman*, 25.

With the arch commences another cycle in the history of architectural art, and like every other great agent of progress, it is slow and progressive in its development. The capacities of the arch, and its adaptations to different varieties of architecture, required almost twenty centuries fully to develop. Although known undoubtedly both in Egypt and in Greece, yet in neither did it form any marked feature in architectural construction. It is not until we arrive in Italy that we find the arch employed as a principle in construction. It appears to have been in use among the ancient Etruscans, and by them was communicated to the Romans.

In Roman architecture the arch was the predominant mechanical feature. It was mainly by means of it that the Romans were enabled to accomplish so much by their architectural labors. In their palmiest days, the resources of the world were open to them, and those who had persistent energy sufficient to subdue the world sought by their gigantic structures, to leave lessons in marble for all coming time. They have been reckoned among the best builders, but the poorest architects the world has ever seen. Their architectural works have been of great magnitude, of vast design, and of wonderful mechanical skill, and boldness of execution. Look at their Coliseum, their amphitheatres, temples and aqueducts, many of them on a scale of vastness beyond what had been ever before witnessed. But as architects they neglected the opportunity, so fairly presented, of completing a national round arched style. While the arch, with its piers and imposts, constituted the real frame work of their fabrics, they resorted to the beautiful Grecian models for their ornamentation. Thus the forms of Grecian art, although beautiful in themselves, were, nevertheless, a disturbing element in Roman architecture; and it is only where that element the least prevails that the real Roman construction, the pier and the round arch, comes out in all its purity and majesty, and exercises so wide and lasting an influence upon the architecture of the entire civilized world.

The architectural history of modern Europe is the most fully proclaimed from the churches and edifices consecrated to religion. It is these that have commanded the largest resources; that afford examples of the highest styles of architecture of every people; and that have proved the most enduring as to time. It is, therefore, in the architecture of modern Europe, Christian art which is the real subject of study. The architecture of Europe, since the downfall of the Roman empire, may be included under five great divisions, viz:

I. The Byzantine, or style originating in Byzantium or rather Constantinople, and used by all the Slavonic races of Europe as contradistinguished from the Teutonic, and generally by all belonging to the Greek church.

II. The Romanesque, or Christianized Roman.

III. The Gothic, or that style practiced by the Teutonic, or Celtic races, wherever they predominated in Europe.

IV. The Renaissance, or attempt to return to the classic forms of Greece and Rome consequent upon the revival of letters.

V. Modern architecture.

I. *Byzantine Architecture.*

This, although not the earliest, is, nevertheless, introduced the first, as being the most eastern; as prevailing among a particular race and symbolizing a religious sect nowhere else prevailing; and more especially as exhibiting forms of ecclesiastical art, unique and peculiar, and deriving nothing from Roman and Teutonic elements. All the other kinds we shall find resulting from the Teutonic alone, or that and the Roman, or Roman and Grecian combined. This style applies only to that form of art invented in Constantinople after its virtual separation from the western empire, and practiced by the Greek church during the whole of the middle ages.

The Byzantine builders of Constantinople were away from Rome and its resources. They were compelled to find their own materials, and to originate their own style. Besides, their location placed them in the east rather than the west, and hence, by necessity, subjected them to oriental influences.

The history of this style of architecture is divided into three periods: The first extends from the time of Constantine to that of Justinian. Very few monuments of that period are now remaining. The second extends from Justinian to the eleventh century, and it is this period that presents us with the pure forms of Byzantine architecture. The third, beginning with the eleventh century, extends to the final conquest of the Greeks by the Turks, includes the period of the Venetian conquests, and exhibits the marked influence of Italian features and details.

The main feature that serves more especially to characterize this style is the dome or cupola. This is its crowning majestic ornament, its life and soul, to which every other feature is subordinate. This feature had not here its origin, but its use had hitherto been mainly confined to circular buildings. Here it was employed as the central point of a Christian temple, and involved a revolution in the existing principles of architecture.

The principal difficulty encountered was how it should be sustained. A dome, when constructed in Rome, was supported on a circular drum of solid masonry, and as long as the Byzantine architects confined themselves to domes placed on octagons, or supported by eight piers, they had no great difficulties to contend with. This, however, practically limited the church to the space below the dome.[1] To obviate this they placed the dome on four instead of eight piers, filling up the whole angle of the square by a great bracket. By this means the building could be extended in any direction, without contracting its dimensions. It gave also the power of adding domes or semidomes of

[1] *Ferguson*, II, 947.

any required size or form, all of which could aid in carrying the eye to the great dome, and by contrast of dimensions much increase its apparent size.

In accordance with these principles the churches were at first round or octagonal. They were afterwards square, the nave being a little extended in length, four columns occupying the centre and supporting the cupola, or dome. The bracketing of the angles furnished the pendentives, which could sufficiently resist the outward thrust of the dome. The extremities of the nave were covered with hemispherical cupolas. The façade presented a square without gables, and terminated by a cornice with salient and reentrant angles.[1] Apses were also in use, often three in number, more generally semicircular than polygonal.

The Byzantine architecture sacrificed everything to the dome, making that the centre, the crowning point of all, to which every other portion of the pile converges and rests under the shadow of its majestic canopy. "The western limb of the basilica is too long, the others too short; its oblong form is, therefore, rejected, and the church assumes a square or octagonal form; the surrounding portions only radiating around, and supporting the vast central cupola; nave, choir, transepts, chapels, being little more than its supports and accessories, existing only to lift it soaring above them.[2] And not only did the grand cupola crown the whole pile, but the smaller portions are often covered with smaller domes and semidomes, so as to render the outline of a large Greek church totally unintelligible to one accustomed only to the buildings of the west. The eye habituated to the long naves and triple towers of our own great churches is totally bewildered in contemplating so huge a pile with apses and semidomes sprouting out in every direction, and all circling round the vast central cupola, swelling its majesty, like tributary rulers encircling an imperial throne."

[1] *Freeman*, 166. [2] *Idem*, 167.

The most perfect, complete, and splendid sample of the Byzantine style is the church of St. Sophia, erected in Constantinople by Justinian. It is nearly an exact square of two hundred and twenty-nine feet north and south by two hundred and forty-three feet from east to west, surmounted in the centre by a great dome one hundred and seven feet in diameter, rising to a height of one hundred and eighty two feet from the floor of the church.[1] East and west of this are two semidomes of the same diameter; these are again cut into, each by three smaller semidomes, supported by two tiers of pillars. The great dome is pierced by forty windows, and the greater and smaller semidomes each with five.

The Greek church, constructed according to the Byzantine style, presents a very extraordinary union of contending principles.[2] Although in its ground plan it is usually a mere square, yet it nevertheless preserves the cross form as distinctly as a Latin cathedral. The square is broken up by the four limbs rising above the portions which fill up its angles, and these again converge and support the circular cupola crowning the whole. In its minor features is also carried out the principle of cutting up the flat outline. Curved lines are everywhere sought for until even the outline of the cupola itself becomes interrupted in this manner. This style is a pure offspring of the arch, as it is that which produces the vault, and the vault the cupola. As between the pier and the column, the Byzantine style selects the former, as forming a stronger and much more appropriate support for cupolas. Where the column is employed very little regard is paid to classical proportions.

The Byzantine style was characterized by considerable elegance, with occasional combinations of a high order.[3] It was the age of Justinian that gave to it its greatest grandeur, and enabled it to rank among the great styles of the earth. From that period its history is one of decline until its final extinction caused by the conquests by the Venetians and Turks.

[1] *Ferguson*, II, 950. [2] *Freeman*, 170. [3] *Ferguson*, II, 962.

This style of architecture exerted an influence upon western Europe. This was particularly observable in Ravenna and Venice. In the former, the Church of St. Vitalis, erected in A.D. 547, presents the oriental characters of being octagonal in form; its roof being a magnificent cupola;[1] and having around the arcade a succession of small apses, divided, after the oriental manner, into galleries supported by columns of a completely Byzantine character.

In the latter city the magnificent cathedral of St. Mark, commenced near the close of the tenth century, presents an appearance quite anomalous in its general character. In its façade, pointed arches and pinnacles, it points to the Gothic age. Within are the columns and arches that give it a basilican character. But above and over all soar its five cupolas, or domes, one placed over the intersection of the Greek cross, and one over each of the four great limbs.[2] These domes, however, are different from that of St. Sophia, more resembling those of Saracenic origin, and prevailing among Mahometan nations. It may be possible that the western Christian and the eastern infidel may have developed in the same path from the common Byzantine source.

II. *The Romanesque, or Christianized Roman Architecture.*

The early Romanesque, or debased Roman, grew out of one of the features which characterized the later exhibitions of Roman architecture. The round arched style was essentially Roman, but the direction and character of its ultimate development depended very much upon that which contributed to its support. This is the pier, used here in the sense of any support for an arch. The form of it may either be a mere mass of wall, square or otherwise decorated, or it may be a real pillar. The latter is borrowed

[1] *Freeman*, 175. [2] *Idem*, 175.

from the Grecian system, and hence is a link connecting it with an earlier style of architecture. The former is original in its character; grew out of the necessities of the case; is the natural and legitimate treatment of the arch; and, therefore, harmonizes much the best with the solidity and sturdiness of a round arched style. It is interesting to notice in the palace of Dioclesian at Spalatio, the attempts of architecture, while using the column, to emancipate itself from the style to which the column properly belonged. In almost all its arcades the entablature has nearly vanished, and in its place the arch springs boldly from the capital of the column. Thus the fact is rendered apparent that the arch is destined to supplant the entablature, even upon that which had hitherto been the main support of the latter.

When the Christian religion came to supplant the pagan forms of worship, an imperative want was felt for a church edifice in which the Christians might congregate for worship. There existed, it is true, the heathen temple, but that was never designed, and was illy adapted to Christian worship. The object of that was to present a splendid exterior display. In the interior, it was pent in by four blank walls, was of small extent, dark and dreary in aspect, and designed to be accessible to the priesthood alone. The Christian worship, on the contrary, required the assembling together of worshipers. This originated the necessity of internal adornment, and required large spaces for the accommodation of their assemblies. Hence size of edifice, interior arrangement, and fine architectural design and execution, became demands that were clamorous for gratification. All these conditions could not be immediately supplied by the erection of new buildings. Of those already erected, the temple was entirely inadequate. Recourse was therefore had to the basilica, or hall of justice, in which courts were held and justice administered. This already possessed the long nave separated by arcades from its smaller aisles, sometimes a single one, sometimes two on either side. In some cases was even to be found a kind

of transept,[1] called chalcidica, crossed the aisles at one end. In most cases, the large central avenue was terminated by a semicircular apse, in which was contained the seat of the presiding magistrate. In this is found the complete type of the Christian church, such as has more or less prevailed from the age of Constantine to the present time. The nave is that part westward of the choir in which the congregation assemble. The aisles, one or more of them are the lateral divisions, or wings, for such is the relation they bear to the body of the church. The transept is that part of the church which projects at right angles from the body, being of equal or nearly equal height to it. It is this which gives to the church its cruciform arrangement, and hence the finding of this in a heathen basilica has been hailed as already foreshadowing the future triumph of the cross. The apse is a semicircular recess, at the eastern end of the church, and usually vaulted with a semidome.

Thus in the old basilica all the necessary arrangements for Christian worship seemed already made. The altar had only to be placed at the end of the nave, on the chord of the apse. The bishop's throne behind it took the place of that of the judge. The subordinate seats of the presbytery were ranged on either side of the bishop along the walls of the semicircle.

The choir for the inferior ministers was formed in the nave by screening off a sufficient space in front of the altar, while the long nave and aisles accommodating the congregation, the lateral division maintaining the requisite separation of the sexes. To the west end, not as then but long subsequently understood, was attached a portico. This, in the church, was the place for catechumens and penitents, and, as the place for discipline, was called the narthex. This in time developed itself into a cloister, an open square surrounded by pillars which is found in many early churches.

[1] *Freeman*, 155.

This change of the basilica into a church has not failed to attract attention to its moral aspect. From the hall of justice, the judgment seat of the Cæsars, the Christian martyr had received his sentence, and been led away to his crown of martyrdom. In that same building was now upreared the altar, where holy gifts were offered over that martyr's relics. It seemed like a just retribution to that power that had too often tyrannized in the name of justice.

This early Romanesque, more frequently called basilican style of architecture, had little to commend it externally. There was nothing of the spreading dome of the Byzantine, or the soaring spire of the Gothic minster. Nothing was presented but a long dead wall, unbroken by porch or buttress, by cupola or tower.[1] In front was a low portico, and above it three long, round-headed, undivided windows, symmetrically arranged, and above these, a round window in the pediment. Within, however, were long rows of columns supporting round arches, which were of continuous sweep, unbroken by a keystone, and resting on the capitals of the pillars. The wall rises considerably above the arcades, a gallery being sometimes present, and sometimes absent. Except in the conch of the apse, the vault, as a covering, does not appear in the ancient basilica. The wall, supported by columns of classical proportions, was not of sufficient thickness to sustain one. The roofs were wooden. The basilican architecture, although containing within itself all the main elements which were to constitute the future Gothic, yet presented them so detached, so disjointedly, in such lifeless juxtaposition, that the general effect, as an artistic arrangement, was destroyed.

Contemporaneously with the basilican, there was another style of ecclesiastical building in Italy, and that was the circular form. This was either round or polygonal, the former characterizing the sepulchral chapel, the latter the baptistry. This style of structure had a roof, which was domical within,[2] with an external cone, the aisles being

[1] *Freeman*, 157. [2] *Idem*, 163.

vaulted. The chief constructive principle of Roman architecture we have seen to be the round arch, and here it becomes, for the first time, the great source of decoration; the architect having mastered the great law that, in all complete and perfect architecture, the construction and the decoration must be derived from the same source.

There was a new style of Romanesque still deriving much from the old Roman, but approaching still nearer to the Gothic than the basilican, introduced into Italy by the Lombard. It is sometimes called the Lombard style. This was about A. D. 568. These Teutonic migrators had no architects or architecture of their own, but while they employed those of the conquered country, they infused into their works a new spirit. They gave new forms to the pillars, and their more extended application as decorative features.[1] They added a new style of sculpture. They originated a new ground plan and outline of churches, extended very much the use of vaulting, and, what very much changed the appearance of buildings, introduced steeples or belfries. In the interior, they often introduced piers formed of clustered columns, the pier being lower, while each separate shaft was frequently longer than was allowable by classical precedent. The Lombards resorted to constructive features as a source of decoration, and covered the exterior of their richer buildings with an infinite number of small arcades resting on ornamental shafts of various forms and proportions. Sometimes these are found detached, thus forming actual galleries. At others they are merely decorative enrichments of a blank surface. A whole façade is sometimes found covered with row upon row of these arcades, resting on shafts single or double, detached or engaged, plain, fluted, twisted, as suited the taste and caprice of the designer.

In the Lombard structures we find the strong sturdy pier in the place of the slender column of the basilica. This enabled their architects to substitute the stone vault

[1] *Freeman*, 177.

in the place of the wooden roof, which was often done. The first form of it was plain barrel vaulting, but subsequently cross-vaulting with groined ribs was introduced. These were often supported by tall shafts rising directly from the ground.

The church is made to assume the shape of a Latin cross, and of its four arms the western was much the longest. At the point of junction an octagon was frequently reared on a square base, forming an internal dome and presenting without a conical roof. One or more apses of a semi-circular form were to be found at the east end, the apse end being always termed east, and the entrance end west. These,[1] with the Lombards, were low, distinct buildings, a gallery of open arches often running round the upper part. The church exteriorly presented a low roof, and consequently no prominent gables, and having no buttresses or pinnacles, the façades were flat, and the whole outline but little marked or varied. But the feature of peculiar interest to which the Christian temple in all future time is indebted to the Lombard architecture is the campanile, bell tower, or steeple. This was and has ever since remained, a feature peculiarly Christian. No pagan temple ever possessed it. No mosque of the false prophet ever tolerates it. It is only where worshipers are wont to assemble that the tones of the bell are chimed forth to call them together.

The Lombard campanile was usually separated from the church, or was merely connected with it as an adjunct, and not as an integral part. It was in the form of a tall, round, thin tower, unbroken by buttresses, and usually covered with a pyramidical capping. Octagonal stages crowned with spires are often found, but these are, in many cases, later additions.

The Romanesque style improved upon crossing the Alps, and enlisted the efforts of the German nations. Here the towers, which in Italy had stood apart from the church, were united with, and made an essential part of, the fabric.

[1] *Freeman*, 188.

They were seized upon as beautiful appendages, were shaped in various forms, as square, round, or octagonal. They had a variety of capping, from the low pyramidical roof to the lofty spire, and were made to flank every front and fill up every angle of the larger buildings.

A change somewhat similar was also made in the apse. This also in Italy, and during the period of pure Romanesque, was a distinct part of the church, and attached to a front, although inferior in height and width. But in Germany it was attached to and made a part of the church. The Germans were not satisfied with a single apse at the east end. They were often introduced at both ends of a large church, and were attached both to the fronts and to the eastern faces of the transepts. The square pier was the most characteristic of this style, but the column was not excluded, especially in those churches which were not vaulted.

The triforium is a gallery or arcade in the wall over the pier-arches, which separate the body from the aisles of the church. This in the German Romanesque was by no means a necessary feature, nor very conspicuous when it occurred. As it was not used as a gallery, it appears to have been omitted, or treated as a subordinate feature.

A very interesting style of the early Romanesque is to be found in the island of Ireland.[1] Here are the earliest existing Christian temples in northern Europe, not deriving their origin from the basilica, but from the lowly shrines of the days of persecution. They are small and unadorned, and, what points to a creation prior to the basilican model, they are destitute of an apse. Its type is of the simplest kind, consisting merely of a quadrangular chamber, entered by a single doorway at the west end, and in the larger churches, connected by an arch with another chamber to the east, forming the chancel. The churches were small, varying between sixty and thirty feet in length, compensating for their diminished size by their greater number. There is

[1] *Freeman*, 196.

a great similarity between these and the Pelasgic remains in Greece. This, however, is regarded by some merely as accidental.

There are other buildings in Ireland, besides churches, which are of great antiquity. There are small oratories and houses supposed to have been the dwelling places of the earliest saints. There are also round towers, supposed to have been detached campaniles, which served not only for bell towers, but also as beacons and places for refuge in case of a sudden assault. They are found as the companions of churches, and frequently possessing Christian symbols. Their architecture corresponds with that of the churches of their own date. They are proportionally taller and thinner than the Italian campanile, and covered with a low conical capping.[1] The doorways are placed high, showing that they were also intended for defense.

We can have very little certainty in regard to the remains of Saxon architecture. The Saxons, on their settlement in Britain, appear to have employed wood principally as their building material. Even down to the time of the conquest they employed wood mostly in their buildings. Besides, there is difficulty in discriminating and deciding with certainty what is purely Saxon. As far as can be ascertained, they followed the usual type of the Latin church in regard to the chancel,[2] nave, and aisles, with their arcades and clerestory. The apse, although not excluded, is not of frequent occurrence. The piers were large and square; pier arches rare, chancel and belfry arches not uncommon. The old Saxon tower was a rude imitation of the Italian campanile. It was hard in outline, unbuttressed, and possessed much barbaric grandeur. The Earl's Barton is an undoubted relic of Saxon architecture.

There are two forms of the pier in the Romanesque style. In the one it is a rectangular mass,[3] in the other a column. These two forms are illustrated in the Saxon and Norman architecture. The former is Saxon; the latter

[1] *Freeman*, 201. [2] *Idem*, 206. [3] *Idem*, 215.

Norman. If the Norman is not actually columnar it is at least constructed on the columnar principle. The Saxon arch, on the contrary, is in its essence perfectly rectangular, not channelled or divided, but simply having roll mouldings attached to its square surface.

The development of the Romanesque, which is possessed of peculiar interest to the Anglo-Saxon inquirer, is the Norman. Some have denied this to be Romanesque, but insist that it is incipient Gothic. There is no doubt but that the Norman does point strongly towards the Gothic, and still its style is ranked as a pure Romanesque development. The Normans did not bring over with them a new style, but they did bring over better constructive processes, a more perfect conception,[1] and a more excellent manner of treating the style already in use. Their type of a church was cruciform, the nave being of great length, amounting almost to a deformity. The transepts are shorter, and the choir, although comparatively small, is not hidden by turrets, but stands out boldly as a distinct part of the church. It is apsidal, but without diverging chapels, and sometimes without a surrounding aisle. The tower is made to rise from the point of intersection between the nave and transept. It is sometimes gabled, but more commonly covered with a conical roof or spire. The west front is usually flanked by two lighter towers, which terminate the aisles. Smaller turrets occasionally occur in other positions, but no large ones, as in Germany, at the east end. The towers are square, and it is the central and western ones that give magnificence to the outline of the church.

The end of the nave below the gable was occupied by two rows of small round-headed windows. The gable itself was very plain. So also the towers were plain before arriving at the point at which they became clear of the church. In their upper portion they were profusely decorated with arcades, and usually relieved at the angles by flat pilasters.

In the larger Norman churches the east or apse end was

[1] *Ferguson*, II, 846.

usually terminated by an apse, while in the west was the entrance door, which in the smaller churches, was often of great richness below, while above was a single row of arches, one or more being pierced as windows, and also a gable left plain,[1] or pierced with one or more windows. So also pilasters formed by projection, or by recessing the ornamental parts, usually flank the sides, but pinnacles or turrets scarcely occur. The front is commonly divided vertically into two or three compartments by pilasters, and horizontally by strings into three ranges, answering to the arcade, triforium, and clerestory of the interior; each of the divisions thus formed being occupied by a window. The aisles generally followed the same rule, making a fourth and fifth vertical division, and having the two lower ranges of windows continued across them.

The special mission of the Romanesque style of architecture seems to have been to develop perfectly the round arched construction. The round arch occupies in architecture a middle ground between the entablature and the pointed arch. It is the entablature rounded, and thus bridging over the space intervening between the horizontal and the vertical style of architecture, as it thus presents itself as a kind of transitional agent between the horizontal and the vertical style, the question arises whether there is an ideal perfection of the round arched construction, in the same sense as there admittedly is, of the entablature and of the pointed arch? To this it is answered that although the ideal perfection of the arch is to be found in the pointed style, yet the round arch does certainly exist as a construction, and is as mechanically excellent as any other, and is also a portion of a figure, the circle, which is confessedly beautiful. It has, therefore, its own æsthetical character, distinct alike from the entablature and the pointed arch. So, also, it has its system of ornament consistent with the round, but inconsistent with the pointed arch. It consorts harmoniously with the massive pier

[1] *Freeman*, 333.

which supports it, but not with the soaring clustered pillar which attends the pointed style. All this certainly tends to show that the round arch has its appropriate treatment parallel to that of the pointed, and consequently has an ideal of perfection in which this treatment shall be most completely and consistently carried out.

But there is a great distinctness of the two as mere styles of architecture. "The Romanesque is the development of the round arched construction,[1] and as such has totally different principles from Gothic, the development of the pointed. While the whole soul of Gothic architecture is the vertical line, and while the horizontal stands in a like relation to that of Greece, the distinguishing feature of Romanesque is that neither is allowed to obtain a marked predominance. The other two imply extension, almost motion, in their respective directions. The Gothic minster seems absolutely to rise from the ground; the Grecian temple seems to stretch away to some distant point of the horizon. But in Romanesque the great characters are rest and solidity, an enduring, an immovable firmness, which seems inconsistent with any very strong carrying out of either of the other notions. The eye is neither carried up an infinite series of vertical lines, nor yet does it run along the long line of entablature. It rests on the supporting piers and supported arches, not growing out of their support as in the arborescent Gothic, not laid on them as something distinct, like the long beam of the entablature; neither idea comes out forcibly; the arch simply exists in its immovable firmness, resting on its support, without raising any inquiries as to how it came there. All this is the natural character of the round arch. Channel it with the continuous mouldings of the pointed, or place it on the gracefully clustered shaft, and its own purity is gone without its acquiring the distinct and opposite purity of the other forms. It desiderates its own square section, and its own massive pier.

[1] *Freeman*, 260.

"Every feature in the Romanesque must be solid, and furnished with its due support; the parts must retain a strongly marked individuality, so that each may of itself be sufficient to arrest the eye, and not be a mere link in a horizontal or vertical series. The light and airy character of the Gothic is therefore a total stranger to its predecessor. The former endeavors to render the supporting masses as slight as is consistent with real and apparent security, it connects every part with every other, and fuses all into one harmonious whole. Romanesque, on the other hand, delights in the appearance of strength afforded by the massive pier and round arch, and the vast unbuttressed wall. All the parts retain their separate existence; the pier of every form has a strongly marked impost or capital; the compound pier is not fused into one composition,[1] like the fully developed cluster, but at most has independent shafts attached as something extraneous; and each of these has its own well defined boundary in the square abacus. The square section brings the arch, as a distinct feature, far more forcibly upon the eye. It at once shows more plainly its construction, hinders the continuity of the Gothic architrave, and retains a separate existence for each of its orders. The same principle will be found carried out in the triforium, the clerestory, and all the other features of the building. All remain distinct. There is no attempt at subordination of parts to more comprehensive parts, or to the whole, or at making one fit into another. Rest and immobility are the ideas impressed upon every stone."

The Romanesque is claimed to be not an imperfect Gothic, but a distinct form of Christian architecture, having its own principles, beauties, and moral teaching.

The Romanesque style had its inception with the Lombard. All the great features begin to be designed according to Romanesque principles. The true manner of decorating plain surfaces was arrived at, and that germ of all that was grand and beautiful, the campanile, was added. While the

[1] *Freeman*, 281.

Lombard style was actively at work on the basilican form of churches, the Byzantine was carrying out the domical.

The next advance was made north of the Alps, and the German Romanesque is found fully carrying out the Lombard idea. Both this and the Norman, put in about equal claims as to the perfecting of this style of architecture. The boldness and vigor of the latter are in harmony with the native genius of that conquering race.

Between the German and Norman styles there were some distinctions. The former has two octagons and four towers, or four towers only, all of about the same height, and forming two groups balancing each other. But there is no centre, no one point of unity around which the other portions of the building circle. In the Norman the arrangement is different. There is there no balancing, no distracting equality. At the point of intersection of the nave and transept rises a tower, which thus is made to form a centre of unity. At the west end rises two towers, which being subordinated to the central, produce by their combination with it, a pyramidical outline of the greatest beauty.

The double apse of many of the German churches is a peculiarity which has an unfortunate effect. It breaks in upon the otherwise uniform custom of regarding the apse or altar end as the eastern end of the church, and the other, or entrance, as the western end. The apse at each end necessarily confounds the two. Upon entering the church the triforium, the gallery, or arcade in the wall, over the pier arches, which separate the body from the aisles of the church, assumes in the Norman style the importance which it lacks in the German, and there is more unity in the lateral elevations. The pier also receives greater variety, and capability, and while the column and the rectangular pier are retained, the massive cylindrical pillar is also introduced. The use of the shaft is more fully developed, a fewer flat surfaces are treated as columns or pilasters. Under all these circumstances, the Norman style is generally considered as the most perfect and fully developed form of Romanesque.

This latter may be regarded as the point of union between the waning civilization of Rome, and the rising power of the Teutonic races. Assuming the old basilica as the premises given, they modeled upon it a higher and a better style of art. They found it a remove from the horizontal style, and they approximated it still nearer to the vertical. But the lingering influence of Rome still was paramount. The traces of that power that had reduced a subject world under its dominion, were slow in utterly disappearing. The system of chivalrous and feudal Europe had not yet received its development. The Teutonic races, although politically conquerors, had not yet achieved an intellectual supremacy. In arts, in laws, in all that civilizes, that enlightens, and humanizes the mind, they were content to be the followers of those over whom they bore sway, But the time was to come when they could and would assert their own supremacy; and when as the evidence of it as the embodiment of their principles, and as the symbol of their own free, unfettered, and upward aspirations, they would send up towards heaven the tall shaft, the soaring arch, and the airy spire; when in the fullness of time they would perfect the Gothic style of architecture.

Before entering upon the consideration of the Gothic style it seems proper to notice briefly another element that has entered, although not to a very large extent, into the architecture of a portion of the south of Europe. I allude to the Arabian, or Saracenic, style, brought by the Saracens or Moors into Spain, firmly established there, and from that point influencing the style of other places, particularly Sicily. It has also been claimed that this style contained the lifeless seed which, under more genial influences, grew up into the "pillared forest of the Gothic minster." In its possession and use of the pointed arch it was certainly a foreshadowing of the Gothic style.

As a style of architecture, however, the Saracenic has little to recommend it beyond the excessive richness and gorgeousness of its buildings, and the romantic associations connected with them. But the splendor has been styled

mere barbaric magnificence superadded to fantastic and inconsistent forms, lifeless germs which existed for ages without developing into the features which would seem to be their natural results. It possessed the pointed arch for twelve hundred years, using it systematically as a favorite form, and yet never superadded to it the mouldings which are its natural accompaniments. It dealt in excess of ornament, and in strange forms given to arches and cupolas. It delighted in astonishing the eye with vastness of superstructure raised and sustained upon apparently the most feeble means of support.

It is generally in arcades or colonnades that those features are found which most decisively stamp the character of a style. But here the relation between the arch and its support is badly maintained. The capital is surmounted with a mass of masonry, serving only to crush the column, and cut it off from all connection with the arch. Its frequent use of the horse-shoe arch is also deemed faulty, as, when that occurs, the pier does not support the arch, but the arch seems crushing or falling off the pier.

Not only in the pointed arch, but also in the minor ornaments, are to be found isolated Gothic features. Such, for instance, is the panelling, filled with quatrefoils, or with other figures either actually found in that style, or not incompatible with it. Some of the ornaments, however, are more Romanesque than Gothic. There are found lavish splendor, tinsel decorations and walls where not an inch is left unadorned with sumptuous carving.

The one single edifice that combines magnitude of design, vast extent of arrangement, gorgeousness of decoration, and it may be added, peculiar defects in the style itself, is the splendid palace of the Moorish kings of Granada, the Alhambra. This was conceived and executed in a style of more than oriental magnificence. The imagination almost tires in attempting to grasp the realization of the embodiment of so much splendor. So far as mere decoration is concerned, no edifice in the world can compare with its stately halls. Every inch of wall was covered with ara-

besque and fret work, and the ceilings were fairly dripping with gorgeous ornaments. But the eye is obliged to rest on a forest of slender columns serving as supports to arches far overlapping their capitals. A column of this character is made to support a capital of too great a projection, and this again an overlapping stilt or fragment of entablature. The arch itself, in many cases, does not spring immediately from this entablature, but from corbels overlapping again; so that being thus cut off from all decorative connection with the column below, it appears as if suspended in the air without any sustaining power at all.

There is also another interesting relic of Saracenic architecture in the gigantic tower of the Giralda at Seville, and which now serves as the campanile of the vast cathedral church which later ages have reared close to this proud monument of the vanquished Moor. The analogy is very great between this vast, unbroken, unbuttressed and lofty tower and the campaniles of Italy, especially to the grand contemporary structure at Venice.

The Saracenic structures in Spain have not been without their effect as models of imitation elsewhere. These are more especially marked in the island of Sicily. Here are found buildings in the pointed style, which are reckoned the earliest Latin edifices in which is to be found a systematic use of the pointed arch. It is used here as a general feature at a period of time when it is rarely found in northern Europe. It cannot, therefore, be considered as Gothic,[1] and does not, in fact, combine with its pointed arches a single distinctively Gothic feature.

The principal buildings erected at Palermo during the period even of the Norman rule are of a decidedly Saracenic character, and entirely unlike the contemporary ones of Normandy, or of any other part of Christendom. The pointed arch prevails throughout, but it is unaccompanied by Gothic mouldings, or by other Gothic or transitional detail. Although, therefore, these may have been the first

[1] *Freeman*, 286.

Christian structures which exhibit the systematic use of the pointed arch, yet they are not, for that reason, themselves Gothic, nor could they probably have been developed into a pure and consistent Gothic style. It seems, therefore, clear that the pointed style of Sicily was not Gothic, and that there, where the systematic use of the pointed arch first appeared, the real Gothic architecture was the very last to be received, and then only as an exotic. So, also, in Italy pointed arches occur at a very early period, as in the cathedrals of Pisa and Venice, and yet the time has never yet arrived when Gothic architecture, in its purity, was naturalized in Italy.

III. *Gothic Architecture, or the Style of the Teutonic and Celtic Races.*

The Romanesque style of architecture arose from an infusion of the Teutonic spirit into Roman forms. It imparted to those forms new life and animation. It gave to them their most perfect development. It threw around and over them the charm of rest and solidity.

But there was yet a more perfect style to be developed. The Teutonic spirit was to originate its own forms; to breathe into them its own life; to perfect its own style; and one unlike anything before or since ever witnessed. This has been termed the Gothic, and is the peculiar heritage of the Teutonic race. It came to perfection only where that race was dominant, and never flourished among the Romanic nations of the south. It is the style largely prevailing throughout western and central Europe during the prevalence of the feudal system. It might not inaptly be termed the feudal style of architecture.

This style is essentially based upon one grand principle which subordinates everything to itself, and which unites in its own development every feature of construction and decoration. This principle substitutes lightness and exten-

sion upwards in the place of rest and solidity. It consists in the upward tendency of the building, drawing after it all its minute details. It is the adoption and carrying out of the vertical principle. The entablature of the Greek was the purely horizontal. The round arch of the Roman and Romanesque was in truth only a curved entablature. Although here the purely horizontal style was departed from, yet the vertical was not yet reached. Nothing short of the pointed arch of the Gothic, with its necessary side thrusts and buttresses to meet them. "The Gothic," says Mrs. Whewell, "is characterized by the pointed arch; by pillars which are extended so as to lose all classical proportions; by shafts which are placed side by side, often with different thicknesses, and are variously clustered and combined. Its mouldings, cornices, and capitals, have no longer the classical shapes and members; square edges, rectangular surfaces, pilasters and entablatures disappear; the elements of building become slender, detached, repeated and multiplied; they assume forms implying flexure and ramification. The openings become the principal part of the wall, and the other portions are subordinate to these. The universal tendency is to the predominance and prolongation of vertical lines, for instance, in the interior, by continuing the shafts in the arch mouldings; on the exterior by employing buttresses of strong projection, which shoot upwards through the line of parapet and terminate in pinnacles."

In the composition of Gothic architecture, the pointed arch was a necessary element. This was not, however, invented. It was simply adopted from the Mahometan nations. This was the most important step in carrying out the vertical principle. This was also aided by its system of decoration. Thus, the abacus, the uppermost member or division of a capital, from being square, becomes round or octagonal. While square it constituted the boundary of the column, but when made round or octagonal it became a mere moulding corresponding with the form of the column, and forming a relief without arresting

the progress of the eye in its upward ascent. The true vertical effect can only be produced when the separate existence of the parts is destroyed, and all are subordinated to the whole. To effect this the column must be such as not to exist separate from the arch above it. It must present itself as a trunk with its branches growing inseparably out of it, and this it is enabled, to a great extent, to do by sinking the square abacus into a moulding corresponding with the form of the column.

Another feature essential to the ideal perfection of Gothic architecture is the clustered pillar. While the Romanesque presented its complex piers, forming a rectangular mass, with shafts attached to its surface, or set in its angles, the Gothic pillar consists either of an assemblage of shafts brought into close juxtaposition, or of a mass channelled with mouldings, so as to present as nearly as possible the appearance of shafts. Thus, by clustering and channelling pillars, each order of the arch above may have its own source in the pier below, the shaft being more or less perfectly continued in the mouldings of the architrave. The clustered shaft and the moulded architrave well accompany each other, both being required for the highest style of perfection.

Another important feature in the Gothic style is to be found in the mouldings which are its accompaniments. The great point of difference between these and those which characterized the Romanesque, is to be found in the fact that the latter exhibited the square section, while in the Gothic not a single edge was allowed to remain. Even the simplest form was chamfered off. Bases, abaci, often the angles of buildings, lose their sharp, square edge. But the Gothic, in its complete development, does not content itself with cutting away or chamfering off the square section. It proceeds further and excavates the surface with hollows. In the Gothic, no member of a moulded architrave ever projects from the surface. All is contained within the line of the chamfer. The Gothic mouldings, meaning by these all the varieties of outline or contour given

to the angles of the various subordinate parts and features of buildings, are a remarkable development of the Gothic principle. The square edge, or hard boundary of two plains, being regarded as a mark of distinctness, is swept away. The chamfer and hollow moulding form strongly marked vertical lines. More especially does the deep hollow in a moulded arch form a strong line of shade along which the eye runs with great facility.

We are not, however, to conclude that the Gothic consists wholly of vertical lines. If it did, nothing could be derived from the principle of contrast, the effect of which the Gothic architecture could not afford to lose. Hence it presents strong horizontal lines, deeply marked string courses, transoms, and division of height into stages.[1] These, however, are not so frequent but that the vertical lines predominate, thus constituting the ruling idea through the entire structure. To rise, soar, ascend, is eminently a characteristic of the Gothic style. "From the tall spire forming the crowning point of a vast cathedral to the sharp canopy over a diminutive niche, the same soaring tendency is displayed."

This vertical effect inherent in the very being of Gothic architecture, and developed by those things that may be termed necessaries of the style, is still further aided by what may be called its luxuries. These are the high roofs, spires, pinnacles, and flying buttresses, which are arch-formed props connecting the walls of the upper and central portions of an aisled structure with the vertical buttresses of the outer walls. This latter is merely a mechanical help for producing greater height, and thereby incidentally giving greater scope to the principle of verticality although it becomes itself a vertical feature in the external view.[2]

Another feature still necessary to be considered in the composition of the Gothic style is that of vaulting. The simplest kind of vault is the cylindrical, called also a barrel, and sometimes wagon vault, which, springing from the two

[1] *Freeman*, 306. [2] *Idem*, 307.

opposite walls, presents a uniform concave surface throughout its whole length. This was in use among the Romans. The vault, therefore, is not an emanation from the vertical principle. It is seized hold of by that principle, and so modelled as more effectually to carry it out. It is analogous to the arch, being, in fact, only the arch continued. The Gothic style requires both to be of a particular form.

Gothic churches are found without vaulting, but the style cannot reach an ideal perfection without it. It is the only means by which the vertical principle can be carried out in one continued ascent from the floor to the apex of the roof. Any other form of roof would present the horizontal line of the cornice as a check to the vertical progress of the eye. Even the high pitched open roof is objectionable, as presenting the wall plate which breaks the continuity of vertical ascent as the eye moves from the floor to the high pitch of the roof. The effect is, that it gives the latter the appearance of being something adventitious; put on because necessary, but not architecturally connected with the building below. On the contrary, in a church whose vaulting springs from shafts, not corbels, the eye rises continuously and uninterruptedly from the pavement to the key stone of the vault; and that being formed of pointed arches, carries it still higher, seeming to soar into infinity. The roof, instead of seeming something adventitious, then presents itself as a necessary addition. It is still a distinct design from the walls. The vault and the walls are portions of the same design. They unite together and constitute one whole, the walls forming but one vast impost for the vaulting arch.

Much speculation has been gone into to account for the origin of Gothic architecture. It has been found very much to resemble the Arabian or Saracenic style. In both are found the pointed arch, foliation, and attempts at tracery. The first appearance of the Gothic, also, very nearly coincides with that stirring period when the Crusades brought Europe and Asia face to face on the plains of Palestine. It is supposed, and not without reason, that

the Crusaders, on their return, brought with them certain forms of Saracenic architecture. These were seized upon by the northern mind with its vast fertility of genius, and gradually worked into a style which became the Gothic. The pointed arch, thus derived from the Saracen, is an element of the pointed style, but not the only one. Verticality, as opposed to horizontality, was the real principle, and this may have been suggested by the pointed arch. But the mere use of the pointed arch alone would not make a Gothic building.

Another source, which has been quite a favorite one, is that the style is an imitation of natural forests and of artificial structures of posts and twigs. There is a marked resemblance between the long vista of a thick grove and a Gothic nave with its clustered pillars, its arches and ribs stretching forth in every direction and interlacing one with another, the tracery of its windows doing about the same thing, all its choicest details very closely imitating the vegetable world. The two origins are not inconsistent with each other. The Teutonic architect, after he had established the pointed arch, in looking about for forms the best adapted to his new construction, might very properly obtain from the forest growths by which he was surrounded, those which he deemed would harmonize the best with his design. This may have given us the foliaged capital, and the clustered pillar. It is very generally conceded that natural forests and artificial structures of wicker have contributed ideas to Gothic architecture. The clustered and banded pillar more closely represents a number of rods fastened together than any natural object whatever. So, also, the ramifications of vaulting, as well as several forms of tracery, are easily deriveable from the natural grove. So we have a whole class of windows of the best period of tracery, the type of which is so strikingly vegetable that one can hardly doubt their imitation of the branches of a tree. It is observable that the later Gothic is more forest-like than the earlier; and it is said to be the general tendency of styles of architecture as they ad-

vance to depart further from the sources to which they owe their origin.

The supremacy of the Gothic was not accomplished without a struggle. The old forms of the Romanesque were not so easily surrendered. During the latter half of the twelfth century the new and old forms, both of detail and construction, were struggling for ascendency. The earliest Gothic feature introduced was the pointed pier arch.[1] But while the pointed arch was the first, the round abacus was the last feature of the new style to come into general use. The transition was about equally slow in regard to pillars.

In passing from the Romanesque to the Gothic, changes were made both in the capitals and bases of the pillars. The first step towards the development of the foliaged Gothic capital seems to have been a return towards classical models. In the bases, also, there is a return towards the same models. The early Gothic base is similar to the Attic; its mouldings being the same, a hollow between two rounds.

While the Gothic style has its peculiarities, which serve to distinguish it in a very marked degree from every other, it has its own subdivisions, possessing each its own distinctive features. These have been variously designated. In England they have been stated as three, viz: the early English, decorated, and perpendicular. Others have named them: first-pointed, middle-pointed, and third-pointed. Another more general division, as covering the whole field of Gothic architecture, is into early and continuous Gothic; the former including the early English and geometrical decorated of the common nomenclature, while the latter is made to comprehend the flowing decorated, flamboyant, and perpendicular.

In the early Gothic, the shafts are of great height, clustered together,[2] with delicately flowered capitals, and a round or polygonal abacus; lofty pointed arches, with rich and deep

[1] *Freeman*, 823. [2] *Idem*, 840.

mouldings; ribbed vaults; and windows formed of a combination of lights with geometrical tracery. Flying buttresses, elegant pinnacles, and angular canopies, which are often crocheted, enrich the exterior. Foliation is used freely, but is not essential. The shaft is introduced abundantly, and may be said to mark the style in large buildings. To prevent the occurrence of monotony, angular edges were introduced instead of convex or cylindrical surfaces, by means of which, with narrow, flat faces and bold concavities, a rich effect is produced, at a less expense and in greater variety. Shafts with capitals, though often used, were no longer the same prominent feature, and foliation became much more necessary.

In the continuous, or later Gothic, a great alteration took place in the tracery, which instead of being formed of geometrical figures touching each other, branched out into ramifications, either in free and bold curves, as in the late decorated and the continental flamboyant, or in lines preserving the vertical direction of the mullions, or slender piers forming the division between the lights of windows, screens, etc., as in the English perpendicular style. The mullion itself, also, had a more decided character, not only appearing in the window, but also often repeated in panelling over a large surface of the building. The form of the arch was more varied, especially at a late period; and transoms, and even square heads to windows, were admitted, by which they might be more easily adapted to the space they were designed to occupy.

The beauty of the early Gothic prevails more in its different parts in the slim and delicate shaft, the graceful foliage of the capital, and the bold rounds and hollows of the mouldings, all which are brought into prominent notice and forced on the eye at the first glance.[1] In the continuous Gothic, the parts almost disappear, being merged in the greater effect produced by the combined whole. Hence the grace and beauty of the details of the early style; and in the

[1] *Freeman*, 341.

later, the fact that its beauty is that of the perfect whole, whose parts exist but in and through that which they constitute.

One thing marking the early Gothic is the employment of the distinct shaft and arch in decoration, thus giving an unity to the minutest details, paralleling the main arcades of a church in the decorative ones which run along its walls.[1] It is possible at once to distinguish the shaft from the arch which it supports, and capital, abacus, band, and base, all lend their aid in increasing the distinctness.

In the disappearing or merging of the parts into the whole, the arcading, which stands as a correlative to the pannelling, gradually sunk the one into the other. The shaft gradually disappears, owing first to the fact that the flow of the mullion and the arch is rendered more continuous; and, secondly, because a wider field is thus given for carrying out an uniform design.[2] The substitution of the mullion for the shaft enables the combining a whole wall in one design, as the former runs up the whole height, throwing off successive arches at different heights. The same idea, under different modifications, is presented by blank panelling, tracery, and screen work.

A very important element in the composition of Gothic decoration in its perfect state is foliation. It is not, however, essential, nor is it a development of the vertical principle.

The tracery of the windows offers the feature in which all the principles of the styles are the most readily discernible. In the early Gothic the separate existence of parts is most strongly marked in the windows. They are either actually distinct lancets, or windows, with tracery in which the most severe distinctness still prevails.

The early Gothic had several varieties. The first is the early English, and has been denominated the lancet style. In this the window is single, and is often grouped into combinations, but not divided by mullions and tracery. This,

[1] *Freeman*, 343. [2] *Idem*, 344.

in its details, exhibits the fullest development of distinctness of parts.

The second variety has tracery in its windows consisting of geometrical figures filling up the head, but not springing from the mullions, or fused into each other. This may be called the geometrical variety.

So also the continuous style had its varieties. Its first appearance was in a form denominated flowing, so called from the lines of its window tracery. In it, the mullions are continued, and the figures in the tracery are melted together and completely foliated.

In the fuller development of this style in England and France, it is known by the names of perpendicular and flamboyant. The great feature presented in both these is continuity. The tracery is no longer made up of figures. It is a mere prolongation of the mullions. In the perpendicular they are straight; in the flamboyant, curved lines. The intervening spaces are foliated at one or both ends.

The lancet, or early English, was almost entirely confined to England. It adopted the round abacus, which distinguished it from the Romanesque and the lancet window, which constituted its chief difference from the succeeding geometrical. In France might be found the lancet window, but combined with the square abacus; and in the geometrical is the round abacus, but combined with the traceried window. The lancet windows chiefly distinguished the style, and constitute a feature of great elegance. One effect of the introduction of the lancet principle into windows is that they are brought, by means of it, near together, and become members of one composition.

The detail of the lancet style presents great beauty and loveliness.[1] We have here detached marble shafts, with their deep cut bases, their bands, their capitals of the richest and most graceful foliage. We have the deep mouldings, forming the finest contrasts of light and shade; long

[1] *Freeman*, 358.

rows of the most elegant and satisfactory tooth ornament; corbels and bosses, and knots of foliage, and the greatest profusion of arcades. Although succeeding styles carried out the Gothic principle more perfectly as a whole, yet no one exceeded this in its beauty of detail. The use of detached shafts seems peculiar to this style, and constitutes one of its most graceful features. It is the great distinctness of parts, and the extreme lightness and delicacy pervading the lancet style that constitutes its principal charm. The shaft employed is perfectly distinct, stands free, and acknowledges as its only bonds of union the capital, base, and band.

The geometrical variety of the early Gothic is distinguished from the lancet by the introduction of tracery. Its necessity was the most strongly felt in couplets. Thus the joining together of two lancets left a blank space, the appearance of which could be greatly improved by its introduction.

Another feature of great importance was the tower. Its form was usually square, but occasionally octagonal, and sometimes an octagon crowning a square. The arcade was the principal ornament, sometimes employed in several stages, the whole surface being occasionally covered by arcades. The spire generally grew out of the pyramidical capping.

As regards the interior, the first noticeable thing is the lateral elevations of the nave and choir. The vertical principle here is very seldom presented, and in some instances the horizontal prevails over it.

The pillar is always an assemblage of columns. As the lancet style ceased, the shafts lost their detached condition, but they still remained clustering together, united by their abaci and bases. The proportions of the pillars and arch, and of the whole compartment are regulated by the size of the triforium, which is the gallery, or arcade, in the wall over the pier arches, which separate the body from the aisles of a church. The early Gothic triforia were very analogous to windows. They resembled a window of two,

three, or four lights, and exhibit the complete geometrical tracery, and the same imperfect and transitional forms as the windows.[1] They were abolished by the later architects, but the principles of the early Gothic require their presence.

The idea of a triforium could not be clothed in continuous forms. It is the creation of the shaft and arch, and cannot be translated into the language of the mullion and panel.

In that kind of the late, or continuous Gothic, termed the perpendicular style, we find, as its peculiarity, the application of the four-centered arch, the best forms of which exhibit a very graceful curve. Again, this style presents us with the bold prominent buttresses, which are projections from the wall to create additional strength and support. They are a purely Gothic invention, being there rendered necessary to meet and overcome the thrust of the pointed roof. They impart the appearance as well as the reality of strength. Along with them are the vast windows which occupy the intervening spaces.

So, also, we meet here with the clerestory, which is any window, row of windows, or openings in the upper part of a building, or of a wall or screen. This is more usually applied to the upper part of the central aisle of a church in which windows are formed above the roofs of the side aisles.

Another noble feature of the continuous style is its magnificent steeples either with or without spires. These were ornamental appendages to the tower, springing out from the middle of it, and sometimes abutted on by small flying buttresses from the angles. The spire is now more frequently set on an octagon, which gives it a more graceful and greater sublimity of outline. Being thus reduced to an ornamental appendage, and the tower being complete without it, the former was often altogether omitted, and the latter alone worked into a prominent feature. Thus

[1] *Freeman*, 366.

the square tower, capped by battlements and pinnacles, became one of the noblest features of Gothic architecture.

The perpendicular style brought forward the fan tracery vaulting which is a creation of its own. In it all the ribs that rise from the springing the vault have the same curve, and diverge equally in every direction, thus producing an effect something resembling that of the bones of a fan. This is more commonly found in use for small buildings, as cloisters and small chapels, than over wider spaces.

The flamboyant style on the continent was contemporary with the perpendicular in England. It is so called from the flame-like wavings of its tracery. It abounds in intricacy and redundancy of ornament. It has a waving arrangement of the tracery of windows, panels, etc. This style never had the regularity and fixedness of other styles. It ran wild in quest of ornament; adopted it wherever found; frequently in order to obtain it, reverts to geometrical forms; it alienizes, and introduces forms alien to the true Gothic. All this has contributed to give to it capabilities possessed by no other style, and while it has in some cases reared the noblest church edifices, in others it has run into all the perverse extravagances of an exuberant and undisciplined fancy.

It is by no means all of Europe that is equally the home of the Gothic architecture. The three nations in which it arose and flourished the most, are England, France, and Germany. In each of these it was thoroughly native; although in each it exhibited its own peculiarities. But the pure Gothic, as a style, found difficult, although not entirely impassable barriers, in the Alps and the Pyrenees. It was not a native style either in the Italian or Spanish peninsula. In neither of those countries was the pure Teutonic stock ever so prevalent as in England, France, and Germany. In Italy, more especially, the vast colossus of Roman civilization cast a lengthened shadow. Rome, as a political power, had passed away. But her arts and civilization still remained behind. These proved too strong for the Teutonic races that deluged Italy, ever to

subdue. Classical ideas, and classical forms, still maintained their ascendency throughout the whole Gothic period, until the Renaissance came at last to their relief, and found in them a nucleus around which it could gather its elements to repel back the Gothic tide.

We have an Italian Gothic, but it exhibits none of the necessary features of that peculiar style. There is no Gothic outline presented. Venice exhibits to us her glorious old cathedral of St. Mark, with its strange, rich, and wildly beautiful forms of architecture, savoring of an orientalism, either Byzantine or Arabian. The nearest resemblance to the Gothic style which may be found south of the Alps, is undoubtedly in the cathedral of Milan; which, for noble dimensions, precious materials, and richness of ornament, is hardly surpassed by any other Christian temple.

South of the Pyrenees, the Christian architecture is Gothic, and comes nearer the true Teutonic model than in Italy. There was here no stupendous power to sap from the Gothic its vitality. The great difficulty here encountered was in the preoccupation of the Spanish soil, or at least the southern portion of it, by the Saracenic style. There is a continual recurrence of fantastic forms borrowed from an Arabian source; and, what proves beyond any question, the early and powerful influence of the Saracenic style, is the curious fact, that the Renaissance in Spain appears to have assumed, to a certain extent, the character of a closer return to the forms of that style. There are, however, several cathedrals in Spain, that are essentially Gothic in their character. Among these are the stupendous cathedral of Seville, as also that at Burgos. That of Toledo has all the features of a true Gothic minster. It has its interior, presenting arcade, triforium, and clerestory, together with clustered pillars and vaulting shafts. The triforium and clerestory present only the rudiments of tracery, and most of the shafts have the square abacus.

The Gothic style, as prevailing in England, France, and Germany, had peculiar adaptations to the demands of

Christian worship. In its nave and transept, it symbolized the cross. The choir, destined for those taking an active part in the services of the sanctuary, was early separated from the grand area designed to receive the congregation, and constructed on the noblest scale; forming, as it were, a lesser church, contained within the limits of the principal structure. The necessity of a passage round the choir led to the erection of side aisles, adjoining the nave, which was so completely distinguished from them by its greater elevation,[1] that these aisles often appear like separate buildings attached to the centre pile. Everything contributes to produce that copious variety of design and decoration, which is a distinctive characteristic of Gothic ecclesiastical architecture.

Perhaps the most perfect specimen of Gothic architecture may be found in the vast cathedral at Cologne. The pillars there serve to illustrate the manner in which the idea of this mode of construction arose and developed itself. Each pillar, besides its solid centre, has four others of equal size surrounding it, and four, eight or twelve of the smaller, the number varying according to the situation and importance of the pillar. "When many such systems of clustering columns are assembled together, as at the interior angles of the tower, a surprising idea of vastness is produced by their multiplied variety. Hence arose the peculiar character of the Gothic arch. The high pitched northern roof gave to the arch its pointed form, in accordance with the harmony which it is essentially necessary to preserve between the exterior and the interior. In carrying up these clustering shafts, they naturally unfolded into numerous ribs and branches, which, crossing and intersecting each other in every direction, became a groined and pointed roof, the vaulting of which gave peculiar grandeur of expression to the lofty aisle, and stamped it with a variety and beauty found only in Gothic architecture. The form of the arch derived from the high pitched

[1] *Schlegel's Æsthetic Works*, 178.

roof of the northern manner of building, extends also to the doorways,[1] in which the numerous banded pillars, expanding above form arches, retiring one within the other, narrowing and deepening towards the interior, and exuberantly ornamented. The oldest Gothic windows are mostly trefoiled. Here, again, if we seek the slender, long drawn, pointed arch, in this as in every other part, as far as it is practicable, we find a repetition of the same general principle, and in all its variations the one fundamental figure is apparent. In the close juxtaposition of two such arches, and the introduction of the trefoil, at the point of union, we discover an anticipation of the subsequent foliated tracery. The rose and the trefoil in various combinations may be recognized as the basis of all the highly artistic foliation with which the cathedral at Cologne is adorned."

In the Greek, or classical, and the Gothic or pointed architecture, we have presented the two most perfect representatives of the horizontal and vertical styles of architecture. It may be well to bring the two into contrast with each other, with the view of getting a more perfect idea of each.

In the Greek, the lines are horizontal: they form no arches.

In the Gothic, the lines are vertical, and arches a fundamental principle.

In the former an entablature is absolutely necessary.[2] This always consisted of two, and more generally of three distinct parts, each closely related to, and its character and ornaments determined by, the columns which served as its supports.

In the latter, there is no such thing as an entablature composed of parts. What answers in the place of an entablature is an arch, round in the Romanesque, and pointed, or lancet, in the Gothic.

[1] *Schlegel's Æsthetic Works*, 179. [2] *Pictorial Gallery of Arts*. 2d Series, Fine Arts, 115.

In the former, columns alone support an entablature and nothing else; and no arch can spring directly from a column.

In the latter, the pier, or shaft, supplies the place of the column, which can only support an arched moulding, and in no case a horizontal line.

In the former, the arch, if it exist at all, must spring from a horizontal line.

In the latter, no horizontal line is necessary, and never any but the small cap of an arch. The shaft bears nothing, and is only ornamental, and the round pier still a pier.

In the former, the arch is regarded as foreign to the style, and when introduced, its diagonal presence excludes from the decoration.

In the latter, the arch is the one essential feature. Its diagonal pressures are most studiously manifested, and the rest of the composition harmonizes with them by other inclined planes.

In the former, we have the flat column standing out from the wall, called the pilaster, which can be used as a column.

In the latter, there is nothing analogous to a pilaster. Every flat, ornamented, projecting surface is either a series of panels or a buttress.

In the former, there are no projections like buttresses, and all projections are stopped and bounded by horizontal lines.

In the latter, buttresses are essential parts. They stop horizontal lines, resist the thrust of the arch, and give the assurance of strength and security.

In the former, the pediment, or triangular termination at the ends of buildings, over porticoes, etc., is fixed.

In the latter, the pediment is only an ornamented end wall, and may be of almost any pitch.

In the former, openings are limited by the proportion of the column.

In the latter, openings are almost unlimited, the open lattice work being a great beauty in the Gothic architecture.

In the former, regularity of composition on each side of a centre is necessary.

In the latter, regularity of composition is very seldom found, while variety of ornament is universal.

In the former, different planes of decoration are avoided, and never exceed two in an entire composition.

In the latter, different planes of decoration are placed behind each other to any number, and in every possible degree of variety even in a single member, as in an arch.

In the former, superincumbent weights are united as far as possible by resting on the horizontal cornice, which combines them into one mass.

In the latter, superincumbent weights are divided into as many parts as possible, and then given to independent props.

In the former, artifices of construction are concealed, as they are thought to impair the simplicity of effect.

In the latter, every possible artifice of construction is displayed.

In the former, chamfered surfaces are held inadmissable, and mouldings can only stop against a surface perpendicular to their course.

In the latter, chamfered surfaces are universal; mouldings are applied to them, and may die against them or any other surface at any angle.

In the former, panels are mere superficial ornaments.

In the latter, panels are apertures between the parts of the decorative frame of the building.

In the former, no good steeples can arise, because, when attempted, they nearly resemble ornamented buildings piled on each other.

In the latter, steeples may form a part of the structure. They are there composed of an ascending series of vertical lines which may be carried to any practicable height, with almost ever increasing beauty.

IV. *The Renaissance, or Attempt to return to the Classic Forms of Greece and Rome consequent upon the Revival of Letters.*

The Gothic was truly a noble style of architecture. Its mission was the development of the vertical principle. During three centuries it was employed in originating all the possible styles in which this principle could be exhibited. And when the lancet, geometrical, perpendicular, and flamboyant styles were all run through, it had nothing more to offer. It had worked itself out. All its resources were exhausted. Nothing remained but a repetition of the same principles embodied in similar forms.

But the human mind could not stop. It was a creature of progress. In obedience to the demands of the æsthetic nature, it was still bound to move onward, and to exert its full powers in devising and executing such styles as could promise to be acceptable. It is, however, true that in one, and that too a very important sense, the history of architecture closes with the period of the Renaissance. And that is, that subsequent to that period no new element of a marked character has been introduced into architecture.[1]

The Renaissance, the revival of ancient art, might well commence in Italy. There were many of its most splendid remains. There were still to be found lingering remnants of a taste that was born and nourished amid classic models, with southern and central, and even to a large extent, with northern Italy, the Gothic was ever a foreign style, which had crossed the Alps with its conquering races, and was tolerated from necessity. It hardly even obtained a foothold in central and southern Italy. It would not, therefore, require, on the part of the Italians, the operation of a very powerful cause to induce them to attempt a revival of ancient architectural art. They could very easily abandon that complicated pointed arch, and that expanding buttress,

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 119.

which had become such prominent features, and substitute in their place the simple coved ceiling, a transverse cincture, and upright support. They could easily set aside every species of tracery and tabernacle work, of cusp and canopy and crochet, and other ornaments peculiar to the Gothic style, for the capital, cornice, entablature, balustrade, and vase of the ancients.

It required, however, some time, even in Italy, to work such a change in public taste as would justify a return to classic or pagan forms of architecture. There is an intermediate or transitional style between Gothic and Italian prevailing in Italy at the time of the first attempts to restore classical architecture. This transitional style is called the cinque-cento,[1] literally five hundred, but means fifteen hundred, to designate the century during which it prevailed.

The great distinguishing feature of this style consisted in its application of classical detail according to Gothic principles. Architects had formerly been accustomed to enrich their buildings with many small compartments of paneling and minute ornament. Their successors, in the place of the simple colonnade and expansive arch, used a profusion of small columns, entablatures, pediments, and arches, encrusting the face of the building with classical detail, as the former architects had done with Gothic. Thus many Gothic vestiges still remained, but combined with a style of ornamentation entirely foreign to its own nature.

The architect whose efforts contributed the most towards the introduction of the new style into Italy was Philip Brunelleschi, who flourished between the years 1377 and 1444. The most splendid monument of his architectural genius is the great dome of the Florence Cathedral, which for vastness and grandeur, for greatness of conception and skill of execution, must rank among the noblest of human achievements.[2] It is reared upon a vast octagon, which soars aloft almost like a Gothic spire. As spreading as St.

[1] *Freeman*, 429. [2] *Idem*, 431.

Sophia, it is the largest mass ever reared upon piers and arches, and elevates the cross to a height equal to that of the proudest steeples of the north. Great in every proportion, and with the superadded richness of the octagonal form, it has been called the most wonderful exhibition of mechanical skill, and one of the most glorious products of architectural genius, that the world has ever seen. This domical feature, imported from the east, strikes with a grandeur, power, and even beauty, superior to any and all other things except the towering majesty of a Gothic spire, if that even be an exception.

The Renaissance was rarely applied to sacred edifices, for which it was not so well adapted. For them the Gothic possessed peculiar adaptations which have embalmed its style forever in the memory of the faithful. The Renaissance was much used in the construction of chateaux, hotels-de-ville and domestic buildings.[1]

There are reckoned in Italy during the period of the Renaissance three schools of architecture, viz : the Florentine, the Roman, and the Venetian; the first extending from A. D. 1400 to 1600; the second from 1470 to 1607; and the third from 1500 to 1620. The differences between these different schools were attributable in part to climate, in part to the habits of the people, and in part to the different materials for building which were at hand.

The Florentine school presents its characteristics more in palatial mansions than in churches, and these were influenced in their form and construction by the necessity of affording defense to a nobility in a place where insurrection was continually occurring.[2] The palaces of the great governing families in Florence, such as the Medici, the Pitti, and the Strozzi, present the appearance both of a strong fortress, and of a princely residence. Immense masses with small openings, diminutive details, rustic divisions, crowned by immense cornices, characterize these palaces of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The

[1] *Cleghorn*, I, 116. [2] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 180.

general plan consists of a range of buildings disposed on the four sides of a cortile, or quadrangular court. At the angles are square towers, which are crowned with battlements and machicolations. These towers, as well as the rest of the building, are divided into stories, with a bold horizontal cornice to each. In the lower story are the entrance gateways, generally three in number, covered by semicircular arches.

The Roman school was founded by Bramante, in 1470. The style of its palaces is far less massive than that of Florence.[1] Its buildings have not the fortress-like appearance that mark the Florentine. The models of antiquity were there more abundant, and the style, in its lightness and grace, indicates a better acquaintance with them, and consequently, an advancing state of the art, as well as more pacific habits on the part of the people. Columns are frequently introduced. The buildings are much elevated. The entrance is almost invariably converted into a principal feature. The court is usually surrounded with an arcade, from which a staircase of great dimensions leads to the sala of the palace. The general character is that of grandeur, divested of the severity that marks the Florentine school. The Italian palace had what is termed a mezzanine story, which consisted of a range of apartments of low elevation, between the two principal stories.

Besides Bramante, the two Sangallos, Vignola, and Michael Angelo, are famous names in the Roman school of architecture. To one of the former, in conjunction with the two latter,[2] is attributed the Farnese palace at Rome, which, for grandeur of mass, regularity of plan, and excellence of architecture, holds foremost rank among palaces. It is rectangular; two hundred and forty feet long, one hundred and seventy wide, and more than one hundred from the ground to the top of the cornice. The façade presents an unbroken mass, consisting of three stories, separated by horizontal bands filled by sculptured foliage.

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 130. [2] *Idem*, 131.

Michael Angelo is a great name in painting and sculpture, as well as in architecture. In all three, he attempted to relinquish everything that was minute, and strike for a style that was bold and impressive. In place of the small orders, each only the height of a single story, accumulated over each other, he instituted a single colossal order, spanning the whole edifice. He is, however, charged with wanting taste, and with losing sight of propriety in his pursuit of novelty. In his ardent pursuit of the grand, he frequently found only the gigantic, the affected, the whimsical, and the extravagant. He often presents pedestals preposterously high, pilasters split, sliced, folded, divided, and clustered in every way; entablatures profiling over columns, and all the faults of the Dioclesian age. A portion of St. Peter's, of the Farnese palace, and the Porta Pia at Rome, are among the architectural works of Michael Angelo.

The St. Peter's church in Rome is one, if not the most remarkable, of the architectural products of any age or country. It was commenced as early as 1450, but it was not until 1503, when it was confided to Bramante, that it may be said to have commenced upon a regular plan. His plan was in the form of a Latin cross,[1] with a portico of six columns, and an immense cupola over the crosses of the transept, supported on four colossal pillars. He first advanced the bold idea of "setting the Pantheon upon a basilica," and thus of accomplishing a work unapproached in grandeur. Nearly half a century afterwards, however, the great Michael Angelo changed the plan from the Latin to that of a Greek cross, enlarged the tribune or apse, and the two transepts strengthened the piers, and made preparations for constructing the gigantic cupola, which was afterwards finished exactly upon his plan.

In 1608, the architect Carlo Maderno abandoned the plan of the Greek cross and reverted again to that of the Latin. In 1780 it was completed, having continued through nearly

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 131.

three centuries and a half from the time of its commencement, and through the reigns of forty-three Roman pontiffs. So enormous were the expenditures required, that both Julius II and Leo X, resorted to the sale of indulgences for the purpose of meeting them, thus sowing the seeds of the reformation under the dome of St. Peter's at Rome. This immense edifice is six hundred and fifty-seven feet in length. That of the middle aisle, in the clear, is five hundred and sixty-five feet, and that of the transept is four hundred and fifteen feet. The width of the middle aisle is seventy-eight feet,[1] that of the cross arms almost seventy-three feet. The inner width of the dome is one hundred and forty-four feet; the four decorative pilasters seventy-eight feet high and eight broad; the entire height to the cap of the lantern three hundred and sixty-three feet. The church covers an area of one hundred and ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and twenty-six square feet, of which more than one-fourth are occupied by the masonry, the smallest thickness of the outer wall being twenty-six feet. It can hold twenty-nine thousand persons. Its architectural character has been thus described: "To produce the effect of magnificence in architecture, three things seem to be necessary: greatness of dimension, simplicity of design, and richness of decoration.[2] To satisfy the mind after examination, three other things are requisite: correctness of proportion, graceful drawing, and delicate execution. Of these six points, St. Peter's has the first in a high degree, something of the second, and a great deal of the third. The latter three it also possesses, though not in a very remarkable degree; the proportions do not offend, and the drawing and execution are good."

The third Italian school was the Venetian. Venice was early in the field of art. The church of St. Mark was commenced in the twelfth century, and from thenceforward, as the republic rose by its arms and commerce, it was also distinguished by its arts. Both its arms and its

[1] *Iconographic Encyclopædia*, IV, 187. [2] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 134, 135.

commerce enabled it to extend its observation, and thus enlarge the sphere of its knowledge. Greece and the remoter east were open to it. The wealth that flowed in upon its city of the sea not only created new wants, but also afforded the means for their gratification. In Venice were merchant princes; and their rivalry with each other, together with their desire to perpetuate their name by their habitations, although not in general leading to works on a colossal scale, led nevertheless to a more general diffusion of moderately splendid and elegant patterns. Hence the great number of beautiful specimens of the building art which the Venetian school supplies.

This school commenced with San Micheli in the beginning of the sixteenth century, and includes Sansovino, Palladio, and Scamozzi among its chief members. It continued a little more than a century. It is chiefly characterized by its great lightness and elegance, the convenience it exhibits in distribution, and the very abundant, if not exuberant, display of columns, pilasters, and arcades in its composition. As we shall find its sister school of painting emulous of captivating the senses by its strong and vivid coloring, so also does this endeavor to address the same with more effect than the two preceding schools.[1]

The structures of San Micheli, the founder of this style, are characterized by convenience, unity, harmony, and simplicity. The general arrangement of his palatial façade was a basement of rustic work; then the principal story, having an order of pilasters or columns and a range of arched corridors connected with the pilasters in the manner of an arcade, with an entablature crowning the whole.

Palladio was the greatest architect of this school, and has given the term Palladian to indicate Italian architecture. His style originated in the necessity of bending architecture to the requirements of modern society. These could be answered neither by the Greek temple nor the Christian cathedral. Exterior beauty must be accommodated to

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 185.

interior convenience, and the wants of persons must be suited to the means they possessed. His plans were admirably fitted for the climate of Italy, and the means and habits of those for whom he worked. Many of these have served as models upon which mansions have been built in England, modifications being introduced in accordance with the difference in circumstances and climate of the two countries.

The best days of Italian architecture ended with the opening of the seventeenth century. No one of the three schools, just mentioned, ceased at that time; but the architects who came afterwards showed less purity of taste. They possessed less originality; ceased to carry through their structures any single plan or purpose, or to follow out any particular style; accumulated together all sorts of features, and derived their results from all sorts of styles. The consequence was a want of uniformity, and a mixture of features, which was far from being pleasing or agreeable to a refined taste.

V. *Modern Architecture.*

1. Upon the continent.
2. In Great Britain.

The Renaissance grew out of the protest of Greek and Roman ruins against the overwhelming tide that was submerging Italy beneath the buttress, pointed arch, and spire of the Gothic style of architecture. The rally in defense of the entablature, the pilaster and other accompaniments of the horizontal style, as might naturally be expected, was effectual in Italy. But when it crossed the Alps, and attempted to supersede the Gothic upon its own soil, and amid its own defenders, it encountered opposition and difficulty. "In northern countries, Gothic was a favorite style, hallowed by religion, chivalry and art; and the inroads of any principle at variance with it could not work its over-

throw without a severe struggle.[1] The race that had reared Cologne, and Freyburg, Lincoln and Winchester, Amiens and Beauvais, could not at once surrender the deep moulding, the luxuriant foliage, the waving tracery, the clustering trunks and stony branches of their own pillared forest for the dull monotony of the five orders, the stiff forms and hard outlines of the round arch and unmalleable entablature."

The wars in Italy under Charles VIII, Louis XII, and Francis I, no doubt operated extensively as a means of introducing a taste for Italian architecture. These wars opened to the French people a knowledge of Italy, and of Italian arts. These would naturally have an effect, partly as novelties, and partly as a revival of old Roman forms, the remains of which were still frequently to be found, especially in southern France. Francis I was more especially distinguished for his fine taste and enlightened patronage of the arts.[2] He induced several Italian architects to visit France, among whom were Vignola and Serlio.

Notwithstanding all these adventitious aids, the struggle in France was very severe. Although not by any means strictly and purely the land of the Teuton, yet his style of architecture had been so thoroughly adopted, that all direct departures from it were at first made with great reluctance. In some cases, the two styles came into actual opposition. In some cases a kind of compromise was made, by uniting to the old Gothic form, Italian detail and ornamentation. Thus the church of St. Eustace at Paris, erected between 1532 and 1648, retains every feature of a real Gothic minster, substituting the minute details of the new style for those appropriate to its outline. There are the vast height, the tall clustered piers, the vaulting shafts, triforium, and clerestory; the apse and arcade, which are all Gothic,[3] and found in the elder French cathedrals. But along with these, we have the

[1] *Freeman*, 432, 433. [2] *Cleghorn*, 1, 116. [3] *Freeman*, 435.

round arch, classical capital, heavy impost, and general squareness and flatness of the Italian style. So the front of St. Michael's, at Dijon, is conceived on the old outline; with two towers of noble proportions, with buttresses of the boldest projection, staircase turrets, and an advanced porch with three entrances, on the old plan. But here again the details are all Italian; round fretted arches, a grotesque entablature, the whole façade crowded with small columns, entablatures and pediments; the windows round headed, and almost all without tracery, and the octagonal lanterns on the two steeples terminate in cupolas. So in St. Peter's, at Caen, its east end furnishes one of the best examples of this corrupt style, having a polygonal apse, and apsidal chapels, with buttresses, pinnacles, flying buttresses, niches, and open parapets, all cinquecento; the Italian element being shown rather in the strange character of these ornaments, than in the actual presence of classical members.

Even in cases apparently the most favorable for the introduction of the pure Italian, the Gothic has asserted its claims. Catharine of Medici, an Italian, and queen of Henry II, resolving on the construction of a palace, selected, as a site, the spot occupied by some tile-kilns (tuileries), and employed the architect, De l'Ome, who is said to have "seen ancient Roman buildings with eyes preoccupied by the Gothic style," and thus a certain commingling of the two elements is observable in his works. But at a later period Mary de Medici, the queen of Henry IV, a Florentine by birth, directed her architect, De Brosse, to build the Luxembourg palace as near as circumstances would allow, like the palazzi of Florence. The queen's preference made this style fashionable, and was thus instrumental in producing an intermediate style, which lasted long in France, and retarded the advancement of the art.

Under Louis XIV, Mansard constructed the Church of the Invalids and the Palace of Versailles. Of the former it is said that it is a whole in which "richness and elegance are combined; in which lightness and solidity are well

balanced; in which unity is not injured by variety; and whose general effect silences the critic, however he may be disposed to find fault." He was also the architect of the splendid dome of the Invalids. The palace is a work of extraordinary grandeur and magnificence, but having in it a mixture of Florentine taste.

The latter part of the reign of Louis XV was characterized by the introduction of an improved taste into French architecture. At the commencement of the eighteenth century, French palatian architecture had attained a degree of excellence which it has never surpassed. During the last half of that century were erected or commenced some edifices that have acquired much celebrity. Among these are the St. Genevieve or the Pantheon, by Souflot, which is said to form an era in French art. It is the largest modern church in France, and occupies the fourth place of the modern great churches in Europe, those of Santa Maria del fiore at Florence, St. Peter's at Rome, and St Paul's at London, being in advance of it. The corrupt Italian style is made here to yield to the forms of the antique. In its plan it unites the Latin and the Greek cross. The interior is separated into three very unequal parts by isolated columns, instead of arcades decorated with pilasters. The building is three hundred and fifty feet long including the portico, and its width at the transepts is two hundred and sixty feet, and at other parts about one hundred. A range of columns sixty feet high forms the portico. The entablature is continued along the whole building, constituting almost its only decoration.[1] It has no windows, the interior being lighted by a dome, and by large semicircular windows above the internal colonnade, which are not visible externally. The lower part of the dome is encircled by a Corinthian peristyle of thirty-two columns, thirty-six feet high, on an unbroken stylobate, or base of the wall.

But of all the monumental structures of Paris the Temple of the Madeleine takes the lead in style of architecture,

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 138.

grandeur, dimensions, and rich decoration. The history of its construction extends over half a century, and carries along the history of art in its architectural applications, during that period. It was in progress at the breaking out of the revolution, which caused its temporary suspension. The emperor, Napoleon I, with a view to commemorate his victories in December, 1806, decreed that it should be converted into a national temple of glory, and decorated with the statues of the marshals and distinguished generals of France. From his camp at Tilsit he decided on the plan of a Grecian octostyle temple, of the Corinthian order, as the best suited to the grandeur and magnificence of a national monument. The work was in progress at the restoration of Louis XVIII, but the restored Bourbon did not care to have it perpetuate the glories of Napoleon. The exterior was already completed, but the interior was so changed in its arrangements as to adapt it to the wants of a Roman Catholic church. Externally it resembles a Corinthian peripteral temple, and is one hundred feet longer, and forty wider than the Parthenon of Athens. On the stylobate are fifty-two columns more than sixty feet in height. The interior is divided lengthwise into three aisles,[1] covered by as many iron flat domes, through which the building is lighted, there being no side windows. In order that its heathen style should not belie its real character, the frieze all round the colonnade is decorated with angels holding garlands, intermixed with religious attributes. It is one of the most classical and magnificent structures in Europe.

The classical character, however, of the French style, has been rather Roman than Grecian, but, as between that and the modern schools of Italy, the portico style has been much in advance of the palace style.

The Madeleine is by no means the only architectural record left by Napoleon. There are also the gallery uniting the palace of the Louvre and Tuilleries; the triumphal

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 138.

Arch de l'Etoile; the Bourse, which is the great tribunal of commerce; the cupola of the corn market; the triumphal arch in the place de Carousel; the Fountain of the Elephant, the Pont des Arts, the column of the place Vendome, besides many others. Many of these were left incomplete by Napoleon, and owe their full completion to Louis Philippe. Among those thus left was the Arco della Pace, the Arch of Peace, which at the time of his fall was in the process of erection at Milan, being at the southern or Italian termination of the road he caused to be constructed across the Alps, at the pass of the Simplon, and designed as a trophy of his victories. This, along with the duchy of Milan, fell into the possession of the emperor of Austria, who transformed it into a record of his own fortune and of Austrian prowess.

The pointed, or Gothic style, fell into a state of decline in Germany, although the father-land of the Teuton. It would seem as if when one thing had become perfected by man in his onward progress, it is always sure to be abandoned and another substituted in its place, although it might be in itself far less meritorious. It is thus that every successively civilized nation may, in its turn, develop all the different styles to which human ingenuity has ever given rise. Immediately after the decline of this style the mansions of the nobles were constructed in a castellated style, upon the plan of a square or parallelogram, consisting of buildings surrounding an open court, the windows being high and narrow, and at each angle a square or round tower, crowned by an embattled parapet with machicolations, or openings formed for the purpose of defense, and terminating in a high pyramidical or conical roof. They were generally planted on terraces supported by sloping walls, with a watch tower projecting beyond the walls at each angle. At a somewhat later period, there was an excess of ornament. The old houses still existing in Germany,[1] Holland, and Normandy, have octagonal towers,

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 142.

high roofs, and disproportioned columns with spiral flutings. They also used dormers, or windows, in the roof, and these, as also the surfaces of the walls, were covered with a profusion of ornament.

It is, however, true, and perhaps creditable to the Germans, that no German architect of any celebrity ever arose to transplant the styles of the Italian schools, or the excesses into which they run, into Germany. Some Italian architects brought their native style to Germany, where they built many structures. But it was not until near the close of the eighteenth century that native Germans of distinction arose, and then they sought their models not in Italy but in Greece. Thus they were enabled to introduce a style more purely classic, at least possessing more of the Grecian element, than that derivable through the schools of Italy. The result of this has been that since the present century commenced, many buildings have been constructed in Berlin, Munich, and some other places, exhibiting a much nearer approach to the columnar style than had ever before been made in Germany.

It is to art-loving Munich that the admirer of art will delight more especially to refer, and it is to the Bavarian king, Ludwig I, that not only architecture, but its sister arts, painting, fresco, sculpture, are so largely indebted. The most celebrated architect, whose structures have ennobled the reign of this monarch, is Leo von Kleuse. Of the most celebrated of his works two are in Munich and one near Ratisbon, those in Munich are the Glyptothek, or sculpture gallery, and the Pinacothek or picture gallery.

The first is a free application of Greek architecture. It is a square of about two hundred and twenty feet, surrounding a central court. In front is a portico which may be termed an Ionic octastyle, having a cornice above it very richly decorated, and the pediment filled with sculpture representing processes connected with the arts of modeling, sculpture, and carving.

The Pinacothek is a larger building, and more in the Italian style. The body of the building is of brick; the

balustrades, entablatures, and windows of stone. It consists of an upper and lower story, the upper to contain the pictures. The gallery is an oblong edifice with two wings at the extremities. Along the front of the building runs a corridor, about four hundred feet in length and eighteen in width, lighted by twenty-five lofty arched windows.

The Valhalla, or Walhalla, is a German national monument, a temple erected to national glory, and was projected by the Bavarian king when crown-prince.' It is situated on a rocky cliff on the Danube, near Ratisbon. It is in the form of an octostyle Grecian Doric temple, after the Parthenon, with seventeen columns in the flanks, the whole constructed of marble. Although not a precise copy of the Parthenon yet its interior is a perfectly fresh architectural conception, faithful to the spirit of Grecian art, and giving us not merely its forms but its essence and its poetry. No other edifice of modern times is so intensely Grecian, or so highly elaborated as a monument of art. It is planted upon an enormous substructure of Cyclopean masonry, forming successive terraces, and flights of steps leading up to the platform on which stands the Doric temple itself, displayed with a pomp of architecture that may be said to have no precedent. It is two hundred and seventy feet long by one hundred in width. The columns and entablature are about forty-five feet high and the pediment twelve. In the two pediments are groups of sculpture, representing symbolically some of the earlier personages of German history. The whole structure is of marble, and equally remarkable for beauty and for strength. This splendid specimen of Germanized Grecian art is intended for the reception of modern sculpture of illustrious German heads who have distinguished themselves in German history either in war, politics, science or art. It is this use to which it is dedicated that has given it the name of Valhalla or Walhalla, the paradise of the Scandinavian mythology.

The Berlin Museum, the work of Schinkel, comprises both a picture and a sculpture gallery. It forms a regular,

unbroken oblong of two hundred and eighty feet by one hundred and seventy. The principal façade consists of a grand colonnade of nineteen intercolumns, formed by eighteen fluted Ionic columns forty feet high, and two very broad antæ at the angles. These columns rest upon a solid stylobate. The portico has five open intercolumns. The main portion of the interior is occupied by a rotunda, nearly seventy feet in diameter, by nearly as much in height. The lower part is surrounded by a peristyle of twenty fluted columns, above which runs a gallery communicating with the apartments on the upper floor. The rooms on the lower floor contain the sculptures, those of the upper the pictures. This edifice has great merit attributed to it for its architectural design and execution. It is of a character well calculated to direct an architect's ideas into a fresh and vigorous current, leading to originality of style. The works of Schinkel have attributed to them the merit of originating enlarged ideas, and of affording instruction as to the copiousness and variety of which architecture is susceptible, and as to the real spirit of antique art when applied to modern purposes.

Another national structure of considerable celebrity erected on Mount Michael by the king of Bavaria after M. Von Gartner's plan, is the Befreing Shalle, Deliverance Hall.[1] This consists of a rotunda and cupola, surrounded by grand arcades, forming a polygon of eighteen angles. The whole rests on a basement of three gradations, rising together twenty-four feet in height. An opening twenty-five feet in diameter admits the light into the large spherical chamber of the interior, which is ornamented with eighteen columns. The diameter of the building is two hundred and thirty-six feet, the span of the cupola one hundred, and the height of the whole one hundred and seventy feet. The vaults of the interior gallery are to be adorned with trophies and allegorical representations; the cupola to be richly ornamented, the floor laid with mosaic mar-

[1] *Cleghorn*, 1, 127.

bles, and the walls coated with marble. The general style of it resembles the old Italian.

In Russia, the style of architecture, until the last century, was, more or less, after the Byzantine pattern. Recently, St. Petersburg has become a city of marble palaces, and attracted much attention to its architectural features.[1] It presents one street nearly three miles in length, longer than any street in London. The houses in St. Petersburg have great elevation compared with their number of stories, those of no more than three stories rising to as great a height as one of four or even five in London. The basements of many of them are occupied as shops, even when persons of distinction reside in the upper stories.

Russia has no style of architecture of its own. Its difference of races from those occupying central and western Europe is sufficiently proclaimed from the fact, that when compelled to import a foreign architecture, instead of resorting to the Gothic, which, in some of its features, is peculiarly adapted to a cold climate, it had recourse to the bland climate of Italy, and transferred to the rigors of a Russian winter the revived classical or Græco-Roman style, taken principally from designs of Italian architects. It is from these that have been erected most or all the public buildings of the city, the royal palaces and the mansions of the princes or nobles.

What goes under the name of the Admiralty is a pile of vast extent, reaching along the Neva nearly half a mile, and then extending off from it at right angles between six and seven hundred feet. In the centre of one façade is a tower with a tapering gilt steeple. It incloses a clock-yard, school-rooms for naval cadets, and officers connected with the royal marine.

The Winter Palace, which was burnt down a few years since, was one of the most gigantic buildings in Europe. It was, however, more remarkable for vastness than for beauty. Another royal residence, built by Catharine II,

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 146.

is called the Marble Palace. The Hermitage is still another royal palace, whose principal façade faces the Neva, and consists of three distinct parts, the work of three different architects. This was the principal residence of Catharine II, and where, frequently casting aside the robes of royalty with the etiquette of a court, she gathered around her those who were most distinguished for their talent and learning.

Another continental nation in which there is much confusion in its architectural remains is Spain. We may naturally expect this from the number of different races that have, at different periods of time, held dominion over the whole, or of different parts of the Spanish peninsula. Ferdinand and Isabella, in the latter part of the fifteenth century, succeeded in uniting Spain under their joint sovereignty at the precise period when the Renaissance was successful in driving back over the Alps the last remnants of Gothic architecture. They were the first to patronize the revived orders then so much in the ascendant in Italy. Several buildings erected during the latter part of that century, as the college of Santa Croce at Valladolid,[1] the church of Santa Engracia at Saragossa, the College of Alcala, and Cathedral at Salamanca, present a mixture of Gothic, Saracenic, and Italian, the latter obviously gaining upon the others. During the next century many edifices of note were erected, but much the most famous of them all was the palace of the Escurial near Madrid. This was commenced in 1563, by Philip II upon the plans substantially as furnished by Giovanni Batista, although it was not completed until after his death. It is an immense building, or pile, enclosing fifteen courts, many decorated with porticoes and galleries, and containing upwards of eighty fountains. At the four angles of the building are towers rising four stories in height. The principal façade towards the west is seven hundred and forty feet long, by sixty in height, the towers at the corners rising to the height of two

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 146.

hundred.[1] This façade has five stories of windows. Its central compartment is one hundred and forty feet long, and consists of two orders of half columns; the lower eight semi-columns, which are Doric, and stand on a plinth, the upper of four Ionic columns or pedestals, surmounted by a pediment. The plan of the whole building was intended to have the shape of a gridiron, to commemorate the martyrdom of St. Lawrence. To carry out this plan the eastern façade has a projection in the middle answering to the handle of that instrument.

Modern Architecture in Great Britain.—The reaction, or rather revival, of classic art in Italy, was slow in finding its way and becoming established in England. The means of intercommunication between nations at a distance from each other, and differing essentially in manners and language, were so few, and so restricted, that a state of almost complete isolation was the result. Besides the suppression of the monasteries under Henry VIII, and the entire withdrawal of England from the dominion of the pope, led to a sundering of all the ties that had once existed between England and Italy. These, and some other causes, rendered the introduction of the Renaissance into England so slow that its traces are hardly perceptible there until the last half of the sixteenth century. It was not until the era of Elizabeth that Italian styles had made any marked progress in England. The Italian palace style was the first introduced. The mansion at Longleat in Wiltshire was erected in 1580. This was in the Italian style. The arrangement here was found so elegant, and yet so delicate and effective in detail, that it strongly commended itself to men of taste and judgment.[2] The sixteenth century in England was the transition period during which there was a sort of struggle going on between the Tudor and Italian styles. The latter becoming more and more prevalent as the time of Inigo Jones approached.

---

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 146, 147. [2] *Idem*, 147.

This celebrated architect was born in 1572, and flourished during the reign of the first Stuart, James I. He studied architecture in Italy, having gone there for that purpose as early as the year 1612. He planned the royal palace at Whitehall, which had it been completed in conformity with the plan, would have been one of the grandest of European palatial structures. It was found, however, easier for Jones to plan than for James to execute. The banqueting hall (the present Whitehall chapel) which was only a fragment of the entire plan, was the only part ever completed, the death of James I, the poverty of the early years of Charles I, and the calamities which marked the close of his reign, effectually arresting and destroying its further progress. But as the whole of the plans,[1] elevations, and sections were worked out by Jones, they have been subjects of criticism, the structure, either as an entire palace, or in relation merely to the finished part, having been made a sort of standard in discussions relating to the merits and demerits of the Italian style. The chief defect in the ideal palace seems to be the absence of some central point, or crowning object of attraction, to correct and combine the whole.

While Jones was in the height of his reputation in 1632, was born Sir Christopher Wren. The occurrence of the great fire in London in 1666, left to this remarkable man the opportunity of giving full scope to his architectural powers. He was destined to raise a metropolis from its ashes, and nobly did he perform the task. The number of public buildings he designed and executed while employed upon the constructing of St. Paul's Church, seems almost incredible, and their merit is not inferior to their extent.

The one single edifice, however, upon which his great reputation principally rests, is that of St. Paul's in London. This was commenced and completed under his superintendence. The St. Peter's at Rome furnished him with a model. The plan is that of a Latin cross, with nave, choir

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 150.

and transepts. The length from east to west is about five hundred feet; that of the transepts from north to south about half this amount; the general breadth from wall to wall a hundred and twenty-five. The height of the middle aisle is ninety feet, the inner vault of the dome two hundred and sixteen feet above the church floor, the outer to the foot of the lantern two hundred and eighty feet. The whole height, the lantern included, is three hundred and sixty feet.[1] The outer breadth of the dome is about one hundred feet, and its height fifty-six feet, forming a half ellipsoid. The effect of the interior is weakened by no defects, and its grandeur of proportions and neatness of execution are well calculated to make a deep and lasting impression on the beholder. It may, for elegance of design, bear comparison with the Cathedral of St. Peter's at Rome, although far less in size. Within it is the tomb of Sir Christopher Wren, his epitaph concluding with :

Reader, if you seek his monument, look around you.

The architectural labors of Sir Christopher were by no means confined to St. Paul's. No less than fifty-one churches from his design were constructed in the city of London. His reputation is chiefly based upon his church edifices.

As applied to them the Italian was the only style of architure then in vogue,[2] and he may be said to have naturalized that style in England. He invented plans by which that style could be adapted to Protestant worship. He adopted three different forms, the dome, the basilica, and the plain quadrangular pile. His most beautiful specimen of domed churches, after St. Paul's, is the church of St. Stephen. As specimens of churches on the basilica plan of a nave and side aisles, separated by columns or piers and arches, are St. Magnus and St. Michael. Again he made the most out of steeples, rendering them very prominent features. He ran up steeples and campaniles

[1] *Iconographic Encyclopædia*, IV, 199. [2] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 151.

far above the sordid and dingy mass of habitations, and made them to cluster like satellites round the majestic dome of the Cathedral, and thus imparted to the general aspect of the city a picturesque grandeur scarcely rivalled by Rome itself. Although he did not originate the principle upon which his spires and lanterns are composed, of applying Italian details to Gothic forms, yet his mode of adapting it is peculiarly and exclusively his own, and he has been eminently successful in maintaining the most characteristic features of the English church in a style never before applied to it.

Sir Christopher Wren lived through the eventful period from the reign of Charles I, to that of George I; and for nearly a century succeeding, no architect of any celebrity, except Sir John Vanbrugh, appeared in England. He did not build churches, but mansions; and hence was compelled to put turrets and chimney stacks in the place of Wren's steeples. Both in the construction of these, and in his general plan, he departed much from the Palladian, or Italian style, which Inigo Jones had introduced into England. His style was more massive, and that feature provoked the following epigram from Horace Walpole:

> Lie heavy on him, earth; for he
> Laid many a heavy load on thee.

There is much controversy as to Vanbrugh's merit as an architect. This has grown in a great measure out of his originality. He did not exclusively follow any one form or style, and hence has incurred both praise and censure. When judged upon the principles of universal art as applied to architecture, his performances have generally met with approval. Sir Joshua Reynolds thus speaks of him according to the principles of his own art, and I refer to it in part to show that all the fine arts, have, with each other, closer and intimate connections: "To speak of Vanbrugh in the language of a painter," says Sir Joshua, "he had originality of invention, he understood light and

shadow, and had great skill in composition. To support his principal object, he produced his second and third groups of masses; he perfectly understood in his art, what is most difficult in ours, the conduct of the back ground by which the design and invention are set off to the greatest advantage. What the back ground is in painting, is the real ground upon which the building is erected;[1] and no architect took greater care that his work should not appear crude and hard, that is, it did not abruptly start out of the ground without expectation or preparation."

So, Sir Uvedale Price, in speaking of his most celebrated work, the Blenheim mansion, says: "He has conceived and executed a very bold and difficult design, that of uniting in one building, the beauty and magnificence of the Grecian architecture, the picturesqueness of the Gothic, and the massive grandeur of a castle. His first point appears to have been massiveness, the foundation of grandeur; then, to prevent the mass from being a lump, he has made bold projections of various heights as foregrounds to the main building; and, lastly, having been forcibly struck with the variety of outline against the sky in many Gothic and other ancient buildings, he has raised on the top of that part where the slanting roof begins in any house of the Italian style, a number of decorations of various characters. The union of these gives a surprising splendor and magnificence, as well as variety, to the summit of that princely edifice."

He, no doubt, departed wholly from the severity of Grecian models; but it is claimed that he obeyed the spirit, even while he was violating the letter of the old classic law. He excels in the poetic effect and richness of his combinations. He has grouped his building, with all its cupolas, pediments, pavilions, clustered chimneys, and statues, in a way at once original and harmonious, and which gratifies all admirers of picturesque magnificence.[2] He had especially, the art of grouping his chimneys till

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 154. [2] *Idem*, 154.

they resembled pinnacles, or of connecting them into an arcade, by which the massiveness of the building was much relieved. He was also a great master of perspective, and in the summits of his houses, always raises a central point of attraction, and groups pinnacles, peaks, towers, domes, and pavilions around it, uniting them into a splendid whole, little regarding the rules of classic art, but obeying those of poetic composition.

During the later years of the reign of George II, the Earl of Burlington and his architect, Kent, gave the tone to English architecture. He is accused, however, of being a mere copyist, and of working strictly according to pattern and rule. From his time to that of Sir William Chambers, in the reign of George III, there was little variety, the Italian style being imitated so strictly, that the mansions constructed appeared to be little more than mere copies of each other. Lofty basement stories, external flights of steps to reach to the principal story or piano nobile, and a small or minor opening in the basement were the principal characteristics. Sir Robert Taylor, about the same period, made great extensions to the bank of England, and also applied to country villas many Italian features, which till then had only been applied to the larger mansions.

Down to and including the time of Taylor and Chambers, the Italian style was that mainly adopted in English architecture. Soon afterwards a taste began to be formed for the more simple and severe style of Greece. This arose in part at least, from the increased means of studying it. In 1753 and 1757, Wood and Dawkins published descriptions of the ruins of Palmyra and Balbec. In 1762 began to appear *Stuart's Antiquities of Athens*, and in 1769 Revett published the *Antiquities of Ionia*, and Robert Adam the *Ruins of Spalatro*. From these different sources a new desire was awakened for an elder and severer style of architecture.

At the end of the last and beginning of the present century, war and political agitation prevailed to such an extent as to prove extremely unfavorable to the progress of art in

England, but the tendency was to the Greek style. The refinement of Greek art, as revealed by Stuart and others, so affected the public mind as to lead to its adoption more as a fashion than a principle.[1] The reproduction of its forms was demanded without reference to the propriety of their application, or to the relations which essentially constitute the beauty of architecture.

The present century has already witnessed in England three phases of change: 1. The fashion of Greek porticoes and pillars, everywhere employed, and without much reference to convenience or conformity to other parts of the edifice. 2. The application of the Italian palazzo style, and of this, many of the club houses are very fine specimens. 3. The Gothic pointed style has been again revived for ecclesiastical structures.

The strong tendency existing in modern times to recur to Grecian models has led to the introduction of polychrome architecture. Many students and travelers insisted that remains of color were observable on the columns, friezes, cornices, etc., of Grecian temples. Hence the question came to be agitated whether the aids of coloring were not required to render architectural effect full and complete.

This has led, in some instances, to the application of colors to the interiors of buildings. It never seems to have led to such application to the exteriors. No warrant for this latter could be gathered from any remains of Grecian art, or from the disinterred houses of Pompeii, or other Roman remains.

The search after evidence of polychromy was not restricted to ancient Greek and Roman remains.[2] The remains of Gothic coloring in our ancient cathedrals was diligently explored. Many were carefully restored with as much of the ancient colored decoration as reliable models could be found for; and whatever was wanting modern design attempted to supply. In Germany the most striking example of restored Gothic polychromy is the great

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II. 155. [2] *Ten Centuries of Art*, 26.

Cathedral of Cologne, while in France the restoration of the Cathedral of St. Denis, and of the Sainte Chapelle offer similar, and perhaps in some respects superior, examples.

The polychromy of modern times is the most frequently found in France and Germany. In the former the chapel in Chausse d'Antin affords an example. The interior walls are entirely covered with paintings on gold grounds after the Byzantine manner. It offers a splendid instance of the return to richly colored interiors. Another example is afforded in the Madeleine church,[1] although in a different style. The great principle of the abundant use of color forms the basis of its internal decorations. The severe intentions of the original plan have been even superseded by the overwhelming passion for color. Richness and variety, both of color and material have in fact been so splendidly wrought out, that the eye, captivated by the blended richness of painting, sculpture and gilding, scarcely perceives the peculiarities of the structure. Other splendid examples of internal decoration are found in the walls and ceilings of the Egyptian museum in the Louvre, and also in some of the new apartments of the Hotel-de-Ville. These, however, are founded rather on the works of the period of the Renaissance than on classical examples.

The polychromic element in Germany has been more limited to the purely classical in character.[2] The palace and the Glyptotheca and Pinacotheca of Munich offer themselves as examples. Although the first glitter and freshness of these works have faded, and they are, to a certain extent, failures, yet they have given rise to a great many inquiries and investigations, and have been the means of educating quite a class of students to that branch of architectural decoration.

Polychromy has also been introduced into England. It has been employed to decorate the ceiling of the Royal Exchange. So also has it been introduced into the leading club houses, and several private mansions. One of

[1] *Ten Centuries of Art*, 27. [2] *Idem*, 28.

the most conspicuous examples is afforded in the new internal decorations of the British Museum. In this last, the gallery of antiquities is considered excellent, especially in the mass of rich red which forms the back ground to the statues.

As to the ground upon which artificial coloring is best applied, it has been suggested that a white ground, similar to Parian marble,[1] may be colored with a general tone of color, or receive a painted pattern, because it is suited, by the uniform tone of its surface, to the reception of either a plain color, or a painted device. On the contrary, granites, and veined marbles, having their own natural coloring, are unsuited to receive any artificial additions of color.

In one respect, however, modern taste seems not to have followed that of the Greeks. The latter occasionally, if not very frequently, painted their statuary, as well as columns, mouldings, etc. The modern feeling and taste seem hitherto opposed to applying polychromy to decorative sculpture, or statuary. That must remain white without any addition of colors, the light and shade produced by the varieties of relief being deemed a sufficient effect.

It may perhaps be doubtful whether polychromatic decoration has been yet sufficiently tested, in all the different varieties of which it is susceptible, and for the length of time necessary fully to establish it as an aid to architectural art. The colors, however skillfully laid on, must in time fade and disappear. Besides, the effect is different in cases of natural and artificial coloring. The shell cameo pleases when the artist is able to produce an agreeable and striking, yet natural contrast. But the same effect would not be produced if he were to paint the relief orange or green, or the ground blue or scarlet.

There is a natural polychromy from which the richest combinations of color may be obtained. Of this, the interior of St. Peter's offers one of the most splendid

[1] *Ten Centuries of Art*, 29.

examples. There, all is natural polychromy; and yet the variety of color is described as endless. "The blue is lapis lazuli;[1] the violet, marble of Africa; the orange and yellow, are from the quarries of Sienna; the green is the antique serpentino; the red, the famed rosso-antico; the white, the stainless stone of Carrara. All these various materials, under the skillful hands of the great race of architects who successively spent their lives on this vast monument, gravely dispose themselves into glorious masses of light and dark, of warm and cool, of rich and sober, every mass endlessly, yet unobtrusively, enriched with exquisite details, formed, either by sculpture in relief, or inlaid designs; the whole blended into one harmonious whole, by the pervading, yet subdued glitter of the profuse gilding. All this gorgeous richness of effect is yet, at the same time, chaste and pure, because the spectator feels there is no sham, no artificial dye, or color; like the cameo, its contrasts and its colors appear innate, and have those intimate associations with each other, that cast an atmosphere of reality and propriety over all, such as the artificial can rarely attain to."

We cannot take leave of the architectural art without indulging in a few reflections. It constitutes the link uniting the useful with the fine arts. Its combinations must, therefore, adapt themselves to those two phases that enter into its composition. It is an art which employs the most substantial materials in the most substantial manner. Its monuments remain standing witnesses to attest to future generations and centuries, the excellence and purity of the style and taste of their builders. And they are the most valuable when they are allowed to stand as they were originally constructed. Alterations and amendments destroy their unity, and convert them into patch work. They are not fit subjects for experiment. The plan once adopted, cannot be materially altered or transposed, without impairing its beauty and character.

[1] *Ten Centuries of Art*, 31.

Architecture, unlike the other arts of design, possesses no specific prototype in nature. The artist here, may be influenced by certain analogies, but nature can present him nothing that can serve as a pure model for his imitation. The sculptor and the painter find in nature, that which their own art brings out and represents. The architect has no such resource. He is obliged to deal more with abstractions. He is more limited by fixed principles, rules, and mathematical precision; by laws of stability and fitness for definite purposes. In his compositions there is less scope for the fancy. They are less addressed to the passions and senses, than to the judgment and reasoning faculties.

It is the belief of some that architectural versatilities, and varieties of exhibition, are nothing but the outward expression of what is internally felt. This, to a certain extent, is undoubtedly true, but to suppose that some of the oddities and eccentricities of architecture are gone into deliberately to work out a whim, or to show the utter absurdity of a conceit, would seem to be carrying the joke too far, and making it a little too practical and expensive.

There can be little doubt, however, but that the real and essential spirit of a people runs into, and is exemplified by the styles of its architecture. The pure and refined taste of the Greek, the grave and energetic cast of the Roman, the fresh and aspiring character of the Teuton, are each traceable in their different styles of architecture. It is not improbable that every peculiar feature of every different race or variety of mankind, may be traceable into the style of architecture to which each has given rise. At the same time it must be obvious that one may have copied from another; and thus, in the course of time, an approximation of two or more to each other may have resulted. More observation than has hitherto been made is necessary to trace out the different styles, and to assign them to the people or race to whom each respectively belongs.

The history of architecture thus far discloses two principles, and only two, that lie at the foundation of all the

different styles. These are the horizontal and the vertical. The former was developed and perfected by the Grecian, the latter by the Goth. The former was characterized by the entablature, the latter by the pointed arch. These represent the two extremes. Something was required to connect the two, to bridge over the intervening space. This was found in the round arch developed by the Roman. Each one of these was accompanied by its own species of decoration.

For the purpose of fully carrying out and developing these principles, we have the different styles of architecture. These seize upon some peculiar feature embraced within one of the principles above mentioned, and accompanying it with its own appropriate system of decoration, carry out that feature and system to its utmost possible extent. As a general fact, each style when introduced, has not passed away until all contained within it has been brought out and perfected. Thus while the principle is general, the style is partial, limited, unique and busied only in applying so much of the principle as, with its appropriate decoration, form together a system complete and perfect within itself. It is thus that, through the medium of the different styles, the principle may attain to its full and complete development. Thus we have in modern Europe the Byzantine, the Romanesque, the Gothic, the Renaissance, and the modern, which is in reality only the continued Renaissance, embracing the three Italian schools, and the subsequent developments in modern architecture.

It will be perceived that when all the different styles of which a principle is susceptible, have been introduced and carried out into all their possible applications, the whole subject will be exhausted, and nothing new can be possible, except what may arise from new combinations among the different styles. It has been asserted that the rising race of artists of every class is fast emancipating itself from the thraldom of fixed styles of any epoch. This is probably so; but their efforts in the direction of architecture, have tended to mix together features of different styles,

and thus to offend, instead of gratifying, the dictates of a pure taste.

The problem now presented may be considered to be: whether, for all practical purposes, the different styles already introduced and carried out, have not exhausted everything contained in the principles; and whether, therefore, anything now remains but a repetition and reiteration of the same styles, or the adoption, in architectural art, of the eclectic principle in philosophy, viz: a careful selection from the different styles, according to site, association, and circumstances, and a recombination, such as in effect would present the essentials of a new style. That this is the ultimate destiny of architecture, I have little doubt. But whether the period has yet arrived at which it should be resorted to, is among the yet unsolved problems of the future.

SCULPTURE.

The idea of sculpture was first suggested by a shadow. This gave origin to the notion that forms, and even resemblances, might be raised upon, and even indented into, plain surfaces. Hence, reliefs were probably the first species of sculpture. These were of three kinds:

1. Low; scarcely raised above the surface, little more than a stereotyped shadow, one rendered permanently visible by a material device.

2. Middle; in which the figure is half raised, and thus made much more prominent.

3. The high, full, or alto relief, in which the figures are nearly entire, and seem to project from the ground. Thus a progress is indicated by which any solid body, as the human figure, emerges by successive steps or stages from the solid material, or marble, in which it is contained. The shadow continues to deepen in intensity, until it becomes substance. The figure is gradually eliminated from

its marble thraldom, until it stands forth wholly detached, the perfect statue.

A severe contest was once waged between sculpture and painting, each claiming the supremacy for itself both in its history, objects, and processes. It is, however, of more importance to determine wherein the two agree, and in what respect they differ; what each is susceptible of borrowing from the other; what is the peculiar province of each; what the boundaries which divide them; and the particular goal for which each should strive. Each has a definite nature and limits, within which the artist should possess the full knowledge of his art, and know the danger of disregarding either.

The aim of the painter and the means by which he seeks to accomplish it, will be hereafter considered. The sculptor has little to do with light and shade, color and perspective. These are the great instrumentalities by which the former endeavors to make his figures project from the canvas. But that projection is seeming, not real. It is a real deception, and the further it is carried, the more perfect the art.

The sculptor practices no deception. He first forms a conception of his figure. The clay, ductile to his touch, is made to assume a form corresponding to this internal conception. The accuracy of the correspondence depends upon the strength and power of the conception, and the ability to mould the clay in conformity with it. The model which exists in his conception should be as perfect as was that of the archetypal man in the creative mind. He projects it from his own mind, building it up in idea from a scaffolding of bones, which he covers with muscles, gradually working it into perfection of form and attitude. Thus the statue is made to assume the proportions and form of man. When cut in marble it appears only to differ from its living prototype in substance, color, and weight.

Both to the sculptor and painter, one thing is common, viz: design; but with the former that design has to do with the entire figure in all its dimensions, viz: height,

breadth and depth;[1] while with the latter, it is limited to the two former, and attempts to represent the latter by shadows, light, and color.

The sculptor is limited as to his means of representation. He can deal only in forms, and attitudes, and such motion and expression as he is able through them to represent. The painter has other and ampler means. He can represent not only action, but passion. As passion prompts action it displays itself through it in many different ways. In strong concentrated action everything about the man concurs. His color changes; the character of his look alters; the features themselves are less regarded by the spectator than their expression. All this the painter can give. But the sculptor cannot. All violent action is transitory in its very nature, and hence utterly incapable of putting on the permanence, the eternity, so to speak, of marble. It is repose, passivity, endurance, that marble is fitted to proclaim, and hence activity, resistance, aggression are rather for the pencil than the chisel.

While the painter may more appropriately give the action, the sculptor can more forcibly represent the position. The first, by a few strokes of his pencil, may transfer to his canvas looks of alarm, terror, rage, grief, joy and ecstacy, every fierce passion, or deep emotion, and that by a sudden flash of genius far more transitory than the passion or emotion whose expression he records. The latter calmly and quietly develops his subject, evincing more of depth than of brilliancy. Deep and abiding emotions, like grief, may be perpetuated in marble, but those which are rapid and transitory, like anger or rage, never. A wrathful or a laughing statue would be hardly endurable.

The sculptor should ever aim at simplicity, whether it be in the choice of his subject, or in attitude, form, or expression. By simplicity is here meant singleness. Men may be under the influence of different or contradictory emotions, but not statues. It is enough, and if violent too

[1] *Guizot*, 12.

much, for them to be under the influence of even one emotion. Hence in all the master pieces of antiquity each one presents one simple, strongly defined expression, in accordance with the nature and capabilities of the art.[1]

As to the subjects, and their mode of treatment, a far wider field opens to the painter than to the sculptor. To the former opens up the landscape with all its vast variety. Its amplitude of plain, its diversity of hill and valley, its waving woodlands, its meandering streams, its ever moving panorama, are all legitimate matters for the canvas. But the pencil has far higher aims than the portrayal of nature even in its lower organized forms. It looks higher when it transfers to its canvas the human form divine. And far higher still, when that form is filled with emotion, animated by passion, and intensified by action on the theatre of history. It exhibits to us Alexander at the Granicus, on the plains of Arbela, and amid the repose of his tent life. It follows our Lord and exhibits him to our view when in the cradle or the arms of his mother, and thenceforward through all the marked phases of his short but eventful life, until his final disappearance amid the glories of the ascension. Landscape, portrait, and historical painting, each has its own devoted followers, who consider the field of his own special labors as sufficiently extensive for his own cultivation.

So also in the mode of treatment the painter has much the greatest variety. The sculptor deals more with single figures, and produces more effect with them than the painter. This he is enabled to do by virtue of his power of presenting to spectators the human form in all its beauty and fullness. With him it is the dignity of repose, not the excitability of action. His work may be suggestive of powers and energies, but they are slumbering, gathering strength for renewed effort.

The painter may awaken, unchain them, and display them in action. He invests them with life, and doing so,

[1] *Guizot*, 23.

is bound to represent them as possessing and exercising life's powers, forces, and energies. The spectator beholds passion stirring the brain, animating the countenance, and moving the muscles. Besides, his power of complication is very much greater. By means of grouping together great numbers of figures, he has almost infinite means of varying his effect, and enlarging his sphere of operations.

The rules by which the two are governed as to composition and attitude are derived from different principles. The sculptor studies the philosophy of repose. "A figure when at rest, naturally and unconsciously takes the position best suited to the development of its characteristic forms,[1] simply because the physical structure, and the relative weight of the parts, determine the manner in which they dispose themselves. If the action is a simple one, and restricted to one figure, the attitude will be equally simple and the natural result of the action. The artist will give his figure the position it would assume in order to the action in question, the forms developing themselves according to that action. Such are the Sitting Menander, Reposing Fawn, Sleeping Ariadne, Jason, and the Discobolus."

But the moment composition is entered upon (which belongs more peculiarly to the painter); the moment several figures are rendered necessary to concur in an action; then both the place, attitude, position, personel of each will be determined by the part which it is designed to perform. Everything must be planned with reference to the production of some general effect,[2] The single figure can no more afford to be individualized, isolated, falling into its natural position, or considered separately from the rest, than can the companies or battalions of an army, when a battle requires their joint, united, concurring action. It would even take from the general effect if, under such circumstances, any individual peculiarities were so marked and peculiar as to attract the attention. The main en-

[1] *Guizot*, 31. [2] *Idem*, 32.

deavor of the artist is no longer to develop the forms of his figures in the best manner. He will no longer place them just as he chooses with reference to individual impression, but will give them such positions as they should occupy in contributing their part to the joint action.

Here, therefore, is one point of difference. The sculptor limiting himself to one figure, has only to consult the interest of a single actor, while the painter must sacrifice that interest to the accomplishment of his general purpose. Men, amid the busy scenes of life, take positions and attitudes varying essentially from what they would naturally in a state of perfect isolation. The former belongs to the painter to represent, the latter to the sculptor.

Another important, in fact necessary feature for the painter is the introduction of perspective by means of which distances are realized, and all the figures subordinated, in reference to space, to the production of a single effect. The practice of this art forms no part of the study of the sculptor.

In regard to the element of expression, the study and the practice of the painter and sculptor are found essentially to differ. The former has many means of giving or varying it which the latter has not. The former can give or change it so as to conform to the circumstances under which the individual is placed. The latter can only give a single unvarying expression, and hence it is that those forms of expression which are borrowed from sculpture are either cold and stiff or exaggerated. Lanzi blames the scholars of Michael Angelo for having imported into their pictures that strength of limb, that anatomical precision in the marking of the muscles, the stern features and peculiar attitudes which characterize the terrible style of their mighty master.[1]

Thus the two sister arts of painting and sculpture have seldom the same aim, and never the same means of reaching it. While the latter deals in forms individualized,

[1] *Guizot*, 38, 1

striking, and perfect as far as art can go, the latter looks to combinations, composition, corresponding attitude and expression, and the production of general effect.

Architecture is invoked to furnish man a dwelling, a shelter, a home. In its form, style, and arrangement, recourse is had to art. Not only does art preside over the structure. It presides to a still greater extent over its embellishment. Sculpture affords one of the means by which this latter is accomplished. This, as an art, ranks much higher than that of architecture. Its origin and development are due to moral and intellectual wants, while architecture, in one of its aspects, regards only the physical.

The art of sculpture had reached its highest point of attainment in ancient Greece. There the climate, mode of life, and athletic exercises had all united in the giving of unrivaled perfection to the human form. The manner in which those exercises were conducted, affords the best possible opportunity of witnessing that form in all its varieties of position and action. The lively imagination of the Greek could easily select the varied excellencies discoverable in different forms, and by a happy combination, present the magnificent, beautiful, and faultless figures of his Jupiter, Venus, and Apollo. The multiplication of sculptures in the age of Pericles, filled Greece with statues, and rendered her the wonder and admiration of the world.

When Rome, by force of arms subdued the world, and gathered within the walls of her capital all the treasures of art which were accessible, Greece was despoiled of her beautiful sculptures, which were taken to adorn the great patrician mansions, and thus Italy became almost as full of wonders of art as Greece had been before her. But in time the avenger came. The barbarian hordes pouring over the Alps came down upon Italy. The fifth century was the most fatal of all for the remains of ancient art and civilization. The west Goths under Alaric captured Rome

in 409. In 437 was the persecution of the catholic Christians by Genseric the Arian. In 445 Attila, the scourge of God, came down upon Italy. In 455 Genseric set fire to Rome, destroying the palace of Sallust with all its treasures of art. In 476, Odoacer, king of the Heruli, put an end to the western empire, destroying many treasures of art.

But there was another cause of destruction besides that proceeding from indiscriminate barbarian rage. It proceeded from the hostility of the Christian against these sculptured figures of pagan deities. In their destructive zeal they not only demolished statues, paintings and mosaics of mythological import, but attacked also other objects of art. The great effort was to destroy everything pagan. Both these destructive agencies resulted in entirely or partially destroying almost all the beautifully sculptured marbles that were not kept so fully concealed as to elude the keenest search. The history of the modern European arts of design begins, therefore, with the destruction of every accessible ancient model. This was followed by about five centuries, during which the fine arts, if they could be said to exist at all, were in so rude a state as not to be deserving of that appellation.

All the arts depend very much for their origin, growth, and development, upon two sources, viz: religion, and the form of government. The first furnishes subjects and scenes, and, what is of more importance, the moral element that breathes through and animates both. Grecian art went to heathen mythology, and gave form, expression and action to those gods and goddesses who had been born of the poetic fancy, and worshiped by those who could find no higher objects which they could recognize as deity. The moral element here was materialistic and sensual. Christian art visits the first pair in Eden, depicts the fall, goes to the manger in Bethlehem, exhibits our Lord in all the varieties of his earthly pilgrimage, unveils the beauties of Paradise, and reveals the terrors of the last judgment. The moral element here is eminently spiritual. We may,

therefore, expect to find modern art differ from ancient in its subjects, scenes and the moral element by which it is animated.

The form of government exerts only an indirect influence. The arts have never flourished to any extent except under a free government. It is those forms only that have been developed in an atmosphere of freedom, that can furnish models worthy of the plastic art. It was so in the days of Grecian greatness. It is so in the revival of art in Italy in modern times.

Some have attributed to the Crusades an important agency in the revival of modern art. It is not, however, true that any important works of art were brought by the Crusaders into the west to serve as models. It is true that many bishops, abbots and monasteries availing themselves of the rage of land owners to join in the Crusades, by means of making money advancements, were enabled to enrich themselves in lands. These, therefore, becoming opulent, could indulge their taste in the fine arts, and adorn their palaces and churches with marble, works of sculpture, paintings, and mosaics. At about the same period, several of the cities of Italy, as Venice, Florence, Genoa, Pisa, etc., assuming republican forms of government, and embarking in profitable commercial pursuits, many of their citizens became wealthy, and able to indulge themselves in the same luxuries as the bishops, abbots and monasteries. The demand from these two different sources not only originated, and often successfully, a search after lost or concealed sculptures, but also had the effect of stimulating to the production of new ones.

It is in Germany and Italy that we find the first successful efforts made for the revival of sculpture. With the eleventh century commenced the period at which this art began to make its influence felt in Germany.[1] It, however, then, and during the entire period of Gothic architecture, stood in intimate connection with the architectural art.

[1] *Iconographie*, IV. 49.

In fact, sculpture became the handmaid of architecture. Its works were almost exclusively of an ecclesiastical character,[1] consisting of alto-relievos, representing different passages in the life of Christ, treated more or less symbollically, and also figures of the apostles and evangelists, after the same style. So both in Germany and Italy, and other parts of western Europe, sculpture began to present its sepulchral monuments.[2] These were in the sculptured effigies of the first Crusaders, presenting their chain mail, their massive swords, and their crossed legs, each portraying great individuality of character.

This mode of sculpture in alto-relievo was long continued. Even from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries this art was almost entirely confined to that, and semi-detached statuary on the exterior of the great Gothic cathedrals, and to the sepulchral monuments within.[3] The taste for statuary, in the place of mere carving, continued to increase, as the works of masters in the art were gradually presented. Then it was that sculpture retreated more from the fronts to the interiors of churches, the better to satisfy the increasing tendency to a fond elaboration of details. Still the connection between sculpture and architecture remained so intimate that the architectural idea was predominant.

During the fourteenth century, the sepulchral monument attained a very high degree of excellence in the truly Gothic phase of the art. Every successive link of progress for nearly two centuries continued to exhibit some new and exquisitely worked out features of ornament or general structure. The figures were recumbent as in the earlier periods,[4] the arms generally joined over the breast, while the hands were placed palm to palm, and raised as if in the attitude of prayer. This posture of perpetual prayer is given to nobles and princes equally as to prelates. Above rich canopies of fretted stone exhibited elaborate tracery, often of most exquisite design, and wrought out

---

[1] *Ten Centuries of Art*, 41, 42. [2] *Idem*, 42. [3] *Idem*, 42. [4] *Idem*, 42.

with a high finish, and a patient and persevering labor. "By the close of the fifteenth century, the richness and beauty of these works, combining the skill of the ornamentalist, the architect, and the sculptor, attained the culminating point of excellence."

Thus the plastic art in modern Europe first consecrated its efforts to embellish the temple and the tomb, and thus imparted to them a solemn grandeur, and a sedate grace, which in after times gave way to popular and poetical works of a more worldly tone and lighter character. But the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries witnessed the extinction of Gothic sculpture as well as Gothic architecture, and beheld new schools in progress, giving birth to new forms of art, formed and fashioned upon new models. Not that the temple or the tomb was by any means deserted, or had lost any of their elaboration or richness. They both seemed to increase, but under the guidance of a different feeling. Instead of a single figure with its canopy, thus giving birth to that solitariness, and isolation appropriate to the domain of death, we have sometimes, as in the tomb of Maximilian, groups of attendant statues standing around, thus seeming to guard the mighty dead from any intrusion. The tombs of Francis I, at St. Denis, of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, and of Henry VII, at Westminster, among other works of art, exhibit a great style of splendor belonging to this era, which almost entirely expired with the close of the seventeenth century. We do not mean to be understood, however, that sculpture has ever deserted the tomb. She has ever been there exerting her utmost powers and energies in bestowing all of immortality she could upon the remains of those she loved. It is not her fault if the monumental marble does not bear to future ages the memory of the dead, together with the noble specimens of her own glorious handiwork. Her torch has ever burned with the greatest brilliancy where the death damps have lain with their heaviest pressure. Her chisel has ever worked with its most wondrous cunning, when she could fancy that by some curious de-

vice she was perpetuating the memory of the dead, or by a life-like resemblance, almost anticipating the resurrection. Her silent monitions have ever spoken with greatest effect to the living, when she has given to death a tongue, and out of the stony mouths of the tomb, given her utterances of love, of wisdom or of warning. When she sounds a retreat from man's last resting place, we may bid a long farewell to her greatest, most moral, and most glorious creations.

We must now visit Italy, and witness there the rise and progress of modern sculpture, Art was never wholly extinguished in Italy. Many remnants of Grecian art survived the general wreck which the fifth and several following centuries made of those inestimable treasures. These could not fail of meeting with some appreciation in the free cities of Italy, in which the activity of the human mind leading to accumulations of wealth created in time a new class of wants, which that wealth could supply, and the lersure they now enjoyed would afford an opportunity of gratifying. Even as early as the commencement of the eleventh century the cities of Pisa, Florence, Bologna, Sienna, Venice, and Amalfi assumed the privileges of free cities, and very soon afterwards the antique remains, both architectural and sculptural, began to be studied and appreciated.

The first great name that presents itself is that of Nicolo Pisano, or Nicolo of Pisa, who was born in the beginning of the thirteenth century, and distinguished himself both as a sculptor and an architect. At that early period so little had the division of labor in the field of the arts progressed, that the same artist often united in himself the avocations of architect, sculptor and painter. While this fact proclaims the kindred character of these arts, it affords evidence equally clear that comparatively little progress had been made in each. While he is regarded as the reviver of the plastic art in Italy, his manner of composition did not differ essentially from that of his predecessors and contemporaries, but in his forms he copied far more closely the antique. He did not excel so much in deline-

ating the terrible and grand, as the gentle and delicate. His principal works are the descent from the cross, and the pulpit in the baptistery of Pisa, and also that in the cathedral of Sienna. He may be considered the founder of the primitive school of modern sculpture, in which were educated his son, Giovanni da Pisa, and Augustino and Anasto da Sienna, his favorite pupils. To this school may be traced the practice of the first separation of modern sculpture from architecture, and to it Europe is indebted for the revival of classic art and a taste for the antique. From this point ecclesiastical sculpture goes into a gradual decadence, while the sculpture of romance, of poetry, and of history is as gradually rising in importance.

A question has been raised as to how much the imitation of the antique contributed to the revival of modern art. While it is conceded that such imitation would result in the production of the most faultless forms, it is still asserted that the mind and spirit observable in the paintings and sculptures of the time of the revival,[1] are of an entirely original character, and quite independent of the ancient schools. In the modern Christian art are discernible great depth of feeling, and of intention, and its revivers seem to have aimed at appealing to the sympathies, rather than gratifying the eye and pleasing the fancy only, by presenting to them the most beautiful forms.

In the fourteenth century art was carried by Andrea Pisano, the grandson of Nicolo, to Florence, which very soon became its great head and fountain. He was the father of the Tuscan school. His sons Tomas and Nino, were the means of diffusing it over Lombardy and other parts of Italy.

The sculptures of this period were mostly relievi in bronze, there being but very few statues. These relievi were mostly dedicated to religion or to the memory of the dead, were simple, truthful, and of natural expression, and form an interesting link between the barbarism of the dark

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 303.

ages, and the splendid productions of the two succeeding centuries.[1] The close of the fourteenth and commencement of the fifteenth centuries were signalized by a remarkable work of art, viz: the relievi executed upon the bronze folding doors of the baptistery at Florence. On one of these, Andrea Pisano wrought a bas-relief illustrative of the life of St. John. About the year fourteen hundred, the Arti, or guild of merchants, at Florence, resolved upon the construction of a second gate or door of bronze, as a companion to the one just mentioned. The proposed work was opened to the competition of the greatest of the Italian artists. It was finally awarded to Lorenzo Ghiberti, who consumed twenty-two years of his life upon the work. He chose for representation a series of scripture subjects embracing various events from the annunciation to the descent of the Holy Ghost, which were wrought in relief on twenty panels or compartments, ten on each of the folding doors.[2] The Florentines subsequently confided to him a third gate upon which he expended the labor of sixteen years, choosing his subjects from the Old Testament and representing them on ten compartments, each two and a half feet square.[3] The series began with the creation and ended with the meeting of Solomon and the queen of Sheba.[4] Although these have been somewhat criticized, yet the fertility of invention exhibited the felicity and clearness with which every story is told, the grace of some of the figures, the simple grandeur of others, the luxuriant form displayed in the ornaments, and the perfection with which the whole is executed, are justly considered as entitling them to the praise bestowed upon them by Michael Angelo, viz: that they "were worthy to be called the gates of Paradise."

There were also others of the same period who distinguished themselves in sculpture. Among these were Donatello, born in 1383, whose performances, in almost every variety of material, are scattered over all Italy, the

---

[1] *Cleghorn*, I, 292. [2] *Pictorial Gallery*, II. 303. [3] *Idem*, 306. [4] *Agincourt*, xli, *of Sculpture*.

best being in Florence.[1] The most of them are in bas-reliefs, and those so little raised above the level of the back ground as to appear, in some respects, more like pictures than sculptures. He also sculptured completely detached statues of which the famous group at Florence, treated after the antique manner, without drapery, has served as a type of so many more recent and less excellent works.[2] He is considered as having been the first to throw off the conventional stiffness of Gothic art, and to idealize the fine forms of nature rather than servilely to copy them. He revived the idealized treatment of natural forms, and in correctness and perfection of finish, is said even to have excelled Michael Angelo. Another great contemporary was Brunelleschi who represents architecture as well as sculpture, and excelled in both.

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries have been termed the infancy of sculpture, during which we find views frequently derived from the antique, as well as a faithful imitation of nature, and just expression.[3] An appearance of restraint and meagreness long pervaded the early labors of sculpture, arising from the want of acknowledged principles of taste or of composition. The plastic art; during this period, was chiefly dedicated to devotion, and to the memory of departed worth. By means of it, the heart is often awakened to deep feeling by unexpected beauties of the sweetest power, arising from a diligent imitation of nature.

The three great contemporary sculptors already mentioned, had their pupils who carried the practice of the art into the fifteenth century. Its cultivation was not confined to Tuscany, but extended also to Bologna, Modena, the whole of Lombardy, Venice, and Naples. Its style and character was more elevated. Down to the close of the century "it was distinguished by general improvement, more than by any marked superiority of individual

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 306. [2] *Ten Centuries of Art*, 44. [3] *Constable's Miscellany*, 97.

genius and manner. It is remarkable for simplicity, chaste fidelity to nature, unaffected composition, sweetness of expression, as well as an acquaintance with the antique;[1] though it is, at the same time, deficient in vigor, freedom, and grandeur, grace, and selection of form. The object was, not so much to produce ideal beauty, as a faithful imitation of individual nature, in which a very high degree of excellence was attained."

The largest proportion of the sculptures wrought during this century continued to be in bronze and relievo. The execution in bronze is assigned as a reason why the style appears in some respects harsh, with an appearance of restraint, and occasionally defective in energy.[2] The design, however, is always chaste, and often extremely elegant. The composition appears judicious, and is seldom contrasted or grouped artificially. "The expression is sweet and calmly dignified, for rarely is strongly marked passion attempted. No decided aims at representation of abstract or ideal beauty can be observed; the powers of fancy are never presumed upon, seldom rounded by remote associations. The mind of the artist, now no longer entirely engrossed in mechanical detail, or confined by difficulties of mere representation, expatiates, selects, combines. If the forms and conceptions are not invested with the sublimity of ideal elevation, the beautiful models of real existence are imitated not unsuccessfully. Were the extent and object of art confined to simple imitation, the aim of the sculptor would now nearly be attained."

One department of sculpture during the fifteenth century[3] attained a perfection which has never since been surpassed, and that is the sculpture of high and low relief, the former as practiced by Donatello, and the latter by Ghiberti, the former in the church of San Lorenzo, representing the most memorable events in the life of the Saviour; the latter on the gates of the baptistery at Florence. The principal source from which sculpture, during this age, drew

[1] *Cleghorn*, I, 293, 294. [2] *Constable's Miscellany*, 98. [3] *Idem*, 99.

best being in Florence.[1] The most of them are in bas-reliefs, and those so little raised above the level of the back ground as to appear, in some respects, more like pictures than sculptures. He also sculptured completely detached statues of which the famous group at Florence, treated after the antique manner, without drapery, has served as a type of so many more recent and less excellent works.[2] He is considered as having been the first to throw off the conventional stiffness of Gothic art, and to idealize the fine forms of nature rather than servilely to copy them. He revived the idealized treatment of natural forms, and in correctness and perfection of finish, is said even to have excelled Michael Angelo. Another great contemporary was Brunelleschi who represents architecture as well as sculpture, and excelled in both.

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries have been termed the infancy of sculpture, during which we find views frequently derived from the antique, as well as a faithful imitation of nature, and just expression.[3] An appearance of restraint and meagreness long pervaded the early labors of sculpture, arising from the want of acknowledged principles of taste or of composition. The plastic art, during this period, was chiefly dedicated to devotion, and to the memory of departed worth. By means of it, the heart is often awakened to deep feeling by unexpected beauties of the sweetest power, arising from a diligent imitation of nature.

The three great contemporary sculptors already mentioned, had their pupils who carried the practice of the art into the fifteenth century. Its cultivation was not confined to Tuscany, but extended also to Bologna, Modena, the whole of Lombardy, Venice, and Naples. Its style and character was more elevated. Down to the close of the century "it was distinguished by general improvement, more than by any marked superiority of individual

---

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 306. [2] *Ten Centuries of Art*, 44. [3] *Constable's Miscellany*, 97.

genius and manner. It is remarkable for simplicity, chaste fidelity to nature, unaffected composition, sweetness of expression, as well as an acquaintance with the antique;[1] though it is, at the same time, deficient in vigor, freedom, and grandeur, grace, and selection of form. The object was, not so much to produce ideal beauty, as a faithful imitation of individual nature, in which a very high degree of excellence was attained."

The largest proportion of the sculptures wrought during this century continued to be in bronze and relievo. The execution in bronze is assigned as a reason why the style appears in some respects harsh, with an appearance of restraint, and occasionally defective in energy.[2] The design, however, is always chaste, and often extremely elegant. The composition appears judicious, and is seldom contrasted or grouped artificially. "The expression is sweet and calmly dignified, for rarely is strongly marked passion attempted. No decided aims at representation of abstract or ideal beauty can be observed; the powers of fancy are never presumed upon, seldom rounded by remote associations. The mind of the artist, now no longer entirely engrossed in mechanical detail, or confined by difficulties of mere representation, expatiates, selects, combines. If the forms and conceptions are not invested with the sublimity of ideal elevation, the beautiful models of real existence are imitated not unsuccessfully. Were the extent and object of art confined to simple imitation, the aim of the sculptor would now nearly be attained."

One department of sculpture during the fifteenth century[3] attained a perfection which has never since been surpassed, and that is the sculpture of high and low relief, the former as practiced by Donatello, and the latter by Ghiberti, the former in the church of San Lorenzo, representing the most memorable events in the life of the Saviour; the latter on the gates of the baptistery at Florence. The principal source from which sculpture, during this age, drew

[1] *Cleghorn*, 1, 293, 294. [2] *Constable's Miscellany*, 98. [3] *Idem*, 99.

its representations, was from scripture, and it is to the influence of deep religious impressions that its improvement is mainly attributable.

The sixteenth century, that saw at its opening such mighty changes occurring in European affairs, witnessed in Italy a state of things highly favorable to the further advancement of art. The progress hitherto made in that of sculpture had inspired a higher and a purer taste. The Italian republics, like the Grecian centuries earlier, by their rivalries and efforts to outdo each other, contributed to advance the arts. Their merchant princes possessed the amplest means for indulgence in these elegant luxuries. In Florence arose the house of Medici by whose efforts the Florentine museum was established, and whose munificent patronage awoke and called into active exercise the dormant powers that might otherwise have forever slumbered in such lofty minds even as that of Michael Angelo. The Roman pontiff, possibly fearing that the spread of knowledge and intelligence might endanger his exercise of power, was inclined to favor the arts, and by their gorgeous display divert the attention from other and more serious considerations. Besides, by deriving from religion the subjects upon which art could exercise all its powers and skill, an union was effected between the two, and thus mutual aid rendered to each other.

With the exception of poetry, sculpture had made the greatest advances since the revival of intelligence. Still there was wanting to its perfection "greater ease and execution,[1] more perfect and elevated expression; more refined selection of form and composition; more of that heightening charm which fancy lends to reality, which constitutes the poetry, not the fiction, of art." The hour had arrived when Italy and the human race demanded a great genius, with powers adequate to combine together everything scattered over the field of art. That genius arose in the person of Michael Angelo. This remarkable

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 100.

man was born of poor parents, near Florence, in the year 1474. The world is indebted to Lorenzo de Medici, termed by some, Lorenzo the Magnificent, for the first nurture and maturing of those tender buds, whose blossoms and fruit were afterwards the wonder of the world. It will be long before the devotees of art will cease to bow before the shrine of Michael Angelo.

In the minds of many he was a great genius self-taught, self-inspired. This is a mistake. Few are more indebted to rigid, severe culture than he. We find him early devoted to every branch of study connected with art. He visited the remains of antiquity, architectural and sculptural, and imbued himself with their spirit. He devoted himself long and arduously to the study of physical and anatomical science, more especially to the latter. His knowledge of muscular development, the contour of the different muscles in a state of repose; the variations produced while in a state of action; the mysteries of movement that go to constitute and vary the expression, was deeper, more profound, more perfect, probably, than that of any other living man. His paintings and sculptures all proclaim that.

Michael Angelo, for more than half a century, was the great leading genius in all the schools of art. In all the arts of design, he was a master. To be convinced of this, we have only to look, in sculpture, upon his Moses; in painting, upon his Last Judgment; and in architecture, to elevate our eyes to the cupola of St. Peter's, a dome so lofty, so capacious, so poised, so hung in the realm of ether, as to suggest the idea of its being upheld and sustained by a hand let down from heaven for that purpose. He stood upon so high a platform, that in him were combined elements so lofty, as to find themselves at home in every art, at least of design; thus affording the amplest proof, that those arts are all kindred to each other; that they progress in converging lines, until, arriving at their utmost reach, they meet and mingle with each other in one blended and inseparable union.

existence.[1] It has been well observed of this statue, that it has no resemblance to the antique, but it rivals the best excellencies of the ancients in expression combined with repose and dignity." Sir Charles Bell traces minutely, the action of the muscles in the figures of this group, and points out how wonderfully they correspond with the actual development which would accompany the attitudes chosen. He adds, "in these statues, great feeling of art and genius of the highest order have been exhibited; anatomical science, ideal beauty, or rather grandeur, combined." Another of his statues, the Moses, is termed the realization of his high conception of the human figure. In his bronze statue of Pope Julius II, he threw into the figure and attitude so much of the haughty and resolute character of the original, that Julius, on seeing the model, inquired of him, whether he intended to represent him as blessing or cursing mankind. Two of the statues intended to compose a part of the monument of Julius II, were carried to France by Cardinal Richelieu, and there the French sculptor, Falconet, who, without having seen, had censured his style, on beholding them exclaimed: "I have seen Michael Angelo, he is terrific."[2]

He seldom attempted subjects of an ancient or classical character. Most of his works related either to Christian subjects or to portraiture of individuals. His works in sculpture are not numerous, and few are even finished. Nor did he like many other artists leave many models or designs for future execution. Few, however, as his sculptures were, they have exercised a mighty influence in the realm of art. His style and manner have elicited the highest commendation and the severest criticism. They have been regarded by many as the standards of perfection. But they were the results of a high disdain to follow in the path of his predecessors, and, in their construction, he overleaped the truth and modesty of nature,[3] as well as the

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 307. [2] *Roscoe's Lorenzo de Medici*, II, 388. [3] *Cleghorn*, I, 295.

principles of the antique, giving loose to his own daring, sublime, and terrible conceptions. "He had marked the perplexities and constraint under which his predecessors had labored, in their endeavors to unite the forms and expressions of living nature with images of ideal beauty, overlooking the productions of classic sculpture, in which this union is so happily accomplished."

The point of divergence at which Michael Angelo differed from all other sculptors was in grasping at expression and endeavoring to bring that, as a controlling element, into sculpture. The ancients had selected form as the principal element of sculptural design. But the great Tuscan preferred expression. He desired to import the painter's art into sculpture. His aim was, by means of the chisel, to enable internal passions and emotions so to proclaim themselves through his stony structures, as to leave unmistakable evidence of the severity of their action in the expression of features and the contortion of muscles. As to the merits of this point of difference the critics generally side with the ancients, maintaining that "passion is inconsistent with the beautiful in form, or the dignified in sentiment;[1] that a sweetly pleasing, a gently agitating excitement, or a nobly repressed feeling, visible only in the resolve of soul, and mastering of sorrow, is the true and the only proper expression in sculpture."

Where expression as well as form is sought to be brought out, a double difficulty is imposed upon the sculptor. In his eagerness to bring out both, and the consequent impossibility of giving his undivided attention to either, it is quite possible that both may suffer. Besides his practice was to cut from a mere sketch or small model, or without any guide whatever. "While the hand, the eye, the mind, were thus in instant exertion; while propriety of expression and beauty of outline, mechanical detail, and general effect, grandeur of the whole, and propriety of parts, were at once to be studied, and that, too, where each stroke removes

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 106.

what never can be again united, imperfection was almost a necessary consequence." Hence undoubtedly arises some of the defects of his style. Among these is the want of proportion sometimes noticed. Then it has been observed that in the salient lines of contours, the circles rarely have their just value, nor the surfaces their proper fullness.[1] To compensate this deficiency in the advancing curves, and also by way of producing an appearance of strong muscular development, the retiring lines, or muscular depressions, are expressed in exaggerated depth. Of his works in sculpture the virgin and dead Saviour, completed in his twenty-fourth year, is called the least exaggerated, and the most natural of all. So also his Bacchus is correct in its forms, while every one of his six figures in the tomb of the Medici "bears the strong impress of a spirit delighting in the great and the wonderful; an imagination eager in the pursuit of untried modes of existence, and a consciousness of power to execute the most daring conceptions. Intelligence in science, breadth of touch, boldness of manner, fearlessness of difficulty, unite to give life and movement to attitudes the most remote from such as nature would voluntarily assume, or graceful design select."

Thus the sixteenth century is enobled by one great name in art; a name that towers far above all others, shedding over the century a halo of glory. He impressed his own peculiar style and manner upon the age. The beauty, and symmetry and loveliness of the antique, even under its own Italian skies, gave way to the stern, original, strongly marked, inflexibly severe, and awfully expressive forms and features, that grew out beneath the chisel of Michael Angelo. No other sculptor appeared during the century who was not either his pupil or imitator. The result of this was the rapid decline of art. His pupils and imitators had neither his knowledge, nor the fire of his genius. They imitated his defects as well as his excellencies. Besides, in imitating him they neither imitated the antique,

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 106, 107.

nor still life, nor living nature; but only both the latter as conceived in the brain of Michael Angelo. The last thirty years of the century was more especially marked by a rapid decline in the art of sculpture. The principles which had been originated and matured by the great Tuscan, could only be upheld and sustained by his genius. That alone could consecrate and conceal their errors. All imitation must degenerate more and more into mere mannerism, in proportion to its more distant removal, both in time and space, from the source of its original inspiration.

One other cause of a deterioration of art was, that a profusion of ornament began to be associated with sculpture, to the neglect of the simpler qualities of design; mouldings, flowers, scrolls, and other objects of minor importance, were allowed to absorb the time and attention, which were really due to matters of much greater magnitude.

The seventeenth century opened with no brilliant prospect for the art of sculpture. The art had hitherto only flourished in Italy, and there had been almost or entirely limited to those free commercial republics, whose activity was so signally manifested in so many departments of life. Over those republics had swept a sad change. The commerce of the world by doubling the cape, had found for itself new channels, and thus left the city of the sea, and the plains of Lombardy, to mourn over their vanished wealth and departed glory. Those republics had also lost their liberty, and with it all their lofty aspirations. They could not, therefore, be expected to vie with each other in the encouragement of art. Besides the sister art of painting had been continually claiming for itself a larger measure of attention, and thus diminishing that which was paid to sculpture. In addition, the art itself, having reached a peculiar style of excellence under Michael Angelo, and no other great genius appearing either to sustain it, we should naturally expect a rapid decline.

The most prominent original sculptor that next succeeded the great Tuscan, was Bernini, who was born at Naples in 1598. His powers of execution were very great, and he also possessed great exuberance of fancy, but no sound judgment or manly taste. Like Michael Angelo he commenced his career early, his much admired groups of Æneas and Anchises, Apollo and Daphne, being produced, the one at the age of fifteen, and the other at eighteen. He thought the antique style too tame, and that of Michael Angelo too severe, and hence desired to invent a new style, steering clear of the defects, and embracing the beauties of both. But he lacked the judgment to select, the skill to combine, and the taste to approve. He gave way to caprice and extravagance, and thus made a further departure from good taste. The school, which he may be said to have founded, sought to produce an effect by flying drapery, striking and affected attitudes, and strength devoid both of nature and science.[1]

Bernini died in 1680, and Camilla Rusconi, a Milanese, during the remainder of the seventeenth, and the early part of the eighteenth century, attracted the most attention as a sculptor. He followed out the principles of his predecessor, but with less genius and talents, and hence the deterioration of taste became more rapid. Thus through defect of principle, and poverty of means, the plastic art continued more and more to languish throughout the Italian peninsula.

The history of sculpture, almost, or entirely, like that of other arts, and even speculative sciences, when critically examined, has its cycles or periods of advance and recession; and those of advance will probably be found to possess characteristics peculiar to themselves; so that in process of time all the possible developments of which the art is susceptible, will be brought out and exhibited in all their fullness of perfection. Thus one cycle found its farthest advance in the works of Michael Angelo; and in them art was found treading with adventurous step on

[1] *Cleghorn*, I, 299.

that extreme limit at which a union of profound knowledge of nature and muscular development, and powers of imagination, active, vivid, and efficient, sought to rescue sculpture from the dominion of form, and to place it under that of attitude, action and expression. It may be well doubted whether the world's history will ever furnish stronger instances of this peculiar phase of art than is exhibited in the works of the great Tuscan. Upon his demise the art of sculpture rapidly declined. There were no shoulders left to sustain the weight of his mantle. It is said that in his very old age, he perceived and lamented the brilliant but fatal errors of his style, and in the few works then finished,[1] a degree of sobriety and chasteness is observed. That he saw and lamented, too late, the fall prepared for sculpture.

This cycle in the history of sculpture was run entirely in Italy. It is not until comparatively quite a modern period that sculpture, as an art, is found flourishing north of the Alps. Even the next cycle it runs in, its advancing history is to be found in Italy. This brings us to the latter part of the eighteenth and the first quarter of the nineteenth century, to the age of Canova.

Antonio Canova was born at Possagno, a village at the foot of the Venetian Alps, on the 1st Nov. 1757. His ancestors, for two generations on the paternal side, were stonecutters. In his fifteenth year he repaired to Venice, and there obtained, through the benevolence of the good fathers, the cloisters of a convent for a work shop. As his mind expanded, he became disgusted with the mannerism and conventional style of the academy, he at length resolved to return to the study of nature, and explore alone those paths which had been followed by the ancients. When not engaged in the practice of his art, he spent his time in dissection and the study of anatomy, in observation made upon living nature, in acquiring languages, and improving himself in literature.

---

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 107.

His first essays were models of animals and various ornaments, some of which he cut in marble. There was then an academy of art in Venice but into it the new light had not yet penetrated. His great study was nature, and his first productions grounded upon such study were his Orpheus and Eurydice at the moment of their separation. This was at the early age of sixteen and seventeen. These shadowed forth the meridian splendor that might be expected from such a dawn. Next in order followed his Dædalus and Icarus, a group which shows a careful study of nature, and an abandonment of the conventional modes of the day. In December, 1780, he went to Rome, and there, in the palace of the embassador, the last mentioned group were exhibited to a number of the most eminent artists, who examined it for some time in wonder and silence. At length Gavin Hamilton,[1] addressing himself to Canova, advised him to endeavor to invest so beautiful and affecting a representation of nature with the grace and ideal of the antique, assuring him that by such a course of study, for which Rome afforded every facility, he would reach an excellence never yet attained by modern sculpture.

This advice, thus timely given, was followed by the young sculptor. His first three years of residence at Rome was devoted to a profound and severe study of the antique, without, however, losing sight of anatomy and living nature. Had Michael Angelo followed the same course, it is not difficult to perceive that his style would have been quite different. As the result of this course of study, Canova became convinced that the style of sculpture, as then practiced, was false and corrupt; and he, therefore, resolved to strike out a new path of his own, which should be founded both on an assiduous study of nature and the true principles of the antique; and that this presented the only means of attaining excellence and originality. By strenuously proceeding in this course he ultimately succeeded in effect-

[1] *Cleghorn*, 1, 302.

ing a complete revolution in taste, and became the great agent on the continent in the establishment of a purer and finer style of sculpture than had previously prevailed.

The life of Canova exhibits an instance of unwearied study and devotion to the practice of a single art. A series of more than two hundred compositions, some merely modeled, some moulded in clay, some cut in soft stone, and many in marble, attest an industry that might well be deemed the labors of a generation. His works have been classed under three general heads:[1]

1. Those in which the subjects were heroic.
2. Compositions of softness and grace.
3. Monumental erections and relievos.

As the two first mentioned require a difference in style and composition, it is hardly possible to expect equal excellence in both. He has been justly styled the sculptor of Venus and the Graces. Here probably lay his greatest excellence. And yet no one can deny that he possesses in the heroic a very superior style of excellence. His Perseus exhibits a manly and vigorous beauty of form; his Pugilists a degree of forceful expression seldom equaled;[2] his Theseus combatting the Centaur is a harmonious and noble composition, while his Ajax, Hector, Paris, Palamedes, all belonging to the grand style in art, may challenge comparison with any works of the modern chisel, in the beauties of sustained effect, learned design, and boldness yet exquisite delicacy of execution. His Hercules and Lycius, in all its circumstances, proclaims the terrible intensity of suffering, and under the chisel of Michael Angelo would undoubtedly have exhibited a horror of expression most frightful to look upon. But under the chisel of Canova the features of the hero god, although distorted by the fierce pain which consumes him, are still made to preserve that dignity of aspect which the great masters have always observed even in depicting the greatest severity of suffering. It is the high tribute which the sculptor pays to mind and power

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 121. [2] *Idem*, 122.

of will, in thus enabling it, by forces peculiarly its own, to control the natural expression which the tortured organs would, of themselves, assume. In the successful accomplishment of this lies, perhaps, the highest office of sculpture.

Under the second head are found the most glowing conceptions of elegance and grace, and these are raised and yet more refined, by the expression of some elevating or endearing sentiment. Here has been generally conceded to lie his greatest excellence; but this is denied by Dr. Memes, who claims that this class is less uniformly dignified and excellent than the first; but he concedes that the Venus Recumbent, the Nymph and Cupid, are superior, as examples of beauty and grace, to any one of masculine character which might be compared with them. The defect he complains of is a want of dignity in the female figures, exhibiting sometimes the meagre and the cold, where grace should be found united with sweetness. "This," he says, "is occasioned by a want of harmony between the just height and roundness of the forms, from an absence of those firm, yet gracious contours, meeting, yet eluding the eye, rounded into life and dissolving in the animated marble, which render, for instance, the Medicean so incomparably superior to the Venus of Canova."[1] The ornate runs through this entire class. But it is accompanied by inimitable ease, and that which indicates a refined taste and cultivated mind. Little is derived immediately and simply from nature. Everything has been determined after much thought and many trials. Art has here acquired that degree of perfection by which it is enabled to conceal itself, and this lends to its creations, the enchantment of nature's own sweetest graces.

Under the third head are included a class consisting of architectural elevations, supporting colossal statues, and of tablets in relievo. As instances of the former we have the tombs of the popes at Rome, of Alfieri at Florence, and

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 123.

of the Archduchess Maria Christina at Vienna. The second, which are quite numerous, are composed of nearly the same simple elements of design, viz: a female figure or a genius, in basso-relievo, mourning over a bust or an urn, yet exhibiting much diversity of character and arrangement.[1] The tomb of the archduchess, and the grand relievo of the d'Haro family mourning over the funeral couch of the deceased daughter and wife, are cited as the choicest illustrations of this class and as equal to anything in the whole compass of art.

From the great multitude and variety of the works of Canova the inquiry very naturally arises, what were the constituents of his genius, and what his rank in the history of his art? One thing that strikes us at once is the universality of his genius. He seems almost equally at home in every province of his art. In each varied exercise, he displays the same judgment and taste, blending into one harmonious and regular effect the outbreakings of those peculiar energies that usually characterize the possession of great powers. This would indicate correctness rather than force. And yet very clear evidence is afforded that his mind was deeply imbued with both fire and enthusiasm. It was in the first place richly stored with materials, and upon those an ever active imagination was constantly at work shaping them into forms of beauty and grandeur, until the marble could be made reluctantly to yield up its contained treasures. And yet he possessed the power of controlling its too prurient suggestions, and of ever bringing to them the chastening influence of the understanding. Energetic and rapid in composition,[2] he was slow and fastidious in his corrections and final determinations. He changed often, and always improved by it. Such a mental constitution was most eminently fitted to correct public taste; a necessity that then the most strongly required the mission of such a genius as Canova. And it is interesting to notice that however vicious the public taste may have

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 124. [2] *Idem*, 125.

become, and however much fantastic exhibitions, and displays of meretricious ornament, may have succeeded in usurping the public mind, yet no sooner do the works and outgrowths of a pure, cultivated, and refined taste make their appearance, than they are immediately recognized, and their authors acknowledged as the true oracles of their art. It is to this great fact that true art must ever owe its success and triumphs in the world.

Canova practiced so thorough a study of the antique, that many of his works remind us of more than casual imitation. But on the other hand some of his uncommonly numerous compositions proclaim great powers of invention, and to them he has applied, not unsuccessfully, the principles he derived from the antique. His claim for preeminence among the moderns rests upon his being the first who established improvement upon genuine and universal precepts of art.[1] The perfection to which he aspired in the ideal is found in the union of the two elements of sculptural design, keeping each in just subordination to beauty. In the antique, it is the form which constitutes the primary, if not the sole thought,[2] that fills the mind of the sculptor. To perfect it in all its varieties, its shades, its fullness of contour, so as by its angularity to present the grand, and by its waving line, the beautiful, was the great object, whose successful accomplishment lay in the minds of the ancient masters. The art of sculpture had run through one cycle of its history, when it had attained to this perfection of form. This was the mission of the ancient masters, and their successful performance of it is recorded in the marbles constituting the antique. Among the moderns this art, as we have already seen, ran through another cycle of its history, and that was to make it the instrument of expression as well as of form, giving to the former greatly the preponderance. This was the mission of Michael Angelo in the sixteenth century. His was a style of composition more purely ideal, and little connected

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 126. [2] *Idem*, 126.

with nature. In its masterly, and terrible execution, "genius hovered on the very confines of credibility and of the impossible, deriving the elements of its creations from imaginings awful and imposing, embodied in forms of gloomy sublimity and power, overwhelming not awakening to the human sympathies. As characteristics of this imaginative style, the proportions are enlarged, the expressions forced, and action and energy are given, destructive of grace and reality.[1] Art is raised to the regions where nature is unknown, and where the very highest exertions of intellect and fancy could hardly sustain interest." It was impossible to retain it there. Its fall was owing to an internal necessity. All that could be pressed into the service of art had worked out in that direction. It ceased from further progress because its energies were exhausted.

The new cycle which commenced running in the history of this art under the auspices of Canova was eclectic in its character. In his figures there is not, as in the antique, so exclusive a devotion to the beauties of form; nor is it made so subservient to action and expression as in the works of Michael Angelo.[2] The expression holds an intermediate character between the unmoved serenity of the ancients, and the strongly marked lineaments of the great Tuscan. In some instances this union is very happily accomplished. It has been remarked as a defect in his development of form, more especially of the female, that there is a meagerness and want of vigor; but his contours are full, flowing, and well sustained. Another remark is, that all his grand parts may be resolved into a primary, and two secondary forms; and as this ternary combination is sweetly yet decidedly marked, blending yet separating its constituent lines, the graceful ease and infinite variety of natural outline is obtained. He adopted and put in practice that principle derived from the old masters of the antique, "that from whatever resources of imagination any figure

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 118. [2] *Idem*, 13.

may be composed, the final surface, all that meets the eye at last, must be finished, and faithfully imitated from individual nature."

There has been remarked one other characteristic which preeminently distinguishes the works of Canova, and that is the exquisite beauty of their composition.[1] "They unite the dexterity and force which constituted the peculiar praise of the masters of the sixteenth century, with a delicacy, a refinement, and truth, exclusively their own." He was the first to introduce the practice of using finished models of the exact dimensions of the work to be executed.[2] He died on the 31st of October, 1822, in the sixty-fifth year of his age.

The history, progress, and development, thus far achieved in European sculpture since the downfall of the Roman empire, although not confined to the Italian peninsula, has, nevertheless, there found its great masters, and run its great cycles. Since the downfall of Greece, Italy has ever been the father-land of sculpture. The ancient sculpture, the antique, has there, by its solemn presence, proclaimed what were the possibilities of the art; what had been accomplished by it in earlier times, and thus made a constant appeal to each successive generation not to be wanting in efforts to contribute to its further progress and development. These appeals we have seen to be successful. In countries north of the Alps, sculpture was long associated with ornamental architecture.

In the latter part of the fifteenth century, Charles VIII, by his invasion of Italy, brought the French mind into contact with the Italian, and its works of art. Francis I, whose reign continued until near the middle of the sixteenth century, had the opportunity to see much of Italy, and had, himself, a strong perception of the beauties of art. He introduced among his subjects, some knowledge of Italian refinement, so that by the middle of the sixteenth century, French sculptors begin to make their appear-

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 127. [2] *Cleghorn*, 1, 307.

ance. The first one of much eminence was Jean Gougon, who is regarded as the restorer of the art in France, as before him no sculpture of French execution had been done since the reign of Charlemagne. All the adornment of churches and monasteries had been done by Italian artists. Gougon flourished about the middle of the sixteenth century. His principal work is Fountain of the Innocents. Little, however, presents itself in France worthy of note, until the last half of the seventeenth century, the reign of Louis XIV, the golden age of refinement in France. Then appear two sculptors: Girardon and Puget. The manner of design of the former, with a degree of hardness,[1] is yet noble; and though cold, is more correct than that of his contemporaries. The style of the latter was somewhat assimilated to that of Michael Angelo. To the schools of these two, and more especially the latter, the succeeding sculptors of France are to be referred. His works, are, in many respects, superior to his Italian rivals, Bernini and Algardi.[2] Among these are his celebrated Caryatides, which support the great balcony of the Town Hall at Toulon. These are magnificent of their kind, and the vigor with which they are conceived and executed, earned for their author the title of the French Michael Angelo. Another celebrated work of this sculptor, is his Milo of Crotona, who, while attempting to split a tree, had one hand caught fast, and, at the same time, a lion attacks him in the rear. This has been criticized as attempting too much for sculpture. The aim was to represent two simultaneous actions;[3] the one hand being engaged in attempting to free itself from the tree, while the other is repelling the lion. The critic complains that the whole statue is not, as it should be, in a state of tension; but that while the arms and upper part of the body exhibit but little tension, the lower extremities, the thighs, knees, muscles of the calf, and feet, exhibit a great deal of it. That thus "in the head and arms there is

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 110. [2] *Ten Centuries of Art*, 46. [3] *Guizot*, 16, 17.

more suffering than resistance; in the lower extremities, more resistance than suffering."

During the seventeenth century many equestrian statues of great excellence were executed in France.[1] Among these the Horses of Marly are perhaps the most celebrated. In the beginning of the eighteenth century, there were indications of decay in the French school of sculpture, and the last names connected with the art,[2] previous to the revolution, are those of Bouchardon and Pigal, whose chief merit consists in expert execution. The style is trivial, and the flutter of the draperies greatly exaggerated.

The French revolution exerted a depressing influence upon this art. It might well fly from the reign of terror. It could find nothing congenial in the stormy debate, or the ferocious mob, or the descending guillotine. Since the restoration of social order no sculptor has arisen of more celebrity than Jean David of Angers, who was born in 1792, and became to France what Canova was to Italy. He enjoyed for some time the benefit of Canova's instruction, and at the same time the opportunity of studying the antique. He afterwards prosecuted his studies in London, availing himself of the opportunity there presented of studying the Elgin marbles. His works are very numerous. Among the principal of these, is the statue of the great Condé[3] representing the hero at the moment of hurling his commander's staff into the enemy's redoubt, to rush forward at the head of his troops and recover it. Another is Gutenberg's monument in Strasburg, a colossal figure executed in bronze, his physiognomy exhibiting deep folds and furrows, holding in his hand a proof sheet, on which were words printed, meaning "and there was light." He manifested a great fondness for portraits, and in this line, as also in that of bas-relief, he has furnished the finest specimens of his talent. The bust of Alexander Von Hum-

[1] *Ten Centuries of Art*, 46. [2] *Idem*, 46. [3] *Iconographic Encyclopædia*, IV, 59.

bolt is accounted a perfect likeness, and his two busts of Goethe and Tieck, are much celebrated.

His style was not formed from a pure imitation of the antique, but embraced also an imitation of nature, and a free expression of his ideas.[1] He was opposed to the baldness and severity of the antique, and practiced a style of sculpture which was effective and powerful, and hence eminently adapted to the colossal. At the same time it is very different from the prevailing mode of treating clay and marble, especially in Germany, giving him liberty to exercise a warmth of inspiration and bold sweep of the hand with which he embodies his ideas.

There is also among French sculptors a lady artist of celebrity. This was the Duchess Marie of Orleans, a daughter of Louis Philippe, late king of the French. She lived to be only twenty-six years of age, but developed a great talent for sculpture. Her principal works are the Maid of Orleans, which stands in Versailles, and a beautiful angel of white marble, which stands in the chapel of Sablonville,[2] on the sarcophagus of her brother, the Duke of Orleans. Her productions are equally remarkable for the spirit of their conception and the beauty of their execution.

The German mind was slow in accomplishing much in the plastic art. Its early efforts betray no traces of the study of the antique.[3] Prior to the seventeenth century, it accomplished nothing worthy of notice in a general history of sculpture. Its constitution has always better fitted it for sounding the depths of the philosophy of sculpture, than of excelling in the practice of it as an art, and yet that very constitution may ensure, in the end, the greatest degree of advancement, although it may be the slowest in its progress. All its processes, under the guidance of a critical philosophic spirit, become surer in their aims, and more certain of accomplishing their purposes, the more fully the longer they are continued in operation.

[1] *Iconographic Encyclopædia*, iv. 60. [2] *Idem*, 60. [3] *Constable's Miscellany*, 117.

In the last half of the eighteenth century appear several German sculptors of eminence. Among these, Schadow is reckoned the father of sculpture in northern Germany, and Dannecker in southern. The works of the former, which are quite numerous, are distinguished by great truth to nature and vigorous conception.[1] Among them are the monument of Count Von der Mark in the church of Saint Sophia in Berlin, and that of Frederick the Great in model of the beautiful quadriga over the Brandenburg Stettin; also the statue of Duke Leopold of Dessau, and the gate in Berlin. The works of Dannecker breathe more the spirit of the antique. His works are more of characters derived from the antique. They consist of statues of Ceres and Bacchus, which procured for him admission into the academies of Bologna and Milan. His Ariadne is also much celebrated. Besides these were his colossal Christ, and his Amor and Psyche, both in England. Another celebrated German sculptor of a little later period was Tieck, the brother of a poet of the same name, who was the pupil of the elder or old Schadow so called. Like the French David he excelled in portraits, and very many of the busts of celebrated Germans, which grace the Valhalla at Ratisbon are the productions of his chisel.

Another whose works are estimated as having greatly advanced the plastic art in Germany is Christian Rauch, whose works are all included within the present century. He was the first German sculptor, who after a lapse of two and a half centuries, attempted to revive the taste of the middle ages,[2] as manifested in the works of Albert Durer. He revived the old German style of Fischer, improving and adapting it to the present state and intellectual progress of society. He seemed to combine a true conception of nature with a very refined study of the antique in the design and execution of his works.[3] He executed a statue of the late queen of Prussia, two colossal busts of Blucher in bronze, besides many busts and monumental statues to

[1] *Iconographic Encyclopædia*, 61. [2] *Cleghorn*, 314. [3] *Iconographie*, 63.

field marshals, generals, etc., He has so modified the forms of military dress as not to offend the æsthetic feeling in its demand for drapery of a free, unconstrained, picturesque character. A recent work of his is a colossal equestrian statue of Frederick the Great at the entrance of the Linden in Berlin, and one of the grandest monuments of modern times.

Schwanthaler is another recent German sculptor of great celebrity. He was a pupil of the celebrated Thorwaldsen, who influenced considerably his style. He has executed a large portion of the sculptural decorations of Munich,[1] including those of the Valhalla. Every public edifice in the German capitals is more or less enriched with works of sculpture, thus giving a more extended encouragement, and a more ample scope for its production.

The German mind is by no means ill adapted to the appreciation of art. The German artists are generally men of liberal and refined culture, possessing retired habits, enthusiastic temperament, and great elevation of mind. This has been, no doubt, influenced by the flourishing state of classical learning, and the great attention paid to philosophy, poetry, and music. The higher arts all lend their mutual aids to each other. They are each and all only so many outgrowths of the same æsthetic nature. One result of this is that art is there cultivated less for worldly gain, or even fame, than for its own sake, as a noble, intellectual, and national object. The fine arts in Germany have been truly appreciated,[2] and highly honored. More especially within the last half century the kings of Bavaria and Prussia have extended their enlightened patronage to sculpture and painting, and thus caused these arts to be pursued with enthusiasm and success. The great national structures of Munich and Berlin, their sculptural and pictorial decorations, the restoration of fresco and the ancient encaustic, the formation of splendid galleries of pictures and antique marbles, have all con-

[1] *Cleghorn*, 315. [2] *Idem*, 313, 314.

tributed to give an extraordinary impulse to the higher departments of art.

In turning our attention towards the north of Europe, we find one great name eclipsing every other, viz: that of Thorwaldsen the Dane, born in 1770. From his early childhood he busied himself with the art of sculpture. When twenty-six years of age he visited Rome, and there, after much study of the antique, he modeled his statue of Jason, which in despair of encouragement, he was about to break in pieces, when its execution in marble was ordered by the late Mr. Hope, the English banker. On its completion its great beauty established his reputation as a master, and his subsequent success was certain. His professional career extended over nearly half a century, and was marked by a great number of works, statues, groups, relievi, and busts, all of them the result of his fertile genius and imagination, and of his unceasing ardor and perseverance. One of his great works was the Procession of Alexander, designed in honor of Napoleon, and executed in marble for the villa Sommariva on the lake of Como. In this he shows much penetration into the spirit of the antique. Its subject is the entry of Alexander into Babylon. Besides this his principal works are Venus Victrix with the apple of Eris, the Three Graces, the Apollo, a beautiful relief of Achilles and Briseis, two celebrated reliefs of Night and Morning. Of subjects taken from the Christian religion we have the colossal Christ, the Twelve Apostles, the Angel of Baptism, Christ's procession to Golgotha, and other bas-reliefs in the cathedral of Copenhagen, one remarkable group of which represents St. John the Baptist preaching in the desert, another Christ bearing the cross, another the four great prophets, and around the altar the twelve apostles with the Redeemer ascending in the midst. So also we have his colossal Swiss Lion cut out of a mass of rock near Berne, between sixty and eighty feet in height, and the Poniatowski and Gutenberg monuments.

Thorwaldsen was the contemporary of Canova, and in the qualities of power and energy, forms a decided contrast

to the style of the latter. Canova represents the type of the effeminate and voluptuous region of Italy, while the other embodies the more stern and rugged character of Scandinavia. The general character of his works will perhaps approximate him nearer to Michael Angelo than Canova. His merits and defects are thus summed up by an able critic: "His character and powers are doubtless of a very elevated rank;[1] but neither in the extent nor excellence of his works do we apprehend his station to be so high as sometimes placed. The genius of the Danish sculptor is forcible, yet is its energy derived more from peculiarity than from real excellence. His ideal springs less from imitation of the antique, or of nature, than from the workings of his own individual mind. It is the creation of a fancy seeking forcible effect in singular combinations, rather than in general principles, and therefore hardly fitted to excite lasting or beneficial influence upon the age. Simplicity and imposing expression seem to have hitherto formed the principal objects of his pursuit; but the distinction between the simple and rude, the powerful and the exaggerated, is not always observed in the labors of the Dane. His simplicity is sometimes without grace; the impressive—austere, and without due refinement. The air and contours of his heads, except, as in the Mercury, an excellent example both of the beauties and defects of the artist's style, when immediately derived from antiquity, though grand and vigorous, seldom harmonize in the principles of these efforts with the majestic regularity of general nature. The forms, again, are not unfrequently poor, without vigorous rendering of the parts, and destitute at times of their just roundness. These defects may, in some measure, have arisen from the early and more frequent practice of the artist in relievos. In this department, Thorwaldsen is unexceptionably to be admired. The Triumph of Alexander, originally intended for the frieze of the government palace at Milan, notwithstanding an

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 128, 129.

occasional poverty in the materials of thought, is, as a whole, one of the grandest compositions in the world; while the delicacy of execution, and poetic feeling, in the two exquisite pieces of Night and Aurora, leave scarcely a wish here ungratified. But in statues, Thorwaldsen excels only where the forms and sentiment admit of uncontrolled imagination, or in which no immediate recourse can be had to fixed standards of taste, and to the simple effects of nature. Hence, of all his works, as admitting of unconfined expression, and grand peculiarity of composition, the statues of the apostles, considered in themselves, are the most excellent. Thorwaldsen, in fine, possesses singular, but in some respects erratic genius. His ideas of composition are irregular; his powers of fancy surpass those of execution; his conceptions seem to lose a portion of their value and freshness in the art of realizement. As an individual artist, he will command deservedly a high rank among the names that shall go down to posterity. As a sculptor, who will influence, or has extended the principles of the art, his pretensions are not great; or, should this influence and these claims not be thus limited, the standard of genuine and universal excellence must be depreciated in a like degree."

Works of sculpture were early introduced into England. They came with the Roman eagles. The Romans overspread the southern part of the island with temples, baths, and public buildings, decorating them with a profusion of statues both in marble and bronze. Thus the Britons had an early introduction to these arts, and retained them long after the departure of the Romans. But they were subsequently all destroyed by the Picts and Scots, and the Saxons, and probably left little, if any, influence upon the mind and character of the subsequent dwellers in Britain.[1] The art of the Saxon was of the rudest kind, consisting in carving images of their gods in wood and stone. The early introduction of Christianity in the beginning of the seventh

[1] *Cleghorn*, 315.

century destroyed all traces of this art. This was followed by the introduction of Christian art, at first foreign, but later of domestic production. The first introduced was the rudest style of painting. The earliest sculpture was the monumental sepulchral, which was first introduced at the Norman conquest. The figures of the deceased were generally cut in low relief on the gravestones. The cloisters of Westminster Abbey furnishes some instances of this early sculpture.

The Crusaders on their return from the east endeavored to introduce the arts and magnificence they had witnessed. They began to decorate the architecture with foliage, and to introduce statues against the columns. So successful were these efforts, that the early reign of Henry III is remarkable for the improvement of architectural sculpture. In the cathedral of Wells, rebuilt by bishop Joceline in the beginning of the thirteenth century, there is a great variety of sculpture consisting both of statues and relievi embracing subjects from the holy scriptures, such as the creation, the acts of the apostles, the life of the Saviour, etc., all executed in a style of great skill and truth for that early period. From the fact that the tombs of Edward the Confessor and Henry III, which were executed by Italian artists, are different both in style and architecture, it is supposed that these early sculptures were executed by English artists.

Much of the early sculpture in England was, no doubt, the work of foreigners. As early as the middle of the fourteenth century confraternities of itinerant artists existed in Italy,[1] the members of which were seeking employment in foreign countries. Besides, the style of many of the early sculptures in England betrays their Italian origin. This is more especially the case with those beautiful monuments of Eleanor, the queen of Edward I, which partake largely of the character and grace particularly cultivated in the school of Nicolo Pisano. So also in these and other

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 180.

English works are decidedly apparent the improvements introduced by Giovanni da Pisa, son of Nicolo, in the drapery. While the decorated style of architecture prevailed in England during the reign of Edward III, sculptured statues were used to a considerable extent as architectonic embellishments. Sacred sculpture was also cultivated with much ardor and success. Examples of this are found in the key-stones of the Lady chapel of Norwich Cathedral in alto-relievo, from the life of the virgin, particularly those of the cloisters, one hundred and fifty in number, embodying subjects from the Old and New Testaments.

The reign of Henry VI was productive of many monumental statues of great interest. The figures are remarkably natural and graceful, and are considered by Flaxman equal to anything which the Italian artists of the same age could have produced.

The chapel of Henry VII, attached to Westminster Abbey, presents the greatest work of sculpture of that reign, if not of that age. The statues belonging to it number about three thousand. Many of them are now destroyed. They were the work of Touigiano, the Italian artist. Henry VIII, in the fierce warfare waged by him against the monasteries and religious establishments, caused much destruction of works of art both of painting and sculpture. He regarded both as idolatrous in character. The same system was continued under Edward VI.

Sculpture seems never to have been practiced as a separate branch in the early history of Scotland. Her masters appear to have been derived from France, not Italy. The art of carving in wood, associated with Gothic architecture, seems to have reached considerable excellence. This is evidenced by the Stirling Heads, which decorated the roof of the presence chamber of the palace at Stirling Castle.

In the reign of Charles II, we have the name of Grinling Gibbons, who is accounted by some as commencing the English native school of sculpture. He excelled the most as a carver in wood. It is asserted that there is no instance

before him of a man "who gave to wood the loose and airy lightness of flowers, and chained together the various productions of the elements with a free disorder natural to each species."[1] Under his operations birds seemed to live, foliage to shoot, and flowers to expand.

From the fall of the Gothic sculpture to near the middle of the eighteenth century, the plastic art in England, with very few exceptions, was exercised exclusively by foreigners. Cibber, Roubilac, Schumacher, Carlina, Locatelli, Rysbrac, all foreigners, flourished in England during the greater part of the eighteenth century.

The commencement of commemorating British worth by British art, dates from the birth of Banks in 1738. Few have excelled him in power of modelling, and he is mentioned by foreign writers as among the very few at Rome, who, previous to the appearance of Canova, presented in their works the dawnings of reviving art. He established several points of improvement afterwards more fully worked out by Flaxman.

Contemporary with Banks was Nollekens, inferior as a sculptor of classical composition, but superior in the making of busts. His marble portraiture maintained a long rivalry with the canvas of Sir Joshua Reynolds. His treatment of heads is peculiarly his own, and yet entirely free from mannerism. His reputation rests upon his busts.

Another contemporary was Bacon, in every respect an English artist. In simplicity, his works have great merit, and he was not unacquainted with the literature of his art.

The greatest of English sculptors is John Flaxman, a name which is the same to England as that of Canova to Italy, and Thorwaldsen to Scandinavia. He belongs to posterity, and has more widely extended the influence of his genius, more intimately connected his labors with general improvement, than any other English sculptor. To his genius, fine taste, and classical conceptions, England unquestionably owes the regeneration of sculpture.

---

[1] *Pictorial Gallery*, II. 314.

His fame, however, rests more upon his illustrations, designs and models, than his works in marble, which are often deficient both in invention and execution. In 1787, at the age of thirty, he went to Rome, where he remained until 1794. It has been thought that had he remained in Rome he would have rivaled his great contemporary, Canova. "From his youth, Flaxman was distinguished by the strength of his genius, by devotion to the study of the ancient models, and by fearless, but judicious disregard of those conventional affectations by which art was disgraced. He was among the first, if not the earliest, to awaken the long dormant energies of sculpture, to unite a new art with nature. The simple and the grand of antiquity he made his own; nor, since the best ages of Greece, do we anywhere find greater meaning, more deep feeling of truth, with less pomp of art, than in the sculpture of Flaxman. The wonderful designs from Homer, the statues of Mr. Pitt and Sir Joshua Reynolds, the monuments of Montague, Howe, and Nelson, the group of Michael and Satan,[1] will alone fully justify this character. If, in the works of this master, a defect may be pointed out, it is an excess of the severe and simple, which nearly approaches to harshness. Surpassing both Canova and Thorwaldsen in the loftiness of his conceptions, and perhaps in classic purity of taste, in the graces of composition, and the facilities of modeling, he is inferior to the former. But in all that constitutes the epic of the art, Flaxman is not surpassed. To Flaxman our obligations are very great, since as far as our acquaintance with his works extends, they served nobly to elevate from a certain monotonous lethargy, and to create afresh that taste for the severe and golden style of antiquity, which he applied to his own inventions."

Another English sculptor who died in 1841, was Sir Francis Chantrey, who, in many respects, presented a contrast to Flaxman. He effected but little in the poetical, the religious, and the classical,[2] three departments which

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, 133, 134. [2] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 818.

Flaxman cultivated with so much success. His great strength lay in chiseling the marble into the semblances of living forms. He expended over twenty years upon statues and busts. "To represent the living man without affectation and without disguise; to dignify the action and bearing, and to impress the mind upon the countenance; these powers, aided by a skill in execution, which invests the marble with the texture of flesh, constitute the excellence of Chantrey."

Macdowell is a sculptor of much celebrity. His heads are ideal, and yet there is about them a seeming reality belonging to the present age, and to the Anglo-Saxon race. The inquiry may very well arise as to what may be considered the highest aim of the plastic art as to form and expression, in sculpture busts. There can be no real excellence in any art without idealism.[1] But what shall lay at the foundation? What is it that must be idealized? Not other times, or other forms of civilization, or extinct peculiarities of race. But present times, existing forms of civilization, and races that are now running their courses of activity. All sculpture should reflect the living forms of its own age. The individuality that is brought out should be subjective, not objective. It should proceed from the special mode of idealizing, belonging to each sculptor, and not from mere copies of individual nature.

Macdowell, it is claimed, acts upon these principles. His Eve is cited as an illustration. The features are not those of any individual woman. If they were, they would contain the defects, as well as the beauties. They are not an embodiment of the style of beauty which characterizes the antique. That was brought out and fully displayed, under the chisel of the Grecian sculptors. It has performed its part in the role of sculptural art. It is now for other races, and other forms of civilization, to become idealized under the chisel of modern sculptors. The world of art is rapidly waking up to this great idea. Its

[1] *Ten Centuries of Art*. 51.

creations in marble, are not, in the future, to be limited to the mere portraiture of individuals. They are not to be servile imitations of the antique. They are not to reflect the forms of past races and civilizations. Their embodiments are to present the history, the poetry, the eloquence, the religion, the industry, all that goes to constitute the life of present races in the enactment of new forms of civilization which they are continually unfolding. It is thus we are to see great thoughts embalmed in marble. It is thus the sculptors of each successive age and century, are to idealize the forms of their own times, and to send them down as their visiting cards to posterity. And so, as time continues its march, and centuries run their cycles, each will open up more and more perfectly, the idealized embodiments of its own forms and ideas, thus presenting a continuous history of races and civilizations, written in marble. If a trust so noble and mighty is confided to sculpture it may, perhaps, well claim to rank as the highest and purest of the arts.

PAINTING.

The painter's art has a history more deeply interesting than even that of sculpture. It affords means, opportunities, and facilities for reflecting the civilizations of races, as they successively appear in the world's history, much beyond those offered by the plastic art. We have already had occasion to call attention to the principal points of difference between these two sister arts.

Painting, as an European art, has been either in tempera, in fresco, or in oil. The first is so called because the colors are tempered with some glutinous substance,[1] as the yolk of eggs, milk, gums, etc., to such a consistence that

[1] *Art Studies*, 106.

they become easy of application and adherence. The viscid mediums were made diluent with wine, the juice of the fig tree, or vinegar and oil. The ingredients properly mixed gave a firm surface to the painting. Where the colors were prepared with wax subjected to heat, the encaustic process, derived from antiquity by the Byzantine painters, the effect was very permanent. The effects of time and atmosphere were alike resisted, and great depth and richness of colors given. Its employment gives great precision of outline, gemlike hues, and intense, full light.

Painting in fresco is executed upon the last coat which the plasterer puts on when finishing a room, while it is freshly laid and still wet. This coat is usually composed of finely sifted river sand and lime mixed in certain proportions. The character and durability of fresco is owing to the tendency of lime, when thus used, to imbibe water and harden. The colors being ground in water and mixed with lime, when applied to this absorbent surface, become incorporated with the lime water and sand of the plaster, and when dry are not again dissolvable by water. Thus the basis of fresco and the colors become inseparable and harder than stone. One of the difficulties presented is found in the rapidity with which this coat of plaster dries. Only so much of the plaster must be laid on as the painter can cover and complete as a portion of a picture in one day. This renders joinings unavoidable, and requires the exercise of considerable ingenuity to conceal them. The fresco painter is limited to natural colors, or earths sober in hue, which light and lime will not deteriorate. He has not, therefore, the same compass of depth, transparency, fusion, gradation, and force of shadow as the oil painter. But to compensate for this, he has more breadth of execution, brilliancy of light, and largeness or scope for composition.

The earliest modern paintings were in tempera and fresco. That in oil is of more modern discovery. The origin of it is not settled. Some claim it of Italian origin, and its earliest use appears to have been in Italy. But the Italian painters were much given to fresco, while in the Nether-

lands that style of painting was very little followed on account of the climate. Whatever might have been its origin, it is certain that the perfecting and introducing it into general use is due mainly to John Van Eyck, a Flemish painter, at the very commencement of the fifteenth century. His chemical knowledge enabled him to discover a varnish with which he covered his pictures in water colors, thus giving them more brilliancy and strength. But this would sometimes crack upon drying. He then made another varnish out of nut and linseed oil, and resinous ingredients, which was itself nearly colorless, and of a consistence allowing the most delicate execution. With this the colors easily mingled. The greater transparency, luminousness, and richness of oil painting, "its magical illusions of light and shade, the mysterious melting of form into colors," the greater capacity it offers for imitation, and more manageable tones, led ultimately to its more general adoption everywhere.

The different kinds or varieties of painting employ, with a view to their perfection, the processes of invention, composition, expression, color and chiaroscuro. It is invention that discovers, selects, and combines the possible, the probable, the known, in a mode that strikes at once with an air of truth and novelty. Its realm is the visible universe made known to us through the channel of sense; and the invisible one, its counterpart, in which the visions of sense are subordinated to a higher power, that of the fancy or imagination. A question has been raised whether a painter can find or combine a subject from himself, without any recourse to tradition, to history, or to poetry. This is answered in the affirmative, provided it to be within the limits of his art, and the combinations of nature, although it might have escaped observation. Some have possessed a very remarkable power of flashing their intuition into the sudden movements of nature, and of seizing its pure emanations, whether arising from the conflict of passion, the lovelier round of gentle emotion, or the almost silent hints of mind and character.

Invention is much indebted to poetry and authenticated tradition for its subjects. There is what is styled the epic painter, whose aim is the production of astonishment by strongly impressing upon the mind one general idea, one great quality or mode of society, or one great maxim, without descending into any of those minute details or subdivisions which, by dividing and distracting the attention, inevitably weaken the general result. With such a painter the visible agents he employs are only engines to force upon the mind and fancy one irresistible idea. Invention here arranges a plan by general ideas; and the selection of the most prominent features of nature, or favorable modes of society, or strong beings from the realm of fancy, serve visibly to substantiate some great maxim. The employment of mere history for its basis, and keeping within its limits, would operate to dwarf the epic character. It is rather in the regions of mythology, in the undefined conceptions that belong to the supernatural, that it finds both its appropriate home, and objects. It there revels in all the greatness and vastness of its own mighty conceptions. Probably the strongest instance of this is to be found in the fresco of the Last Judgment in the Cistine chapel by Michael Angelo.

There is also the dramatic painter, whose powers of invention are tasked rather to move than to astonish. He finds his realm and subjects within the real world. He meets pure history, but is unwilling to recognize it as such. The change he effects in it is by elevating, invigorating and impressing the pregnant moment of a real fact with character and pathos. This is best illustrated in the cartoons of Raphael.

There is still the historic painter, who follows next upon the dramatic. His business is neither to move nor to astonish, but simply to inform. All mere fiction now ceases, and invention consists only in selecting and fixing with dignity, precision, and sentiment, the moments of reality. Its first great aim is to administer to truth while the exhibition of character in the conflict of passions with

the rights, the rules, the prejudices of society, is the legitimate sphere of dramatic invention.

One test of the sufficiency and merit of a painting as a work of art is that it constitutes one whole; that it be independent; that it pronounce its own meaning, and tell its own story.[1] In order to enlarge the range of subjects, invention introduces a cyclus, or series, to tell the most important moments of a long story, its beginning, its middle and its end. Thus the whole story becomes known by dwelling on the firm basis of it, on its most important and significant moments, or its principal actors.

The series of subjects presenting themselves to the pencil of the painter, and in relation to which his invention may properly be tasked, are the following. The first subjects are only a single remove above the scenes of vulgar life, of animals, and common landscape, the simple representation of action purely human.[2] Their effect is immediate, and they require no explanation.

The next step brings us to historic subjects, either singly or in a series. Beyond these lie the delineation of character, which introduces us into the realm of the dramatic; and above these, the highest in the ascending scale, lies the epic with its mythologic, allegoric, and symbolic branches. There is also portrait painting, which is said to bear the same relation to historic painting in art, that physiognomy does to pathognomy in science.[3] While the former shows the character and powers of the being which it delineates, both in its formation and at rest, the latter shows them in actual exercise.

Composition superintends the disposition of those materials to which invention has given birth. It has both physical and moral elements. The chief of these are unity, propriety, perspicuity and perspective, light and shade. By virtue of the first such an arrangement and reciprocal relation of these materials is effected as to constitute them so many

[1] *Fuseli*, II, 190. [2] *Idem*, 192. [3] *Idem*, 171.

essential parts of a whole. Its elements are: 1. Unity of purpose, as having relation to the mind of the artist. 2. In relation to the parts, there is necessarily variety as expressed in diversity of shape, quantity and line; the latter term signifying the course, or medium through, which the eye is led from one part of the picture to another.[1] 3. Continuity, such as is carried out and expressed by the connection of parts with each other, and their relation to the whole. 4. Harmony of the several parts, or the essential agreement of one part with another, and of each part with the whole.

But while unity enables it to span its subject,[2] propriety is also necessary in order that it may properly tell its story; while perspicuity is equally essential in banishing everything tending to disturbance and confusion. I cannot better or more vividly describe the effects of light and shade than by adopting the words of another: "The charmed eye glides into the scene: a soft, undulating light leads its on,[3] from bank to bank, from shrub to shrub; now leaping and sparkling over pebbly brooks and sunny sands; now fainter and fainter, dying away down shady slopes, then seemingly quenched in some secluded dell; yet only for a moment, for a dimmer ray again carries it onward, gently winding among the boles of trees and rambling vines, that, skirting the ascent, seem to hem in the twilight; then emerging into day, it flashes in sheets over towers and towns, and woods and streams, when it finally dips into an ocean, so far off, so twin-like with the sky, that the doubtful horizon, unmarked by a line, leaves no point of rest: and now, as in a flickering arch, the fascinated eye seems to sail upward like a bird, wheeling its flight through a mottled labyrinth of clouds, on to the zenith; whence gently inflected by some shadowy mass, it slants again downward to a mass still deeper and still to another, and another, until it falls into the darkness of some massive tree, focused like midnight in the brightest noon;

[1] *Alston*, 143. [2] *Fuseli*, II. 339. [3] *Alston*, 158.

there stops the eye, instinctively closing, and giving place to the soul, there to repose and dream her dreams of romance and love."

The term chiaroscuro is adopted both to express the division of a single object into light and shade, and also the distribution of light and shade over an entire composition. The term is of Italian derivation, and its use is employed to give substance to form, place to figure, and create space. It is one of the great agents, probably the greatest, that enables the painter to throw over all the varieties and diversities of his composition the bond and charm of a single unbroken unity.

Legitimate chiaroscuro is different from mere natural light and shade. The latter is given or withheld indiscriminately, every object having what its place and position entitles it to receive. By means of the former, they are at the command of the artist, and by fixing a centre, he can distribute them according to the more or less important claims of the subject. He can thus exercise a species of creative power, and radiate his principal mass of light from a central point, or wind it in undulating shapes, or dart it in decided beams from the extremities. He can make it emanate from a single source, or borrow additional effect from subordinate ones. He can compel it to mount like flame, or descend in lightning.[1] Emerging from a dark or luminous medium, he can dash it in stern tones of terror on the eye; or stealing stealthily through the twilight, he can immerse it in impenetrable gloom, or make it gradually vanish in voluptuous repose. It is thus that in painting a vessel in a tempest you are made to hear the howling blast, to see the grasp and fiery exertion of the sailors, to mark the lightning that bursts from the clouds, to look upon the oars bent by the flood, and the flood broke by the oars,[2] and dashed to spray by the sinews of the rowers, until, to your own terror stricken mind, the very canvas itself is made to tremble.

[1] *Fuseli*, II, 279. [2] *Idem*, 291.

The full effect of chiaroscuro is accomplished far less by brilliancy than by unison of color. The following is a statement of one of its laws: "A sovereign tone must pervade the whole,[1] which, though arbitrary and dependent on choice, decides all subordinate ones; as the tone of the first instrument in a regular concert tunes all the rest." Another law is that whatever tone of light is chosen, the shade designed to set it off is only its absence, and is not a positive color; and both are to be harmonized by demi-tints composed of both. It is thus that the central radiance is to be modified and softened by its counterpart, purity of shade, and the coalescence of both through impercetible demi-tints.

The discovery of Chiaroscuro as a distinct and all important agent in the painter's art appears due to Leonardo da Vinci,[2] about two hundred years after the resurrection of art in Italy. Since that period it has performed an essential part in the different schools of painting.

The painter's art may be said, perhaps, to commence with design, the term being limited to the drawing of the figures and component parts of the subject. This is necessarily involved in the representation of form, or figure. The existence of all form is given, subject to one condition, that of the outline within which it is included. It is here, therefore, we are to find the seat of corporeal beauty. Form is its legitimate vehicle, and hence design is a necessary element of art.

Design has two elements, viz: correctness and style, the opposites of which are incorrectness and manner. It also embraces both copy and imitation. For the former, is required an eye geometrically just, and a hand steady and implicitly obedient. But there is nothing of choice or selection embraced in it. Imitation involves the necessity of choosing, and is the more perfect when the choice is directed by judgment and taste. It is, therefore, the latter that presents us with those elements that compose the

[1] *Fuseli*, II, 279. [2] *Idem*, 281.

artist. As regards the former it is fidelity of eye and obedience of hand that form precision,[1] while precision gives proportion, proportion symmetry, and symmetry beauty. The line and the proportions of the ancients, it is said, have never been reached by the moderns. It is probable that the full and perfect development of physical nature in Greece has never yet been exceeded, and hence no greater or higher perfection of outline has ever presented to the human eye. It is, therefore, that now the artist is compelled to make the antique the basis of his studies, because in the doing of that he reaches the sources of form.

While correctness applies to copy, style more regards imitation. It pervades and consults the subject and coordinates its means to its demands. It manifests itself in a power of selecting and combining together such parts and proportions as will be productive of the most harmonious result.

Besides accuracy of drawing, whether in copy or imitation, thus arriving at perfection of outline, the coloring enters largely as an element into the painter's art. The painter seeks to reach the intellect and heart through the senses. The first impression, therefore, must be made upon the latter. To do this, form and color are important agents. "To color" says an eloquent writer, "when its bland purity tinges the face of innocence and sprouting life,[2] or its magic charm traces in imperceptible transitions the forms of beauty; when its warm and ensanguined vigor stamps the vivid principle that animates full grown youth and the powerful frame of manhood, or in paler gradations marks animal decline; when its varieties give truth with character to individual imitation, or its more comprehensive tone pervades the scenes of sublimity and expression, and dictates the medium in which they ought to move, to strike our eye in harmony; to color, the florid attendant of form, the minister of the passions, the herald of energy and character, what eye, not tinged by disease or deserted by nature refuses homage?"

[1] *Fuseli*, II, 311, 312. [2] *Idem*, 334.

The gradations of color are infinite, but they all lie between the two extremes of light and shade.[1] From the point of light in all directions the existent parts advance or recede, by, before, behind each other; the two extremes of light and shade making a whole, which the local or essential color defines; rounding by its coalition with the demi-tint the shade and the reflexes, and tuning by the corresponding of each color with all the others.

It seems to be an admitted law, that one color has a greater power than a combination of two, and that a mixture of three impairs that power still more. Again, color has two essential parts, imitation and style.[2] Its history is peculiar, commencing its mission in glaze, being caught by deception, eliminated or emerging to imitation, and finished by style.

In the infancy of taste, the first feature is glaze. The paint as deeply colored as possible, is spread over a surface unbroken by tint, and unrelieved by shade. Such are the flaming remnants of feudal decoration, the missal painting, the alluminar of Dante, the art of Cimabue. It was the prevailing taste down to the age of Michael Angelo and Raphael.

Next follows deception, which attempts to substitute the image for the thing, by means of form or color. It realizes its highest idea in the "successful mimicry of absent objects." From this stage in its history, much was learnt respecting the nature of color; such as the difference of diaphanous and opaque, of firm and juicy color. So also that this color refracts, and that absorbs light. Here was taught the contrast of the tints, of what is called warm and cold, and, by their balance, diffusion, echo, to poise a whole. It was here learned that "color acts, affects, delights, like sound; that stern and deep-toned tints rouse, determine, invigorate the eye, as warlike sound or a deep base, the ear; and that bland, rosy,

[1] *Fuseli*, II, 336. [2] *Idem*, 338.

gray, and vernal tints soothe, charm, and melt like a sweet melody."

If color in the earliest stages of its history found its able representative in Cimabue, in its more perfect completed stages it realized its highest idea in Titian. "He penetrated the essence and the general principle of the substances before him, and on these established his theory of color.[1] He invented that breadth of local tint which no imitation has attained, and first expressed the negative nature of shade. His are the charms of glazing, and the mystery of reflexes, by which he detached, rounded, connected or enriched his objects. His harmony is less indebted to the force of light and shade, or the artifices of contrast, than to a due balance of color equally remote from monotony and spots. His tone springs out of his subject, solemn, grave, gay, minacious, or soothing." From him landscape dates its origin, and portrait painting a mighty advance towards perfection.

The effect of color is made to depend on the choice of a sovereign tone, and the skillful disposition, gradation, rounding and variety of the subordinate tones, their principal light, the local color, the half tints, the shades, and the reflexes. The selection of the primary tone depends on choice, and is arbitrary; but being once selected it decides all the rest, "as the tone of the first violin in a regular concert tunes all the voices and all the instruments. Its effect entirely depends on the union of the surrounding tones with it, and has no other value but what it derives from contrast."

It is the delineation of form and the disposition of color that enables the painter to give expression to the creations of his pencil. In expression is, therefore, found the point in which form and color meet and harmonize. In its highest sense it is understood to be "the vivid image of the passion that affects the mind.[2] It animates the features, attitudes, and gestures, which invention selected, and com-

[1] *Fuseli*, II, 361. [2] *Idem*, 255.

position arranged; its principles, like theirs, are simplicity, propriety, and energy." True expression is only found where the line is true to nature; and the delineation of passion, whose inward energy develops itself in the organism with which it is connected now with heat, and glow, and fervid redness, then with cold and fainting, and deadly pallor, according as the vital current is thrown to the surface and extremities, or recedes from them and concentrates near the heart, can only be accomplished by the right disposition of color, and the correct dispensation of light and shade. All similar passions, although resembling each other in their general character, are yet modified in their exhibition by the individual and the temperament which they animate. The joy of the sanguine is not that of the phlegmatic, nor the anger of the melancholy that of the fiery character. The passions do not speak in all with equal energy, nor are they circumscribed by equal limits. But in their highest state of intensity, when they become too big for utterance, then all alike must sink into a species of tranquillity. The extreme of passion, whether it be joy or grief, or fear sunk to the level of despair, annihilates all individual expression, absorbing everything into itself.[1]

The painter, by his art, seeks to rival, and even to excel, the beauties of nature, by reproducing them according to a law which his own genius dictates. By sensuous imagery and spiritual symbolism, he translates the senses to a higher sphere, and interprets to them a language known and fully recognized only in man's æsthetic nature. To accomplish this, he requires to be appreciated and encouraged, and this is only possible among communities and races in which a certain degree of cultivation and refinement prevails. The practice of the art in its turn tends to refine and cultivate, and thus mutual action and reaction should result in an ever increasing advancement.

Both painting and sculpture have two great cycles to run in their historical development; both, however,

[1] *Ruskin*, II, 259.

founded upon the same idea. These have relation to their pagan and Christian features; but the motive idea, lying at the foundation of each, has been worship. The highest ideal to which man could reach, he has made his deity; and the loftiest effort of his art has been to render that deity familiar to his mind.

To the pagan world there was no revelation, and hence the human mind was there left unaided in forming its own conceptions of deity. This it could only do by enlarging its conceptions of human power and virtue to their extremest limit, and then producing such embodiments in material forms as would best aid them in the realization of such conceptions. This, in one point of view, rendered this cycle the most favorable for art development. It caused all artistic effort to be exerted in the direction of arriving at and developing the most perfect forms, and so arranging and disposing of color, and light and shade, as to render them the embodiments of the largest amount of intellect, power, and passion. This cycle reached its highest possible point of attainment in the city of Athens in the age of Pericles. The means here resorted to for the accomplishment of what pagan art proposed to itself, consisted almost entirely of sensuous imagery. In its perfect production the Grecian chisel has probably never been exceeded or even reached. As art here proposed to itself no other or further end than the production of the most beautiful forms as embodiments of the largest intellect, the highest power, the deepest sentiment, and the strongest passion, and its entire line of effort lay in that direction, it would naturally follow that its achievements would be correspondingly great. Accordingly, the great chef-d'ouvres of Grecian art have ever remained the most faultless models for all subsequent imitation. It may, perhaps, have lain in the order of providence that the limited end proposed, the singleness of effort, and other favoring circumstances, should have been designed to carry mere sensuous imagery far into the region of the ideal and the perfect, before another and higher cycle should commence its course.

The ancient world, wedded to its sensuous imagery, expired with the downfall of Rome. With the modern and Christian world commenced the new cycle, which was destined to embrace in its comprehensive sweep, not only the sensuous imagery of the former (for humanity loses nothing in her onward progress), but also that higher element of spiritual symbolism, which still remained as a new development. The necessity of adopting this new element is apparent from the fact that the new religion which the light of revelation flashed upon the world could accept of nothing less in satisfaction of its demands. That religion dwelt essentially in the supersensuous, and hence neither its teachings, doctrines, nor anything about it, could be properly represented by mere sensuous imagery. It could and did employ that imagery, but only for the production of higher ends, the linking of the unseen with the things of time and sense by means of symbols taken from the latter and opening into the former.

Before speaking of the individuals and schools through which the art of painting has received and is still receiving its developments in modern times, it may be well to observe that there are three great eras of modern art under which all the different schools may be arranged. These are the theological, religious, and naturalistic. The first designates the period during which art was controlled by the dogmas and traditions of the church. The second that in which religious ideas often furnish the subjects and also the inspiration, but the whole soul of art is left free to revel in its own beautiful creations. The third is that in which both the motives and the models are derived directly from the natural world. The first had a double origin, viz: the Roman Catacombs, and Byzantium. The second was the art of catholic Rome, and culminated under Michael Angelo, and Raphael. The third was developed in the protestant countries of Europe, particularly in the schools of the Teutonic race. The first made use of allegory and symbolism, and finally terminated in lifeless forms, uncouth and exaggerated. The second, bursting from the control of theolo-

gical fetters, taking mostly from religion the subjects it represented, folding around it its mantle of delightful imagery, it walked forth the glory of Italy, seeming to envelop itself in all the beauties of this earthly sphere in order to point the more effectually to another and a higher, until when religion gave way to skepticism, freedom to despotism, and luxury to sensuality, it sank into helpless imbecility and degradation. The third, under the free spirit of protestantism, and in countries where private domestic life presents more charms than public, is accustomed to gather up its stores from the familiar scenes of every day life, to be truthful to the beauties of the landscape, to exhibit those scenes of gravity and gayety which are the most familiar, and thus to present to the eye and mind the idealized picture of what life in all possible moods has in store for us. The first commenced in the second century, and continued until the thirteenth. The second was born in the general awakening of mind in Italy towards the thirteenth century, and in four centuries had passed away by the reactionary force of the causes which produced it. The decline of the second led the way to the third, which has continued until the present time.

The theological was the earliest and the longest in continuance. It succeeded the decadence of Roman art, and so far as related to that part which had its origin in the catacombs, was little more than pictorial writing and emblematic language, being simple in motive, rude in style, and narrow in idea. Rome from an early period has been undermined by subterranean excavations, extending in every direction, constituting the catacombs. In these, during the ages of persecution preceding the reign of Constantine, lived and suffered and died the early Christians. These constituted the home of the primitive Christian church, and here was born and nourished the first rudiments of Christian art. The subjects are few and meagre, and their execution generally inferior to the worst specimens of contemporary heathen art. They were either symbols such as the cross, denoting salvation; the peacock,

Christianity; the anchor, hope, faith and fortitude; the ship, the church; the lyre, public worship; the dove, the Holy Spirit; or there were compositions derived from scripture.[1] Among those the most frequently occurring is the Saviour, represented as the good shepherd either leaning on his staff or carrying the lost sheep on his shoulders. So also are found many scenes from the Old and New Testaments, such as the Fall, Abraham's Sacrifice, the Nativity, Adoration of the Magi, etc. All these are pure, simple and suggestive, differing from the classical, by avoiding altogether the nude. The art thus born in the catacombs, although it survived its translation to upper earth, yet never flourished there. Its richer development was to be found in the subterranean home of its origin.

The other origin of modern European art, and one whose relative importance seems not to have been fully acknowledged, is the eastern, Grecian, or Byzantine. Many of the symbols, or hieroglyphical language of the early Christian world, derive their origin from the east. The council of Constantinople, in 692, prohibited the use of symbols, enjoining in their place direct representation.[2] Within the next succeeding century, there originated in the Greek church a cycle of compositions of extreme beauty, feeling, and simplicity, although of debased mechanical skill in the execution. Several of these Greek Christian compositions, such as the Creation of Adam and Eve, the Nativity, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, Glorification, and the Last Judgment, have been standards to the great Italian painters, and from which they scarcely ventured to deviate for ages. It was these early compositions, the products of Byzantine art, that subsequently exercised the maturer powers of Nicola Pisano, Cimabue and Giotto, and being by them reissued, modified, and improved, were again taken up by succeeding schools, until in the golden age of Michael Angelo and Raphael, they received the last touch of genius, and became forever

[1] *Lewis*, 79, 80. [2] *Lord Lindsay*, 1, 71–3.

after the acknowledged embodiment of the great canons of art. It is worthy of remark, that the head of the Saviour,[1] as represented in the catacombs, is not personal, but is intended to represent the genius of Christianity, the whole form and figure being youthful, to signify the everlasting prince of eternity. It was the place and era of symbols. Byzantine art presents us with the traditional head, with which we are at the present day familiar; an expressive type, which, if not the actual likeness, comes nearer to our conceptions of what that likeness may have been, than Christian humility could have hoped to soar. The representation of angel ministry was peculiar to Byzantium.

There are two peculiarities in the art compositions of the Byzantine school,[2] viz: the approximation of successive incidents of the same story, within the same field, or compartments, and the representation of personages of superhuman power as of superhuman stature.

In the commencement of the thirteenth century, the Venetians captured Constantinople, which brought the east and the west more into contact with each other, and tended more strongly to the revival of art under the skies of Italy. Several of the Italian states had fortunately succeeded in achieving a position which would enable them to attend to matters of art. They had passed through centuries of turmoil and revolution, and were achieving a new and vigorous civilization, in which the remnants of the earlier races that had peopled Italy, were largely impregnated with the Gothic element. Circumstances were, therefore, extremely favorable for infusing new life into the old, sunken, and lifeless forms, that entered into the traditional compositions of the Byzantine school. That school constituted the channel through which the spirit of Christian art passed from Greece into Italy, and Europe. Its great compositions have never died out. They have reappeared under the improving touch of the

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, 1, 76. [2] *Idem*, 1, 97.

great Italian masters. Each one of the great Italian schools will be found, on close examination, to have its distinct series of traditional compositions;[1] a few original, but the greater number inherited and improved by its immediate founder. Thus each series is inseparably linked with those which precede and follow it, by means of which, the continuity of art is preserved unbroken.

It is usual to connect great movements with illustrious individuals who seem to originate and control them. They are regarded in the light of causes, whereas they only act in virtue of principles or influences which come from the unseen, and through their agency pass into realization. There is still a mighty mystery hanging around these movements that, like electrical currents sweep at times over the earth, leaving only their effects behind them, with nothing to indicate whence they came or whither they go. It may yet be that the laws that govern their movements may be brought within the grasp of the human intellect.

The Italian Schools.

The new art movement in Italy commenced during the last half of the thirteenth century, and reached its climax in the sixteenth. We can only note the different schools, their successive development, their peculiarities, the indications of progress afforded by each, and the great name or names which they have given to the world.

One of the principal features which characterized the revival of art in Italy was that the chief aim of the artist came to be the intelligible expression of the theme he had chosen,[2] to seize this characteristically, to represent it faithfully, and to give it animation and power. He strove to infuse life into the dead forms of Byzantine art.[3] Besides, an arbitary symbolization was no longer held

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, I, 98. [2] *Kugler's Italian Schools*, I, 119. [3] *Idem*, 120.

sufficient. The representation itself was required to be at once both symbol and meaning. Great names now began to present themselves as the representatives of Italian art. Schools, obedient to local influences, and receiving an infusion of new life from the vigorous individualism of the times, everywhere rose into existence. They were both formed, and in their turn gave birth, to the great masters of the art.[1] "All art of a certain character is baptized by the name of its most prominent or distinguished representative, who thus perpetuates his personal influence as the head of a distinct school, apart from his position as a leading member of the great national school, of which the former may be classed as a variety." Thus Giotto, Orgagna, Ghiberti, Masaccio, Fra Angelico, Leonardo, Raphael, and Michael Angelo, centered in themselves epochs and styles that, through schools, spread themselves far and wide through all subsequent time. These, and all such, labored for universal skill and knowledge. Some of them were eminent not only as painters or sculptors, but excelled as architects and engineers, and even were accomplished as musicians and poets; thus demonstrating that all the arts in their higher relations, possess in common such kindred elements as to kindle in great minds the earnest desire, and awaken the capacity of achieving success in all. These generated multitudes of artists less distinguished, who limited themselves to specialties of art, seeking success in some one of its departments.

The first outburst of revived Italian art was in the old Etruria, comprising Tuscany, and portions of the adjacent Roman states. This may well rank as the chosen home of genius. It boasts such names as Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Galileo, Giotto, Brunelleschi, Ghiberti, Masaccio, Raphael, Leonardo, and Michael Angelo; names that in different departments of art will continue household words to the end of time. What is the law that assigns a home to genius? Obviously some spots of earth are vastly

[1] *Jarves*, 103.

more favored than others. Is this in virtue of the higher gifted races that inhabit them, or of a multitude of physical or moral causes, or of unseen agencies that there exert themselves? Whatever may be the original cause there is little doubt that the action or influence exerted by each favored one on all the others, together with a highly appreciating community, thus furnishing a motive, are among those causes that press on to the highest styles of development. This was certainly the fact in the region of the ancient Etruria. And the idea of the importance to be attached to original races is much favored by the fact that although new motives were here brought to bear, yet art still clung tenaciously to the primary characteristics of its most ancient manifestations.[1] These were naturalistic as distinguished from the idealism of Greece.

Although all admit the vast agency of Florence as a nursery of art during the fifteenth century, yet it may be well doubted whether the first impulse was there given to it. In this respect the schools both of Pisa and Sienna prefer their claims.[2] The revival of classical sculpture and design by the Pisan school extended far and wide its influence, and was the means of effecting a similar revival in painting. The two earliest schools of painting are to be found in Florence and Sienna.[3] While the former aimed more at reality of character, and exhibit richness of thought and composition, the distinctive feature of the latter is more exhibited in the grace of their single figures.

The founder of the Tuscan school at Florence, and the so-called father of Italian art, was Giovanni Cimabue, of noble lineage, who flourished in the last half of the thirteenth century. He developed an independent style, improved draperies, and grouped his figures with animation and vigor. His heads have a deep, earnest character, and are fairly individualized. From him dates the history of Italian painting. His chief merit, however, in the world of art, consists in his giving to it, Giotto, whom he found, a shep-

[1] *Lewes*, 105. [2] *Cleghorn*, II, 22. [3] *Italian Schools*, I, 122.

herd boy, at the age of ten years, drawing a sheep upon a slab of stone. He is properly the first great master appearing in the fourteenth century. His genius was not limited to painting, but extended also to kindred arts. He practiced sculpture with considerable success, and his design of the beautiful Gothic campanile, or bell tower, adjoining the Duomo of Florence, proclaims his skill in architecture. In painting, his works spread from the Rhone to Vesuvius, and from the Adriatic to the Tyrrhenian sea. He painted both in fresco and in tempera. He was the restorer of portrait painting, imparting the resemblance to character of face and attitude. He went to every accessible source for information and inspiration, being eclectic in his tendencies. He seems to have commenced and prosecuted his art studies upon system, his first object being to infuse new life into the traditional compositions, by substituting the heads, attitudes, and drapery of the actual world, for the spectral forms and conventional types of the mosaics and the Byzantine painters,[1] idealizing when the personages represented were of higher mark and dignity. He next ventured to introduce modifications and improvements into the traditional compositions, and also new creations derived from sacred or ecclesiastical history, or from the fairy-land of allegory. He was the intimate friend of Dante; and the allegorical mode of conception embodied in the *Divine Comedia*, the grandest poem of the age, no doubt impressed its allegorical character strongly on all contemporary art. Tradition asserts that the designs of his allegorical frescoes at Assisi, were suggested to him from the spirit world, by his deceased friend, Dante.

Giotto was naturalistic in all his tendencies. He is regarded as the fountain head of naturalism in the Tuscan schools, but is more apparent in motive than in execution. His invention is mainly distinguished from the earlier productions by the introduction of natural incidents and expressions.

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, II, 260, 261.

It seems to be in the order of arrangement that power must be acquired in the gross prior to its distribution in detail,[1] and that the progressive, or dramatic principle, must necessarily take the lead, before the contemplative can do itself justice. Giotto impressed upon the schools of Florence the dramatic character. He exhibited powers and forces in action. To do this the more effectually all his compositions are made to bear the impress of a strong individuality.[2]

His heads frequently exhibit a peculiar and not very beautiful habitual form. The eyes are generally long and narrow, and very close to each other. Beauty was less his object than the expression of character, showing clearly the dramatic character of the school he founded.

For the first time in the revival of art we observe a successful attempt at the regular disposal of the subject in the space allotted. In the true dramatic spirit he incorporates the accessory incidents into the main story by concise and vigorous modes.[3] He tells his stories in brief, simple, touches, in the execution of details often sketchy and suggestive. During his life of sixty years' continuance he painted works for the cities of Avignon, Milan, Verona, Ferrara, Urbino, Ravenna, Lucca, and Pisa, of which few comparatively now exist, and these of doubtful authenticity.[4] His Crowning of the Virgin in the church of Santa Croce at Florence, and his scenes in the life of St. Francis at Assisi are much celebrated. His crucifixions instead of exhibiting physical suffering, have infused into them dignity, feeling, and religious sentiment. Although, at the commencement of his career "binding himself to nature's chariot wheel,[5] confident that ere long she would emancipate and own him as her son;" yet throughout his works an earnest, lofty, and religious aim and purpose are constantly revealed as laying at the foundation and guiding the movements of his art.

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, II, 103. [2] *Italian schools*, I. 133. [3] *Lewes*, 129. [4] *Cleghorn*, II, 25. [5] *Lord Lindsay*, II. 360.

" Giotto may well be regarded as the type of a coming great and important epoch. He was more than the founder of a school. He was the representative man of this epoch. In him really centres the principles which receive their development in the art of the fourteenth century. His disciples, followers, and imitators, known as the Giotteschi, for almost a century, were occupied in following the lead he indicated, and in more fully carrying out and developing the principles he originated or suggested. Some of these equalled, in some respects even exceeded, their great master, and yet they made very little progress in the art of painting.

This art has a history, a development, which its different epochs and schools fully proclaim. In the Giottian epoch, now under review, great advances were made in coloring, composition, and expression, and yet at that early period, perspective, chiaroscuro, and foreshortening, were either entirely unknown, or their possibility only was admitted. The imitators of Giotto, says Fuseli " saw little in chiaroscuro, and less in perspective and line;[1] their figures still step from their planes, their fabrics have no true point of sight, their foreshortenings depended solely on the eye." Stefano dal Ponte, the grandson of Giotto, possessed of an ardent and inquisitive spirit, prompt in the discovery and ardent in the overcoming of difficulties, first ventured on foreshortening, and improved perspective. But he saw rather than conquered the difficulties. The rest either evaded or palliated them.[2] The Umbrian Pietro della Francesca was the first who called geometry to the assistance of painting, and taught by his works at Arezzo the principles of perspective.

Thus slow has been the progress of the painter's art, and the Giotteschi, although laboring for nearly a century are said to have fulfilled their mission nobly, and to have left little or nothing undone that the original impulse of their patriarch implied.

---

[1] *Fuseli*, III, 172. [2] *Idem*, 172.

The student of the history of painting before passing to the next epoch of that art will devote some attention to the school of Sienna, and the peculiar style of painting which it produced. This school had as early or even an earlier origin than that of Florence, Sienna having been in the early part of the fourteenth century a city of great importance even among the Italian cities of that period. "Every one," says an old chronicler, "minded his own business, and all loved each other as brethren," a sufficient reason to account for the greatness of any city.

The works and influence of the great sculptor Nicola, Pisano, in the early part of the fourteenth century, gave a new impulse to art, which was long felt in its results. The citizens of Pisa were Ghibelline in politics, enthusiastically devoted to the virgin, and possessed of a deep feeling of religion. The many points of difference in feeling and character between Florence and Sienna led to a difference in their art. While that of the former was more original and dramatic in its character, the latter was more symbolical, allegorical, and lyrical, adhering more closely to the old traditional compositions, and having in it a stronger infusion of the spirit of Christian Greece.[1] The prominent traits of lyric art have been stated to be "delicacy and grace; moral and physical harmony; the realization of exalted idea in corresponding form; pure, simple colors, brilliant as gems; flowers and quietude; the absence of disturbing passion;[2] the song of joy; faith triumphant; and the sense of beatitude." While, therefore, it was less historical, less natural, less inclined to portraiture, possessed of less force and breadth, it had within it a much larger infusion of spiritual beauty.

Of the fathers of this school, Mino flourished in the latter part of the thirteenth century, and Duccio was the contemporary of Giotto. He painted an altar piece for the cathedral of Pisa much celebrated in its time, and the fragments of which still remain. He is said to have rivalled the great

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 4. [2] *Lewes*, 189.

Florentine in richness of fancy,[1] taste in composition, truth and variety of expression, and general mechanical execution. He has been placed at the head of that line of succession in the Siennese school, characterized by a preference and general tendency to the darker coloring and the peculiar religious feeling of the Byzantines.

Another celebrated artist of this school was Simone Martini who is described as being prolific in grace and beauty, tender in sentiment, noble in character, delicate and bright in color, and copious in all that has its origin in the finer sensibilities of our being.[2] To him are described three great fresco paintings, one in the Campo Santo at Pisa, one on the cupola of S. Mariæ Novella at Florence, and one in the chapel of St. Martin at Assisi. The Campo Santo, or cemetery, of Pisa, is the most important place in the history of the art of the fourteenth century.[3] In truth, the great master painters of that century, by means of churches and public edifices, were enabled through their art to hold communion with the public mind. There were no printed books, and no manuscripts except for the few. It was an age in which the appeals to sense were the only ones much heeded. These could be made the most effectually through pictorial representations. Hence the loud demands made by religion upon the painter. His art was the material medium of knowledge, the great awakener of sentiment and emotion. He who possessed the art of so embodying facts, of so presenting character through form and expression, as to arouse, inform, and affect the mind of the beholder, met the demand of his age, and was made immortal.

Church edifices had other tongues besides those of the preachers. The frescoes that adorned their walls were living sermons that, from generation to generation, proclaimed the great truths of the gospel. Whether dramatic in their character, indicating power in action; or contemplative, lyric, indicating it in repose, it went home to the heart

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 14, 15. [2] *Lewes*, 195. [3] *Italian Schools*, 144.

of the gazer. The great efforts of the great masters were with a singular unity of purpose, all directed to the promulgation and enforcement of religious truth. They drew from the abstract, mystical, and doctrinal, seeking from nature suggestive forms. Their object was rather to interpret than to delineate, and what was too subtle, or far removed for direct presentation they sought to render clear to others by a profound symbolism. Thus all the resources of art were appealed to for the purpose of teaching and enforcing moral and religious truth, and to this is undoubtedly owing the golden age of Italian art which we are gradually approaching.

There are two other painters, who, although not Si ennese, yet deserve mention in connection with that school. One of these is Andrea Orgagna, or Occagna, who flourished in the second half of the fourteenth century, dying in 1389. Like many other of the great Italian artists, especially in the early history of art in Italy, he excelled in the three arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting. In the latter, he achieved the highest celebrity. His three frescoes on the walls of the Campo Santo at Pisa, have rendered him immortal. These are the Triumph of Death, the Last Judgment, and Hell. These embrace the whole world of passions that make up the economy of man;[1] not confused or crushed into each other, but expanded and enhanced in quality and intensity, to meet the mighty magnitude of the change attendant upon the resurrection. And yet, from their very intensity, these passions appear suppressed and subdued, stilling the body, and informing only the soul's index, the countenance. All is calm. The saved are too full for utterance; the lost exhibit a grief too deep for caricature; and "while every feeling of the spectator, every key of the soul's organ, is played upon by turns, tenderness and pity form the undersong throughout, and ultimately prevail."

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 140.

The other artist is Fra Angelico of Fiesole, born in 1387, and died in 1455. He has been styled the St. John of art, the highest type of the ecstatic purists, one of those painters "who seem to have dipped their pencils in the rainbow that circles the throne of God."[1] Great artists unconsciously proclaim their own character in their art. The form and expression they produce is but the outgrowth of the feelings, passions, emotions, and sentiments that stir their own bosoms. Perhaps this truth is nowhere more fully proclaimed than in the case of this artist. He enjoyed a profound serenity of feeling, a pure and holy frame of mind, a confiding devotedness, knowing nothing of human anxieties, of struggling with passion, or of victory over it.[2] Consequently, he endeavors to reveal to our view a more glorified and blessed world than the reality can present. "He seeks to invest the forms he places before us with the utmost beauty his hand could lend them; the sweetest expression beams in all their countenances; an harmonious grace guides all their movements. He selects the most cheerful colors, and employs every auxiliary that can give a new glory to his holy subjects. He adheres scrupulously to traditional types, and ventures on none of the innovations which were already introduced into art at Florence. He is inimitable in his representations of angels and glorified saints, but weak, timid, and embarrassed when he introduces man in his human nature." All his themes are said to have followed his supplications to deity, and when the composition of them was once fixed in his imagination, he always refused to change it, believing the design to be inspired by the divine will. His most celebrated paintings are the Annunciation, the Flight into Egypt, the Resurrection of Lazarus, the Compact with Judas, the Coronation of the Virgin, Christ's entry into Jerusalem, the Arraignment before Pilate, the Burial, Descent into Hell, and the Last Judgment. In reference to his rank and position in the history of art an eloquent writer remarks that "to those

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, II. 264. [2] *Italian Schools*, I, 164.

who regard society as progressive through the gradual development of the component elements of human nature,[1] and who believe that providence has accommodated the mind of man, individually to the perception of half truths only, in order to create that antagonism from which truth is generated in the abstract, and by which the progression is effected, his rank and position in art are clear and definite. All that spirit could achieve by herself, anterior to that struggle with intellect and sense, which she must in all cases pass through in order to work out her destiny, was accomplished by him. Last and most gifted of a long and imaginative race, the heir of their experience, with collateral advantages which they possessed not, and flourishing at the moment when the transition was actually taking place from the youth to the early manhood of Europe, he gave full, unreserved, and enthusiastic expression to that love and hope, which had winged the faith of Christendom in her flight towards heaven for fourteen centuries, to those yearnings of the heart and the imagination, which ever precede in universal as well as individual development; the severer and more chastened intelligence of reason. Fra Angelico belonged wholly to the earlier age, a simpler and more believing, if a less progressive one; the technical improvement and anti-Christian tendency of art during his latter years in no wise affected his essential imaginative spirituality, it remained precisely what it was, and even anticipated the result of the struggle by drawing additional vigor from the contact. This constitutes the distinctive difference between himself and his contemporaries, Masolino, Masaccio and Uccello."

We have now arrived at the fifteenth century, and this brings us to a new epoch in the painter's art. The previous one had been characterized by the internal working in the mind of the painter. It was the subjective era. The painter had awoke to the consciousness of his own powers.

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 189.

He felt stirring within him forces and energies which must make themselves realized in the world of art. Giotto, and the Giotteschi, had taken the direction of forces in action, the dramatic; the school of Sienna, of forces in repose, the lyric. The main sources of inspiration in both those from which all their themes were taken, and to which all their invention and composition had reference, were the sacred scriptures. The object was less to wed sense with spirit, to approximate nature to God, to develop the beautiful in nature through artistic laws, than to lead the mind back to those early periods in the history of the church when the primal truths of Christianity were proclaimed. Nor is it to be doubted but that the ascetic tendencies of the times, the mortifications of sense as a means of purifying the spirit, exerted an influence upon art. Under all these influences, together with the additional one that power, in its newborn consciousness, is always less solicitous as to the manner than as to the fact, of making itself felt, we shall not be surprised to find that art, as a thing of beauty, and a product of law, had yet much to attain. The laws of perspective, of foreshortening, of chiaroscuro, although in part apprehended, were yet to be almost wholly developed and applied.

It is obvious that art can have recourse to only two sources for its models.[1] The one is the subjective, the imagination of the painter summoning from the depths of his own mind those forms or embodiments of power, whose original types were taken from the natural world, but into which fancy has introduced many curious and sometimes strange modifications. This will better characterize the epoch we have just passed through. The other source is the objective, the objects existing in nature, the scenes and things by which we are everywhere surrounded. These require to be copied or imitated, and this cannot be done effectually without recourse to laws to be ascertained and applied. The laws of form in its various appearances, had

[1] *Lewes*, 245, 246.

less application when those forms were mere creatures of the fancy. But when taken from the world without, they must be subject to those conditions of representation without which their accuracy would fail to be acknowledged. We have now arrived at the epoch in which the laws, which are the expression of these conditions, are to be investigated, and their application more fully understood, the era of the emancipation of art in its external relations, as the preceding was of its internal life.

We here return again to Florence and the Tuscan schools. Masolino and Paolo Uccello herald the coming of Masaccio, who sustained about the same relation to this epoch that Giotto did to the last. He was born about the beginning of the fifteenth century, and died in 1443.

Masaccio went neither to his own imagination, nor to the antique, the idealized forms of Greece, for his models.[1] He went to the exhibitions of actual nature as the sources of his supply. He portrayed the man, animal, tree, individualized, not idealized. His aim was to supply to nature nothing, either from his own imagination or from the idealized antique. He thus inaugurated a principle in the process of painting which has continued in active force until the present time. This necessarily led him into a thorough study of the philosophy of form. It originated a feeling, which in beauty recognizes and preserves the expression of proportion, and in repose and motion, that of an harmonious development of the powers of the human frame. With him the nude first assumes a close alliance with living nature. The art of raising the figures from the flat surface, the modelling of the forms,[2] hitherto only faintly indicated, here begin to give the effect of actual life. We find also a style of drapery adopted, which is free from the habitual type-like manner of the earlier periods, and adopted in reference to the form underneath. So also a style of composition has been noticed exhibiting a powerful feeling for truth and individuality of character.

[1] *Lewes*, 253, 254. [2] *Italian Schools*, I, 195.

He is claimed to have excelled all modern painters up to his time in harmonious and correct delineation of forms and proportions, strength of relief, truth of modeling, gradations of color and skill in chiaroscuro, and in mingling outline imperceptibly into distance. His most celebrated paintings are Adam and Eve expelled from Paradise, the Tribute Money, St. Peter and St. John healing the Sick, and St. Peter baptizing.

Nearly contemporary with Masaccio, was the Carmelite Filippo Lippi,[1] who was the first notoriously profligate artist among the old masters; and in harmony with this character, was in sentiment, the first great sensualist that occurs among them. He therefore exhibits a new moral aspect in painting, and commences the naturalistic reaction on its purely material side. Down to his time, painters had idealized the head of the virgin, having taken the type from the loveliest head they knew of in existence, there being no one fixed traditional resemblance, as in the case of the Saviour. He seems to have been the first to take the head from living models, usually those of his mistresses.[2] This practice of copying from living heads was subsequently more generally followed, so that those who now suppose themselves looking upon the heads of St. Peter and St. Paul, are probably contemplating those actually worn by venerable Florentines of the fifteenth century.

The two most distinguished painters of the Tuscan schools that adorned the last half of the fifteenth century, were Luca Signorelli and Domenico Curadi, more generally known as Ghirlandajo. The first was the great precursor of Michael Angelo. Ever since the great change effected by Masaccio in reference to the objects about which art should busy itself, there seemed to be a growing desire, and increasing effort to vie with nature herself in representing the nude, or naked figure. The progress that had been for some time making in the sister art of sculpture

[1] *Lewes*, 262. [2] *Idem*, 264.

no doubt contributed to increase this desire and effort. This would involve the necessity of possessing a larger amount of anatomical knowledge than had hitherto been required in the painter.

The painter who seems first to have brought into exercise, in the construction of his nude figures, this larger knowledge of anatomical structure, was Luca Signorelli. His extent of knowledge and peculiar powers in the application of it are best developed in the frescoes with which he embellished the chapel of the Cathedral at Orvieto. Here he painted the End of the World, or Last Judgment, and the History of Antichrist. These frescoes are four large representations on the two side walls, in which the History of Antichrist, and also the Resurrection, Hell, and Paradise are depicted, the figures chiefly being nude, and replete with meaning, action, and expression.[1] A severe but perfect and noble drawing of the nude is observable in these pictures; and a number of new positions of the body, never before attempted in art, are introduced with careful study and success. There is no apparent striving for mere anatomical correctness, but a peculiar grandeur and elevation stamped alike on scenes of tranquillity and beatitude, and on representations of vehement and fantastic action. There is also a subordination of the merely accidental to the living majesty of the pure human form, which might well form an introduction to the higher creations of Michael Angelo.[2] In the language of an elegant writer. "preceding creations, being monotonous repetitions of Byzantine inventions or plagiarisms from Dante's forcible imagery, had become ineffective. Here we have original thought with an intensified diabolism and despair, depending, as heretofore, not on mere brutal forms for horror, as with Orgagna, Spinello, and Fra Angelico, but upon the action and expression of evil spirits whose organisms are almost human. Their inventions recognized in hell's demonology distinct creations, without likeness to man, and

[1] *Italian Schools*, I, 216. [2] *Lewes*, 274.

as far removed below him in the power and ugliness of sin as heaven's hierarchy is above in the beauty and power of holiness. But Signorelli calls up out of their everlasting burnings devils with such transformations only from humanity's shape as it might be supposed to undergo by the force of unchecked lusts, passions and despair. Of a verity, his are God's avenging ministers of evil; overflowing with wrath and affright; filled with the violence and desire of wickedness; men, as incarnated devils and the damned, recognizing their coming likenesses in them; such is his idea of the inhabitants of hell."

The aim of the other artist, Ghirlandajo, was no longer external for itself, but a predeliction for particular forms,[1] for the purpose of illustrating grand and important relations of life. He had a faculty of so constructing his art,[2] as to betray no secrets of the artist. His characters are made to act themselves, not him. His observation and sagacity enable him to adapt form to character, and his manysidedness gave him the power of exhibiting the characters of others in connection with their appropriate forms, with much the same power and effect, as if he had drawn from his own consciousness. The art which is thus possessed, "pertains to the object, reflects its image, and vitalizes it with its appropriate form and expression."

The portrait, in the largest signification of the word, is the prominent characteristic in his productions.[3] He introduced the portraits of his contemporaries into his church historical representations; not, however, as the holy personages themselves, but as the spectators or witnesses of the scene he intended to represent. This scene he usually places in the domestic and citizen of the time.

He is the first of Florentines who gave depth and keeping to composition,[4] while gold and tinsel glitter appear less frequently in his colors. Precision of outline, decorum of countenance, variety of ideas, facility and

---

[1] *Italian Schools*, I, 208. [2] *Lewes*, 286. [3] *Italian Schools*, I, 208. [4] *Fuseli*, III, 186.

diligence, distinguish his works. His most celebrated productions are found in the churches Degli Innocenti, Santa Trinita, and Santa Maria Novella, at Florence.

During the fifteenth century, another and different school of art was also flourishing in Italy, viz: the Paduan. This originated with Francesco Squarcione, who, in the early part of the century, collected together at Padua, statues, torsos, reliefs, vases, etc., all remains of ancient art, which he was able to procure. This collection, much the largest of the time, attracted many students from different parts of Italy. It gave a peculiar character to this school of art. These masterpieces of antique sculpture, in which the common forms of nature were invested with an ideal beauty, were substituted as models, in the place of the actual productions of nature herself. This led art in a new direction, bringing it face to face with the antique. The result was that it borrowed from it first the outward decoration, and subsequently sought to attain to the plastic representation of form.[1] This originated a style of conception and treatment, more plastic than pictorial. The forms are severely and sharply defined; the drapery assimilated to the antique costume; the general arrangement more resembling that of basso-relievo, than of rounded groups. The study of antique sculpture led not only to exaggerated sharpness in the marking of the forms, but also to the use of small, sharp, oblique folds, which break the large flowing lines in the drapery.

The greatest of the classically trained painters, and chief representative of this school, was Andrea Mantegna, who flourished during the last half of the fifteenth century. "Precision, sharpness, richness, at times a slight admixture of gold, deep color, marvelous finish, severity of design, dignity and intensity of expression, considerable beauty but not equal grace, refined feeling, much overborne, however, by his technical force, distinguish the best manner of Mantegna."[2] He seems to have aimed much at optical

[1] *Italian Schools*, I, 219. [2] *Lewes*, 311.

illusion, and his works, taken generally, leave an impression of great meaning.[1] Some of his most celebrated paintings are of classical origin, such, for instance, as the Triumph of Cæsar, and the Triumph of Scipio.

The Florentine schools of the fifteenth century gave themselves up to the delineation of form and expression as actually exhibited in nature. The Paduan resorted to the antique, and sought to reproduce the idealized forms and expression which had been hallowed by antiquity. There is also a third element that contributed to the emancipation of art in its external or imitative character to be found in the Venetian school, which unfolded itself in the second half of the fifteenth century. This was the element of coloring, which it seems to have been the special mission of the Venetian school, if not to originate, certainly to improve, and almost to perfect.

The Venetians were of a cheerful and festive spirit. Their relations were more intimate with the orient, where splendor, especially in coloring, was more prevailing. In addition to these facts they were the first among the Italian schools who practiced oil painting, which by its greater fluidity and juiciness was highly favorable to their peculiar aim.[2] It was about the middle of the fifteenth century that Antonello da Messina learned from the school of John Van Eyck, in the Netherlands, the secret of preparing and using oil colors in painting. He also learned there the treatment of those minor objects of life which constitute accessories in composition. This naturally led to a greater embellishment of their compositions with pleasing accessories, such as sportive boy angels, sometimes represented as singing and playing on instruments, sometimes bearing festoons of flowers and fruit.

The foundation of Venetian coloring has been stated by an elegant writer to be "in an innate passion for warm tones, deep shadows and sparkling play of light.[3] In its luminous fusion of tints, subtle gradations, powerful yet

---

[1] *Italian Schools*, I, 221. [2] *Idem*, 235. [3] *Lewes*, 314.

harmonious contrasts, force of projection, imperceptible outlines lost in the sleight of color, festive or serious aspects, rarely descending to absolute sensualism nor arriving at full spirituality, always clinging to its peculiar choice of light, its oligarchical features and semi-oriental feeling for the alternations of deep repose or strong action, above all in its magic unity of tone, it has a fascination as strong and mysterious as the wave-worn queen of the Adriatic herself. It is the romance of color, as the Greek sculpture is the idealism of form. In proportion as beauty assumes sensuous or sensual feeling, its expression in color deepens and darkens, for it seeks a grosser incarnation in material, and relies more upon contrasts of lights and shadows, warmth and fusion of tints, and the subtleties of imitation, elevated or common, according to the quality of the inspiration, than upon the power of symbolism or the suggestiveness of etherialized pigments."

The real depth and power of color, however, required time and effort for its full development. Among the earlier Venetian artists the predominant taste was exhibited in a fondness for glittering magnificence and varied splendor in the place of that harmonious union of color, which was the attainment of a subsequent period.

The head of the Venetian school is Giovanni Bellini; connecting by a life of ninety years' duration the fifteenth with the sixteenth century, extending from 1426 to 1516. His long life was devoted to his art, even the two last years of it producing the Bacchanals, to which Titian after his death added the landscape. Many of his paintings, showing no diminution in power, were executed after he had attained the age of fourscore.[1] They approximated closely the Venetian style of the sixteenth century.[2] In everything relating to drawing, arrangement and embellishment, the early Venetian school adopted the practice of the Paduan, but in the hands of Bellini its sharpness and austerity were essentially modified, and a moral beauty exhibited,

[1] *Italian Schools*, I. 238. [2] *Idem*, 235.

which, without totally spiritualizing the life of this world,[1] displays its noblest and most edifying side, and stops with unerring certainty on the narrow line of demarkation between the actual and the visionary. His type represents a race of men of easy and courteous dignity, a race not yet extinct in Venice. His Madonnas are amiable beings, imbued with a lofty grace; his saints powerful and noble forms; his angels cheerful boys in the full bloom of youth. In his representations of the Saviour he displays a moral power and grandeur seldom equalled in the history of art. With him the art of coloring as practiced in the Venetian school, attained, if not the highest truth of nature, at all events its greatest intensity and transparency. The greatest number of Bellini's works are to be found in the galleries and churches of Venice.

Bellini trained a great number of scholars in the practice of his art. They have been divided into two groups, one distinguished by a soft and graceful manner, the other severer and more sculpturesque.[2] Besides, issuing from the school he established, were Giorgione and Titian, who adorned the coming magnificent era of Italian art.

Another Italian school that came into existence in the last half of the fifteenth century was the Umbrian, so called from its arising in the province of ancient Umbria. In this retired valley of the upper Tiber, the habits and circumstances of life tended to give a spiritual direction to art. Here arose a counteracting influence to those schools whose great aim was to arrive at mere truth and beauty of external form,[3] rather than at spiritual depth of meaning. The tendency of thought here reached in time the external forms, developing in them that idealizing habit which is the natural result of spiritual and devotional sentiment. The influence of the early school of Sienna was strongly felt in giving birth to that of Umbria. The spiritualistic tendencies of both were the same. The Umbrian school had, however, much more to contend against in the strong re-

[1] *Italian Schools*, I, 238. [2] *Idem*, 242. [3] *Idem*, 249.

alistic tendency of the Tuscan schools of the fifteenth century.

The origin, or rather the prevailing tendency of the Umbrian school, is due to Nicolo Alunno. He gave his figures a generally attractive expression, imparting great refinement and purity to his female and angelic heads. Another Umbrian painter was Giovanni Santi or Sanzio, of Urbino, a progressive artist, whose works contain the germs of that purity and tender seriousness which afterwards characterized the first manner of his son Raphael. Another Umbrian painter who commenced the prosecution of his art in his forty-sixth year, was Francesca Francia of Bologna. He excelled in portrait painting, his style resembling the Florentine manner of Raphael. He introduced no superfluous accessories, and arranged his draperies, costumes, movement and background in harmony with his leading motive. He also excelled in landscape, giving it delicate gradations of distance and aerial perspective. He aimed at repose, being sparing in minute details, and, by a few well chosen features, suggesting the variety of nature.

The Umbrian painter, who serves more especially to connect the Italian schools of the fifteenth with those of the sixteenth century, was Pietro Perugino, born in 1446 and dying in 1524. His art culture was quite extensive, having spent considerable time at Florence, Rome, and some other parts of Italy, but his earliest and strongest impressions were derived from the pure mysticism of his native Umbria. Near the close of the fifteenth century he opened a large studio and school at Perugia.

The fact that Perugino had been in the practice of his art in different places, the seats of different schools and styles of painting accounts for the variety that is found in his works, sometimes being naturalistic and at others spiritualistic in their tendencies. Those frescoes remaining which he executed in the Sistine chapel at Rome in 1480, viz: the Baptism of Christ, and the Delivering the Keys to Peter, are in the Florentine manner, whether reference be

had to the composition as to arrangement of groups, or to drapery. After passing through the schools, and settling at Perugia, he returned to his own first manner. It was then that his paintings exhibit "that grace and softness, that tender enthusiastic earnestness, which give them so great a charm; and if they sometimes leave much to be wished for in force and variety of character,[1] the heads, especially the youthful and ardently expressive ones, are of surpassing beauty. In the coloring both of the flesh and drapery, in the warm bright skies, and in the well managed gradations of his landscapes, he had great and varied merit. He was the teacher of Raphael Sanzio.

In closing the fifteenth and commencing the sixteenth century, we arrive at the golden era of Italian art. During the last half of the fifteenth century were born five great masters, whose names will be forever identified with the highest and noblest styles in the art of painting. These were Leonardo da Vinci, born in 1452, Michael Angelo in 1474, Titian in 1477, Raphael in 1483, and Correggio in 1494. All these lived and labored in the sixteenth century, some of them, however, not reaching very far into it. Leonardo da Vinci died 1519, at the age of sixty-seven, Raphael in 1520, at that of thirty-seven, Correggio in 1534, at that of forty, Michael Angelo in 1563, at the advanced age of eighty-nine, while Titian reached even to 1576, spanning the long period of ninety-nine years. The two last lived to witness the declension of art. The other three closed their eyes when its glories were culminating to their highest point. They might all be said to be contemporaries, except that the artistic life of Leonardo da Vinci preceded the others by nearly an entire generation. His labors, therefore, although not affected by the others, may have exerted some influence upon those of Raphael and Michael Angelo. With that exception, and the possible influence which the great contemporary works of the two latter may have exerted upon each other, each one of these projected and

[1] *Italian Schools*, 1, 254.

wrought out his own art creations wholly uninfluenced by any artistic performance of the other or others. In fact, each one seems to have had an important mission confided to him in reference to the development of some feature or quality of art, and to have been permitted faithfully to perform it, before being called away. Even the youngest, called Raphael, was allowed to accomplish his mission as fully as the venerable Titian, who laid down the burden of life in his ninety-ninth year.

The period politically would have seemed unpropitious. The golden period of Italian industry and liberty had passed away. The world's industry had created for itself new channels after the discovery of the passage round the Cape of Good Hope, and liberty had expired under the joint action of intrigue, faction, force, and tyranny resulting from usurpation. And yet it may have been the most favored time for art. The liberty that had existed had aroused every faculty and power into activity, which would, to some extent, remain after its cause had ceased. Again the wealth that had arisen from the profitable employment of industry was on hand, and as it could not be so profitably used as formerly, naturally gave encouragement to the labors of artists. The outgrowths of art had already been such as to attract great attention, and to command much admiration. The wealthy and powerful became in many instances, the patrons of art. The usurper sought to bury in the light of its glorious creations the very memory of those rights and privileges of which he had deprived the people. That day is the brightest for the liberation and triumph of art that witnesses the fetters of a growing despotism gradually tightening upon the limbs of the people. It has been so from the age of Pericles down to that of the Medici; and even to that of Napoleon, who gave utterance to the principle when he sent his message from Egypt to gild the dome of the Invalids.

In all the great departments of human progress a law has lain at the foundation, in accordance with which the special elements of that to which the progress relates are first

developed and unfolded. Human industry and effort first attaches itself to each, and singly exerts itself in bringing distinctly into realization everything belonging to each. The elements are then brought into union with each other, and genius of a higher order acting upon the combined result, carries out to a remoter limit the lines of progress. The history of painting at this period furnishes an apt illustration. The schools of Florence, of Sienna, of Venice, and of Umbria, under the old masters who had flourished during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, had each been developing elements, all of which were necessary in combination to render the art perfect. About the close of the fifteenth century, presents the point of time when their union was required, when the attainments hitherto made must be combined together, thus presenting a new starting point for the further progress of the art. "This union constituted a most rare and exalted state of human culture, an era when the diviner energies of human nature were manifested in all their purity.[1] In the master works of this new period we find the most elevated subjects, represented in the noblest form, with a depth of feeling never since equalled."

The first who led the way into this higher region of art progress was Leonardo da Vinci. He was a mortal most singularly favored. "Facility, ingenuity, versatility, industry, inquisitiveness, boldness, and thoroughness; a prodigious memory, a plastic will,[2] a rich, creative imagination, and inexhaustible capacity of invention, a predominating reason holding all these intellectual and executive reasources in perfect control, undisturbed or misled by illusions, operating with mathematical certainty, and sustained by a physical organization as strong and healthful as it was beautiful and untainted by vice; such was the fundamental force and universality of this wonderful being, who was perhaps the most completely endowed man by nature of all time." So rarely and singularly gifted by nature, his

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 378. [2] *Lewes*, 383.

mission to the world of art could not be mistaken. He could only conceive the essence of beauty as confined to no fixed canon, as pervading life in its whole extent as still to be conceived freely, and represented in a freely created form, by the gifted artist according to his individual feeling.

He was an intense student. His leanings towards science were as great as towards art. He excelled in civil and military engineering; made many inventions, was styled by Alexander Von Humboldt the greatest physical philosopher of the sixteenth century. His was emphatically a mathematical, constructive, and inventive mind. And yet his excellence lay in the higher region of art. There he excelled as poet, musician, architect, sculptor, and painter. He learned anatomy, animal and human, by dissection. He followed criminals to execution in order to sketch from them the pangs of the deepest despair.[1] He invited peasants to his house, and related to them laughable stories that he might catch from their physiognomies the essence of comic expression. He studied inanimate nature with the same persistent earnestness. Nothing that he could infuse effectually into his art escaped his vigilant observation. He wrote a treatise on painting, and unfolds probably the secret of his own action by saying:[2] "Thus, as a mirror reflects all objects with their particular colors and characters, the imagination of a painter accustomed to reflect will represent to him without difficulty all that is most beautiful in nature." "No painter" he says "should imitate another, always have recourse to nature, consult her for everything." His recourse uniformly was to reflection, law, analysis, synthesis. He desired always to superadd to feeling the sanction of reason. He derived little or nothing from classical art. He went directly to nature and to the resources of his own mind for the material of his art. So effectual were these resources that it has been said "he could compose new forms, as it were, for nature, un-

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 277. [2] *Leoes*, 387.

like any of her own creations, and yet in such apparent harmony with her ways that in admiring their strength and beauty, and interpreting their meaning, we lose sight of their impossibility."[1] It is said he once painted a fabulous monster so frightful in appearance that his own father drew back in fear from the horrible picture.[2] His ideal of truth and beauty was not, however, so much a sudden flash of intelligence as a thing of study and toil. With him the law of perfection had its foundations reposing on imperishable labor.

When he attempts the production of his idealized conceptions he evinces a peculiar predilection for one type of male or female beauty, and which is much alike in both. "It is full of grace, and refined, pure sentiment, verging upon weakness and languishment,[3] and destitute of real spiritual elevation. His Ledas and virgins enlist our sympathies as beings to be cherished for the sake of their entire loveliness of person and character, as we love the grace and innocence of infancy." "His ideal females are the creations of a chaste soul united to a refined taste; not aspiring to the spiritual, nor descending to the level of common womanhood, yet true and substantial."

He was a consummate judge of character, and knew thoroughly the modes of expression by which its workings were displayed. He had made himself familiar with the language of the passions and knew their appearances as they indexed upon the form their internal action. He imparts to his works no idiosyncrasies of his own. He deals in abstractions. The revelations he makes are not of himself nor of any other particular individual. He carries an idea back to the laws of its own being, and from the action of those laws determines how, in what form, and under what circumstances, it should appear. It is often, therefore, nature as cast in the mould of his own mind, which he presents to us. But in that mould he seeks to plant universal laws, and to present as his creations the results of their action.

---

[1] *Lewes*, 390. [2] *Italian Schools*, II, 278. [3] *Lewes*, 393.

Leonardo's authentic works are not numerous. It was long before he would dismiss a work as completed. His portrait of Mona Lisa, the wife of his friend Giocondo, in the Louvre, is a picture of extraordinary loveliness and of exquisite finish.[1] The painter had worked at it for four years and pronounced it still unfinished. In reference to this it has been said: "His flesh is virginly warm and tender, his anatomy and modeling the reproduction of nature itself;[2] the beating of the arteries and the movement of the chest are indicated; the lucidity of the eye, the flexible, soft quality of hair and its adhesion to the skin, the bony and muscular structure; in fine, every element of nature's handicraft, to the strictest truth of likeness itself, without any approach to idealization, yet all harmonized into a head of exceeding interest, if not of beauty, was united in this portrait."

The work by which he is far the most extensively known, through the medium of the engravings taken from it and everywhere diffused, is the Last Supper. Here Jesus and the twelve are alone, and are seated at a plain table, on which a light repast is spread. The traditional style of composition handed down from an earlier period is adhered to, the assembled guests being made to sit on the further side of a long narrow table, Christ being seated in the middle. The point of time selected is that at which the announcement is made: "One of you shall betray me," the effect of which, upon that impassioned audience, is sought to be portrayed. The different exhibitions of feeling with which this is received; the different outbursts of passionate expression; marking all the gradations of character from the loving John to the fiery Peter, are sketched by a master's hand. The heads are the ideal embodiments of the several characteristics of the apostles.[3]

An interesting incident is related which well shows his method of composition. The prior had accused him before the duke, of dilatoriness, and of passing half a day at a

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 287. [2] *Lewes*, 400. [3] *Idem*, 396.

time absorbed in reflection before his work. He replied, that "men of genius are sometimes producing most when they seem to be laboring least, their minds being occupied in the elucidation of their ideas,[1] and in the completion of those conceptions to which they afterwards give form and expression with the hand. Adding, that he could not hope to find the Saviour's head on earth, and he had not yet attained the power of presenting it to himself in imagination, with all that perfection of beauty and celestial grace, which appeared to him to be demanded for the representation of the divinity incarnate." So also the head of Judas was still wanting, and he distrusted the power of imagination to form up to itself features adequate to express his character, but closed by intimating that if all other resources failed him, he might possibly take the face of the impertinent and annoying prior.

A very celebrated cartoon of his, or rather fragment of one, is what is termed the Struggle for the Standard, in which he has attempted to depict the turning point of victory. "His horses and men are the very incarnations of the fury and fierceness,[2] the animals rivalling the rage of their riders, of deadly strife for the most precious of military trophies. The intensity of the struggle is appalling."

Giotto and Leonardo have been thus compared with each other. "They were complete, universal men, with a range of intellectual power capable of eminence in any direction. Leonardo's more varied acquirements were in unison with the advanced knowledge of his age. Giotto's influence on art was more profound, inasmuch as he concentrated his genius solely upon it. Each sought its development through similar processes of imagination, reflection, and study of nature. Each was independent of the influence of other artists. Each largely inspired in thought and manner the greatest of the masters of their times."

The next great genius in art that looms up near the commencement of the sixteenth century, is Michael Angelo,

[1] *Lewes*, 398. [2] *Idem*, 400.

born in 1474, and who lived to witness the decline of art. The preeminent qualities of this great man as an artist have already come under review while on the subject of European sculpture. We shall here only consider him as a painter, and his architectural and sculptural power are here rendered apparent. His painted figures are said to have "a certain mysterious architectural grandeur.[1] They are the expression of primeval strength, which stamps them, whether in motion or in rest, with a character of highest energy of intensest will."

He did not excel in every species of painting. His landscape is little less than a barren line of horizon. He seems entirely to ignore it. For the lesser, feebler, more delicate forms of nature he had no predilection. Neither did he excel in portrait painting. His character of mind stands alone, great, original, creative; of a depth and intensity far removed beyond ordinary comprehension. His superior excellence lay in sculpture, and his profound knowledge of anatomy, and comprehensive mastery over form would naturally attach him strongly to that style of art. At the same time his deep penetration into the sources of passion and emotion, and into the laws of their evolution, enabled him, by means of expression, to give a depth, spirituality, and power to his painted figures, much beyond the reach of any who had preceded him. In the characters of form and expression he may be expected to excel.

One of his earliest performances in painting is a cartoon, of which a fragment only has reached us of a party of soldiers bathing in the Arno when an unexpected summons to battle reaches their ears. This was to him a lucky idea. It enabled him to display in full and lively development, his knowledge of the human form. All is in movement. Some are already clothed, some half, others wholly naked. All crowd hastily together. It is a most graphic and vigorous display of martial forms with fine muscular

[1] *Italian Schools*, II. 299.

developments acting under emotions of mingled alarms, courage, surprise, confusion, and impatience for the combat, drawn and grouped with amazing skill and naturalness of action and feeling.

It is, however, on the ceiling and end wall of the Cistine chapel that are found the mightiest remains of Michael Angelo.[1] On the former are represented in fresco the creation and fall of man with its immediate consequences. "It required," says Kugler, "the united power of an architect, sculptor, and painter to conceive a structural whole of so much grandeur, to design the decorative figures with the significant repose required by their sculpturesque character, and yet to preserve their subordination to the principal subjects, and to keep the latter in the proportions and relations best adapted to the space to be filled. After the creation and fall, come the prophets and sibyls, represented seated, and employed with books or rolled manuscripts.[2] They sit pensive, meditative, inquiring, or looking upward with inspired countenances. Their forms and movements are majestic and dignified. They appear capable both of bearing the burdens of earth, and of receiving consolation from the secrets of the future."

This, as a whole, is pronounced by Jerves, the noblest monument of Michael Angelo's mind, "combining the most varied and profound motives with adequate material expression,[3] in which not only are the technical difficulties of position and art wonderfully overcome, but it also presents a tenderness of feeling, and delicate appreciation of woman's most winning traits and domestic nature, and a general grace, not usually characteristic of him; and at the same time, the dignity, majesty and intensity, more exclusively his, harmonize admirably with these qualities. Not only is it the highest effort of Michael Angelo's mind, but if it be viewed as a composition blending in one great whole the supernal elements of Christian faith and historic truth, poetry, tradition, and revelation, in their fullest and

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 301, 302. [2] *Idem*, 304. [3] *Jerves*, 430.

deepest significance, vitalized by an inspired imagery suggestive of man's creation, fall, and redemption, and symbolizing in grand and solemn forms the whole compass of religion, it embodies the highest excellence that strictly Christian art has ever attained."

The immense work in fresco, however, by which, as a painting, Michael Angelo is best known to posterity is probably the Last Judgment. This was undertaken in his sixtieth year, and required seven years for its completion. "If," says Kugler, "we consider the countless number of figures, the boldness of the conception, the variety of movement and attitude, the masterly drawing, particularly the extraordinary and difficult foreshortenings, this immense work certainly stands alone in the history of art,[1] but in purity and majesty it does not equal the paintings on the ceiling." He had much to contend with. The pope, Paul IV, reproached him with the nudity of his figures, but he replied that "if his holiness would only reform the opinions of mankind the picture would be reformed of itself."[2] The same objection somewhat offensively had been made by Cesena, master of ceremonies to Paul III, whereupon Michael Angelo transformed his diabolical Minos into an unmistakable likeness of the complainant,[3] who forthwith demanded redress of the pope. "Where has he placed you?" inquired his holiness. "Put me, why in hell" exclaimed Cesena in deep distress. "Alas, then," said Paul, "he has put you out of my reach; had it been only in purgatory, I might have delivered you, but in hell there is no redemption." Many of the figures were, however, subsequently draped by another artist.

The artistic world has been somewhat divided as to the merits of the Last Judgment. The attempt by fresco or any other means, to represent the triumph of the saved and the despair of the lost, the joys of heaven and the horrors of hell, was too daring even for Michael Angelo. Hence all must feel that an adequate conception of such

[1] *Italian schools*, II, 806. [2] *Lewes*, 420. [3] *Idem*, 420, 421.

a theme is beyond mortal power. He has succeeded best in the lower part depicting hell. In the groups he there presents,[1] "from the languid resuscitation and upraising of the pardoned, to the despair of the condemned, every variety of expression, anxiety, anguish, rage and despair, is powerfully delineated. In the convulsive struggles of the condemned with the evil demons, the most passionate energy displays itself, and the extraordinary skill of the artist here finds its most appropriate exercise."

In this fresco the powers of the sculptor, and the knowledge of the anatomist, are fully displayed. "In this stupendous work" says Flaxman, "in addition to the genius of the mighty master, the mechanical powers and movements of the figure, its anatomical energies and forms,[2] are shown by such perspective of the most difficult positions, as surpass any examples left by the ancients on a flat surface or in low relief, and are only to be equalled in kind, but not in the proportion of complication, in the front and diagonal views of the Laocoon, and all the views of the Boxers, which are both entire groups."

We must now take leave of Michael Angelo. We have seen him as architect, sculptor, and painter, in certain styles of art, looming up, the grandest among the greatest of this proudest era of Italian art. Originally constituted of the sterner stuff that exalts character; favored by circumstances in his commencement and in much of his progress through life; honest and untiring in his devotion to art, and in his efforts to reach its highest styles, he has left behind him a soul that still lives in his productions, and a name that will be among the very last to die out from the memory of men.

The next great painter who occupied the foremost rank in the galaxy of artists, who adorn the commencement of the sixteenth century, was Raphael Sanzio born in 1483, and who ran his brilliant career, dying at the early age of thirty-seven, in the year 1520. And yet it has been said that during the thirty-seven years of his short life,[3] he tra-

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 307. [2] *Pictorial Gallery*, II, 359. [3] *Guizot*, 74.

versed a distance equal to that which usually lies between separate epochs of art. He possessed a progressive nature, one capable of rising to higher and still higher degrees of improvement. Michael Angelo's system of art seems to have been born with him; at least his infancy, virility,[1] and age, exhibit one uniform principle. The peculiar elements that compose it, the marked characteristics of the great painter appear in all his works. With Raphael it was different. "He arrived" says Fuseli, "by degrees at style in design,[2] by degrees at style in composition, by degrees at invention, expression, and at what appeared to him color. His genius emancipated him from the shackles of prescription and fashion, rapidly, if we compare his progress with the shortness of his life or the progress of the rest of his contemporaries, but slowly if we compare him with Michael Angelo."

There were three distinctly marked epochs in the artistic life of Raphael, characterizing the styles of three different schools. The first was the Umbrian, which was acquired under his pupilage to Perugino. His first independent works bear the general stamp of the Umbrian school, but in its highest beauty. It was probably well that his art life drew its first inspiration from the deep spiritual tendencies of mystic Umbria. The tender enthusiastic sentimentality which is the general characteristic of this school, not only harmonized well with his character, but was excellently well adapted to impart to it such elements as are, among others, essential to its perfection. Here were made his first youthful efforts, which contained the earnest of a high development. Here were executed some of his Madonnas, some easel pictures and altar pieces. Before leaving Perugia, his pictures although still bearing the features of the Umbrian school, show nevertheless the freer impulse of his own mind, a decided tendency to individualize.[3]

At the age of twenty-one he visited Florence, arriving there at a period when Tuscan art had attained its highest

[1] *Fuseli*, III, 257. [2] *Idem*, 256. [3] *Italian Schools*, II, 334.

perfection, and its glories were developing under the efforts of the most celebrated artists. One remarkable quality in the mind of Raphael was that of extreme susceptibility to beauty of every degree and form, and a ready facility of adopting any new style of art that appeared to him to possess a superiority over every other. This ability to reflect the high art of his age, and yet so to specialize as to stamp it with his own individualism, formed one marked distinction between himself and his great contemporary, Michael Angelo. The latter was everywhere, and throughout life the same lofty, unbending, inflexible Michael Angelo; his style, his spirit, his embodiments of form, of beauty, and power, were his own, and in their essence unchangeable. He derived little from others.

Raphael, being so favorably constituted, could not fail to derive an immense benefit from the higher style of art, which was then developing in the Tuscan schools. He was already imbued with the spiritualistic tendencies of the Umbrian school. This constituted one essential element in the formation of a great painter. But along with it was a confined manner from which any considerable degree of perfection required an emancipation. The perfect mastery of form, the untramelled development of free life, could not be acquired without it. Hence the necessity of drinking at the well-springs of Tuscan art, of imbibing the spirit of the schools at Florence, before the painter could feel satisfied that he had gone to all the accessible sources of supply.

Raphael profited from his Florentine teachings. He became transformed by them from the sweet and pensive spiritualist into the dramatic artist. A love for the naturalistic was inspired. His sphere of observation became much enlarged. Nature became now his great field of study, and he was led to practice more in portraiture and historical painting. The former works contain an expression of his own mild spirit. Those now succeeding are characterized by a cheerful and unconstrained conception of life. His progress while in Florence is marked more especially in the small pictures, half figures of the Madonna with the

child in her arms. The earliest of these are characterized by the deepest,[1] tenderest feeling, while a freer and more cheerful enjoyment of life is apparent in the later ones. To this period also belong some portraits and altar-pieces. Among the latter the Entombing of Christ is the most celebrated.

In 1508, when in his twenty-fifth year, on the invitation of Pope Julius II, he removed to Rome, and here commenced and was completed his third and last epoch of art life. Here he acquired the full consciousness of his powers. The treasures of antiquity were around him, and he stood face to face with the antique. The walls of the Sistine chapel were already kindling into life under the pencil of Michael Angelo.

The papacy might then well claim to be a leading power in Europe, and in all matters relating to mental culture undoubtedly stood the highest. For the purpose of rendering Rome the great centre of attraction, it was decided to adorn the walls of the Vatican with paintings in the highest style of art. These paintings are all executed in fresco, covering the ceilings and walls of three chambers and a large saloon, now bearing the name of the stanze of Raphael. The execution of these paintings occupied Raphael during the whole of his residence in Rome, up to the time of his death, and were only completed by his scholars. They are not, however, altogether the work of his own hands, but they were done under his directions. What is termed the Roman school, had its culminating point in Raphael.

The subjects selected for representation in these great works, were no Bacchanalian or vulgar scenes; but they were the exalted symbols of science, the sacred functions of religion, great military actions, and important events of former days. The first apartment was devoted to the representation of theology, poetry, philosophy, and jurisprudence; those four high intellectual pursuits, embraced,

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 340.

to some extent, in every branch of human culture. These are represented on the ceiling by four allegorical female figures, and on each of the neighboring façades, is a large historical picture illustrative of these subjects. As a sample of the manner in which these high intellectual pursuits are represented, we may take philosophy, which is portrayed in that celebrated painting called the School of Athens. Here we have Plato and Aristotle in earnest dispute; the former to indicate the source of his philosophy pointing to heaven, the latter, for a similar purpose, pointing to earth. On either side are listeners. On one side Socrates instructs Alcibiades; on the other, various figures are employed in discourse or study. The arts and sciences have their representations in Pythagoras and Archimedes, Zoroaster, and Ptolemy, the geographer. There, also, alone and avoided by all, sits Diogenes the cynic, while just entering the hall are seen Raphael himself, and Perugino. This picture is one of the most perfect of Raphael's creations, exhibiting in its regularity and sublimity, a great variety and dramatic vivacity; the drawing, both of the nude figure and the drapery, being free, accurate, and spirited.[1] The group of Archimedes and his scholars has been more especially commended. There are not here, as in the others, poetic or allegorical figures, and the genius of the painter is shown less in the poetic effect of the whole composition, than in the beauty of the single groups and figures, which fill the mind with wonder and delight.

In the second chamber of the Vatican are the series of compositions representing the power and glory of the church, and her miraculous deliverance from her enemies. Among these, the expulsion of Heliodorus from the Temple is one of the grandest and most poetical of all Raphael's creations. Here is also the miracle of Bolsona, representing a priest who had entertained doubts as to the doctrine of transubstantiation in the art of being convinced by per-

[1] *Munich Gallery*, II, 10.

ceiving the blood actually flowing from the consecrated wafer.

In the third chamber are pictures representing events in the lives of Leo III and Leo IV, the most remarkable of which is an immense fire in the Borgo of Rome represented as extinguished miraculously by St. Leo IV.

In the last of these chambers is the Hall of Constantine, which is decorated with scenes from the life of that emperor. These, although from the designs of Raphael, were nevertheless mostly painted by his scholars, and many of them after his death.

While these great frescoes were in progress Raphael was also engaged in many other works, among which were the decorations of the loggie of the Vatican, which are open galleries running round three sides of a court. These which were originally so beautiful and resplendent as to be thought "a vision of paradise," are now merely the shadow of what they once were.

In each one of the thirteen cupolas are four pictures, the subjects of which are taken from the Old Testament. They are known as Raphael's Bible. The composition of each is his, but the execution is by his scholars.

Another work which has rendered Raphael the most universally known through the civilized world by means of engravings made from them, are the cartoons, eleven in number, executed by him in water colors to serve as patterns for the tapestries subsequently worked from them at Arras in the Netherlands, and which, with two exceptions, are now in the galleries of the Vatican. Seven of these original cartoons, all that now remain, are at Hampton Court, England. There were originally two series, the one representing the principal events in the life of St. Peter; the other in that of St. Paul. Among these those the most generally known from engravings are: the Miraculous Draught of Fishes, the Healing of the Lame Man, the Death of Ananias, the Conversion of St. Paul, Elymas the Sorcerer struck Blind, and Paul Preaching at Athens. "Compared with these," says Hazlitt, "all other

pictures look like oil and varnish;[1] we are stopped and attracted by the coloring, the penciling, the finishing, the instrumentalities of art; but here the painter seems to have flung his mind upon the canvas. His thoughts, his great ideas alone prevail; there is nothing between us and the subject; we look through a frame and see scripture histories, and are made actual spectators of miraculous events. Not to speak it profanely they are a sort of revelation of the subjects of which they treat; there is an ease and freedom of manner about them which brings preternatural characters and situations home to us with the familiarity of every day occurrences; and while the figures fill, raise and satisfy the mind they seem to have cost the painter nothing. Everywhere else we see the means, here we arrive at the end apparently without any means. There is a spirit at work in the divine creation before us; we are unconscious of any steps taken, of any progress made; we are aware only of comprehensive results, of whole masses of figures: the sense of power supersedes the appearance of effort. It is as if we had ourselves seen these persons and things at some former state of our being, and that the drawing certain lines upon coarse paper by some unknown spell brought back the entire and living images, and made them pass before us, palpable to thought, feeling, sight."

In addition to these works, Raphael, while he resided in Rome, executed a large number of commissions for princes, public corporations and private individuals. Instances of these are afforded in the fresco of the Four Sibyls in the church of S. Maria della Pace, that of the Prophet Isaiah in the church of S. Agostino, and the decoration of the chapel belonging to the Chigi family in S. Maria del Popolo at Rome.

It has been remarked that Raphael always appears the greatest when, undisturbed by foreign influence, he follows the free, original impulse of his own mind.[2] His peculiar element, and that in which he more especially excelled,

---

[1] *Munich Gallery*, II. 18. [2] *Italian Schools*, II, 372.

was grace and beauty of form, in as far as these are the expression of high moral purity. In the abstract conception of form he is inferior, and hence in his mythological representations he becomes feeble in proportion as he generalizes. He is the painter of men as they live, feel and act, embodying actual sentiment, feeling, and passion, and not the delineator of man in the abstract, portraying the capacities, energies, and idealities of form. Notwithstanding the greatness and grandeur of the works in which he was employed by the popes, his peculiar powers are the most fully developed in the Madonnas and Holy Families, of which an immense number were painted from his designs, and under his superintendence, receiving their last touches from himself. They amount to about one hundred and twenty in number. His natural tendencies are shown in the fact that in his youth he was the fondest of this class of subjects, and if his earliest works of this kind appear dreamy and sentimental, and the later ones exhibit a more cheerful conception of life, the works of his third period form the happiest medium between cheerfulness and dignity, between innocent playfulness and a deep penetration of the spirit of his subject. "They are conceived with a graceful freedom,[1] so delicately controlled, that it appears always guided by the finest feeling for the laws of art. They place before us those dearest relations of life which form the foundation of morality, the choicest ties of family love; yet they seem to breathe a feeling still higher and holier. Mary is not only the affectionate mother, but she has, at the same time, an expression of almost virgin timidity. The infant Christ is not only the cheerful, innocent child, but a prophetic seriousness rests on his features, which tells of his future sacred destiny. In the numerous representations of these subjects, varying in the number, attitude, and grouping of the figures, there prevails sometimes a more simply natural, sometimes a more profound conception; and thus they offer many interesting

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 373.

points of comparison."[1] In those of a later period there is a grander style of ideal beauty, and instead of a tender enthusiasm, earnestness, and fervor of youth, there appears a tranquil enjoyment of life, ennobled by the purest feeling. But these are not the glorified holy forms which inspire adoration. They exhibit interesting moments of domestic life, the accidental reunions in a family, when the agreeable sports of graceful children attract the delighted observation of parents.

Raphael also in the best time of his art executed a great number of portraits. The most celebrated of these are that of Bindo Altoriti, the Fornarina (baker's daughter), Julius II and Leo X, together with those of the cardinals Medici and de Rossi. The chief excellence of these resides in their unaffected conception, and characteristic expression, and many of them display also the purest and most admirable execution.

The last great painting undertaken by Raphael, not quite completed at his death, and suspended over his corpse, a trophy of his fame, at the time of his funeral, was the Transfiguration of our Saviour on Mount Tabor. This is distinguished by the dramatic development of an historical event, by the important prominence given to the principal incident, and by grandeur of style. With these qualities is also united a profound symbolical treatment, which, in the representation of a particular event, expresses a general idea. The composition is divided into two parts. On the summit of Tabor lie prostrate the three disciples, dazzled by the divine light, and above them the Saviour floats in air, accompanied by Moses and Elias. At the base of the mount the other nine disciples are in vain besought to heal those maladies which God alone can do by directly imparting his power. The lower portion is thus made to represent symbolically the calamities and miseries of human life, the rule of demoniac power, the weakness even of the faithful when unassisted; while above, in the brightness of

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 376.

divine bliss, undisturbed by the suffering of the lower world, we behold the source of consolation and redemption from evil. Some of the disciples, conscious where help and strength lies, are pointing upward to the summit of the mountain.

In Raphael, we have a third instance in immediate succession of one, the universality of whose genius pervaded the entire domain of objective art. While he did not neglect the study and even the practice of sculpture, he was for the last six years of his life the chief architect of St. Peter's Cathedral, and was superintending the excavations ordered by Leo X with the view of disinterring and bringing again to light the remains of ancient art that lay buried in Rome. The wonder and marvel among men is that he could have accomplished so much within a life of thirty-seven years. It shows pretty clearly that life is to be measured by thoughts, words and acts, and not simply by duration.

It is, however, only as a painter that Raphael entitled himself to the praises of posterity. His mind was endowed with that rare good fortune as to harmonize with the age in which he lived.[1] It was so constituted as to be rich in the power of acquisition at a time when the germs of all things were bursting into life with an incredible vigor. It possessed a preeminent faculty of discrimination at a time when it would seem that all that was necessary was simply to choose. It was a fruitful soil where the germs of all styles could fructify, and attain each to a high degree of excellence without dwarfing any of the others. His genius almost equally pervaded the whole domain of painting, while it failed to attain those lofty heights to which others singly were successful in ascending. In grandeur of invention and form he is inferior to Michael Angelo, in chiaroscuro to Correggio, in coloring to Titian. But in the composition of Raphael the style of design is made to accord so exquisitely with the forms, the coloring with each, the

[1] *Guizot*, 75.

chiaroscuro being just adequate to the degree of perception meditated, the whole harmonized by innate and unerring propriety, animated with his own peculiar grace and sentiment,[1] while each separate quality becomes yet more perfect in the combination, thus altogether, not singly, but in combination, giving to the pencil its greatest possible triumph. He, above all other painters, possesses the power of concentrating himself on an idea, simple in its relation to the present, but brilliant as regards both past and future;[2] on some expression at once pure, simple, and full of meaning, in which he makes even the minutest details of his composition meet and assist. As stated by Mengs "in the invention of his pictures he attaches himself above all to expression to such a degree, that he has never given to a limb a movement which is not precisely necessary for it, or which does not convey some expression; nor has he ever bestowed one touch on any figure, or any limb of a figure, without its having a direct relation to the main expression, from the general structure of man to the smallest movement. Everything in his works has reference to the chief intention of the picture; everything unconnected with it is rejected. At the same time he gives a different expression to each of the persons of his picture according to its place in the general idea. For he had a power of seizing, with the most rapid perception, and in a kind of inspiration, the appearances caused by the momentary actions of passion."

Raphael was suddenly called away while yet young, and in the full tide of success. He had many designs unfinished, many works in progress. He had many painters in his employ, who were chiefly occupied in advancing the works he had designed, the finishing touches, equally with the designs, being generally his own work. In addition to these, many painters had flocked to Rome, attracted thither by his great reputation, in order to perfect themselves in the art. All these, more especially the former, had drank in the manner and style of the great master, as

[1] *Sculpture, Painting, and Architecture*, 169. [2] *Guizot*, 69.

far as their different idiosyncrasies would permit. But none ever reached the fountain head, or attained to all the excellencies of Raphael. They, however, exercised considerable influence over art in various parts of the Italian peninsula.

Among these, none were more famous or accomplished than Giulio Romano, who, together with Gianfrancesco Penni had been intrusted by Raphael with the completion of his works. He afterwards removed to Mantua, and as painter, engineer, and architect of the duke, undertook and completed so many splendid structures, that the latter declared he had a better title to be called master of Mantua, than he himself had.[1] He was there the head of a school, rich in studies copied from the antique and Raphael, powerful in design, combining fertility of imagination with taste and selection; celerity with correctness; and knowledge of history and fable, with grace and facility of treatment. He followed the example of Raphael in preparing the cartoons and making his pupils paint them, subsequently going over the whole with his pencil, retouching, and correcting defects. He was great in design, having a very perfect knowledge of the human figure, its muscles, movements, and foreshortenings.

There were several others, pupils of Raphael, and belonging to the Roman school, who subsequently obtained considerable distinction, as painters, but not sufficient to justify our devoting to them any special consideration. The Roman school found its greatest glory in Raphael. That school is characterized by deep religious sentiment and aspiration, by noble and correct design, by a profound study of nature, founded on the antique, but having reference still to the old Christian types, by sober and dignified composition, by unrivalled passion and expression, by clear conception and wonderful invention.[2]

The Tuscan or Florentine, and Roman schools of painting, together with the ancient Siennese, and more modern

[1] *Cleghorn*, II, 64. [2] *Idem*, 77.

Umbrian, by the close of the first quarter of the sixteenth century, had, in many points of excellence, carried this art so far in advance of everything previously known as almost to discourage all future effort. Florence furnished living nature as models, thus giving it its naturalistic features. Sienna and Umbria had evoked the spirit, and in its workings as outwardly displayed, had given the tendency to the spiritualistic. Rome had yielded up the antique, and thus had contributed the idealistic element. And now what was required further to complete the works of the old masters, and to traverse the entire circle of what was essential to perfect art? The answer is ready. We still lack the perfect chiaroscuro and color. Hence the necessity of Correggio and Titian.

The chiaroscuro, or disposition of light and shade, owes its discovery to Leonardo da Vinci, who made such advances in it as to render it an important instrument in the art of painting. But with him its progress made a pause. Even Raphael so thoroughly catholic and alive to every element of his art, considered chiaroscuro as a subordinate vehicle, and never would suffer it to absorb meaning, or to supplant expression and form.[1] But although both the Florentine and Roman schools appear indifferent to this element, and omit the proper study and use of it, yet the Venetian school, the nurse of color, has rendered to it a due degree of homage. The effects it produces by the opposition of dark to lucid, opaque to transparent bodies, and cold to warm tints, were well understood by Paolo Cagliari.[2] But the great master who the most fully comprehended the mysteries of this subtle agent, developing and applying it more thoroughly than all preceding, contemporary, and subsequent schools, was Correggio.[3] To the schools of Florence and Rome, light and shade were esteemed necessary, only so far as they were attendant on design, composition, and color. But all these were to Correggio little more than submissive vehicles. He made

[1] *Fuseli*, II, 285. [2] *Idem*, 296. [3] *Idem*, 297.

them in a great degree subservient to his disposition of light and shade. This disposition, and the foreshortening he so frequently and successfully introduces, entitle him to the rank of a representative man in the art.

An able writer thus draws the parallel between Raphael and Correggio:[1] "The simplicity of Raphael's forms is little beholden to that contrast and those foreshortenings which are the element of Correggio's style. Raphael sacrifices all to the subject and expression; Correggio, in an artificial medium, sacrifices all to the air of things and harmony. Raphael speaks to our heart; Correggio insinuates himself into our affections, by charming our senses. The essence of Raphael's beauty is dignity of mind; petulant naïvete, that of Correggio's. Raphael's grace is founded on propriety; Correggio's, on convenience and the harmony of the whole. The light of Raphael is simple daylight; that of Correggio, artificial splendor. In short, the history of artists scarcely furnishes characteristics more opposite than what discriminate these two."

Correggio was born in 1494, at Coreggio, in the duchy of Modena, and much obscurity rests upon his history. He died in 1534 at the early age of forty. There is no evidence that he derived anything from the labors of Michael Angelo or Raphael. The works of Leonardo da Vinci, and his school, exercised upon him the most important influence. He is supposed to have formed himself principally by observation and practice. That may perhaps account for the fact that he is distinguished by a subjective mode of conception, a susceptibility to the highly wrought feelings and affections. His perfect command over the element of chiaroscuro appears to have been founded on that delicacy of perception,[2] that quickness of feeling which is alive to every lighter play of form, and is thus enabled to reproduce it in exquisite modelling. He could anatomize light and shade in endless gradation, and could give the greatest brilliancy without dazzling, and the deepest shade

[1] *Fuseli*, III, 369. [2] *Italian Schools*, II, 419.

without offending the eye. He observed also the relation of colors with such masterly skill that each appears in itself subdued yet powerful in relation to others. He delighted in undulating lines, avoiding the straight and angular.[1] He was superior in the management of draperies, both in regard to their masses and contrasts. His youthful heads are natural, beautiful, radiant with smiles and unaffected simplicity. His pictures possess an internal light. In every variety of chiaroscuro and aerial perspective, in the disposition of his masses of light and shade in their infinite gradations, oppositions and reflexes, he is unrivalled. So also in the expression of grace, sweetness, tenderness, and rapture, as well as sorrow and suffering, it is claimed he has never been excelled. In his own peculiar sphere he attained such greatness and freedom,[2] that the highest pesition has been assigned to him. He could depict, as it were, the very pulses of life in every variety of emotion and excitement. And yet it seems conceded that he never reached, especially when compared with Raphael, the higher elements of beauty and dignity, or of ideal grandeur of form, and of intensity of expression. In expression he has endeavored to impress the soft hues and undulating lines which rapture and joy leave on the countenance. He does not appear to have entertained even the slightest conception of the ideal. He copied nature with the utmost precision, and every form wears the stamp of that living original whence he derived it.

The principal works of this master are the two noble cupolas of the cathedral churches of Parma, painted in fresco, the subject of one being, the Assumption of the Virgin, that of the other, the Ascension of the Saviour. Besides these his most celebrated paintings are his famous Notte, the Holy Night, celebrated for the striking effect of the light, which, in accordance with the old legend, proceeds from the new born babe, the radiant infant and the mother both being lost in the splendor which has

[1] *Cleghorn*, II, 88. [2] *Italian Schools*, II, 420.

guided the distant shepherds. The Nativity of Christ, Jupiter and Io, Leda, Antiope asleep, St. Jerome, the Marriage of St. Catherine, the Magdalen, and a Holy Family, are all remarkable for the dominant qualities of the painter.

Correggio left no pupils of any eminence. Indeed his works did not acquire that celebrity to which they were entitled until after his death. Then it was that students having resorted to Parma from various quarters to make them their study, his influence became extended over the different schools of Italy.

We have now seen the different Italian schools developing either successively or simultaneously, the different elements that lie at the foundation of the painter's art. The mysteries of form, whether lying in nature, or in the imagination, or in the antique, have been thoroughly investigated and brought to light. Masaccio, Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, and Raphael, had left little to be accomplished in either of those directions. So also the marvels of expression, the spiritualistic, had been much indebted to the schools of Sienna and Umbria. The chiaroscuro had remained for the master touches of Correggio, who has never been surpassed in uniting the relievo and the morbidezza, as the Italians call it. There was one element yet remaining, in the development of which, no painter had yet acquired much celebrity, and that was color. The true development of this brings us to the mission of the Venetian school.

The full display of color in all its beauty and gorgeousness, was well confided to Venice. The Venetians loved splendor. The magnificence of the orient found its appropriate home in this city of the sea. The Italian skies no where revealed more clearly the blue depths of ether, or looked down more lovingly than upon the queenly city of the Adriatic. The Roman school gave us beauty of form; Correggio, chiaroscuro; to the Venetian we must look for color. It is this school that gives the warmth of life to the color of flesh; that imitates the splendor and brilliancy of

different materials, and relieves light on light. The Venetian school painted very little in fresco. Its works were chiefly in oil, that being more favorable to its peculiar object than the severer methods of fresco.[1]

The great representative and chief embodiment of the Venetian school was Titian. This great painter was born at Cadore, near Venice, in 1477. In the same year was born Giorgione, who may be regarded as the first successful pioneer in the new art of color. He died in 1511, having shown the way to eminence as a colorist.

Parallels have been drawn between Titian and Correggio and Titian and Raphael. He has been distinguished from Correggio by the totally different aim which actuated each, while Correggio seeks animation and excitement, Titian prefers repose and quiet dignity. The former apparently calls his figures into life only to make them the organs of particular emotions;[2] the latter gives them first the grandeur of mere conscious existence; the former, in the warmth of his passion can hardly muster sufficient patience to proceed to the development of fine forms; the latter always builds on the immovable foundation of necessary and general beauty. The former is the developer of chiaroscuro which is something conditional and accidental, a phenomenon lying on the surface of objects; the latter develops coloring which is the expression of life itself. "Raphael and Titian," says Sir Joshua Reynolds, "seem to have looked at nature for different purposes;[3] they both had the power of extending their view to the whole, but one looked for the general effect as produced by form; the other as produced by color. Titian attended to the general form of his object as well as color, but his deficiency lay in not possessing the power like Raphael, of correcting the form of his models by any general idea of beauty in his own mind." The style of Titian may be divided into three periods, viz: "when he copied, when he imitated, and when he strove to generalize, to elevate, or invigorate the

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 431. [2] *Idem*, 442. [3] *Munich Gallery*, II, 51.

tones of nature. The first is anxious and precise, the second beautiful and voluptuous, the third sublime. In the second the parts lead to the whole;[1] in the last the whole to the parts. It is that master style which in discriminated tones imparts to ornament a monumental grandeur."

Titian had but few and simple colors on his pallet, but his great merit consisted in his knowing how to combine and contrast them to the greatest advantage. When light and shade were insufficient for his purpose he applied either simple tints taken from nature, or artificial ones to produce illusion.[2] In the nude, he avoided masses in shade and deep shadows, which are destructive of the grace and delicacy of the carnations. He made use of various degrees of middle tints for the flat portions. He used a variety of colors one over the other, which, while it gave the appearance of a mere accident of nature, was the most dexterous art.

He was also a master of perspective, and was the first who availed himself of an ideal harmony in the colors of his draperies. He was also skilled in giving grace, clearness of tone, and dignity to his shades, middle tints and lights, as he distinguished with infinite variety of tints the various complexions and carnations. He imagined a chastened light from on high, which admitted of various gradations and middle tints. His pictures possess a peculiar internal light, supposed to result from the clear or tempera grounds, and color placed above color, so as to produce the effect of a transparent veil.

Titian produces his most gorgeous effects both by keeping down and by heightening his colors. The fineness of his gradations adds to their variety and force. It is the severity of his eye, and the patience of his touch that accomplishes his work.[3] He keeps pace with nature by never trying to outrun her, and "as he forms the broadest

[1] *Fuseli*, II, 363. [2] *Cleghorn*, II, 80. [3] *Hazlitt's Literary Remains*, 199.

masses out of innumerable varying parts and minute touches of the pencil, so he unites and harmonizes the strongest contrasts by the most imperceptible transitions. Every distinction is relieved and broken by some other intermediate distinction, like half notes of music; and yet all this accumulation of endless variety is so managed as only to produce the majestic simplicity of nature. So that to a common eye there is nothing extraordinary in his pictures, any more than in nature itself. He hides the artifice of his coloring and execution in its apparent simplicity, and is therefore the most difficult perfectly to copy."

Titian displays peculiar mastery in the representation of the naked female form, because here the magic of his coloring is developed in its fullest power.[1] His flesh color partakes of the glowing nature of the climate, and the luxuriousness of Venetian manners.[2] He represents objects not through a merely lucid medium, but as if tinged with a golden light.

Titian may be considered as the finest portrait painter of all times. In his heads the Italian character is always observed to predominate. They are marked by a look of piercing sagacity, of commanding intellect, of acute sensibility. Their countenances exhibit the daring spirit and irritable passions of the age and country. They have great consistency of form and expression. This consistency constitutes as great a charm as the harmony of coloring. He always seems to have taken his sitter at the happiest moment, and thus has left us the true conception of the old Venetian.

He appears never to have made a thorough study of anatomy, or of the antique. He did not possess, therefore, a full knowledge of the muscles, nor did he always give ideal beauty to his contours. His figures, nevertheless, are possessed both of truth and character. In landscape backgrounds he is said never to have been equalled. He did not make use of them merely as ornaments, but rendered

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 447. [2] *Hazlitt*, 199.

them strictly subservient to the purpose for which he introduced them. In his mastery of coloring three principles have been remarked:

"1. The interposing medium between the eye and the object is supposed to be a mellow golden light.

"2. The most glowing and gorgeous lights are produced, not so much by rich local tints as by the general conduct of the whole piece, in which the gradations of tone are almost evanescent, yet in their strongest hues powerfully contrasted.[1]

"3. The colors are laid on pure, without mixing, in tints by reiterated application, and apparently with the point of the pencil."

Titian lived a long life, not laying down its burden until he had reached his ninety-ninth year; and then, while seated at his easel he was seized with the pestilence which ravaged so large a portion of Italy in 1576. He was honored by kings and senators. His pictures are very numerous, and to be found in several European galleries, in those of Spain, of Rome, of England, and of France. The Martyrdom of St. Peter the Dominican is esteemed his chef-de-ouvre. Of this picture Haydon says: "The terrific gasping energy of the assassin, who has cut down the monk; the awful prostration of the monk, wounded, and imploring heaven;[2] the flight of his companion striding away in terror, with his dark mantle against a blue sky; the towering and waving trees, the entrance as it were into a dreadful forest; the embrowned tone of the whole picture, with its dark azure and blue sky, the distant mountains below, and splendid glory above, contrasting with the gloomy horror of the murder; its perfect though not refined drawing; its sublime expression, terrible light and shadow; and exquisite color; all united, render this the most perfect picture in Italian art."

The Venetian school reached its culminating point under Titian. There were, however, two other painters who at-

[1] *Sculpture, Painting, and Architecture*, 172. [2] *Cleghorn*, II, 79.

tained considerable celebrity. The first one of these was Tintoretto, born 1512, died 1594, who was called the lightning of the pencil, from his miraculous dispatch. He sought to combine the coloring of Titian with the grandeur of design of Michael Angelo. He studied anatomy, and hung up models of wax or clay in different attitudes to become studies for foreshortening.[1] He united great strength of shadow with the Venetian coloring, and thus became a vigorous painter seeking rather than avoiding difficulties; but under him Venetian art was rapidly drifting into the mistaken path of collossal and rapid productiveness. He takes his attitudes and movements from common life, and not from the best models.[2] His compositions are revealed more by masses of light and shade than by any studied degrees of participation in the principal action. His was an off-hand style. Reckless and rapid in execution he gave the reins to his imagination without much study or selection. With a few patches of color he could express the liveliest forms and attitudes, but he is often harsh and gloomy, with exaggerated contrasts of light and shade. In his landscapes there is much brilliancy of color, and great vigor and impetuosity of pencil.[3] His compositions are often grand and noble, full of elevated ideas, but he fails in that artistic arrangement of the whole, and in that nobility of motives in parts, which are the necessary exponents of a high idea.[4] His most celebrated works are the Miracle of the Slave, the Crucifixion," and the Universal Judgment.

Paolo Cagliari, Paul Veronese, of Verona. born 1528, and died 1588, is another apt representative of the Venetian school. "Had I," says he, "the time, I should like to paint a grand entertainment in a superb gallery,[5] at which I would introduce the virgin, the Saviour, and St. Joseph. They should be waited upon by the most glorious company of angels that one could conceive of,

[1] *Cleghorn*, II, 81. [2] *Italian Schools*, II, 460. [3] *Cleghorn*, II, 82. [4] *Italian Schools*, II, 460. [5] *Guizot*, 111.

who should be presenting them the choicest viands, and the most rare and costly fruits, on dishes of gold and silver. Others should be pressing upon them the most delicious beverages in transparent crystal, and in brilliant golden vessels, showing thereby, how eager such happy spirits are to serve their master." There speaks the soul of the great master. His high ideal was to develop scenes of worldly splendor. His imagination revelled in festivities. His most celebrated work is the Marriage of Cana. He painted many Last Suppers and Banquets, usually introducing a large number of figures, but preserving throughout an unity of purpose. He had the merit of originating a new, magnificent, and decorative style, peculiarly adapted to the gorgeous splendor, rich ornament, and characteristic voluptuousness of the queen of the Adriatic. His paintings are said to be like full concerts of enchanting music. Through all is proclaimed the pomp of color. He found his models in nature, not in the antique, or the ideal; but his imitations were select, not servile. Although wanting in the perfection of flesh-tones, yet, by splendor of color, aided by rich draperies and other materials, by a clear and transparent treatment of the shadows, by comprehensive keeping and harmony, he infused a magic into his pictures, which surpasses almost all the other masters of the Venetian school. He diffused through all his paintings a beautiful vitality, a poetic feeling. They abound in grand architecture, in splendid vases and furniture, in brilliant and gorgeous costume, and in a race of human beings, powerful and noble, elate with the consciousness of existence, and full of enjoyment. But his was, nevertheless, a style of beauty more addressed to the senses than to the soul, and like all such, contained within itself the seeds of corruption. It was like the last gleam of the setting sun, more resplendent from the depth of shadow that succeeded it; like the last rallying of the living system ere death asserts its sway, putting forth yet one more effort to live, pouring forth one more beam of unclouded reason, as if to reveal in its very light, the

dissolution that extinguished it. The school of Venice expired with Paul Veronese.

By the middle of the sixteenth century the Italian schools of painting had completed one great cycle in the history of art, viz: they had produced great masters who had, either simultaneously or successively, developed every element which went to constitute it. What now remained to be done? The proclamation of, and action upon the eclectic system. This brings us to the eclectics, who assuming that all the different elements of their art had been separately developed and unfolded, and that hence nothing new remained for them to develop, directed all their efforts to the selecting and uniting the best qualities of each of the great masters, not, however, at the same time excluding the study of nature. They failed to observe that the greatness of those masters largely consisted in their individual and peculiar qualities, and that hence the attempt to unite together characteristics that were in themselves essentially different, could hardly be expected to succeed. Eclectism in art, equally as in philosophy, appears more beautiful in theory than successful in practice. In art it proposses simply to open a new well spring of supply. It allows still a resort to nature and to the antique, but along with this seeks to unite according to theoretical rules, derived from man's æsthetic nature, into a new and more perfect whole, the many varied excellencies they coveted in those great masters, who were their models in painting. From one, for instance, they propose to borrow invention, from another the rules of composition, from a third the management of shade, and from a fourth the art of laying on colors. Aside from the difficulty of universally agreeing upon theoretical rules, it is obvious that the widely differing qualities of the old masters could never be brought to unite into an harmonious and homogeneous whole. And yet this school, although incapable of ultimate success upon its own principles, had nevertheless some good practical results. It made the strongest possible appeal to intellect, and was therefore adapted to the development of talent, and to the teach-

ing the theory and practice of art according to established rules.[1] It was, therefore, directly opposed to the lawless habits and crude inventions of those painters who took as guides their own erratic wills, desirous rather to dazzle or astonish, than to win truth, or create beauty.

Ludovico Carracci, born 1555, died 1619, is regarded as the founder of the eclectic school. In conjunction with his two nephews, Agostino and Annibale Carracci, he opened an academy at Bologna, which they jointly furnished with casts, drawings, engravings and living models for drawing and painting, instructing in perspective, anatomy, the study of nature, and the imitation of the great masters.

This school was far more successful than any other of its day. Its founders possessed a true feeling for the representation of the higher subjects of life, and by their zeal and perseverance they attained a considerable, though not a perfect harmony of corresponding style. Although they all entered on the same path, yet they pursued it in different manners. Ludovico excels in variety and intensity of expression, Agostino in ingenuity of conception,[2] while Annibale has surpassed them both in purity and grace. But the productions of all three were alike in evincing great depth of thought. Annibale was accounted the greatest painter, Agostino the greatest genius, and Ludovico the greatest master.

Annibale is very happy in small compositions, such as Madonnas and Holy Families. He was also one of the first who practiced landscape painting as a separate department of art. In some of his historical pictures the landscape divides the interest with the figures. His best performance is a series of frescoes of mythological designs in the Farnese palace at Rome.[3] These works are regarded as the fairest criterion of the school. They are among the most finished specimens of fresco painting. They were his last important works.

---

[1] *Lewes*, 473. [2] *Guizot*, 129. [3] *Italian Schools*, II, 487.

The school of the Carracci, thus successfully established at Bologna, gave birth to several artists of distinction whose productions take a high rank among the works of art. The most distinguished of these are Domenichino, Albani, and Guido Reni.

The first mentioned excelled both in oil painting, and in fresco. He is less skilled in invention than some others, but his attitudes and expressions are just and true to nature. His most celebrated works are the Communion of St. Jerome, the Flagellation of St. Andrew, and the Martyrdom of St. Agnes. The first mentioned is pronounced by Poussin to be one of three best pictures in the world, the Transfiguration by Raphael, and Volteria's Descent from the Cross being the other two.

Albani achieved the characteristic of elegance as a painter. He surpasses in the representation of females and children. He was designated the Anacreon of painting. He is sometimes allegorical, as in his paintings of the four elements in the Borghese palace.

Guido Reni, exhibits two styles of painting at different periods of his life. Those of his early time abound in grand, powerful figures, majestically arranged, and dark shadows giving an imposing, sometimes solemn air, to his pictures. Such is the Crucifixion, the Crucifixion of St. Peter, and the Massacre of the Innocents. Subsequently he changed, and made beauty, grace, and sweetness his aim, seeking them both in design, touch and coloring. He formed an abstract and ideal beauty of his own, which being his own creation, he could change or modify to suit his purpose. The best illustrations of his latter style are in his fresco painting of Phœbus and Aurora, Concert of Angels, and St. Andrew on his Way to Execution.[1]

The entire cycle in the history of Italian art is completed by the advent and development of the eclectic school of the Carracci and their followers, as was that of European philosophy by that of Cousin. But in the latter a new

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 492, 493.

cycle was commenced, finding its first starting point, but not certainly its last resting place in the positivism of Auguste Comte. So also in the former, the first step taken from the eclecticism of the Carracci was into downright materialism. It would seem as if the latter, both in philosophy and in art, was the starting point from which the first rebound was taken, and the refuge to which those of tired wing and exhausted energies might return, but which never could furnish a final resting place either to thought itself, or to thought realized in art, because it could never satisfy the cravings of a nature which was not in it or of it, but beyond and above it. As we took leave of philosophy merged, crippled, obscured, but not forever to be confined, to positivism, so we shall now take leave of Italian art by a brief reference to the school of the naturalistic.

The principle upon which this school proceeded was the direct imitation of common nature, founded on a peculiar feeling strongly manifested in that particular direction. The object was more especially the development of passion. The forms it brings before us are not those of modified nature in which beauty is the evidence of moral harmony, but those in which some powerful and demoniac passion was either just on the eve of an outbreak,[1] or in the art of revelling in its intensest workings. Even when no animated scene is represented, the spectator feels that they are capable of the wildest excitement. As the thoughts and workings even of a well constituted mind when they are all displayed fully to the calm gaze of another, could not but present in many points an unfavorable result, so this indiscriminate imitation of nature has been not inaptly termed the poetry of the repulsive. This common nature is imitated in the sensualistic direction, their works displaying sharp, abrupt lights, and dark shadows.

This school finds its chief representative man in Caravaggio, born in 1569 and dying in 1609; an artist whose

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 506.

avowed principle of painting was the "imitation of individual nature without selection,[1] taking the first model that offered, and that the more hideous the better. He deals in the blackest and fiercest shadows. He revels amid banditti, murderers and maniacs. But notwithstanding his vulgarity of conception his works display a peculiar breadth, and, to a certain extent, even a tragic pathos, to which the grand lines of his draperies lend a special assistance. Through all his works he develops a powerful nature, which fails not to interest through the coarse superficialities of the naturalistic school. He succeeds best in scenes of sorcery, murder, and midnight tumults and treachery. His Cheating Gamester is much celebrated. So also are his Martyrdom of St. Matthew, and Entombment of Christ.

Caravaggio had several scholars and followers, among whom was Lo Spagnoletto, a Spaniard, whose Adoration of the Shepherds is much celebrated, but his pictures, in general, exhibit a wild, extravagant fancy, his figures being bony and angular, and his greatest delight being apparently in executions, tortures and martyrdoms.

From his school, however, came Salvator Rosa, who painted history and landscape, following in the former the style of the naturalistic. Among these, the Conspiracy of Cataline is the most esteemed. He also adopts the same style in portrait in which he excels. But his principal excellence lies in his landscapes, in which he attained much celebrity. Faithful, however, to the naturalistic principle, he displays more beauty and originality in wild mountain scenes, lonely defiles and deep forests. "In the wild and stormy scenes of Salvator Rosa," says Allston, "the lines" (by which he means the course or medium through which the eye is led from one part of the picture to another), "break upon us as with the angular flash of lightning;[2] the eye is dashed up one precipice only to be dashed down another; then, suddenly hurried to the sky, it shoots

[1] *Cleghorn*, II, 70. [2] *Lectures on Art*, 149.

up, almost in a direct line, to some sharp-edged rock; whence pitched, as it were, into a sea of clouds, bellying with circles, it partakes their motion, and seems to reel, to roll, and to plunge with them into the depths of air."

He usually peoples his landscapes, introducing into them hermits, robbers, or wandering soldiers, who assist in the general effect, and deepen the impression of loneliness and desolation. In a later, sometimes termed the Florentine period of his painting, he appears to break away from the peculiarities of the naturalistic style,[1] and to adopt an ideal treatment relaxing into simple purity of line and serenity of atmosphere. An instance is found in a coast scene in the Colonna gallery at Rome. We here see an approximation towards a style which finds its ultimate and highest development in Claude Lorraine. Salvator Rosa died in 1673, and with him the history of painting in Italy, as a living art, and animated by genius, may be said to close.

German Schools.

We now cross the Alps, and find ourselves among other races of men, and other styles of art, than those that flourished under Italian skies. We are in the old German father-land and among the Teutonic races. We find, however, that similarity of political institutions are followed by similarity of results in matters of art. We encounter in central Europe, as in Italy, the great political fact, of the rise and commercial prosperity of free cities, which, almost independent of each other, attained to great wealth and power. They ran the same round, and perished in the same manner, history everywhere teaching the same lesson, viz: that the seeds of decay and dissolution of free institutions are sown in the luxury and effeminacy which are consequent upon wealth, and that disorganization and anarchy, or a resort to tyranny as a refuge, are sure to follow as the

[1] *Italian Schools*, II, 509.

certain and inevitable harvest. From this the old Teutonic types could claim no exemption, and accordingly the histories of Cologne, Augsburg, Antwerp, and Brussels follow in the wake of Florence, Sienna, Milan and Venice.

The influence of Roman art long lingered in central Europe, and classic forms were rudely imitated. The northern races had, at first, no other models, aside from actual nature, than those of classic origin. But with these they were never entirely satisfied. In the tenth and eleventh centuries they broke away from them in their architecture, shooting up their pointed Gothic in the place of the old Roman basilicas. Its innumerable columns, ample windows, and vaulted ceilings left less space for wall painting than the churches of Italy. A few paintings of the thirteenth century are still to be seen in the churches of Germany, and also something is to be gathered from the illuminations of manuscripts. The first out-croppings of Teutonic art indicate a marked difference between it and the Italian. The difference results from the different character of mind in each, and the tendencies to which each is subject. While the Teutonic is subjective in its character, the Italian is objective. While the former worships reason, and is always ready to sacrifice fancy to truth, the latter inclines to revel in the boundless field of the imagination. The former is analytic in its action, the latter synthetic. The former is practical, the latter theoretic; the former real, the latter ideal; the former looks to earth with its earthy atmosphere, the latter can accept no earthly model until it has been bathed in the hues of heaven. Consequently, the features of Teutonic art, which are the most prominent, are great energy, individuality attained by striking contrasts and exaggerated expression, human feelings and emotions indicated by contorted action and violent gesticulation, vice displayed by hideous distortion and absurd caricature, nature copied in her lowest and most vulgar instead of her highest and best features. One very natural result from this tendency, and this disposition to break away from classic forms and models, would be a love for

landscape painting, and we accordingly find the German schools in early pursuit of that as a separate branch of art. This indicates a love of nature for itself, and hence proclaims an innate purity in the German mind; for vice, disease, and human deformities have nothing to do with the beauties which God has given to the landscape.

It may well follow from what has been remarked that the tendencies of the Teutonic mind were all naturalistic, and that is another of its distinguishing features. It too often fails to discover that there are degrees of beauty in nature, and that the highest style of mind, in its works of art, is best employed in selecting and combining such objects and things as in its judgment are best calculated to awake in the beholder a sense of the beautiful or sublime. Instead of this, the Teutonic mind presents a precise transcript of what actually exists in nature in the exact order and arrangement of nature herself.

The first school north of the Alps, and worthy of notice as presenting the workings of the Teutonic mind, is the school of Cologne on the Rhine, in the latter half of the fourteenth century. This school stands in nearly the same relation to Teutonic art as that of Giotto does to Italian. Its chief characteristics are: correct design, frequently evincing considerable knowledge of anatomy; drapery flowing and dignified, free from the angularity of the later German and Flemish painters. Expression at first rather Byzantine,[1] afterwards less so, the types of the male saints being full of dignity and character, those of the female sweet but exceedingly German, that of the Virgin being nearest the ideal; the coloring rich and harmonious; linear perspective adhered to; ærial little known. Its principal painters were Meister Wilhelm and Meister Stephan.

This brings us down to the fifteenth century, with the commencement of which a new element in art, viz: a strong feeling for nature, appears amongst the nations of the German race. The school of Cologne had intimate

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 280.

relations with architecture and sculpture, being, like that of Giotto, largely derived from the latter. The old Flemish school of Van Eyck adopted strongly the principle of Masaccio. The motto that has been ascribed to it is: "Nature as she is, in all her beauty and all her deformity, and farewell to the ideal." The two brothers, Hubert and John Van Eyck, particularly the latter, exercised a mighty influence in the history of painting. They discovered, or rather perfected, the art of painting in oil colors, which gradually in Italy and all over Europe, took the place of the fresco and the tempera modes of painting. In the celebrated altar-piece, the Worship of the Lamb, the joint work of the two brothers, are united all the highest qualities of the first period of Teutonic art. But the greatest work of the school is the Adoration of the Lamb, in which the spiritual and conventional art of the middle ages was probably carried to as high a degree of perfection as the Teutonic artist was able to attain.

In this school, the Byzantine types and traditions were almost wholly rejected. In its later period little sympathy existed with Cologne, or sculptured art. The heads of its saints are individual, truthful, vigorous; exhibiting little variety of emotion, becoming at last, pure, unmitigated Flemings. One great point of excellence consists in its coloring and anticipations of still life. A vast improvement is made in lineal and ærial perspective. Landscape painting is made to glow with a reality hitherto unknown. The eye is carried into distant space; the world around us, objects both near and distant, the green meadow, the trees laden with fruit, the overhanging heavens, the graceful swell of the mountain looming up in the distance, the dwellings of men, both their interior and exterior, the implements and necessaries of life, are all reflected in the works of the school. It was the first to express in art that quiet enjoyment of natural beauty out of doors,[1] of which the Italians seem far less susceptible than the Teutonic races. The

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 305.

latter are by far the most strongly impregnated with the sentiment of individuality and of home. Again, the Teutonic mind is more strongly inclined to fix on points of dissemblance rather than similarity;[1] on things exceptional, rather than those establishing the rule of nature. This accounts for the reason why the Flemish and German artists apparently delight to dwell on personal deformities; why, for instance, if a wrinkle or a wart happen to exist, it is brought forward and assigned a prominent place among the individual peculiarities.

Hans Meneling, who was removed a full generation from the Van Eycks, carried the peculiar qualities of their school to the highest perfection. In him there is a reaction from the pure naturalistic. A strong feeling for beauty and grace modified the realistic spirit, which worked without selection of types. His compositions are less conventional, the expression of his heads less vulgar, his delineation of the human form less hard and dry, and his draperies less angular and artificial in the folds. The features he paints are less lovely but more earnest;[2] the movements are less soft, the handling sharper, with greater finish of the detail. His grouping is symmetrical, and he confines himself to the characters absolutely necessary. He excelled in carrying miniature painting to a perfection that no other artist had hitherto attained. He could represent upon the very smallest scale, and with great truthfulness, events of the greatest interest and variety.

The old Flemish school of the Van Eycks exerted a powerful influence upon the art of painting, both in central Europe and Italy. It was the greatest school north of the Alps to which the fifteenth century gave birth. Near the close of that century we must return to Germany to find in the old city of Nuremburg a man destined to exert a great influence in the world of art both as a painter and an engraver. This was Albert Durer, born in 1471, and who died in 1528. He is by some esteemed the father of paint-

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 305. [2] *German Flemish Schools*, 84.

ing in Germany, and is admittedly the exponent of Teutonic art during the first quarter of the sixteenth century. The same period which in Italy witnessed the full blaze of art under the glowing pencils of Raphael, Michael Angelo, Correggio, and Titian, in Germany was no less propitious in ushering in Albert Durer to work out under German skies the peculiar beauties of Teutonic art. What is the law of progress in the development of Art? Does its history march onward in successive strides gradually and continuously; or do great single pulsations, as if coming from another sphere, occasionally from different points, scatter over our world those sublime and splendid products of art, which the men of all time may admire, which few of the men of any time can reach, and which are the embodiments of a genius that expired in the light of its own creation? It would seem as if the latter were the law of its development.

In Italy, art presents us with the most perfect forms of beauty. But in Germany there seem to have been obstacles in the way of developing such forms. The subjects upon which art must be exercised were not in all respects the same. The land of the Teuton is not covered with the bright skies of Italy. Its vales are dim with mists. For almost half the year it wears its wintry shroud. Its landscapes are more angular and broken. Its human forms savor far more of strength than of beauty. Existence is there taxed with severer efforts for its own support. The musings of its mind are far less upon the glories of the setting sun than upon the labors which on the morrow must earn its daily bread. Its thought is more profound than sprightly, its vein more philosophic than ideal. Its tendencies are realistic from necessity rather than choice. It possesses nobility of purpose, but lacks elevation in sentiment. The rougher aspects of nature, the ruder forms of society, the stronger demands upon living energies, leave less time, opportunity or disposition to cultivate the ideal. Its pleasures are more gross than refined. Its thought penetrates so deep that it perceives everywhere mysteries, which it is utterly unable to unravel. Its sympathies are

with death, and with sorrow and suffering, rather than pleasure and enjoyment, while those of the Italian art are with life, and all that life brings in its train. Hence the multitude of fancies and of fables that fed the old Teutonic mind. Hence the fantastic ornaments in the architecture of the middle ages, and in the illuminated borders of the elder manuscripts. It is only where nature's types, springing from fixed organic laws, are regarded and idealized, and not where fancy is allowed to reign, that the sovereign power of beauty can be fully manifested.

From these or other causes the fantastic betrays itself early in the development of northern art,[1] being the most visible in subordinate parts, although occasionally in those of higher pretensions. The strong realistic tendencies also developed a coarseness and vulgarity in the types from which were derived the models of Teutonic art. All these, together with a feeling and love for the grotesque, weighed heavy upon Teutonic art, and prevented its early rapid development.

Albert Durer marks a transition period from a lower to a higher style. He was not only a contemporary with the great Italian painters, but spent some years in Italy. His genius was essentially German, and he was never able wholly to divest himself of his Teutonic proclivities. He had strong powers of conception by which he was enabled to trace nature through all her finer shades, accompanied with a lively sense as well for the solemn and sublime as for the simple and tender. His invention was inexhaustible, and in the versatility of his genius he rivalled the great Italian painters. His drawing is full of life and character, with occasional strange attitudes. His coloring has a peculiar brilliancy arising from a play of the fancy indulging itself in light and splendor.

All are not agreed as to the principle upon which Albert Durer proceeded. One says: "Albert saw nothing but what was, and painted nothing but what he saw;[2] nature

[1] *German, Flemish, and Dutch Schools*, 115. [2] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 375.

was his model in all things, nature as developed at Nuremburg, in healthy, robust, substantial truth." Another says, "even in the expression and form of the countenance,[1] Durer follows a certain form, which cannot be called the normal type of ideal beauty, nor even a faithful copy of common life after the manner of his predecessors, but can only be explained from his prevailing tendency towards what is singular."

And, again, it is evident that at the time when Durer designedly entered upon the execution of individual minutiæ,[2] he did not strive to purify the earthly form of man from its defects and accidents, but rather assigned a value of its own to strict individuality of character, with all its narrowness and imperfection, that he sought to give it elevation by a sort of miracle (for what else can we call the phantasmagoric play of his color) rather than to impart to it a higher dignity by the instrinsic significance of its form."

This shows more clearly that he belonged to the transition period, the period when Teutonic art had in part emancipated itself, from the low, realistic, grotesque, fantastic, and mere common forms of nature and life, and ascended into the higher, more select, artistically combined, and idealized forms, which were issuing from the schools of Raphael, Correggio, and Titian.

Albert Durer himself undoubtedly made a progress from the lower to the higher. We have towards the last of his life a confession "that the beauty of nature had not unfolded itself to him until a late period;[3] that he had then only learned that simplicity is the greatest charm of art; that he sighed over the motley pictures of his early days, and mourned that he could no longer hope to emulate the great prototype, nature." He must, therefore, most certainly have caught glimpses of what should be the highest aim of art, viz: "the representation of the beautiful, whose province is to disclose the one great mystery,[4] and place

[1] *German, Flemish, etc., Schools*, 119. [2] *Idem*, 135. [3] *Idem*, 144. [4] *Idem*, 118.

before us the inward subject and the outward form as one and indivisible."

The most celebrated works of Durer are the Trinity; the Life of the Virgin, the Greater and Lesser Passion, Christ taken from the Cross, the four Apostles, John, Peter, Mark and Paul, beside many others. No painter seems to have excelled him in concentrating thought, meaning and expression in a subject. His works have been termed poems in themselves. He possessed the power of conveying his ideas in the most striking allegories, dressed up in the most original and fanciful forms. For instance, that of the Knight, Death, and the Devil, representing a solitary knight riding, with stern resolve, through a dark glen, the rugged valley of life, unmindful of the two horrible demons, death and the devil, who are besetting him on either side, is the most important work which the fantastic spirit of German art has ever produced. Another allegorical painting, not much less celebrated, is that termed Melancholy, in which is a winged woman seated in the midst of the various inventions of man's skill, her head resting upon her hand, her face the tablet of unutterable thoughts as she muses in sadness upon the realities of life, and the insufficiency of the human intellect to penetrate the hidden mysteries of creation. It is thus that art may teach its lessons of duty, and strike that mysterious net-work in the meshes of which our being is involved.

Another painter of distinction in the school of upper Germany was Hans Holbein, the younger, born at Augsburg in 1498, who spent the earlier part of his life at Basle and the latter part of it in London, where he died of the plague in 1554. He has been termed the Leonardo da Vinci of German painting, having carried the German branch of Teutonic art almost to the highest perfection, developing to the utmost its best qualities.

Holbein attained great excellence in portrait painting. "Nothing," says Lord Lindsay,[1] can surpass his portraits

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 393.

in their peculiar style of truth, actual and unidealized; his heads are life itself, but life in repose, as the originals appeared when resting on the lowest step of their intellectual or moral ladder; the eager eye, the speaking lip of the great portrait painters of Italy, his contemporaries, seldom or never animate them." "He proceeds," says Schlegel, "on principles essentially different from those of Titian.[1] He aims not only at producing an impression such as charms our senses, and at attaining an effect in itself strikingly great and forcible, but he endeavors to give the truest, and most profound representation of character, joined with the most perfect objective truth. Hence it is that the position which he chooses is generally quite straight and simple, and the background only a dark green uniform surface; whilst all the details of the dress are executed with the greatest diligence and exactness."

Holbein was a little later than Durer, and is evidently less purely German in his works. The influence of the great Italian masters was beginning to be felt. He is not, however, more than Durer, a copyist of German styles. The influence is manifested by the infusing into the old German feeling and style the utmost beauty of which they were susceptible. This is the more specially made apparent in his celebrated picture of the Burgomaster of Basle kneeling with his Family before the Virgin, which, while intensely German, has still about it a softness and richness which give it a high characteristic of purity and beauty; and yet when contrasted with the Madonna di S. Sisto, by Raphael, in the same gallery of Dresden, the one appears materialistic, as if bound to earth, and incapable of rising above it; while the other is spiritualistic, as if soaring on high, and seeking to elevate the human form and sentiments to the utmost limits of the imagination.

Holbein shows in his paintings a very intimate acquaintance with human passions and emotions, and a power of representing them with great truth and fidelity. But he

[1] *German, Flemish and Dutch Schools*, 193, note.

had, to a larger extent than other German painters, preceding or contemporary, a tendency to the objective conception of nature, and to the delineation of it in repose rather than in action. In him the coarse, fantastic or grotesque phase of Teutonic genius is displayed not in mere distortion, ugliness, and caricature, but in the most profound satire and irony. This is the most fully developed in his celebrated Dance of Death, in which the enigmatical, the visionary, and the marvelous, are all kept in subordination to a higher aim. Through the whole composition, consisting of some forty prints, is carried a most daring humor and cutting irony, death being made a fantastic skeleton, and appearing in a great variety of grotesque forms, surprising his victims often in their very act of sinning, always unexpected and unwelcome, except in the case of the very old man in the last stage of senility, who with his bowed head and tottering step, leans confidingly upon his bony arm, attracted onward by his tinkling dulcimer towards an open grave into which the next step will inevitably land him.

Contemporaneously with Durer and Holbein we meet in Saxony with Lucas Cranach, born in 1472, and dying in 1553, whose long life marks also in his own experience a transition from the German to the Italian style of art. "His works," says Lord Lindsay, "are characterized by singularly original, often profound thought,[1] coupled with an almost irresistible propensity to caricature; the composition is highly graphic, but sometimes confused; the expression often very forcible, occasionally even dignified, but never beautiful; his design is, for the most part, careless and inaccurate, his coloring very pale, but still fresh and clear; in a word, the thought and the purpose of his pictures far exceed their technical merit. This applies to his works of purely German character; in others, he has adopted the Italian manner, yet like a mask in the carnival to be donned or doffed at pleasure." He also was a portrait painter

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 397.

of celebrity, and distinguished by his simple and faithful adherence to the forms of nature.

His works are very numerous, but we only notice the Font of Youth, at Berlin, a large basin fed from a miraculous fountain, into which numbers of old women, the ugliest of the ugly, having entered, are seen splashing about, and gradually regaining youth and beauty as they approach the opposite side, until having regained it, they become young and beautiful, and join in the feast and dance which is there awaiting them.[1] This affords an excellent opportunity, which is happily improved, of marking the gradation from ugliness to what the artist conceived the finest expression of beauty.

We have now reached the termination of the first cycle in the history of Teutonic art. Its important mission was to work out artistically the Teutonic character. The Germanic races possessed their own distinct features, which were shadowed forth in their manners, customs, feeling, thought and physiognomy. These it was the first business of their art of portray, and the old German masters were faithful to their trust. But their works, in some respects, compared unfavorably with the more splendid productions of the great Italian masters at the commencement of the sixteenth century. This produced an endeavor on the part of the German painters to reconcile the opposite principles of the two developments of painting, which were founded upon opposite national characteristics. A class of painters arose seeking to unite the features most easily imitated or caricatured in both forms of art, but who possessed none of the highest qualities of either. This was the first step downward. It was, of course, a failure, and, therefore, necessarily required another course to be pursued.

This brings us to the second half of the sixteenth century, when the influence of Italian art having superseded all others, the German painters wholly abandoned the old

[1] *Lord Lindsay*, III, 400.

German masters, and occupied themselves in imitating the works of the Italian artist. It has been truly remarked that "the Greeks and Egyptians, the Italians and Germans, all became great in art while it was confined within severe and well defined limits,[1] and in all alike we may date their decline from that high eminence at the period when indiscriminate imitations were first practiced. That painting which can present an outline only of material forms, must depend greatly on its power of seizing both the purely spiritual and the individual expression of those forms, and it should so employ the magic of coloring, as to embody and retain the exact proportions and appropriate ideality of each object, as existing in different nations and localities."

This imitation was first of the Roman and Florentine schools in order to attain a more perfect development of form. But however perfect the imitation the true spirit of Italian art was not there. They could reach no further than the imitation of external types. The living principle, the source of all loftier beauty in the Italian masters, was denied them. They could, and did, by mere imitation attain to the ideal, but when they had reached and grasped it, it had ceased to be the glorious ideal of the Italian artists, but had hardened into a mere form without spirit, meaning or inward life. One form of art peculiar to one race cannot be transplanted wholesale to another.

There was a revival of art during the first half of the seventeenth century. This was in the schools of the Netherlands and of Holland. It was not distinguished by the attainment of perfection of form, or the highest kind of feeling. It was rather characterized by its apprehension of individual life in its singularities, interests, and passions; in the concernments of its daily life,[2] in the expression of a happy tone of mind, in the play of light and color, and in a certain delicacy of execution which affords delight by

---

[1] *Schlegel's Æsthetic Works*, 118. [2] *German, Flemish, and Dutch Schools*, 221.

the brightness of its images. It was chiefly developed in the experiences of three men, Rubens, Vandyke, and Rembrandt.

Peter Paul Rubens, the founder of the Brabant school, was born in 1577, and died in 1640. He spent seven years in Italy studying mostly the works of the Venetian masters.

He has been accounted the most artificial of all the great painters, and the one who painted the most from his imagination. His forms are not derived from the antique, nor are they selected according to some universal and arbitrary principle of beauty. They are those of a bold and vigorous nature, in which the fullness of life that distinguished that period is strongly and appropriately expressed. It is hence that his compositions exhibit great dramatic power. His characters are not only expressed with precision, but their gradations are accurately marked. Each individual is original and independent.

Rubens has been called the Flemish Michael Angelo, although no one claims that he has ever made any near approach to the startling splendor of his genius. The resemblance consists in his throwing off all conventional trammels, and giving full play to a genius of singular power and originality. He also shows a similar daring conception, inexhaustible invention, and mastery over technical difficulties. There is also in both the same tendency to exaggeration of form and idea, but the Fleming, instead of exaggerating the loftiest form, resorts often to the lowest, taking the most common and vulgar types which were the readiest recipients of sensual elements and animal passions. At the same time "he is always great when decided action, energetic power, or lively feeling are to be expressed."

Again, it has been said that what Michael Angelo was in form, Rubens was in color; that he came to nature and tinged her with his color, the color of gay magnificence. He has not taken altogether the splendor of the Venetian coloring, but a more blooming tone of complexion, arising from moister air and a colder climate. He

has given to his flesh greater transparency and freshness than any other painter. In his Peasant Family going to Market, the figures have all the bloom of perfect health, the very surrounding atmosphere appearing to strike sharp and wholesome on the sense.

Rubens had another excellence. He is, par excellence, the painter of motion. All his forms have ease, freedom, and excessive elasticity. Everything that relates to the expression of motion is given with great power and effect.

Rubens did not alone excel in historical painting in which his great dramatic power came into special requisition. He also excelled in landscape painting, which first came into special notice about the beginning of the seventeenth century. His vivid conception of life, and power of seizing individual character, eminently fitted him for this species of painting. His landscapes, however, are generally Flemish in character, giving such general outlines as are presented in the Low Countries. But there is in all his landscapes "the same juiciness and freshness, the same full luxuriant life, the same vigor and enthusiasm as in his historical pictures."

The works of Rubens are surprisingly numerous, but, very many of them, especially of his great works, were painted by his scholars from small colored sketches by his own hand. Among his most celebrated paintings are: The Elevation of the Cross, the Descent from the Cross, the Battle of the Amazons, the Conversion of St. Paul, and Sampson betrayed by Delilah.

Anthony Vandyke was born in 1599, and died in 1641. He was the scholar of Rubens, and at first an imitator of his style. After pursuing his studies in Italy he formed a style of his own, exchanging the heavy forms of a ruder nature for the more graceful figures and softer coloring of the Italian masters, at the same time that he endeavored to give the "expression of deeper feelings, of a more tender love, a more spiritualized sorrow, and a more touching emotion." His subjects have generally a character of outward repose, and are confined within a narrow circle.

There is a class of pictures of his painting, the subjects and composition bearing a close affinity to each other, in which he has succeeded admirably in expressing the action of the most profound sorrow that can overwhelm the soul. They represent the body of Christ taken down from the cross, and mourned by his followers. In his Holy Families, of which he painted a number, we generally find a charming expression of cheerfulness and soft repose.

But it was as a portrait painter that Vandyke stands unrivalled. "His portraits," says Hazlitt, "have a cool, refreshing air about them, a look of simplicity and modesty even in the very tone, which forms a fine contrast to the voluptuous glow and mellow golden lustre of those of Titian. There is a quality of flesh color in Vandyke which is to be found in no other painter, and which exactly conveys the idea of the soft, smooth, sliding, continuous, delicately varied surface of the skin. The objects in his pictures have the least possible difference in light and shade, and are presented to the eye without passing through any indirect medium. It is this extreme purity and silvery clearness of tone, together with the facility and precision of his particular forms, and a certain air of fashionable elegance, characteristic of the age in which he flourished, that places Vandyke in the first rank of portrait painters." His portraits, although marked by perfect individuality, are nevertheless regarded as historical works, recording the types of the highest civilization and intellectual culture of his age.

The Holland School.

The Dutch school of painting, or school of Holland, was ennobled by the appearance of Rembrandt in the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Paul Rembrandt was born in 1606, and died in 1664. He was the son of a miller, born in his father's mill on the banks of the Rhine, was so imperfectly educated as scarcely to be able to read, and in the art to which he devoted himself is said to have been

ignorant of the principles of perspective, and even of the common rules of practice in painting. And yet he was a man of singular genius and originality, standing in some respects almost alone in art. There is certainly no painter before or since with whom he can in all respects be compared.

There are seeming contradictions in his character. He loved the most finished and perfect works of art, and made himself bankrupt in collecting them, and yet took a position in hostility to the study of the ideal, or of pure beauty of form, rejecting every type of it, and choosing as his models objects of the most common and vulgar nature. He gave to them, however, a certain ideal character, leaving behind the suggestion that he may have cultivated ugliness in his forms in order to show what obstacles he could overcome. His great aim was to transfer to the canvas the character of his own mind with its dark feeling of dreamy power and subdued passion; and not, like other artists of his time, represent on it the sublime repose which the contemplation of perfect beauty produces. His style throughout was, therefore, eminently subjective. He made use of external nature, and often the ugliest part of it, to proclaim the tone and feeling of his own mind. Hence his figures often appearing as singular and fabulous beings, yet with their accessories always excite in us the peculiar tone of mind aimed at by the artist, and which is generally of a gloomy character. His pictures, although professedly from the forms of common life, yet seize upon our inward feelings far more deeply than a mere imitation of nature could possibly do. They touch a hidden cord that lies profoundly deep in our common nature.

In contrasting Rembrandt with Rubens it has been said that "if the latter represents exciting events in a thoroughly dramatic form,[1] the former generally portrays the stillness of passion fermenting in concealment. If the latter endeavors to delineate life objectively, with a full

[1] *German, Flemish and Dutch Schools*, 251.

development of all the varied shades of character, it is the subjective element, the expression of his own tone of mind, which is the chief aim of the latter." While Vandyke made use of the smallest contrasts of light and shade, and painted as if in the open air, Rembrandt used the most violent and abrupt contrasts, and painted as if in a dungeon.

Rembrandt produced results the most striking and peculiar by means of his laying on of colors, and his disposition of light and shade. The former he sometimes drops in lumps upon the canvas, laying them on at times with his fingers, and painting with the handle as well as the point of his brush. Sometimes they are laid on as smooth as glass. Masses of light and shade are so placed in opposition as to produce a mysterious and solemn effect. "Mystery and silence have been said to hang upon his pencil." His pictures are "bright with excessive darkness." "He gives," says Kugler, "no sharply defined forms, but merely indicates them with a bold and vigorous brush; the principal points alone are made bright and prominent by striking lights, but at the same time the lights reflected from them penetrate in a wonderful manner the surrounding darkness to which they thus give life and warmth. There is something phantasmagoric in this style, which reminds us of the predominant tendency of northern art towards the close of the middle ages to the marvelous and strange." [1]

Rembrandt excelled in historical, landscape, and portrait painting. His peculiar style appears to most advantage when the subject represented accords with his own gloomy and powerful mind, as in the representation of the prince Adolphus of Gueldres threatening his imprisoned father to compel his abdication. So also Moses destroying the Tables of the Law.

In some of his works the effect depends almost wholly upon some fanciful burst of light appearing to strike on

[1] *Hand Book*, 251.

the persons in the picture with a startling and stunning power, hurrying the spectator with irresistible force into the world of the marvelous and the romantic.[1] Thus we have as illustrations the Sacrifice of Abraham, and Tobit and the Angel. In some others it is less this sudden effect of light than a still, mysterious play of chiaroscuro, exciting a peculiar dreamy tone of mind, as in the Two Monks engaged in Study. His landscapes one can look at forever, although there be nothing in them.

In the department of portrait painting he possessed peculiar excellence. He is known to have sketched the outlines of his portraits with great rapidity, and afterwards to have completed them with touches of such vigor, and laid on his lights with such considerable substance, that he seemed rather to model his figures than to paint them. One of his heads is cited, as having the nose, a Dutch one, it is presumed, almost as solid as it was in the living subject. In his celebrated painting of Nicholas Tulp dissecting a dead body in the presence of several hearers, the execution, modeling, and truth of the portraits are admirable, and the coloring and chiaroscuro of the dead body so perfect that it has been said skillful physicians could, from the appearances by that means presented, determine by what desease the death had been produced.

Until near the middle of the seventeenth century, historical and portrait painting were the only branches of the art that were much recognized. At this period of time an outgrowth of the Flemish school cultivated genre painting, that is, the representation of common life in its every day relations,[2] as opposed to religious or heroic subjects, or to any others of an elevated character. There were two classes of subjects. One sought to represent life under the regulation of established customs and civilized manners. The other exhibits its rude and vulgar side, with the unchecked license of a free and unbridled humor.

[1] *Handbook*, 356. [2] *Idem*, 366.

Among the most distinguished painters of the latter class stands David Teniers, the younger, born in 1610, dying in 1690. The subjects and scenes he excelled in portraying were those of peasant life. He exhibits nothing pastoral, but his peasants have the garb of every day life, and even when occupied in the most common place employments, have the expression of peculiar seriousness and importance. They are the most commonly occupied in smoking, card-playing, and beer drinking. His works usually have but few figures, often exhibiting low tavern scenes, in which the clowns, in their appropriate costumes, are seen whiling away their time with cards, beer, and tobacco, apparently content with such a routine of life, and asking nothing further of the world or of fortune. Sir Joshua Reynolds characterizes his works as being worthy the closest attention of the painter who desires to excel in the mechanical knowledge of his art; that his manner of touching, or what the painter calls handling, has perhaps never been equalled; there being in his pictures, that exact mixture of softness and sharpness, which is difficult to execute. The peculiar merits of the painter, so far as form, position, expression, and the outflow of the internal life-principle is concerned, may be, perhaps, as well displayed in paintings of this, as in those of any other character.

Another painter, but belonging to the Dutch school, is Adrian Van Ostade, born 1610, and dying in 1685, who also gave himself to genre painting, and stands second amongst the painters of the low and humorous style. His subjects are also taken from peasant life, but he exhibits more homeliness and less humor in his treatment of them, than Teniers. He seems the most at home in the representation of low public houses, in front of which, under a ruined arbor, the peasants sit together enjoying themselves in singing and playing the fiddle.

Another master in this species of painting is Jan Steen, the jovial tavern keeper of Leyden, born 1636, dying in 1689. He was decidedly a genius, and kept a hotel for the

fun of it, himself patronizing the bar fully as much as his guests. He gives a cheerful view of common life, treating it with a careless humor, as if the whole concern were a laughable masquerade, or mere scene of perverse absurdity. It is not so much the situation of his boors and drinking parties that he depicts, as he does the action, together with all the reciprocal relations and interests between the characters, which spring from it. He gives great force and variety of individual expression, evincing the closest and the sharpest observation. He brings into full play all the elements of comedy. Among his paintings, the Representation of Human Life, the Alchemist's Laboratory, and the Physician visiting the Sick Lady, are very highly esteemed.

We have hitherto seen illustrations only of the rude and vulgar side of genre painting. It now remains to give one or two of the other class, in which a higher and more regular style of life is made the subject of the painter. This style finds a representative in Gerard Terburg, born in 1608, and dying in 1681. His great merit, like that of Van Steen, consisted "in accurately seizing the feeling of a particular scene or action, and in discriminating with the utmost nicety, the finer shades of individual character." He has been called "the creator of conversation painting, which may be said to bear the same relation to historical painting on the one side, and to the buffooneries of Jan Steen on the other, that genteel comedy bears respectively to tragedy and to farce."

In Gerard Dow, born in 1613 and dying in 1680, is another delightful instance of the genre species of painter of the higher order. He rarely seeks, like Terburg, to awaken interest by the traces of some passion hidden beneath the surface. He delights most in subjects taken from the circle of the family, in portraying the affectionate relations of simple domestic life, and the peaceful intercourse of quiet homes. The execution is neat and highly finished, the accessories, as they perform so necessary a part in domestic life, are handled with the same care as the

figures.[1] They not only combine agreeably with the whole, but not unfrequently occupy a considerable portion of the picture. He was formed in the school of Rembrandt, and hence possessed a superior knowledge of light and shade, and the power of producing harmonious effect by its proper distribution. By means of it he very frequently renders the comfort of domestic privacy more striking through the twilight of evening or by candlelight.

There is also another species of painting in which the Flemish and Dutch painters attained to considerable excellence, viz: that of landscape painting. As this, however, made so much larger attainments under the pencil of Claude Lorraine, it is unnecessary here to enter into any particulars relating to it. The tendency of the Dutch painters to imitate with perfect truth to nature rendered them very successful in portraying the landscape. But as they exhibited on canvas just as it appeared in nature, neither selecting nor idealizing, they could not attain the highest order of excellence in that species of painting. The same tendency to imitate also rendered them skillful painters of flowers, fruit, animals, birds, and all those things that usually come under the denomination of still life.

The German, Flemish, and Dutch, have exhibited little originality, little skill in painting, little of the pulsation of art-life for almost two centuries past. The great intellectual movement in Germany of the present century, which has hitherto been manifested in philosophical speculation, minute analysis, and broad generalization, may, and most probably will sweep into the world of art, and commence there a new cycle in its history, whose higher course, and more comprehensive development, it will be for the future to unfold. The elements of the Teutonic mind, the slowness and sureness of its march, the tendency that exists towards the complete development of all it contains before

[1] *Handbook*, 290.

it closes any cycle in its progress, certainly promise much in reference to the coming generations.

The Spanish School.

The Spanish peninsula has not been wholly unproductive in the realm of art. Art was here characterized by some peculiarities. It was grave and solemn. The workings of an ascetic spirit were plainly discernible. The prevailing tone was one of gloom and severity. Along with this, however, are expressions of enthusiastic devotion, as both sternness and enthusiasm enter into the composition of the Spanish character. The circumstances which formed that character were peculiar. Of these the contests with the Moors, and the establishment of the inquisition, were the most important. The former developed sternness and severity, with a dash of religious enthusiasm. The latter exerted a constant and uniform pressure on all the means of developing and cultivating the human mind, or of imparting its ideas and sentiments to others.

An illustration of both these is afforded in the precepts prevailing as to the proper mode of painting the virgin. Any approach towards nudity must be most carefully guarded against. The representation of her sacred feet, uncovered and naked, was forbidden by the holy inquisition. Besides, they could prove that she was in the habit of wearing shoes by "the much venerated relic of one of them from her divine feet in the cathedral of Burgos."[1]

The coloring of the early Spanish schools was less brilliant than that of the old German, but to compensate for that there was about it a softness producing the effect of a veil thrown over the picture, and giving a breadth of coloring. Subsequently they adopted the warm coloring of the Venetians, as being better adapted to the glowing fancy of the Spaniard. But with all that brilliancy of sur-

[1] *Spanish and French Schools*, 14.

face the skin of the Spaniard seems reposing on an under surface of an olive tint.

The Spanish schools went through the three usual phases of progressive advancement, highest attainment, and decline. Their culminating point was reached under Velasquez and Murillo, about the middle of the seventeenth century. It marked that period in Spanish history when the peninsula was developing the most fully all its powers and resources; when, fresh from the conquest of the Moors, it was carrying its arms and civilization into both hemispheres; and when the glories of Italian art were kindling all over Europe that love and passion for painting which in Raphael and Michael Angelo had apparently reached the summit of perfection. Under Charles V and Philip II, the Spanish taste for painting was formed on Italian models. Painters of some distinction as Morales, Becerra, Campana, etc., flourished in Spain. Under Philip III, appeared also able and powerful masters, as Pacheco, Roelas, Herrera the elder, who trained those of the succeeding age. Then comes the great era of Spanish painting under Philip IV. It was the era of Velasquez and Murillo, during the latter years of whom no school in Europe rivalled that of Spain in portrait and historical painting.[1] The great painters of Italy had then passed away, and Rubens and Vandyke had gone to their rest. It was left to Spain to keep alive the fires of artistic genius.

There were three Spanish schools of painting viz,: Valentia, Madrid, and Seville. Valentia was the first in point of time, having for its founder Vincent Joanes who was born in 1523 and died in 1579. He was a celebrated historical painter, confining his painting to historical subjects, and chiefly for the embellishment of churches. His coloring is in the taste of the Roman school,[2] his draperies broad and well cast, and his foreshortening excellent. He always partook of the sacrament previously to commencing his pictures.

---

[1] *Spanish and French Schools*, 190. [2] *Spanish Painters*, I, 168, 169.

It is, however, only when we come down to the commencement of the schools of Madrid and Seville; to the seventeenth century, and near its middle; to the master works of Velasquez, Murillo, and Ribera; that we reach the golden age of Spanish painting; the age in which the peculiar genius of the Spanish people broke through all restraint, and became embodied in the executed conceptions of the great painters. Then it was that everything is made to bespeak a grand and solemn nation;[1] the dignified outlines, the monastic saints, the melancholy beauties, the proud forms of the men, the stern severity, the dark and vigorous chiaroscuro, all breathing the sad and solemn legends of history.

Velasquez De Silva, the founder of the school of Madrid, was born in Seville in 1594. In order the more completely to be able to command the expression of the countenance at all times, he resorted to the singular expedient of transferring from the field to his studio a peasant boy, whose extremely flexible features he could always control;[2] and who was ever ready to put on a grin, and lengthen it too, to assist his delineation of a mirthful countenance, or to assume a lachrymal expression when a bawling youngster was about to be represented. By this, and other expedients, he acquired great power in delineating with truth and accuracy the force and variety of human expression. In 1623, he went to Madrid, where, becoming the favorite of the king, Philip IV, he experienced, until the time of his death, a series of successes, such as seldom fall to the lot of the most favored mortals. In 1629, he was permitted to visit Italy, and to spend a year and an half in studying and copying there the works of the great masters. In 1648, he made a second visit, at this time more especially with the view of collecting for his sovereign a large number of curious works of art for the new academy of fine arts just commencing at Madrid. He also enjoyed the personal friendship and intimacy of Rubens.

---

[1] *Cleghorn*, II, 117. [2] *Spanish Painters*, II, 234.

With such rare facilities for developing so rare a genius, the greatest expectations may well be formed. Nor were these disappointed. Madrid, the home of the great Andalusian, permits him to be studied "in all his Protean variety of power." He was great, although not equally so in portraits, history, genre, and landscape. His style is marked by correctness, ingenuity, facility, and truth. He maintained that the superstructure of his art must be in strength supplied by the study of nature, and that secured, learning and refinements would rise more fitly from the basis. He had a profound knowledge of the antique, which did not destroy, but rather assisted his designs from nature.[1] While in color he could not reach the great Venetian, Titian, yet he even exceeded him in communicating an elastic airiness to the atmosphere of his picture, which places him on a level with Rubens himself in that magic point of art. He is also ranked as superior to Titian in the knowledge of light and shade, as also in ærial perspective.

He is also claimed to have equalled, if not actually excelled, Titian in portrait painting. His figures have even greater reality than most of the portraits executed either by Titian or Vandyke, although inferior to the former in color, and to the latter in elegance. There is nothing conventional about his portraits. Every touch has meaning, and the effect of the whole is that of nature seen through the clearest medium, all being handled in such a manner as to make a perfect work of art. The feeling and spirit of his subject are admirably conceived and perfectly expressed. Even the heavy, stupid look of the Austrian race is made consistent with dignity or softened by treatment in the picture. So admirable was the resemblance, that when he painted the Spanish Admiral Paresa, the king, it is said, addressed the picture with: "Why, admiral! I thought you had sailed." He often made use of long handled brushes, thus calculating practically the

[1] *Spanish Painters*, II, 261.

result of distance. There is much resemblance between him and the works of some of the chiefs of the English school;[1] but the difference has been said to be, that he does at once what they do by repeated touches.

Velasquez is the only Spanish painter who seems to have made an attempt in landscape, which he modeled upon Titian, and appears to have combined the breadth and picturesque effect for which Claude and Salvator Rosa, who came after him, are remarkable. Besides nearly fifty portraits still remaining, his most celebrated paintings are the Crucifixion, St. Paul the Hermit, and St. Anthony fed by a Raven in the Desert, the Surrender of Breda, las Meninas and the Bebedores, or Drinkers.

The head of the school of Seville was the celebrated Bartolomede Murillo, born in 1618 in obscurity, and who by the force of his own genius and indomitable perseverance achieved a high position in historical, portrait, and still life painting in oil and fresco. He began to sketch even in childhood, and at the very outset with him, invention and connection were marked features. The return of Pedro de Moya to Seville, who imported from England the good taste and fine coloring of Vandyke, awakened in Murillo the consciousness of his own powers, and was thus made the turning point in his life. He visited Madrid, was kindly received by Velasquez, and spent there three years in studying and copying the works of the great Italian and Flemish masters, particularly of Titian, Paul Veronese, Rubens and Vandyke, which were to be found in the capital, and at the Escurial. He returned to Seville in 1645 ready for the execution of great works. Velasquez appeared to feel the most at home while delineating the scenes of ordinary life; but Murillo, with a gifted and brilliant imagination, and a tender and delicate sentiment, had a strong taste for sacred subjects. His art broke through the common rules of nature in order to throw itself with less encumbrances into the ideal world. He was thus enabled to

[1] *Spanish and French Schools*, 155.

give an inspired expression to his Virgins, and supernatural and divine character to his Christs and St Johns, not to be found in any other painter. He spent three entire years in the Capuchin convent, which, by his twenty-five pictures, he rendered one of the richest and most interesting of monastic establishments. His style of color was always charming and progressing in beauty, but in 1655 it was marked by its third change, which brought together delicacy, sweetness, richness, brilliancy, force of effect, and perfect harmony. But the period of his finest manner of painting, during which he was the most prolific, and which forms, in fact, the most glorious epoch of his life, was from 1670 to 1680, when he was approaching and exceeded sixty years of age. He died in 1682, in consequence of an injury he received from the accidental falling of a scaffold upon which he was painting the Marriage of St. Catharine. "The unsullied tissue of his life," says his biographer, "has only presented a web clear of infirmity of disposition and character, while the unrolling of his genius constantly dazzled in proportion as it was revealed. He could never be without force in design, he never could be opaque in his coloring,[1] he never could execute without freedom, for all these characteristics of his talent were allied to his performances from the earliest period of his practice, although not brought to bear in one point of perfection, as in after years."

Murillo's style happily combines softness and vigor with the finest coloring. In his heavenly figures, more particularly, there is "a lightness and clearness, which produces the effect of a texture wholly different from that of the earthly personages, and the contrast often gives additional value to each separate portion of the same picture." Thus the kneeling saint, or crowd in the foreground, is found contrasted with the glorified beings above hovering in a sort of halo of misty light. In the execution of his pictures he made the cold grey tones of his backgrounds serve to

[1] *Spanish Painters*, 267, 269.

bring out and give full value to the mellow color of his principal figures, and in the painting of flesh as such he never was excelled. As a colorist he occupies a higher position than Velasquez, excelling more especially in his flesh coloring, as he appears there, like Rembrandt, to aim at the general character of flesh when tinged with the glow of the sun. Like that of Titian and Correggio his color is not minute and particular, but, a general, and poetical recollection of nature. It is cited as not a little singular, and as evidencing the individuality that runs through the being of the painter, that the two great artists, Velasquez and Murillo, both lived in the same time, in the same school, painted from the same people, and of the same age, and yet formed two styles of painting so different and opposite, that the most unlearned can scarcely mistake them, the former being all sparkle and vivacity, and the latter all softness.

The Murillos, or paintings of Murillo, are numerous, and of great value. Of these we can only mention Moses striking the Rock, which is admirable for its composition; for "whilst the dark mass of the rock and Moses standing beside it, form a sort of focus, the groups to the right and left make up the whole, and, by their details, tell the story of previous suffering, and miraculous relief, with the greatest truth and feeling," In the Conception, the bright glow of light shed around the virgin, and poured full, as it were, from the higher regions of heaven by the angels, is admirable. Others are the Loaves and Fishes, the Prodigal Son, the Beggar Boy, and the Flower Girl.

Contemporary with Velasquez and Murillo was another great Spanish painter, although his art-life was spent in Naples. That was Jose Ribera, surnamed Lo Spagnoletto, or the Spaniard. He was born near Valentia in 1588, was of noble descent but poor; went early to Italy, where he became while young so thoroughly impregnated with the spirit and principles of the terrible Caravaggio as to influence in the most sensible manner his whole after life. He afterwards studied the paintings of Correggio, and for a time

their influence was perceptible in softening the harshness he had acquired from Caravaggio. In his celebrated Descent from the Cross, he has, with exquisite feeling, mingled the softness and suavity of Correggio with his own severer methods, and thus placed the picture among the master-pieces of the world.

One of his chief sources of excellence, as well as means of originating conceptions of horror, was his profound knowledge of anatomical structure. He was enabled by means of it to make his representations so true to nature as to remain unsurpassed by the greatest Italian masters. His executions of criminals, and his martyrdoms of saints, the terrible variety of contortions arising from various modes of torture, are all rendered by him with such faithfulness and accuracy as to be truly dreadful. His works are very numerous, scarcely a cathedral or great church of Spain is without specimens by this truly great master.

Other Spanish painters followed in the footsteps of these great masters, but none acquired a celebrity sufficient to entitle them to consideration here.

The French School.

In France there has never prevailed any very clear, distinct characteristics of a national style of painting. Great French painters have arisen, academies been formed, government patronage afforded, but the influence exerted by Italy on the one side, and Flanders on the other, has prevented the formation of any French style of painting. It has been rather a cross between the two, uniting, to some extent, the excellencies of both, but inferior to either in originality. One very natural consequence has been that taste, as respects painting, has been in that country extremely fluctuating.

The Flemings have always exceeded the French in the life, truth, and variety derived from nature, but were unequal to the latter in their style of arrangment and flow of

outline, and also in drapery and ornament,[1] although in the latter they were exceeded by the Italians, whom in turn they surpassed in the application of perspective to represent space whether in architecture or landscape.

The pictures of the French painters have been modeled the most upon the style of the Italian. The style of the latter had arrived at great perfection ere the former could be said to have attained even the elements of a correct taste; and when art is thus borrowed in a state of forwardness it can receive no new or valuable modifications from hands and fancy unskillful and unpracticed. This art in France has been subject to fluctuations arising from the influence which favorite masters have been able to exercise over the art in that country. Another influence which has been quite controlling in the history of French art is the bestowment of court patronage upon particular painters. This resulted not merely in patronizing and encouraging particular painters, but also in giving currency to the styles of art they adopted; thus rendering the court, and not a refined taste, the arbiter of painting. Thus the French painter has never looked for encouragement to sympathy from his countrymen, but to the patronage of the great, and this has been extended to him because of its contributing to amusement and luxury, and also to the pomp, splendor, and show of *le grand nation*. Hence the total absence of all true national interest, and the conversion of even the painter's art into a court engine. This more especially applies to that period of time included within the reigns of Louis XIII, XIV, and XV. Of these three reigns the culminating point of court influence was reached during that of the second one mentioned, in which this most splendid of the arts was converted into a vehicle of adulation, through fulsome and direct flattery, or glaring and far-fetched allegory.

The first French monarch who could be really said to have a taste for the fine arts was Francis I, and with him, therefore, properly commences the history of French

[1] *Spanish and French Schools*, 223.

painting. This was during the first half of the sixteenth century. His patronage was bestowed upon Italian painters, by whom the school of Fontainebleau was established, all the frescoes of which have been either ruined by the wars or otherwise destroyed.

Jean Cousin, a native artist, born at Soucy, near Sens, and flourished under Henry II, Henry III, and Charles IX, is called by some the founder of the French school. His principal work, the Last Judgment, is now in the Louvre.

Francois Clouet, surnamed Janet, who worked between 1540 and 1560, somewhat resembled Holbein, or the Flemish masters, in the conception of his portraits, but is not equal to either in the treatment of the flesh.

Another, accounted by some the founder of the French school, is Simon Vouet, born at Paris in 1582, and dying in 1648. His tendency was naturalistic; he was influenced both by Caravaggio and Guido. He was also celebrated for his profound knowledge of the science of reflexes, in which he has not only surpassed all the French,[1] but all the Italians also. His naturalistic tendencies gave to his pictures much the appearance of living nature.

The great period of French art, or rather of the art of painting as practiced by Frenchmen, lies in the last half of the seventeenth century, in the reign of Louis XIV. During this period flourished four celebrated French painters, viz: Nicholas Poussin from 1594 to 1665; Claude Lorraine, from 1600 to 1688; Charles Lebrun, from 1619 to 1695, Eustache Lesueur from 1627 to 1655.

The first, Nicholas Poussin, was by birth a Frenchman, but his residence was Rome, and his style of painting belonged to the Roman school. His constant residence at Rome led him to converse more with antiquity than with living men. Hence his style was formed mainly on the antique. So thorough was his devotion to it, that he might be said to live out of his own age, and hence to lack some things which

[1] *Cleghorn*, II, 120.

his successors might wish he had possessed. Drinking in, as he did, the character and tone of the antique, the characteristics of his works are extreme correctness of form and costume, great propriety in keeping, and the most enchanting simplicity of design. These he derived from his profound knowledge of ancient sculpture. "He painted," as Fuseli says, "in basso-relievo." But while he thus drew largely upon one of the great sources of excellence, the antique, he was led to the neglect of another which to the painter was the more important of the two, viz: nature. Hence he appears cold and formal in his ordinary works, as if he was in actual fear of making a nearer approach to humanity than is done by marble. His faces want natural expression, and his figures, grace. His coloring is cold and sombre. There is the absence of that life which in nature breathes through every figure. His landscapes he probably took from nature, and these are accounted superior as paintings to his historical pieces. One of the finest of these is his painting of the deluge. The sun is barely seen wan and drooping in his course. The sky appears overborne with the weight of waters, and the heavens and earth seem mingling together. So also he excels in the back-grounds of his historical compositions. In the Plague of Athens "the very buildings themselves seem stiff with horror."

But in the choice of his subjects, and the manner of representing its incidents, Poussin has few equals. There is also always "a most charming harmony of thought, the scene, the figures, the handling, even the forms of inanimate objects in his landscapes, all have an antique air, transporting the imagination into an ideal world."

Claude Gelee, better known as Claude Lorraine from his native province, was another instance of a Frenchman born, and an Italian painter. The sources whence he drew his inspiration were directly the reverse of those of Poussin. They were nature as displayed in the landscape. The peculiar mission was to exhibit on canvas the beauties presented by nature in her landscape glories. For this

purpose the skies of Italy offered their wealth of glowing beauty. He was a great master of atmospheric effects, and in the sunny scenes of Italy obtained an accurate knowledge of the phenomena of light. He affords an instance of a self-taught genius, and to him landscape painting mainly owes its interest and its loveliness as a separate and dignified branch of art.[1] His actual forms are derived from Italian nature. The flow of his lines is clear and harmonious. The eye of the observer ranges unchecked over outspread plains, often bounded by the sea. He understood well the effect of air, and the brilliant and vivid workings of light. In its sweetest, most varied, and most brilliant effects, "from the first blush of day to the fall of dewy eve, he is unrivalled.[2] The ærial perspective, and the liquid softness of the tones, in his pictures, the leafing, forms, and branching of the trees, the light flickering clouds, the transparency of hue, the retiring distances, all make as near an approach to nature as it is possible for art to accomplish."

Under the magical effects wrought by his pencil "the quivering of the foliage, the silent sweep of light clouds across the clear sky, the ripple of the lake or the brook,[3] the play of the waves of the sea, the pure breezes of morning, the soft mists of evening, and the glistening dew upon the grass, are all truth itself, and all seem instinct with joyous life. A soft vapor separates one distance from another, and allows the eye to wander into boundless space, only to be recalled by the warmth and richness of the foreground. Light pervades the whole, and every object breathes a blessed serenity and repose. He paints the forms of earth indeed, but veils them in an ethereal drapery, such as is only at moments visible to our eyes; he paints that worship of the Creator which nature solemnizes, and in which man and all his works are only included as

[1] *Sculpture, Painting, and Architecture*, 197. [2] *Idem*, 197, 198. [3] *German, Flemish and Dutch Schools*, 316.

One objection has been made to the representations of Claude, which, as far as it goes, destroys the natural effect of the constituent features of his pictures,[1] and that is, that they are too frequently compositions, or what are termed, heroic landscape. This, in one view, heightens the charm, as it adds to the powers of the imagination. But, on the other hand, it detracts from the still deeper interests of reality.

Charles Lebrun was an artist eminently fitted for the age and character of Louis XIV. He was made the court painter, and was largely imbued with the spirit of his master. Critics are not entirely agreed as to the merits of this painter. By French writers, his compositions are termed grand and rich, exhibiting a full knowledge of the art;[2] his heads sublime in expression; his attitudes imposing; his drawing full of vigor; his proportions rather short, and his coloring powerful. By others, the qualities of his paintings are deemed to bear the same relation to true and simple grandeur in art,[3] as his great master, Louis XIV, when he made war in his coach and six, bore as a general to Julius Cæsar. They claim that all is ostentation and struggle for effect, joined with considerable technical excellence, and little genuine feeling. That the scale of his pictures is gigantic, and the impression produced by them, much like that of a scene at the opera. This, however, applies more particularly to his great series of historical pictures, such as his History of Alexander. Those of less pretension, as the Stoning of Stephen, and the Magdalen, have much to recommend them.

Eustache Lesueur was one of the glories of the reign of Louis XIV. He was a native Frenchman, and was never out of France. He exhibits a fine genius in composition, design, and expression, but in his earlier pictures his coloring is hard and crude and his chiaroscuro defective. But some of his finished works, such as the Preaching of

[1] *Sculpture, Painting, and Architecture*, 198. [2] *Painting and Celebrated Painters*, II, 251. [3] *Spanish and French Schools*, 274.

St. Paul, and the Descent from the Cross, are deemed as perfect in color as in design. His greatest work consists of a series of paintings, twenty-two in number, representing the different events in the life of St. Bruno. In this he has shown that he well understood the heart and the mind of the cenobite. He has transferred to canvas the touching melancholy of a life of contemplation. His attitudes, his gestures, the pose of his heads, express the inmost thoughts and feelings of the saint.[1] His forms, outlines and draperies are of wonderful truth and effect, while his personages are represented as they really were in their retired seclusion. The passions in these men seem to have died out; they have surrendered their own will to that of heaven, and hardly indicate, by their appearance, that they belong to this world.

The art of painting is never stationary. Having reached its highest point of attainment in France under Louis XIV, it commenced declining under his successor, the corruption in taste and morals having become simultaneous. The fine arts cannot avoid sympathizing with the character of the times in which they are cultivated. As morals became more and more corrupt, these arts became more and more degenerated. Paintings ceased to be ordered except for the boudoirs of court ladies. The modest graces, finding no admirers, went off into retiracy. Painting must become essentially sensualistic in its character in order to meet the demands of a materialistic age and people.

There was a point beyond which social, political, and moral degradation could not be carried without invoking the horrors of revolution. That point having been reached and passed in France, the revolution came. But it was not confined to politics. It pervaded also the realm of art. It culminated in the school of David.

David, the founder and representative of the new French school, was born in 1750, and lived until 1825. He devoted himself at Rome to the study of design and the

[1] *Painting and Celebrated Painters*, II, 282.

antique, and forsaking the conventional feebleness and false glare of his contemporaries, became the restorer of art. That restoration, however, was limited to form. By the careful study of antique sculpture, he rendered his drawing correct, and his style of design noble; but the whole was cold and devoid of feeling. French art, however, not only was wanting in correct form, but also in simple and natural expression. The most profound study of statuary could give no aid to painting beyond form and proportion. Expression, action, composition, coloring, must come from nature. Here David failed. His pictures are numerous, and some of them celebrated. Among these are his Coronation, his Leonidas, his Brutus, his Sabine Women, etc. But in reference to all his works it has been said that "in him, as in other French artists, we meet the rigid adherence to the antique, and to certain fixed rules, framed as if to compensate by their inflexible character, for the theatrical exaggeration of expression and passion. The personages in David's pictures, are like models in a studio. They convey no impression of reality. There is no genuine life or movement in them. They stand in positions like the Horatii, or sit like Leonidas, as if they knew all the world were looking at them. The color is disagreeable, and there is a total want of transparency, or of true feeling, for the effect of chiaroscuro, and yet one cannot but admire the qualities which David introduces into art. Admirable drawing, and great beauty of form, characterize his productions. The flutter and tawdiness of the artists of Louis XV, is succeeded by a severity and simplicity, which, though not free from affectation, and thoroughly French in its character, is yet full of power and truth of a certain kind."

The school of David having fallen into the wane, has been succeeded by a revival in the various branches of art. Among the most distinguished French painters of the present century are Vernet, Delaroche, Ingres, Prudhon, Delacroix, Ary Scheffer, Couder, Dupres, Decamps, and Ziegler.

The English School.

The cultivation of the art of painting in England is comparatively of recent origin. Whatever there was of it during the middle ages was dedicated to the service of religion. The destructive civil wars so long waged between the houses of York and Lancaster had left little time or inclination to cultivate any other art than that of war. On the accession of the house of Tudor near the close of the fifteenth century, the state of exhaustion was so great that all the energies of the people, were necessarily employed in efforts to improve their physical condition. Henry VIII, the second in the Tudor line, in breaking away from the Romish church, destroyed the influence of that faith which had both furnished the subjects of the painter's pencil, and then by rewarding his labors, afforded him the proper encouragement in the use of it. England thus became divorced from Italy, and that at a period when Italian art was occupying its highest place of power and influence. The persecutions of Mary, and the strong development of the industrial element under Elizabeth, left little time and inclination to cultivate the arts. Charles I, the second of the Stuart line, in the first half of the seventeenth century, was possessed of an excellent taste, and was collecting the works of the great masters, and affording encouragement to artists, when his head fell under the axe of the executioner, and the reign of the puritans banished the arts and elegances of life, lest they should interfere with its sterner duties. The restoration brought back with it only the elegances that could corrupt, and towards the latter part of the seventeenth century another revolution changed the order of succession, and carried to still higher perfection the English constitution. The English mind, down to a comparatively late period, had other occupations than the fine arts. The government element largely occupied its attention in the perfecting that system of checks and balances which together compose the English constitu-

tion. The industrial element also asserted its claim, and the creation, diffusion, and accumulation of wealth drew largely upon all the disposable forces of England's intellect. And then the Baconian philosophy led to the investigation of physical science, and the sublime mysteries unveiled by the genius of Newton, gave an especial bias to men's minds, causing them to view with indifference those artistic pursuits which adminster rather to the amenities than the utilities of life, and are regarded rather as society's ornaments than as essentially contributing to its progress. Thus it came to be late before native artists arose who were capable of acquiring much distinction.

Hogarth was the first native artist whose fame extended beyond the limits of England. His life and labors occupy the first half of the eighteenth century. In comic and caricature he is the greatest painter of any age or country. His paintings are powerful moral satires, presenting vice and folly in the most ludicrous points of view. His aim is to show vice her own feature; scorn, her image. With a great knowledge of human life and manners, he possessed great skill in arranging his materials, and, by a masterly execution, seemed to embody and render tangible the very thoughts and passing movements of the mind. In masterly delineation of character, in fertility of incident, in genuine wit and humor, in life and motion, in everlasting variety and originality, his pictures have never yet been surpassed. His humorous satire struck equally at high and low life, and his Harlot's Progress, and Rake's Progress, and Marriage a la Mode presented so many moral lessons whose effect for two centuries has continued almost unabated. He stands alone as an artist, having had neither predecessors, rivals, nor successors.

The first English school of painting owes its existence to Sir Joshua Reynolds. He was born in 1723, and besides his numerous portraits, of historical and poetic subjects he painted upwards of one hundred and thirty. Through the kindness of a friend he was enabled to visit Italy, and spend some time at Rome. He says "I viewed the pictures

of Raphael again and again. I even affected to feel their merit, and to admire them more than I really did. In a short time a new taste and new perceptions began to dawn upon me, and I was convinced that I had originally formed a false opinion of the perfection of art; and since that time, having frequently resolved the subject in my mind, I am of opinion, that a relish for the higher excellencies of the art, is an acquired taste, which no man ever possessed without long cultivation, great labor and attention."

The splendid display made by the great master-pieces he beheld at Rome induced him to aim at the great style of art as exemplified in the works of Raphael and Michael Angelo. Unfortunately the theory he formed for that purpose does not seem very satisfactory. "The great style in art" says he, "and the most perfect imitation of nature, consists in avoiding the details and peculiarities of particular objects;"[1] and again: "The perfection of portrait painting consists in giving the general idea or character, without individual peculiarities." On the other hand it is asserted by others that the excellence of art, and the most perfect imitation of nature, do not consist in the avoiding of details, but in the happy union of detail and of individual resemblance with greatness and breadth of general power;[2] that to avoid details is to rest contented with an inferior aim in art; to avoid, in fact, the chief difficulty and the chief glory that mark the career of the artist. It is claimed that it is individual peculiarities that give force by the addition of individuality to the general resemblance.

Sir Joshua's principal excellence lay in portrait painting. There he exhibited graceful composition and breadth of light and shade, combined with a rich and mellow tone of coloring. The principal object in the school he originated was effect, and this naturally led to the rejection of all minute and elaborate modeling. Carrying out his general theory, his principle in portrait painting was that likeness and individual character depended more upon the "general

[1] *Sculpture, Painting, and Architecture*, 223. [2] *Idem*, 226.

effect" than upon the "exact expression of the peculiarities or minute discrimination of the parts." In the following out of this principle it has been remarked that the "striving at some delusive, some shadowy excellence of general expression, instead of representing the air and character exactly as in the countenance of the sitter, has greatly depreciated the intellectual qualities of British art." That "his florid unfinish, and his undefined forms, not only long characterized painting in England, but became the principal goal of the painters, and the general standard of excellence."

Sir Joshua's greatest successes in portrait painting were achieved in defiance of his system. Such were the portraits of his intimate friends, as Dr. Johnson, Goldsmith, John Hunter, and Bishop Newton. It was in these men whose habits of thought and action were pressed upon him by constant observance, that he sunk his system into the subject before him, and became a perfect painter, as all others must, by resigning himself to nature.

Contemporary with Sir Joshua Reynolds, were Romney and Opie; the former an original, and, to a great degree, self-taught artist. His style of design is simple, his coloring warm and rich, but in his affectation of breadth he often neglects form, and attempts a too vague generalization of sentiment. His want of early culture led to something defective in his general management, rendering the whole somewhat imperfect. He was, however, a rival of Reynolds in portraiture, and quite a successful one too.

The great attention paid in England to portrait painting has somewhat cast into the shade the historical, although the latter had an earlier development than the former. The first great historical English painter was Hogarth, whose great merit consisted in the delineation of manners, in the correct expression of sentiment, and in striking representation of natural character. He has also extended the bounds of the art in the close alliance he has succeeded in forming between the imagination and the heart; be-

tween amusing of the external sense, and the profound reflections awakened by it. His pictures are less passing scenes, or momentary actions, than profound moral lessons.

Much has been claimed for Sir Joshua Reynolds, as an English historical painter. He exerted great influence on historical as well as portrait painting; but his example has, on the whole, retarded the advancement of its study. In summing up his merits it has been said,[1] that "he owed more to taste and application, than to genius; more to incessant practice than to science. He derived all from his predecessors which he has bequeathed to posterity; but if, in making the transmission, he added no new nor essential principle of imitation or invention, he established, in high practical excellence, the arts of his country."

Another historical painter of distinction was James Barry, born at Cork, Ireland, in 1741. In his character, a great rudeness of exterior was united with a moral grandeur of unshaken resolve, of enduring enthusiasm, and of stern and uncompromising self-denial. With only sixteen shillings in his pocket, he undertook, without remuneration, and alone, to perform one of the greatest works which had been attempted within two centuries. This he accomplished within six years. It was a series of six pictures, of the size of life, representing the progress of civilization, commencing with man in a savage state, and terminating with Elysium. It was painted for the hall of the Society of Arts. Through the friendship of Edmund Burke he had been enabled to visit Rome, and his fancy ever after seems to have revelled amid the beauties of the antique. So strong were his proclivities for the classic, that his pictures were mostly representations of classic subjects. Thus we have his Pandora, Birth of Venus, Philoctetus in Lemnos, Jupiter and Juno, and others. These subjects had worked out all they were designed to accomplish in the Grecian and Roman mind, and hence excited less attention and interest in modern

[1] *Sculpture, Painting, and Architecture*, 230.

times. The artist who fails to reflect the spirit of his own age, will seldom awaken a response in the breasts of his countrymen. His first picture, the Legend of St. Patrick, awoke a higher degree of enthusiasm. He died in 1806, at the age of sixty-five.

For the most celebrated of her historical painters of the eighteenth century, England is indebted to America. Near the middle of that century, the future president of the British Academy might have been seen, while yet a boy, learning archery, and taking lessons in painting, in the town of Springfield, Pennsylvania, from a band of wandering Indians. This was Benjamin West, the Quaker boy, who, secretly and by stealth, composed his first pictures from two engravings he chanced to obtain, and which sixty-seven years afterwards being exhibited in the same room with his sublime painting of Christ Rejected, drew from the painter the remark, "that there were inventive touches of art in this, his juvenile essay, which, with all his subsequent knowledge and experience, he had not been able to surpass." A confession which clearly establishes the supremacy of genius, and would seem to place the highest touches of art without and higher than any of the deductions of experience.

Through the generosity of some of his friends in New York and Philadelphia, West was enabled, at an early period of his life to go to Italy, where he visited Florence, Bologna, Venice, and Rome, surveying with admiring eye the works of the great masters. He finally settled in London, where under the patronage of the crown, he commenced his career as a historical painter. The period of time seemed exceedingly auspicious for that purpose. Hogarth was on the brink of the grave. Reynolds was devoted to portraits. Barry engaged in controversies in Rome; and Wilson and Gainsborough's excellence lay in landscape. The course of the historical painter seemed to open without much chance of opposition. His first painting was Agrippina landing with the Ashes of Germanicus, which was painted for the Archbishop of York; the second, the departure of Regulus

from Rome, was painted for the king, George III. After exhausting courts, and camps, and battles, he undertook a series of pictures on the progress of revealed religion. He divided into four dispensations the Antediluvian, the Patriarchal, the Mosaical, and the Prophetical.[1] They contained in all thirty-six subjects, eighteen of which belonged to the Old Testament, the rest to the New. They were all sketched, and twenty-eight executed. It was probably the most extensive and varied work ever undertaken by any painter, and it would seem that the themes were of too high and glorious a nature to pursue without overtasking the imagination of West, the soft, the graceful, and the domestic being better suited to his talents.

He lived the long life of eighty-two years, having painted and sketched in oil upwards of four hundred pictures, mostly historical and religious, and leaving more than two hundred original drawings. Even down to his eightieth year he was employed in new exercises, not inferior to, or in some respects excelling, the enterprises of his vigorous strength. "He produced," says Sir Thomas Lawrence, "a series of compositions, from sacred and profane history, profoundly studied, and executed with the most facile power, which not only were superior to any former productions of English art, but, far surpassing contemporary merit on the continent, were unequalled at any period below the schools of the Caracci." His pictures appear faultless as to what relates to the composition of the subject; to the regular arrangement of the groups; to the anatomical proportions of the human body; and to the technical knowledge of expression. No academical precept seems to be violated; his figures are arranged with skill; his coloring is varied and harmonious, and to the ordinary spectator nothing appears wanting to render his work complete. He himself furnishes the clue to his own deficiency, when in addressing Lord Elgin on the Phidian Marbles of the Parthenon, he says: "Had I been blest with seeing

[1] *Manual of the Fine Arts*, 181.

and studying these emanations of genius, at an earlier period of life, the sentiment of their preeminence would have animated all my exertions; and more character, and expression, and life, would have pervaded my humble attempts at historical painting." In perfect consistency with this it has been remarked that below all this splendor of coloring, arrangement, and composition, there is little of the true vitality; that in the human face there are only bones and cartilages; that there is monotony of human character, the groupings being unlike the happy and careless combinations of nature, the figures being seemingly distributed over the canvas by line and measure, very similar to trees in a plantation. It is alleged that his pictures do not go beyond the instrumental parts of the art; that they never "snatch a grace beyond the reach of art," that they "exhibit the mask, not the soul of expression."

This want of natural expression is complained of generally in English historical paintings, and it has been suggested that it proceeds from "a certain inertness and constitutional phlegm, which does not habitually impress the workings of the mind in correspondent traces on the countenance, and which may also render Englishmen less sensible of these outward and visible signs of passion, even when they are so impressed there."[1]

With the variety and beauty of English scenery, and the rural imagery that so largely enters into the Englishman's dream of enjoyment, we may well expect to find landscape painting carried to a high degree of perfection. In this department of art we find Wilson, Gainsborough, and Turner, each demanding some special notice. Richard Wilson was born in Wales in 1713. He commenced as a portrait painter, acquired in his thirty-sixth year sufficient by his savings, and the help of friends, to enable him to visit Italy, and while there discovered by accident his ability to paint landscape. For this species of painting he had been unconsciously training while surrounded in his

[1] *Hazlitt's Literary Remains*, 216.

youthful days with the beauties of natural scenery, and the picturesque mountains and glens of his own native Wales. His first landscapes were Italian, and were imitations of the manner of Claude. Then followed his copies of English scenery, and lastly his historical compositions. His first have been deemed the best. "In looking at them" says Hazlitt, "we breathe the air which the scene inspires, and feel the genius of the place present to us. In the first, there is the cool freshness of a misty spring morning; the sky, the water, the dim horizon, all convey the same feeling. The fine grey tone and varying outline of the hills; the graceful form of the retiring lake; broken still more by the hazy shadows of the objects that repose on its bosom; the light trees that expand their branches in the air, and the dark stone figure and mouldering temple, that contrast strongly with the broad clear light of the rising day, give a charm, a truth, a force, and harmony to this composition, which produce the greater pleasure the longer it is dwelt on. The distribution of light and shade resembles the effect of light on a globe."

While he applies these remarks more especially to Wilson's picture of Apollo and the Seasons, he also says his Phaeton "has the dazzling fervid appearance of an autumnal evening; the golden radiance streams in solid masses from behind the flickering clouds; every object is baked in the sun; the brown foreground, the thick foliage of the trees, the streams, shrunk and stealing along behind the dark high banks, combine to produce that richness and characteristic unity of effect which is to be found only in nature, or in art derived from the study and imitation of nature."

As a landscape painter, the merits of Wilson have ever been conceded to be great. While his conceptions are generally noble, his execution is vigorous and glowing. The dewy freshness, the natural lustre, and harmonious arrangement of his scenes, have seldom been exceeded. His process of painting was simple, his colors few, he used but one brush, and worked standing. He had his secrets

of color, and his mystery of the true principle in painting, which he refused to explain. Both he and Gainsborough failed in the proper introduction of figures. The great masters of historical painting, as Titian, Carracci, N. Poussin, always subordinated the scene to the figures. This was also generally the case with the more professed painters of historical or heroic landscape, as Salvator Rosa, Albano, etc. The great difficulty lies in maintaining subordination and unity, and at the same time preserving the interest of the respective parts of the composition. In these higher beauties Wilson, and most of the English artists, have failed. The landscape overwhelms the story, while the story generally discredits the landscape, or the attention being equally divided between both, the interest of each is weakened. In pure landscape painting the figures should always be subordinate, forming merely a part of, and corresponding with, the scene. Everything having a tendency to lead the mind and the imagination away from nature, tends to the deterioration of art. The British landscape presents every element of the painter's art in its best perfection,[1] from the softest beauty in a freshness of dewy verdure elsewhere unknown, to the wildest sublimity of lake, mountain, wood and torrent. Even in the gorgeous magnificence of the changing sky, there is a gloriousness and grandeur of effect, which is never seen even in Italy. If again the painter seek for objects of moral interest, there is the feudal fortalice, the cloistered abbey, the storied minster, the Gothic castle, with all their rich associations ; there the mouldering monument, the fields of conflict, the scenes of tradition, of poetry and of love; and, far amid the wild upland gleams the mossy stone and bends the solitary ash over the martyr of his faith. The painter can therefore hardly be permitted to urge that nature has here left him without models, or history no traces in its onward progress.

[1] *Sculpture, Painting, and Architecture*, 245.

Thomas Gainsborough was born at Sudbury in 1727, and lived until 1788. He was a painter from his early youth. While still a school-boy he used to frequent a beautiful wood about four miles in extent, whose ancient trees, winding glades, and sunny nooks inspired him early with a love of art. It was thus that nature sat early to him in all her attractive attitudes of beauty; and his pencil traced with peculiar and matchless facility, her finest and most delicate lineaments. He was both a portrait and a landscape painter. His custom was to paint standing, and the pencils which he used had shafts sometimes two yards in length. In painting his portraits he stood as far from his sitter as he did from his picture, in order that the hues might be the same.

His landscapes are of two classes or periods, his earlier and later pictures. The earlier are the most exact imitations of nature, while the latter exhibit evidences of great inattention. "It would seem," remarks a critic, "that he found there was something wanting in his early manner, beyond the literal imitations of the details of natural objects, and he appears to have concluded rather hastily,[1] that the way to arrive at that something more, was to discard truth and nature altogether." The works on which his fame principally rests are not what is usually called landscape. They are rather fancy pieces, cottage children, shepherd boys, etc. "The wildest nooks of his woods have their living tenants, and in all his glades and his valleys we see the sons and daughters of men. A deep human sympathy unites us with his pencil, and this is not lessened because all his works are stamped with the image of old England.[2] His paintings have a national look. He belongs to no school; he is not reflected from the glass of man, but from that of nature." His children are running wild about his landscape. They bear about them an untamed wildness and a rustic grace, which speak of neglected toilets and of country life. They resemble more

[1] *Hazlitt*, 207. [2] *Manual of the Fine Arts*, 171..

the offspring of nature, running free in their own wild woods. They are often chosen with great felicity, and have great truth and sweetness.

It has been nevertheless objected even to him that he presents us with an ideal of common life, of which we have had a surfeit in poetry and romance.[1] That his subjects are softened and sentimentalized too much; too much like nature sitting for her picture. His Woodman's Head, and Shepherd Boy in a Storm are highly spoken of.

He has been thus compared with Wilson. "Wilson excels in splendor of effect and magnificence of composition;[2] but Gainsborough is more natural and pleasing, at least in his early pictures. Latterly he introduced the notion of an ideal beauty in rural nature, which has too frequently been imitated. Both possessed genius in no ordinary degree; but though to the first has been conceded the higher walk, as it has been called, because imaginative, to the latter belongs that temperament of mind more essential, we think, to the landscape painter, which powerfully conceives the objects of contemplation and places them in vivid reality before the eye and the fancy."

The latest great painter of landscape is Turner, who, in that department, has extended the boundaries of his art by the invention of prismatic colors, and their novel applications. He is a more original artist than Wilson. He has shown a knowledge of the effects of air, and of powerful relief in objects which was never surpassed. He is the most varied landscape painter that ever existed. It was during his best day that Sir Walter Scott brought romantic scenery into fashion, and Turner became an illustrator of localities.[3] These he realized and informed as no man had ever done before, and at the same time exaggerated, displaced and intensified, filling his canvas or the page of the engraver with hundreds of incidents treasured by his quick and sure observation, treated according to his ideas of

[1] *Hazlitt*, 207. [2] *Sculpture, Painting, and Architecture*, 243. [3] *Scott's History and Practice of Art*, 337.

splendor or romance, or introduced by the merely artistic requirements of composition. Thus his treatment essentially consisted in "making the shows of things answer the desires of the mind." In his depicting the Seventh Plague of Egypt, he has made the ministering elements busy in their work of devastation, the hail descends in sheets, lightnings flash, and fire runs along the ground, trees are uprooted, and man and beast fall before the destroying blast. On the right stands the great legislator of the Hebrews, with outstretched arms, conscious of his delegated power to direct and rule the storm, while Aaron, yielding to the feelings of humanity, kneels and hides his face. The Tivoli, and many other of his beautiful paintings, are executed in water colors, a department of art which within the last half century has made prodigious advances in England, and to the progress and success of which the numerous works of this distinguished artist have, in a preeminent degree, contributed.

British art stands much indebted to a foreigner, Henry Fuseli, who was born at Zurich, Geneva, in 1741. He was a fine classical scholar, and at first devoted to general literature. Through the recommendation of Sir Joshua Reynolds to whom he submitted several of his drawings, he was induced to exchange the pen for the pencil. During his eight years' residence in Rome he did not follow the common method of copying the chief pictures of the great masters, in the hope of thus imbibing and carrying away their spirit as well as the image of their works. He devoted much time to a profound contemplation of them, and thus sought by drinking in their spirit to animate his own compositions.

On his return to England he sought to illustrate, by a series of paintings, the works of Shakespeare and Milton. For the former he seemed peculiarly adapted. He grappled with the wildest passions of the most imaginative plays, and handled them with a vigorous extravagance which exceeded expectation. He painted eight Shakespearian pictures, the most celebrated of which were the Tempest,

the Midsummer Night's Dream, King Lear, and Hamlet, the last of which was strangely wild and superhuman. He understood where lies the boundary line between the terrible and the horrible, and could display the one without trenching upon the other.

He found more difficulty in following Milton. The fearful grandeur of the realm of perdition and the sublime despair of the great arch-fiend, were too much for him. "He might add fury to Moloch, and malignity to Beelzebub; but he could not reach the character of terrible daring, enduring fortitude, and angelic splendor which mark the arch-apostate of Milton."

He was extremely fond of the wild mythology of the Scandinavians, as his Thor Battering the Serpent will clearly indicate. His sketches were very numerous, amounting to some eight hundred. He lived until 1825. His main wish was to startle and astonish. In 1799 he was elected professor of painting in the Royal Academy, and his lectures on Ancient Art, the Art of the Moderns, Invention, Composition and Expression, are considered the best.

The opening of the nineteenth century saw a comparative languor and flagging in British art. Reynolds and his contemporaries were gone, except West and Fuseli, upon whom age was doing its work. But the seed had been sown for a revival and splendid harvest. The works of many great painters remained behind them. There were the Discourses of Sir Joshua Reynolds, the lectures of Fuseli, the writings of Barry, the essays of Burke, the engravings of Strange, Woollett and Sharpe, the works of Boydell, the statuary of Banks, Bacon, Nollekens and Flaxman, especially the classical illustrations of the latter, all tending to create a more refined taste, and a higher and purer appreciation of the beautiful. Among the numbers who have distinguished themselves during the present century we can only mention Raeburn, Wilkie and Sir Thomas Lawrence.

Sir Henry Raeburn was borna t Stockbridge, near Edinburgh, in 1756. It should here be remarked that Scotland,

under the adverse circumstances to which she has been subject, has contributed her fair proportion to British art. The destruction of her separate nationality at an early period, by the accession of James to the English crown, the tendency among her nobles, ever since that event, to make London and not Edinburgh, the place of their sojourn, has no doubt contributed largely, by withholding patronage from Scottish artists, to depress the arts in Scotland. In one respect, however, the Scottish artists enjoyed more advantages than the English. Owing to political causes, and the greater number of Scotch residents in Italy, the intercourse between Scotland and Rome was very free and unrestrained. This led the Scottish artists more generally to Italy, and enabled them to perfect themselves by studying the works of the old masters. Gavin Hamilton, himself an artist, and whose discoveries and knowledge of antique art materially assisted the general restoration of taste, resided for a long time at Rome, and materially aided his countrymen in their studies while there.

Allan Ramsay, son of the poet of the same name, was born at Edinburgh, in 1713. After spending three years in Rome, he spent his artist life in London, where he enjoyed much distinction. In extent of learning and variety of knowledge, he is said to have surpassed all artists of his time. He attempted nothing bold and energetic, but his portraits exhibit correctness in drawing, and are graceful and natural in attitude and expression.

Alexander Runciman was born at Edinburgh, in 1736. He also spent five years in Rome, and acquired a taste for historical painting; on his return he executed a series of paintings, twelve in number, illustrating the poems of Ossian. Some of these subjects were Ossian singing to Malvina, the Valor of Oscar, the Death of Oscar, Death of Agenderra, and the Hunting of Catholda. These were executed with a singular boldness of style, and the wildness of the imagery, and the deep, heroic, and chivalrous feelings which they breathed, rendered them universal favorites.

Sir Henry Raeburn was the representative of painting in Scotland, from 1787 to his death in 1823. He presents the ideal of that style, the aim of which is to speak most powerfully to the imagination, through the slenderest means addressed to the eye. He was first a miniature, and then a portrait painter, and his pictures are said to afford the finest, the most wonderful examples, how far detail may be sacrificed, and yet general effect and striking resemblance be retained. In this respect he is a disciple of the school of Sir Joshua Reynolds. His great object was to produce strong effect, whatever be the means he employed for that purpose.

Sir David Wilkie was another Scotch painter of deserved celebrity. He has chosen to draw the subjects upon which his art was exercised from domestic or common life. The following are instances: Blindman's Buff, Distraining for Rent, The Blind Fiddler, The Cut Finger, Guess my Name, Village Holiday, Village Politician, etc. In these there exists a charm that awakens the sympathies of nature alike in all bosoms. No painter has more frequently or successfully handled these interesting scenes than Wilkie, and no painter's works have been more universally, or more justly admired. His style of composition the most nearly resembles Hogarth's; but while the scenes depicted by the latter display the singularities, more than the leading actions and feelings of life, those of the former are more the every day exhibitions of which the sum total of life is made up. "While Wilkie preserves all the force of individual character and delineation of living nature,[1] he has extended a far more comprehensive grasp of mind over the moralities of his subject. He has brought within the pencil's magic sway, and fixed there in permanent reality, the sorrows and the joys, the hopes, fears, and attachments, the occupations, customs, habits and even amusements, of a whole unchanging class of mankind. The distinction between him and Hogarth is that the latter represents

[1] *Sculpture, Painting, and Architecture*, 255, 256.

general ideas by particular signs. His forms and expressions are individual modifications of the limited society to which they belong, while the conceptions of Wilkie are the idealisms of his models. Each figure is not only pregnant with individuality of character and life, but is the true representative of the class whose constituent it is. Each expression, though generally but the index of humble feeling, sends abroad into the heart of every spectator its artless appeal. He has thus applied the generalizations of higher art to the interests of common life, yet preserving its simplicity, its humbleness and reality. Some of the Dutch painters, especially Teniers, have sought and found their subjects in every day life, but they have painted vulgar instead of common nature; nor, in the complete range of their school, is there once an example of that delightful sentiment which Wilkie has so successfully cast over his most lowly scenes, and by which he has redeemed them from every approach to vulgarity."

Sir Thomas Lawrence, late principal painter to the king, and president of the Royal Academy, was born in Bristol in 1769. He gave early indications of his strong tendencies towards the art of painting. While yet in early youth his portraits were extremely graceful, and accounted fac similes of his sitters. He also learned early how to deal with a difficult face, and to evoke beauty and delicacy out of very ordinary materials. He had, from a very early period, a great delicacy of manner, in which he continued to excel in his maturer years. He commenced and continued the use of crayons until his seventeenth year, when he took to the use of oil colors. From this period his true fame properly dates.

In 1797 and 1798 he brought out some historical paintings of great merit. The first was Satan calling to his Legions. Then followed Coriolanus at the Hearth of Aufidius, Rolla, Cato, and Hamlet. The latter was a work of the highest kind, sad, thoughtful, and melancholy, savoring of death and the grave; the light touching the face and bosom, and

falling on the skull on which he is musing. It is one of the noblest paintings of the modern school.

His great merits, however, lay in portrait painting. In that he would become so absorbed as to be almost unconscious of the lapse of time. His habit was to paint standing, and he once continued to paint without ceasing for thirty-seven hours upon the portrait of Lord Thurlow.

He has been called the second Reynolds, from the fact of possessing very largely the same power of expressing sentiment and feeling, and of giving to the productions of his pencil beauty and dignity.[1] "He resembled him less in breadth and vigor than in the freedom and elegance of his attitudes, in skillful impersonation of human thought, and in the exquisite grace and loveliness with which he inspired all that he touched." "The works of Sir Joshua Reynolds," says Fuseli, "are unequal, many of them are indifferent, though some cannot be surpassed; but on the other hand, even the most inferior picture from the pencil of Sir Thomas Lawrence is excellent." He enjoyed the reputation of being the first artist in Europe. He died in 1830.

One important generalization relating to mind in its historical development is the reactions to which it is subject. These are discernible in all the elements of humanity, the separation and full development of which are destined to exhaust the entire capacity of the race. They are the most clearly disclosed in the elements of religion, government, philosophy, and art. In these reactions are to be found the commencement of great cycles in the history of human improvement, and these will become more and more clear in their workings and development, as the race shall continue to move onward, and to fill time and space with their perpetual recurrence. These reactions, together with the outcropping cycles to which they give birth, will ultimately be found subject to laws by which their recurrence is governed, and these will be the laws presiding over and regulating

[1] *Manual of the Fine Arts*, 225.

human progress, and their ascertainment, settlement, conditions, and limitations, will be among the remotest and highest efforts of human reason. It is entirely clear that the experience of man, the progress of the race thus far, can furnish no facts sufficient to lay a foundation for these loftiest of all human deductions. In their ascertainment will be found the expressed will of God in human history. They will continue long to lie among the unsolved problems of a remote future; not quietly, for many unsuccessful efforts will be made to solve, adjust, and settle, before their complete solution and establishment can be effected.

We are now to notice one of these reactions in the history of painting. The civilized world, in its æsthetic development, has for more than three centuries been regarding Rome as offering the highest and purest specimens of painting. Its artists from the continent and the British isles have all been flocking thither to become transfixed in their wondering gaze upon the works of the great masters; to drink in their spirit by contemplation and copying. This has necessarily led to the adoption of a conventional system, a system containing no other element than those to be found in the works of those masters. This must assume that the works of the old Italian masters are entitled to stand forth as the highest exemplars ever attainable by man. To encourage and give strength to this tendency to worship and copy after the old masters, comes in the doctrine of Sir Joshua Reynolds and his school, to avoid all details and peculiarities of particular objects, thus leaving the painter to express all the more strongly the generalities derivable from such conventional system. This must necessarily ultimately lead to a reaction, because the human mind must seek something else after fully developing all that is wrapped up or contained in the systems of the early masters. Hence the pre-Raphaelites of the present century in England. These consist of a band of devoted young artists, who, in looking back, ascertained that conventionalism in modern art began to take

the place of simple appeal to nature even in the works of the great Raphael. They have, therefore, determined to go behind Raphael, to take up art as it existed previous to his epoch, and to trust to nature alone as the guide of their future progress. Repudiating all conventionalism, they have transferred their studios to the woods and fields. In the beautiful language of another, "they have watched the morning daisy,[1] blushing to the tips of its petals as it unfolded its white veil, and exposed its golden face to the bright daylight; they bent over the water lily, and saw it lift its marble brow above the waters, and expand its glories to the mid-day sun; they watched its massive foliage rise while yet folded like a scroll, and by degrees develop its form, and spread its varnished surface level with the gently heaving waters, rocking it, as it were, in a noon-tide siesta upon a glassy bed. They have peered curiously into the depths of the waters themselves as they flowed by, and distinguished the shy forms of glittering fish darting here and there among the stems of the lilies, or the deep-rooted reeds, where they trace also the vague outline of other dimly shadowed forms, discovering a whole world of mysteries hidden deeply from vulgar eyes beneath the green waters. They have watched the young shoots expand their youngest leaves, pinked with the ruddy hue of their forest strength. They have sat so still, and so wrapt in their communings with this fresh nature, that the woodpecker has resumed his low tapping upon the hollow trunk of the pollard oak, and the jay has lighted confidently in the branches above them, and sits daintily arranging his gaudy plumage, from which a few bright azure feathers, quaintly striped with jetty black, fall noiselessly to their feet, but not unperceived by these ardent students. Thus they are enabled to reproduce the opening daisy, the fresh juicy foliage of the water lily, the glittering and darkening scales, now seen, now gone, of the tiny fish, those nimble swimmers, who dart out of sight,

[1] *Ten Centuries of Art*, 62, 63.

before their form can be defined, except by the gifted eye of the true student of nature."

Thus we see the reaction productive of the commencement of a new cycle, to be characterized by a close, searching, severe, all pervading observation of nature. This will, in the course of time, produce its legitimate fruits, which will tell upon the history of painting. There is already one judicious modification of the new system adopted by Leopold Robert. He has proposed not a rejection of all those principles of art evolved by its greatest masters during three centuries of successive study, but a thorough sifting of them.[1] He found that there really were broad irrefragable principles upon which the art of painting, in its highest sphere, must ever be based; and instead of waiting to discover them over again for himself by a course of laborious study, he gladly accepted the discoveries of his predecessors. This must accelerate the progress of the art, and thus hasten the development of the cycle which it is now to run.

[1] *Ten Centuries*, 64.

SUBJECTIVE ARTS.

We have now arrived at the subjective arts, viz: music, poetry, and eloquence, so called because they are arts commenced, prosecuted, perfected, and wholly exercised in, through, and upon the mind itself. It is in this great agent or instrument of all thought and of all feeling that these arts are nourished, matured, and produce their legitimate results. The medium of production, exercise, and resultant effect is the same. In it both subject and object find their equal identification. The thing that acts, and the object upon which it acts, are both identical.

MUSIC.

Music may be considered as the art of expressing conditions and emotions of the soul by means of beautiful tones; or, more definitely, and considered both as an art, and science, it is a "science which teaches the properties,[1] dependencies, and relations of melodious sounds; or the art of producing harmony and melody by the due combination and arrangement of those sounds." It produces its effects directly upon the mind, and hence it is a purely mental art, of whose operation the understanding can give no account. It is originally either the mother or daughter of poetry, and, in many instances, most probably the former, the early bards first making the tune or melody,

[1] *Mitchell's Encyclopædia*, 532.

and adapting the words to it afterwards. In one sense it is higher even than poetry and eloquence, as it expresses feelings and yearnings to which no words can be given, and is a sort of universal "speech of the heart." It has a great facility in representing and expressing to the mind, more inwardly than any other sensible mean, the turns and varieties of all passions to which the mind is subject. Its effects are by no means confined to the educated, the refined, or the highly cultivated. On the contrary, the humble, the lowly, the least intelligent, are often the most affected by it. The traveler, Acerbi, while assisting others in performing a piece of music before a company of Finns in Finland, says: "The eyes of all our hearers were turned upon us;[1] some seemed to follow with every feature of the face the movements of the melody. We could read in the physiognomy of the Finlanders the character of the music we had played; every look became serious at forced and strong modulations, while soft and melodious passages seemed to disperse the cloud, and their countenances resumed their tranquillity. It was curious to observe the different effects produced by the music on persons of different constitutions. One, for example, remained during the whole of a sonata, fixed and steadfast, his mouth open, his eyes staring, without moving his eyelids, and apparently struck with a stupid astonishment. Another, on the contrary, seemed to follow every step of the melody with his whole body, and appeared to suffer a sort of musical convulsion. But the moment we began to play their runa, every eye was drowned in tears, and the emotion was general."

All music is based essentially upon sounds, but to constitute it, these must be subject to certain conditions. These conditions to satisfy modern music must be four, viz:

Tone, Melody, Harmony, Rhythm.

1. Tone regards sound in its relations of height and depth, and also of grave and acute.[1] In musical instruments it is

[1] *Acerbi's Travels*, I, 282, 283. [1] *Encyclopædia Americana*, XII, 299.

determined by the great or less quickness of a uniform series of vibrations in a sonorous body. The difference of one tone from another, in respect to height or depth, forms an interval, which is made use of to express the difference in point of gravity or acuteness between any two sounds. As music deals only with those tones which are capable of producing harmony, the whole body of sounds, which are used in musical compositions, has been brought into a system, which exhibits their different height and depth, in regular order. In relation to these tones man has made a marked progress in music. In the earlier periods of history, he was guided only by his feelings in the production of tones, and knew nothing of a regulated arrangement. But since the nature of sounds has been, in modern times, more accurately investigated, and their relations settled by musical instruments, the tones, although not limited to a definite number, are yet comprehended within a measured series.

2. Melody, in its more general sense, relates to any successive connection, or series of tones; but more especially it is a series of tones which please the ear by their succession and variety. It expresses the arrangement, in succession, of different sounds for a single voice or an instrument. It has been claimed to bear the same relation to music that thought bears to poetry, or drawing to painting.

3. Harmony expresses the agreement or consonance of two or more united sounds. It signifies the effect on the ear, of proportional vibrations of sound, the result of the union of two or more according musical sounds. The Greeks seem to have limited it to the expression of an agreeable succession of sounds, but the moderns are not satisfied with limiting it to a mere succession of single sounds; but they required for its production, a union of melodies, a succession of combined sounds, which shall be composed of consonant intervals, and moving according to the stated laws of modulation. This quality, by its cadences, the variety of its concords, the fullness of its

modulation, the nature of its rests at the end of phrases, and by the steadiness which it alone can give to intonation, has acquired the character of an essential, and has been termed the "logic of the art of music."

4. Rhythm means a measured division of time. It is used to express the measure of time or movement by regularly recurring impulses or accents, and is found in prose, poetry, music, and dancing. Its constituent parts, in order to please, must excite the feeling of variety in harmony or unity. The various parts must form a whole, and exhibit a beginning, middle and end, by a measured rise and fall. It is in music, what metre is in the art of versification, or perspective in the art of drawing.

Another question may arise relating to the sources of music. These are coextensive with sounds, whose existence is subject to the conditions just mentioned. The sounds rendered up by nature from her own operations undoubtedly furnished hints to man. On the shore, the moan of the ocean was ever striking upon his ear, and filling his soul with the most undefinable sensations. In the country, the shallow brook was always sending up into a noiseless sky its unending anthem. Thus speaks Lucretius of the origin of music:

> Through all the woods they heard the charming noise
> Of chirping birds, and tried to frame their voice
> And imitate. Thus birds instructed man,
> And taught them songs before their art began;
> And whilst soft evening gales blew o'er the plains,
> And shook the sounding reeds, they taught the swains;
> And thus the pipe was framed, and tuneful reed.

The Baron Humboldt informs us, on the authority of credible witnesses, that on the banks of the Oronoco, in South America,[1] are heard subterranean sounds, that resemble the tones of an organ. This, he attributes to the difference in temperature between the external atmosphere

[1] *Higgins*, 145.

and the air confined in the crevices of the granite rocks, which constitute the geological formation of the district. The contrivances by which music has been attempted to be extracted, from what were seemingly the most unpromising materials, have been at times very curious. A concert was once exhibited at Paris in which cats were the performers. They were placed in rows, and a monkey beat time to them. According as he beat the time, so the cats mewed;[1] and it is related that the diversity of the tones which they omitted produced a very ludierous effect.

It is related of Louis XI, king of France, that he once commanded the abbot of Baigne to get him up a concert of swine's voices, supposing it to be impossible. The abbot, however, only demanded money and time, both which being granted, he set himself at work, and in time produced his result.[2] He had collected together a great number of hogs of different ages, and placed them under a tent or pavilion, covered with velvet, so as to be entirely concealed from view. In the front he had a table of wood all painted, and a certain number of keys having some resemblance to a pianoforte. These were each connected by strings or cords with the hogs in the interior, so that as he struck each key a little spike within would stick a hog, and such was the order and consonance of the mingled notes that came out of that highly organized organ, that the king and all the company were highly delighted.

Another unpromising material out of which it has been proposed to extract music is the braying of asses; but no attempt at getting up an ass concert ever seems to been made.

The instrumentalities through which music has been invoked are many and various. Of these the human voice occupies the place first in importance. It is the most perfect, and the most expressive of all musical instruments. Its richness, compass, and ready adaptation render it decidedly superior to any other. No other can both descend

[1] *Hone's Every Day Book*, I, 1110. [2] *Bayles' Dictionary*, II, 803, note *n*.

so low and ascend so high. To realize its greatest capacity, however, requires both the masculine and the feminine voice. Next to the human voice, and greatly in aid of it, come a vast variety of musical instruments. These properly range themselves under three classes, viz:

1. Stringed instruments, which give us the violin, harp, lute, guitar, harpsichord, and pianoforte, the last two of which have keys superadded, and are hence often called keyed instruments. Stringed instruments give forth their music through the vibrations of their chords.[1] The sounds thus produced are more and more grave as the strings or chords are increased in their lengths and diameters, and also as their tension is decreased. These sounds are not produced by the vibrations of the strings alone, but also by the communication of those vibrations to the substances that surround them. Thus if the note given out by a vibrating string be changed by increasing its length or diminishing its tension,[2] the solid in contact with it will undergo the same change and still vibrate in unison. Hence it would appear that a string, and a solid that may be united with it, form a vibrating system. The stringed instruments, when the strings become extended and stretched membranes, give us the drum, the music of which is produced by percussion. So also when keyed the pianoforte, the tones of which are rich, full, and calculated to accompany the human voice.

2. Vibrating plates and bars, including also bells, and vessels of various kinds, the vibrations of which result from their own elasticity. These give us the euphone, an instrument invented by Dr. Chladni, which consists of forty-one fixed and parallel cylinders of glass, of equal length and thickness, resembling in appearance a small writing desk, which, when opened, presents a series of glass tubes, about the thickness of a quill, and sixteen inches long. It gives out a pleasant sound. Another instrument acting upon this principle, is the well known Jew's harp.

[1] *Higgins*, 96. [2] *Idem*, 124.

3. Wind instruments, whose sounds arise from vibrating columns of air. From these we derive the flute, hautboy, trumpet, and organ. The sound here is entirely due to the air that is contained within the instrument. The column thus contained, is set in motion, and vibrations produced either by blowing over or into the tube. The organ consists of a series of pipes which are supplied with air by a pair of bellows. By means of certain stops, the communication may be opened between different sets of tubes, and the quality of the tones greatly varied.

These, and several other instruments that range themselves under these different principles, have mostly been for a long period of time gradually advancing towards perfection. The simplest, and probably the first instrument invented, was the reed or pipe, ultimately perfected in the flute. The pipe is found among many savages. It would very naturally be the invention of the shepherd. The more artificial the instrument, the later its invention. Thus the stringed instruments, being more artificial, are of more recent invention. Instrumental music possesses value and beauty just in proportion as it resembles the human voice, and as each are found to possess a mutual adaptation to each other. In the wind instruments, increased volume gives greater depth, and the contrary. In stringed instruments, the largest gives the deepest note, as it is a law that profundity of tone is in the ratio of size. The most comprehensive of all musical instruments, as to extent, are the pianoforte and the great organ.

Another thing in which progress has been made, is in musical notation, or the expression of musical ideas by means of certain conventional signs. These have undergone many changes in Europe, and the present system is the result of a long series of improvements. We know little of the manner of the ancients in writing music. The earliest notation of Christendom is on three or four parallel lines,[1] the notes being square or angular, and variously

[1] *New American Cyclopædia*, article Music, 54.

colored. Although the notes are of different lengths, yet the melodies are not divided into measures by bars. This old system, with slight modifications, still prevails in the plain chant of the Roman Catholic church. The notes are square and diamond-shaped, and written on a staff of four lines, a bar being used at the end of every word. Now the length of a note is indicated by its shape, and the signs employed denote the length, pitch, and force of tones.

Music, when thoroughly investigated, will be found to be ethnological in its character. Certain peculiarities of tone prevail among different races, owing to the prevalence of peculiar states of the vocal organs in the usual pronunciation of their different languages. The French are observed to have a nasal, the Germans a guttural, and the English a sibilant tone, these being the characteristics of the different languages.[1] The Italians differ from all these. Their smooth and gliding syllables are lubricated by the constant succession of vowels. This gives them a great uniformity in the conduct of the voice. They have a regular and certain method of producing tone, which is the purest and the best hitherto produced by art. The Italians form the tone in singing at the back of the mouth, keeping the throat moderately open. There is a place near the back of the mouth where the voice must pass, and the Italian method of voicing brings the tone to this spot previous to its production, and sends it forth in its finished state from that precise point, untainted either by the nose or the throat, the mouth or the lips. With the English singer the mouth takes a distinguished part in the production of tones, while it has little, if any, immediate influence in the formation of the Italian tone. This manner of forming and uttering the voice, no doubt, exercises no inconsiderable influence upon the character of Italian music.

It is remarked by Dr. Beattie that "there is a certain style of melody peculiar to each musical country, which

[1] *Art of Improving Voice and Ear*, 93.

the people of that country are apt to prefer to every other style."[1] He claims that Scotland presents a remarkable instance of this diversity, and that the native melody of the Highlands and Western isles is as different from that of the southern part of the kingdom, as the Irish or Erse language is different from the English or Scotch. He traces the different styles of music to the different sentiments that control the movements of the musician's mind; and these sentiments he supposes are mainly due to the peculiar features of the country, and the physical influences which the most universally prevail. There is little doubt but that each race, or variety of the species, had originally its own peculiar music in much the same way as each had its own poetry and language; and that the nearer we reach the origin of races, the more peculiar and distinct from every other would be the music which each would originate. But as all music is essentially subject to laws which everywhere control its displays, its natural tendency would be more and more to lay aside its distinctive character, and to assume those common features to which the laws under which it is developed give birth. Thus the tribute from each country and race would aid in swelling the mighty aggregate of musical development, as the tributary rills from each mountain and hill side form together that mighty ocean whose waters wash the shores of every country on the globe.

Great improvements are always slow in originating and perfecting, and all permanent growth and advancement are little regardful of the time necessarily required. But although discovery is introduced in so gradual a manner, as to be hardly perceptible, seeming to crop out from that which preceded it without any effort, yet there are periods when accumulated observations, and wants generally felt, lead men, who are fortunately placed in advance of their age, to reach forward, and, by seizing on more extensive views of the subject, to anticipate the future, and to create more

---

[1] *Beattie's Essays*, II. 345.

powerful methods of arriving at a knowledge of it, thus eventually leading the habits and ideas of the whole mass of mankind in a new direction. These, renewed at intervals, form what is called periods. Of these there may be enumerated five in the history of music, viz :

1. The formative period.
2. That of developement.
3. Progress towards perfection.
4. Permanence.
5. Decline.

The three first appear to be the only ones that now belong to the history of music.

The formative period carries us back to the first centuries of the Christian era. It was the early Christians who, by the introduction of music into their religious ceremonies, have gathered up and transmitted to us all the ancient practical music with which we are acquainted.[1] The early Christian chants, in which all united, must have been of the simplest character. The first great improvement of these simple chants was made by St. Ambrose consecrated archbishop of Milan in 374. He undertook to give a fixed constitution to church music, introduced the Ambrosian chant, one specimen of which has come down to the present time in the celebrated canticle of the Te Deum.

About two hundred and thirty years after St Ambrose, appeared Gregory the Great, who formed and introduced into practice the system known by the name of the Roman, or Gregorian chant. He founded a singing school for the teaching of music, which served as a model for other similar institutions. The education of singers, and the employment of the Latin language in their hymns, by confining the singing to a few, rendered it more artificial. The Gregorian chant was sung in unison with loud notes of similar value, without rhythm or metre. It has been sometimes called the choral song, because sung by a choir; Gregory having been the first who separated the chanters

[1] *Biographical Dictionary of Musicians*, 1, 9.

from the regular clergy. This celebrated chant, or song, was carried both into England and France, and was very generally diffused. It is occasionally used in Catholic churches at the present time, precisely in the form in which it was then established; thus, like the earlier strata of the globe, carrying down to late generations those simpler elements which contrast strongly with the more complex productions of later times.

The influx of the barbarians, overturning the empire of the west, reduced all musical performances to the chants of the church and their own national songs. The Gothic kingdom of Italy, however, imbibed many of the elements of Roman civilization; and among other arts that of music was not neglected. The Roman school of music thus early acquired an ascendancy which, so far as the execution of musical performances is concerned, it has ever since retained. Italian singers and performers on musical instruments were in demand in other parts of Europe. They were introduced among the Franks by Clovis. The Roman, or Gregorian chant, was first introduced into England by St. Augustine in A.D. 590, and a few years later by St. Boniface into Germany. It was found difficult, however, to preserve the Roman chant in its purity among barbarian performers, and new singers from Italy were in requisition to prevent its corruption. These were supplied particularly in England, where John, a celebrated Italian singer arrived about A.D. 680, and taught the monks of Wearmouth the method of singing the ecclesiastical service, and opened several musical schools in different parts of Northumberland. In France, there came to be so great a difference between the Gregorian chant as executed at Rome, and among the Franks, that a quarrel is said to have arisen between the musicians of the two countries, each claiming the superiority.[1] This being referred to Charlemagne to decide, "Declare to us," said the emperor to his singers, "which is most pure, water drawn from its

[1] *Biographical Dictionary*, 1, 12.

source, or that which is taken from a distant stream." The singers replied, "Water from the source." "Well then," said the emperor, "return to the original source of St. Gregory, of whom you have evidently corrupted the chant." There was no doubt very great difficulty in returning, or in ever acquiring the chant in its purity. An old historian says that the French and Germans were quite unable to sing the Gregorian chant.[1] "That their figures were gigantic, and when they sung, it was rather thunder than musical tones. Their rude throats, instead of the inflexions of pleasing melody, formed such rough sounds as resembled the noise of a cart jolting down a pair of stairs." Charlemagne obtained singers from Italy, through whose efforts the Roman chant became so firmly established in France that it continued down to the commencement of the eighteenth century, when the French bishops reformed the liturgy, and consequently the church music.[2] The introduction of the organ into France in A.D. 757, during the reign of Pepin, the father of Charlemagne, contributed much to the advancement of music. It was sent to Pepin from Constantinople by one of the Greek emperors. This greatest instrument of music was unknown to antiquity. Its agency in the creation of modern music has been very great. From it has been derived what may be considered the base of the structure of elaborate compositions for instruments. The fugue, from which have flowed the sonata, symphony, and overture, refined, and in every way enlarged and increased in effect by the vocal proprieties and poetical alliances of operatic music, is mainly the outgrowth of the organ.

To the formative period of modern European music must be referred the songs of the early bards, who, among the Celts, were of the Druidical order, and celebrated the deeds of worthy men. Instrumental music was much cultivated by the primitive Celts; they and their descendants in the different races evincing a strong attachment to it. The

---

[1] *Higgins*, 207. [2] *Biographical Dictionary*, 1, 12, 13.

song of the Druids was revered as a sacred hymn, and the chanting of Druidical precepts was even imitated by the early Christians. Celtic music is generally of a grave and plaintive character, although occasionally running off into cheerful and animating airs.[1] The Welsh, the Scots, and the Irish, have all melodies of a simple sort, which, as they are connected together by cognate marks, evince their relationship and antiquity. The old bardic works contain melodies for war, for love, and for sorrow. There was the song of peace, and the song of victory. The music of the Scots is composed on a peculiar scale.[2] Scotland boasts of the most ancient melodies. The Irish rank next, and then follow the Welsh. The scale made use of by the Gothic nations produces melodies of a character entirely different from that of the Celts.

The formative period is completed when the musical ideas of the barbarous nations become mixed and blended with the remains of Grecian music. Next follows the period of development; and here the first thing of importance that occurs is the invention of the gamut, or scale, and the origin of counterpoint. The musical scale first took its present form in the commencement of the eleventh century, in the year 1022. It was then that Guido, a Benedictine monk, of Arezzo, in Italy, first constructed the gamut. Next follows, about the middle of the same century, the invention of modern rhythm. This invention, if not due to Franco, either of Cologne or Paris, was at least made available through him,[3] as he was the first who reduced into a system the rules respecting rhythm which had been established before his time, also extending and correcting them. He describes measured music as a chant measured by long and short intervals of time, the same to be expressed either by the voice or by rests. He divides time into three degrees, viz: the long, the breve, and the semibreve. He also distinguishes five modes, or elements of rhythm, the first containing longs, or a long followed by a

[1] *Scottish Gael*, 409. [2] *Idem*, 410. [3] *Biographical Dictionary*, I, xvi.

breve; the second a long preceded by a breve; the third a long and two breves; the fourth two breves and a long; and the fifth of two semibreves and two breves. He arranges and classifies the descant, and also consonances, and dissonances. All this was making an obvious progress, and music, with regard to harmony, remained in the same state for more than a century; the Crusades, in the meantime, having almost completely occupied the attention of almost all Europe.

The rhythmical feet, as determined by Franco, began to be abandoned towards the close of the fourteenth century, and as many sounds were introduced into the measure, as the subdivision of the different orders of notes at that time would permit. New forms, or figures, now became necessary to represent new values of time, and these were formed near the close of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth century. Near the close of the fifteenth century appears Fanchino Gafforio, whose writings are numerous, and form quite an era in the history of music. They became so famous, that in the course of a few years they were spread almost all over Europe, and their precepts were inculcated in most of the schools, universities, and other public seminaries in Italy, France, Germany, and England. The most valuable is the Pratica Musica, which he divides into four books, viz:

1. Harmony, by which he means intonation; for harmony had not yet achieved its independence of the limited acceptation in which it was received by the ancients.
2. Measured chant.
3. Counterpoint.
4. Musical proportions.

Of these, the two latter are only of much interest. Counterpoint is when the musical characters, by which the notes in each part are signified, are placed in such a manner, each with respect to each, as to show how the parts answer one to another. Counterpoint in composition, therefore, is the art of combining and modulating consonant sounds. After treating of the different kinds

of counterpoints, Gafforio proceeds to lay down eight rules on the succession of consonances, which are much the same as those now in use. He then treats of dissonances, and produces a piece entirely composed of discords, which used to be chanted in the church of Milan, on the eve of the festival des morts. He also fixed, or nearly so, the value of notes.

There was one important agency in the history of music, in its progress thus far, not yet noticed by us, and that was the songs of the troubadours, the successors of the ancient bards. These were a class of wandering musicians, who traveled through all the southern countries of Europe, singing their songs in the palaces of kings, and the castles of the nobles. The songs thus sung were composed in the Provençal language, a compound of Latin and Teutonic. The troubadours commenced their rhyming and musical mission in the eleventh century, traveling from one castle to another, and singing their songs in celebration of the heroic deeds of warriors, and the beauty of their ladies. They continued thus traveling and singing, until near the fifteenth century, when their vices, chiefly of licentiousness, led to their suppression. The social music of the French people is largely indebted in its origin to the songs of the troubadours.

The period of development may be said to close with the fifteenth century. The great general principles of music were now ascertained. It had traveled through the dark ages, had arrived at the era of light and knowledge, had developed the gamut, counterpoint, rhythm, value of notes, and many other things essential to the completion of its system. Its progress hitherto had been steadily onward. It had constructed and tuned its violin; discovered the principle lying at the foundation of its pianoforte; and learned to breathe through the deep tones of its organ. It had given to religion the Gregorian chant; had accompanied the minstrel as he sang the deeds of his warrior patron, and inflamed the soul of the troubadour as he breathed forth his harmonious lay to his lady-love.

Its progress had gone on keeping pace with the advancement of the humam mind, until it had arrived at the threshold of a new epoch, the sixteenth century. And now commences the third era in its history, viz: its progress towards perfection, the era which is now in the act of development.

Assuming that the elements of music are all ascertained, and its principles settled, we are now to regard the art as permanently established, and a correct foundation laid for those wonderful compositions which have thrilled the soul of so many admirers. During some three centuries, little, if anything, has been added to the principles of music, but its powers have been wonderfully displayed, and its inherent capacities tested by a vast variety of new applications. In many points, the art has been supposed to have attained the utmost limits of perfection; so much so, that if it does not now remain stationary at the same point, it can only recede, unless a complete revolution were to be worked in the whole system.

The approach towards a musical system rendered it necessary to simplify the system of values. To accomplish this, led to the introduction of bars, the object of which was to render their calculation of corresponding values easier by enclosing within the same fixed space as many notes of the score as would agree with one note of great duration,[1] such as a maxim, or a long. Thus originally a bar was only drawn at every eight or every fourth measure. It was only in the sixteenth century that printed works contained any bars, which were not very generally known until the seventeenth century. The distance between the bars became in time diminished until they enclosed but one measure, as at the present day. The introduction of bars, with their gradual increase, has resulted in bringing into disuse notes of great value, the moderns having multiplied the diminished notes by forming crotchets, quavers, semiquavers etc., which are now very common. While rhythm

[1] *Biographical Dictionary*, I, xxv, xxvi.

has sustained but slight variation, it is the reverse with sounds, and consequently with harmony and counterpoint. The tones of the Greeks were preserved in the chant of the Roman church till the close of the fifteenth century. In the course of the next suceeding century a movement appeared which led the art to that state of perfection to which it has now attained. A piece of music, supposed to be throughout in the same key,[1] will, on being decomposed, be found to be composed of a certain number of different keys, each having a direct affinity to the principal key note. The whole system of these affinities constitutes the musical mode, and the placing of all the intermediate sounds, from the tonic to the octave, in regular succession, forms the scale of the mode. From a great number of different modes may be formed a variety of systems, each of which will constitute essentially the same number of idioms or musical languages, which will belong to various races of men. The eastern system of modes seems different from ours. We have but two, the major and the minor. It was during the sixteenth century that this modern tonality first became universally known. If the system of tones had experienced no variation, the science would have attained its utmost limits more than two centuries ago. Harmony in the first place experienced a revolution. Monteverd, in Lombardy, near the close of the sixteenth century, invented the harmony of the dominant. He first used double discord, such as $\frac{9}{4}$ and $\frac{9}{7}$ $\frac{7}{2}$, as well as the flat fifth and the seventh unprepared. The admission of his principle led to the conclusion that only three essential harmonies were to be acknowledged in the mode, viz: that of the tonic, of the dominant, and of the subdominant. All this led to the employment of intervals in melody which till then had been interdicted, and the intervals in harmony soon suceeded each other in a way till then unknown. Viadana, about the same time, invented the fundamental bass, proposing to make it reign through-

[1] *Biographical Dictionary*, i, xxvii.

out the piece, to consider it as the basis of the whole composition, and to represent by figures the chord it was to carry.

Four principal styles are admitted in music:

1. Church music.
2. Chamber music.
3. Dramatic music.
4. Instrumental music.

1. The first admits of four species, viz: the style, à capella, the accompanied style, the concertante style, and the oratorio. That first mentioned most decidedly belongs to the church. By the accompanied style, is meant that in which the voices are accompanied by the organ alone, or with some other low instruments to sustain the basses, and by the concerted style, that in which the voices are accompanied by all sorts of instruments both of a high and low pitch. The oratorio is a kind of drama, the subject being selected from the scriptures, and the performance being in a church by singers representing the different persons of the drama. The oratorio owes its invention to St. Philip of Neri, born in 1515, who in order to divert the people of Rome from the theatre to the church, procured sacred interludes written by good poets to be set to music by the first composers, and then performed by the most celebrated singers. The experiment succeeded. The first oratorios were simple and short, but became gradually of more importance, untill the genuine drama in all but the pomp of scenic effect was fully realized. Commencing with a melange of the madrigal style and of the cantata, its music came at last to differ little, if at all, from that of the theatre.

2. What was styled chamber music consisted of madrigals, simple and accompanied, and also of cantatas and fugitive pieces. The madrigal was so called because it was set to a peculiar kind of little poem, known also by that name, and was termed simple when executed by voices alone, and accompanied, when the voices were accompanied by the music of the pianoforte or organ. The simple

madrigal was the first in order, and was invented about the commencement of the sixteenth century. After being much cultivated during that and the following century, it has been completely abandoned since the early part of the eighteenth.

Accompanied madrigals date from the commencement of the seventeenth century, when the custom was introduced of putting an instrumental bass, differing from the vocal one, below the voices. These also run their course before the middle of the eighteenth century, and have never since possessed much popularity. The cantata is a poem set to music, or a song intermixed with recitative. It has no very determinate character, and may be in all styles, ranging from the simplest forms of musical expression up to the Passion of Ramler, or the Creation of Haydn. It originated about the beginning of the seventeenth century from the lyric drama. This also has run its course, and has now been almost completely abandoned for nearly three generations.

Fugitive pieces consist of an immense number of styles and great variety of subjects. Every nation has its own, as Italy the canzonetto, the villanelle, etc.; Spain the bolero, etc.; France the romance and the vaudeville. As the musical character of every nation is expressed in its songs, these become interesting subjects of study. They also lie at the foundation of the ideal style, and thus present the elements of the modern system of music.

3. Dramatic music arose from the invention of the recitative or recited music, which gave to the lyric drama a peculiar language and construction. The first specimen of this was the poem entitled Daphne, to which was applied a sort of recitation in notes having all the sounds of music, without its regular support and marked time. This was performed in Florence in 1597, at the house of Corsi. This was followed by two others the Eurydice and Ariana, the former being the first that was performed in public. Its representation took place in 1600, at Florence, on the occasion of the marriage of Henry IV of France with Mary

de Medicis. This is supposed to have been a revival of the chanting declamation of the Greeks. This was the epoch of the recitative in dramatic music.

By the middle of the seventeenth century in the opera of Jason, set to music by Cavalli, we recognize airs having a melody differing from that of the recitative. This was subsequently improved upon, and in the operas of Cesti, composed in 1663, airs were introduced in which the talent of the singer might be displayed to advantage. This was termed the epoch of dramatic melody.

The next noticeable phase of the opera is that it began to degenerate into a spectacle calculated to please the sight alone. By the close of the seventeenth century the machinist and decorator appear much more prominently than the poet, composer or singer. Still there were an immense number of composers devoting themselves to this style, and amongst them the celebrated Alessandro Scarlatti, to whom the invention of the obligato recitative is generally attributed. The principal characteristic of these composers is their science, and hence this has been termed the scientific epoch in dramatic music.

At length was felt, by Scarlatti, the necessity of making the melody conformable to the expression of the words, and some attempts made in this direction were successful. It was reserved, however, to the first generations of the eighteenth century to complete this great improvement, and fully to establish the epoch of expression. It was to the pupils of Scarlatti that the approach to it is attributable. They were strongly seconded by the poets of their time, particularly by Metastasio. This same system was followed by three generations, each profiting by the successive embellishments of melody, and of the orchestra.

This was a brilliant period, but it could not be permanent. The singers began to display abilities before unknown, and exacted of the poet and composer such situations as would best suit their talents. This led to a new epoch in dramatic music, characterized by the development of the true lyric drama. The best lyric poets,

Marcello and Metastasio gave their talents to the work, and at length created a perfect lyric drama, that is, a drama composed according to all the dramatic rules, and in which the music should be entirely subservient to the action. The principles upon which this was based were expounded in the writings of Marcello, but their application to the stage, with all the fullness of truth, was left to the celebrated Gluck, who, about the middle of the eighteenth century, effected this important revolution.

One more epoch only remains, viz: that of dramatic symphony. Towards the close of the eighteenth century, the advancement of instrumental music caused a sensible movement in that of the drama, some composers having endeavored to introduce into operatic accompaniments the richness of the symphony. Here we reach the schools of Haydn, Mozart, Cherubini and others. This, as a system, has many great advantages. The only danger seems to be in eclipsing the vocal, and thus of rendering it sometimes apparently less important than the accessory part.

All these remarks apply more especially to lyric tragedy. Lyric comedy has gone through substantially the same revolutions. The most ancient of these seem to be of the sixteenth century. Their music was in the madrigal style. Among its inconveniences was the use of monologues, sung by several voices, on account of the want of instruments for accompaniment. It does not appear when the recitative was first introduced into lyric comedy. Pergolese distinguished himself by introducing declamatory modulation into dramatic music; and Logroscino, by the invention of finales, gave to dramatic melody a new kind of development. At length comic music passed under the dominion of symphony under the reigns of Mozart and his followers.

4. Instrumental music should be regarded in reference to two things: 1. The sonorous principle, which forms its basis. 2. The mechanism of its execution. In reference to the first, instruments are either stringed, wind or vocal.

In reference to the second, they are either bowed, wind, keyed, stringed; instruments of percussion, or mechanical instruments. To the first belongs the violin, the viola, violoncello or bass, and the double bass. To the second, the German flute, the clarionet, the hautboy, the bassoon, the horn, the trumpet, the trombone, the serpent, the fife, and the flageolet. To the third, the harpiscord, the spinet, the pianoforte, and the organ. To the fourth, the harp, the guitar, the lyre, and the mandoline. To the fifth, the drum, and the cymbal. To the sixth, the bird organ, and the bulafo, or organ of Barbary.

Instrumental music consists of a melody or a system of melodies appropriated either to a single instrument, or to several together. There have been the same revolutions, as to taste and style, in instrumental music as in singing; it always having been influenced by the existing style of vocal composition. During the two first generations of the seventeenth century music was entirely in the madrigal style.[1] Dramatic music attained the highest degree of expression, both as to composition and execution, under Tartini.

Since the commencement, or more strictly middle, of the sixteenth century, all the principles of musical construction and design, and every kind of musical composition, have become established, and have been marching on towards perfection. The sciences, also, and the languages and literatures of modern Europe, have, during the same period, exhibited the same principle of development and progress. All these have their derivation from the original barbarian stock, with so much of Greek and Roman origin as were adopted and thus made a part of that stock.

[1] *Biographical Dictionary*, I, xlviii.

European Schools of Music.

Each nation, and more especially each race, develops the general principles of music in accordance with its own peculiar tastes and customs. Still those nations only attain the dignity of having schools of music which have contributed, in a sensible manner, to the progress of the art, either by the suggestion of universally adopted principles or methods ; or by the production of works universally regarded as classical. In this sense three schools have been enumerated: the Italian, German, and French.

The Italian Schools.

Italy, in reference to its schools of music, has been divided into three regions: the upper, middle, and lower. In the first are the schools of Venice and Lombardy; in the second those of Rome and Bologna; and in the third, that of Naples. There are certain traits characterizing all these schools, such are a nice feeling, and profound knowledge of the essential and constitutive principles of the art, united to grace and expression. The origin of passionate grace and refinement in music is due to Italy. The most expressive of instruments, the violin and its family, was fabricated in her cities. The language of her people, both as to metre and syllabication, is the best adapted for song. As before noticed their vocal organs also proclaim the same truth. As might well be expected, a race of singers grew up there who gave method and laws in song to the European world.

But each one of these schools, independently of all general traits, possesses features peculiar to itself. To that of lower Italy belongs, more particularly, vivacity and truth of expression; to those of middle Italy, science, purity of design, and grandeur; and to those of upper Italy, energy, and force of coloring.

Italy, however, had not much early celebrity as a land of music. During the middle ages it was the theatre of destructive wars. These extinguished her rising arts. From the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, she borrowed the most important improvements in the art from the French and Flemings. Of these, the latter seem to have been the original, as an early school there seems to have been the source of all those now subsisting in Europe. France, from proximity, participated in the impulse, and early French and Flemish singers were found throughout Italy, and the music of French and Flemish composers was sung in the eternal city. At that period so great a uniformity existed between all the European nations, that they seemed to form but one school.

It was near the middle of the sixteenth century before the schools of Italy distinctly appear upon the scene. The earliest is that at Rome under the lead of Palestina. He was born in 1529; was appointed chapel-master of St. Peter's, and died in 1594, having brought choral harmony to a degree of perfection that has never since been exceeded. The school of Bologna emanated from that of Rome.

The school of Venice is due to Willaerst, and that of Lombardy to Porta. The school of Naples owes its principal fame to Scarlatti. He was born in 1650, and was the most voluminous composer of cantatas that ever existed in any country. These schools have attained a superiority in almost every kind of music. Having received the old ecclesiastical counterpoint from the Flemish and French, they were the first who gave to it the sentiment of modern sounds. Having fixed and determined these sounds, they have made phrases and melodic periods, and created tonal harmony. They have also perfected counterpoint or musical design, while fugue and intricate counterpoint owe to them their greatest beauties. It is in the Italian schools that the various branches of sacred music, from the plain chant to the most highly ornamented styles, have been successively developed. The style à

capella, the finest counterpoint, the fugued style, the accompanied style, and the concerted style, are all indebted more or less to the Italian schools for their full development.

Chamber music also looks to Italy as its peculiar home. It is the land of the madrigal, whether simple or accompanied. The school of Naples is unrivalled in its cantatas. The opera, dramatic music, belongs almost entirely to Italy, having received its invention at Florence, and its perfection at Naples. The Italians have not only perfected all kinds of vocal composition, but they have also invented all the different kinds of instrumental music, and have been the instructors of all Europe in instrumental composition. In concerted pieces the schools of Italy have furnished some chef-d'-œuvres, but to the symphony, properly so called, they have little or no claim.

As to musical execution the Italian schools have maintained a superiority over the rest of Europe. The superiority of their singers arises from their climate, the organization of the inhabitants, the more favorable construction of their vocal organs, and the excellence of their rules. In regard to instrumental music, the Italians were the inventors of the harpsichord, the bassoon and the trombone, and were the instructors of all Europe in the use of the violin. Instrumental music, however, has been far less cultivated than singing. Instruments are there regarded only as the means of accompaniment, and no small amount of difficulty would be experienced in having a symphony well performed in Italy.

It seems to be conceded that music has experienced a sensible decline in Italy since the latter years of the last century. The falling off has been not so much in the number, as in the excellence of its professors. This declension has been attributed to the preference universally given to dramatic music, which will admit of acquiring considerable success with a very superficial knowledge of the art. The Italian school, however, still holds a high rank, and although the public instruction may be some-

what feeble, yet many scientific masters are still to be found, as well as all the models which have been left by preceding generations.

The German School.

Many schools of music are recognized in Germany. Almost every German capital can furnish one. The Germans are said to prefer those chords which are the most brilliant in their effects, and those instruments which are the most sonorous, such as wind instruments. This gives them great currency among those who confound the tumult of complicated sounds with harmony. So far as music is a science, consisting in the simultaneous employment of sounds, it is the same throughout Europe, and constitutes that part of the art on the foundations of which all nations best agree. Each nation, or race, however, makes its own choice of instruments, and style of harmony.

The German schools have an earlier origin than the Italian, several of their masters having flourished at the same period as the French and Flemish. But during the latter part of the sixteenth, and beginning of the seventeenth century, Germany was devastated by wars, particularly by the thirty years' war, which proved terribly destructive to all the arts, with the single exception of the art of war itself. It was not until near the close of the seventeenth century that Germany seemed to awake thoroughly to a sense of music. She then received an impulse from the works of Keyser, the first German composer, who, after the renovation, evinced an original and superior talent.

The Germans have only followed the Italians in all that relates to the foundation of the musical system. They have never equalled them in vocal melody. It is different in regard to instrumental music. The Germans there can boast some master-pieces of the first class. They have chiefly considered counterpoint as it relates to instruments,

and hence the voice parts often harmonize badly in their compositions, because they affect passages and intervals contrary to the nature and character of the human voice.

The Gregorgian chant was early imported from Italy into Germany. The Germans also composed some peculiar pieces, called chorals, consisting in several parts, to be sung by all the congregation, and which have a very fine effect. This kind of music is peculiar to themselves. They have counterpoint in the plain chant, also fugues, but not equal to those of Italy. But in the accompanied and concerted styles of church music, they have long had the preeminence over the Italians, having possessed many compositions by their great masters, such as the masses of Graun, Haydn, and Mozart. They possessed also oratories of the greatest beauty and power, such as the Ascension and the Israelites by Bach, the Death of Jesus by Graun, and the Messiah by Handel.

So far as relates to the chamber, or concert style, they have nothing very remarkable in madrigals, but in the cantata they have some compositions of rare beauty, the most celebrated of which are those of the Creation and Seasons by Hadyn. They have not succeeded well in fugitive pieces, as that is a style which requires a simplicity and purity of melody little known amongst them. Since the commencement of the eighteenth century, and during its continuance, the German composers who were formed in the school of Naples, conveyed that style to Germany, and it became predominant, and served as a model to all others. Thus improved, it became the style of Graun, Gluck, and even of Haydn and Mozart.

The German school derives its greatest lustre from its instrumental music. The violin and harpsichord each had able composers. In regard to wind instruments, they possessed a species of composition which belongs almost exclusively to Germany, and in which were a large number of excellent composers. The Germans excelled in instrumental concerted music. Haydn raised his own glory, and that of his nation, to the highest point, by bring-

ing the grand symphony to a degree of perfection which it seems almost impossible should ever be surpassed. The Germans excel in musical execution on wind instruments. There are a great number of excellent German organists, and with regard to that instrument, no nation can compare with Germany. Germany boasts a richer musical literature than any other country in Europe. A large number of excellent works have there been published, mostly in the course of the eighteenth century, on all the branches of the art. Its cultivation is very universal throughout Germany. It is publicly taught even down to the most insignificant charity schools, and no schoolmaster is permitted to exercise his profession, unless he is capable of teaching the elements of music, and some instruments. The musicians of Germany are, in general, very numerous, and well informed. Their methods of instruction are much the same as in Italy, with some modifications.

The French School.

At the period of the revival of the arts, the French were the first to follow the example of the Flemish. Some French composers flourished at the same period with the Flemish. The French school attained considerable eminence during the reign of Francis I; but the religious disturbances, commencing about the middle of the sixteenth century and continuing until near the end of the reign of Henry IV, together with the bloody wars by which they were accompanied, and the profanation of the churches, then the only repositories of music, gave a terrible blow to the art. Henry IV was indifferent to music, and the ambitious, gloomy, saturnine, and tyrannical Richelieu, who, for a long time under Louis XIII, ruled the French nation, had no special love for it, and did not, therefore, extend to it his patronage. The long minority of Louis XIV was attended by disturbances still more fatal to the arts. For more than a century there was a

general neglect in the cultivation of music in France, the French school remaining, all that time, behind that of Italy.

The reign of Louis XIV inaugurated a new era in French music. That prince was himself an excellent performer, and passionately fond of music. He powerfully patronized the art which he took so much pleasure in cultivating. Lully, a Florentine, introduced into France, music as it then existed in Italy. He contributed greatly to the improvement of French music. His compositions were chiefly operas, and other dramatic entertainments. He is said to have been the inventor of that species of composition termed the overture; and more especially of that spirited movement, the largo, which is the general introduction to the fugue. The French music, was, therefore, originally little more than an outgrowth from the Italian. The latter was established in the churches, theatres, and concerts, and was generally cultivated with success. The French have also followed the steps of the Italians in this art. So they have also in regard to melody, although when left to their natural impulse, they have a style of melody peculiar to themselves.

But at the beginning of the seventeenth century a violent struggle took place between French and Italian melody, which was kept up during almost the whole of that century. The French melody triumphed on two occasions at the opera, and in the French cathedrals. After a musical war of sixty years the national taste, which had been formed upon the Italian system, obtained the ascendancy, and the works of Gluck, and several other distinguished composers, finally gave to France a melody of a peculiar character in which Italian grace became united to French decorum.

In practical harmony the French have, for a long time, been far behind the Italians and the Germans. They also do not, in general, know so well how to write music as the Italians and Germans, which may be accounted for from the difference of their methods.

In church music the French received from St. Gregory the Roman chant, and by degrees made great alterations in it; so great that it was at length totally abandoned for absurd plain chants, which were composed at the period when the art was most depraved in France. It was relatively to the counterpoint on the plain chant that the French school is the most defective.

Church music in France, with instrumental accompaniment, has always had great connection with dramatic music, and has undergone the same series of changes. In this style the French have had many great composers.

In chamber music, the French have no madrigals except a few by some contemporaries with the Flemish, all of whose works are now forgotten. As this species of music flourished in Italy during the most troublesome periods in French history it never came to prevail much among the latter people.

The chief glory of the French school is in dramatic music. They, in the first instance, borrowed the dramatic melody of the Italians, and then combining with it that of their own nation, have formed one peculiar to themselves. Out of it has issued the lyric drama, which may be considered as of French origin. Lyric representations took place at the French court as early as the reign of Henry IV, being introduced by his wife Mary de Medicis. At a subsequent period the Italian Mazarin imported the Italian taste into France, and in 1646 caused the first Italian opera to be performed at the Louvre. The first French opera was brought out in 1670. The lyric drama of France owes much of its success to the superiority of its national theatre.

The French excel in musical execution. They boast of a number of celebrated singers. The excellence and superiority of the French in respect to execution is the most strongly marked in instrumental music, more especially in that of the violin. The French violinists, both in number and talent, have, for some time, stood unrivalled in Europe.

Of the three nations already spoken of as having schools of music, it is in France that this art is the least generally cultivated. It is also the art which is the least attended to in France, and one on which there are no public lectures, an advantage which it possesses in most other European countries.

In England the old Puritan element has undoubtedly contributed very much to retard the progress of the higher styles of music. Even as early as the reign of Queen Elizabeth we find among the various requests of the puritans, the following:

"That all cathedral churches may be put down, where the service of God is grievously abused by piping with organs, singing, ringing, and trowling of psalms from one side of the choir to another, with the squeaking of chanting choristers, disguised as are all the rest in white surplices;[1] some in corner caps and silly copes, imitating the fashion and manner of antichrist, the pope, that man of sin and child of perdition, with his other rabble of miscreants and shavelings." Thus the change from catholicism to puritanism, and the destruction of the theatre, owing to the spread of more sombre tastes, led to a great declension of the art of music.

The great English composer, Henry Purcell, flourished in the last half of the seventeenth century. He learned the elements of his art very young, and while a singing boy in the chapel composed many of his anthems, which have been ever since constantly sung in English cathedrals. The great powers of his genius embraced every species of composition that was then known, and with almost equal facility. In the church, he adopted the new and more expressive style, which he himself had been instrumental in inventing, and accompanied the voice parts with instruments, to enrich the harmony, and enforce the melody

[1] *Higgins*, 224.

and meaning of the words. In the theatre, he employed to a much greater extent than his predecessors, the coloring and effects of an orchestra, and gave to the voice a melody more interesting and impassioned than during that century had been heard in England. In chamber music, whether sonatas for instruments, or odes, cantatas, songs, ballads, and catches for the voice, he very far surpassed all of musical composition that preceded him. His compositions were very numerous, and were marked by a vigor and a correct art of word-setting that formed the basis of Handel's oratorios. And yet, like Mozart, he breathed out all the hidden harmony and melody of his soul before completing his thirty-seventh year.

In the eighteenth century Dr. Arne made a brilliant, though unsuccessful effort, to rival the Italian opera, by the introduction of recitative song after the Italian fashion. His melody, and that of his Vauxhall songs, subsequently forms an era in English music. It was so easy, natural, and agreeable to the whole kingdom, that it had an effect upon the national taste. It was the standard of all perfection at English theatres and public gardens until a more modern Italian style was subsequently introduced by Bickerstaff and Cumberland. There was in his compositions a natural ease and elegance, a flow of melody which stole upon the senses, and a fullness and variety in the harmony which satisfied, without surprising the auditor by any new, affected, or extraneous modulation. His object seems to have been to please, in which he fully succeeded. He possessed not the vigor of Purcell, nor the grandeur, simplicity and magnificence of Handel.

We shall close with some account of the four greatest musical composers the world has ever seen, viz: Handel, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven.

George Frederick Handel was born at Halle, in lower Saxony, in 1684, and died in 1759 at the age of seventy-five. In early youth he discovered a passion for music, and

by the time he attained the age of nine years officiated on the organ, and began to study composition. After visiting Italy, and spending some time at Venice, Florence, Rome, and Naples, he returned to Germany, and in 1710 established himself in London. It was here that his great musical performances were brought out, and hence the occasion furnished to England to lay claim to his extraordinary musical powers. Here were performed those great oratorios, Israel in Egypt, Saul, Messiah, Samson, Belshazzar, Hercules, Joseph, Joshua, Theodora, and others. During the execution of his oratorios he was accustomed to wear an enormous white wig, which had a certain nod or vibration when things went well, but when the signal was wanting it was ominous of something wrong. He wrote very fast, and with great apparent eagerness to reduce his conceptions to form. He was never married, and during the latter part of his life was afflicted with blindness. This however, did not prevent him from continuing to play concertos and voluntaries between the parts of his oratorios to the last, with the same apparent vigor of thought and touch as ever. He also continued to compose in private after being deprived of his sight. Later in life he seemed more willing to trust his inventive powers than his memory, as after giving the skeleton of each movement to the band, he played all the solo parts extempore. This power of continuing his composition so late in life confirms the opinion of Dr. Johnson: "That it seldom happens to men of powerful intellects and original genius, to be robbed of mental vigor by age; it is only the feeble-minded, and fool born part of the creation, who fall into that species of imbecility, which gives occasion to say that they are superannuated; for these, when they retire late in life from the world on which they have lived, by retailing the sense of others, are instantly reduced to indigence of mind."

His performance on the organ has been thus described: "A fine and delicate touch, a volant finger, and a ready execution of the most difficult passages, are the praise of inferior artists; they were scarcely noticed in Handel,

whose excellencies were of a far superior description. His amazing command of the instrument, the fullness of his harmony, the grandeur and dignity of his style, the copiousness of his imagination, and the fertility of his invention, were qualities which absorbed every subordinate attainment. When he gave a concerto, his usual method was to introduce it with a voluntary movement on the diapasons, which stole on the ear in a slow and solemn progression; the harmony close wrought, and as full as could possibly be expressed, the passages concatenated with stupendous art, the whole at the same time being perfectly intelligible, and carrying the appearance of great simplicity. This kind of prelude was succeeded by the concerto itself, which he executed with a degree of spirit and firmness that no one ever pretended to equal."

The effects of his music on the auditory have been thus described: "Silence, the truest applause, succeeded the instant that he addressed himself to the instrument; silence so profound, that it checked respiration, and seemed to control the functions of nature, while the magic of his touch kept the attention of his hearers awake only to those enchanting sounds to which it gave utterance."

The control exercised by music over the passions has ever been acknowledged, but it has been generally understood to find a limit in those possessing minds susceptible to its charms. But those having no passions or affections upon which music could operate, who if left to themselves would have interrupted the hearing of others by their talking, were, by the performance of Handel not only charmed into silence, but were generally the loudest in their acclamations.

The powers of composition and of instrumental performance, have with each other no necessory connection. The union of both in the same person in any superior degree, has rarely ever been witnessed. And yet in the person of Handel all the perfections of the musical art were concentrated. Though never a master of the violin, yet his manner of touching it was that of the ablest masters; and

although without a voice, yet he sung most admirably such music as required more of the pathos of melody than a quick and voluble expression.

The choruses of Handel are fugues, in which the grandest subjects are introduced, and conducted with such art, as he only possessed. They are in various styles; some in the solemn style of the church; others possessing the natural and easy elegance of madrigals; while others still are in the highest degree expressive of exultation. There are also others in a style peculiar to himself, and calculated to excite terror. He has at times striven after imitation; as to express the hopping of frogs by passages broken in the time, and by others calculated to resemble the buzzing of flies: and in Joshua by the harmony of one long extended note to make the audience "hear the sun stand still." But his great mission seems to have been to develop the sublime in music. In his compositions were united majesty and strength. His style is the great style in music in the same sense in which that of Michael Angelo is deemed great in sculpture and painting. Even his elegance partakes of sublimity.

And yet the work of this greatest of all musical composers were not destined to perpetuity. The school of Michael Angelo perished with its great master. That of Handel was hardly more enduring. It would seem as if the region of the sublime, in all departments of art, was attainable only by a few; and that if those few were fortunate enough to lead other minds thither, and apparently to elevate the popular mind to that lofty stand-point, yet that it could not long remain. The very intensity of its workings, the extreme tension which would signalize its arrival would cause a rebound into a lower sphere.

Thus the English mind could not be long kept keyed up to the sublime of Handel. It was a style too great, too exalted, too full of splendid exhibition, to be of long continuance. The Italian school presented itself with its language, its poetry, and its music, all calculated to excite the gentler passions. "The frequent recurrence of soft

syllables, the sweetness of the passages, and the lubricity with which a true Italian singer glides through melody, melts at once into a dream of pity and love. Thus the passions which most agreeably bias and affect the mind are all to be found on the side of Italy." And thither has gone the musical taste of England for its gratification. The operas of Italy have supplanted the Messiah of Handel.

Francis Joseph Haydn was born at Rohrau about fifteen leagues from Vienna, in 1732. He was born poor, and was compelled to work through many hardships in acquiring a musical education. He composed his first opera, the Devil on Two Sticks, in his nineteenth year. A series of fortunate circumstances attached him to the service of Prince Esterhazy, and from that period his life was uniform and devoted to study. In the three classes of music, instrumental, church, and operas, he excelled, but his great excellence lay in symphony. He was as much at home in that as was Handel in the sublime. In sacred music he discovered a new path which ranks him amongst the first masters. In theatrical music he was merely estimable, because he was but an imitator.

Haydn always kept with him a pocket-book in which he was careful to note down the ideas and passages which occurred to him. He also made it a practice when in a happy and cheerful mood to write subjects for airs and minuets; when in a tender or melancholy mood he would write themes for andantes and adagios, so that afterwards when composing, if he wanted any particular sort of passage, he had recourse to his magazine.

Haydn had some particular and singular rules for composition, which he kept as profound secrets. He never would disclose them. He never undertook a symphony unless he felt himself quite disposed for it, and then putting on his diamond ring, which had been given him by Frederick II, he would commence by noting down his principal idea or theme, and choosing his key. His knowledge seemed perfect of the greater or less effect produced

by the succession of certain chords; and he would sometimes picture to himself a history which might convey musical sentiments and colors to his mind. He understood perfectly all the instruments of which his orchestra was composed. He saw with the quickness of intuition, what instrument was necessary for his purpose. In his compositions there are often singular modulations, but he felt that what is extravagant draws the attention too much from the beautiful. Extraordinary changes were never attempted without first preparing the ear for them by the preceding chords. Many of his finest quartettes commence by the most insignificant idea, but by degrees, this same idea assumes a character, which strengthens, increases, and develops itself, until its proportions become truly gigantic.

Haydn himself ranked as the highest of his productions, the Seven Words. These were seven grand symphonies expressive of the sentiments which the seven words uttered by the Saviour on the cross, were calculated to inspire. A reward had been offered for their composition, and Haydn was the only one who would consent to make the attempt. He composed many comic pieces, few of which have survived. One of these is that well known symphony in which all his instruments are made successively to cease, one after the other, so that, at the conclusion, the violin is left to perform alone. He contrived one very singular entertainment for the prince. Having purchased a basket full of children's whistles, little fiddles, cuckoos, wooden trumpets, and other such instruments, he studied their compass and character, and composed a most amusing symphony with these instruments alone, some even performing solos, the cuckoo being the base of the piece.

Haydn twice visited London, and the second time had conferred upon him by the university of Oxford, the degree of Doctor of Music, on which occasion he gave as his specimen of musical science to the university a compo-

distinguish and point out the slightest variation of sound; and every false, or even harsh tone, not softened by some harmony, inflicted upon him the severest torture. During all the period of his early life he had an invincible horror to the sound of a trumpet, when not used in concert with other instruments. Continued blasts of it would come very near throwing him into convulsions. When a mere boy he was at Rome, and there heard performed the celebrated Miserere, a composition which it had been prohibited either to give or take a copy on pain of excommunication. He listened with such profound attention that on his return home he noted down the whole piece.

At the age of twenty-five he composed for the theatre of Munich the opera of Idomeno, which he always considered as among the best of his productions. His other celebrated operas were: the Marriage of Figaro, Don Giovanni, and the Enchanted Flute.

Mozart never reached his natural growth. His health was delicate during his whole life. He was thin and pale, his physiognomy extremely variable. The expression of his countenance changed every moment. Some part of his body was perpetually in motion. He was either playing with his hands or beating the ground with his foot.

In everything not relating to his art, Mozart always remained a child. He always indulged in the gratifications of the moment. The judicious selection of pleasures, and temperance in the enjoyment of them, were not among his virtues. His mind was always absorbed by a crowd of ideas that rendered him incapable of serious reflection. Music was his constant employment. He most generally employed the morning in composition, but worked very irregularly. When an idea struck him he was not to be drawn from it. If he was taken from the pianoforte, he continued to compose in the midst of his friends, and sometimes passed whole nights with his pen in his hand. At other times he had such disinclination to work, that he could not complete a piece till the moment of its performance.

All the eccentricities of Mozart vanished the moment he placed himself before the piano. His soul then rose above all the weaknesses of his nature, and his whole attention seemed wrapped in the sole object for which he was born, the harmony of sounds. The fullest orchestra did not prevent his observing the slightest false note, and he would point out with the most astonishing precision the exact instrument on which the error had been committed.

No musician ever embraced the art so extensively. He excelled in all styles, from the symphony to the dance, from operas to the most simple ballads. He was one of the first pianists in Europe. He ranks as the greatest composer that ever lived next to Handel, and in some departments even greater than he. "His most brilliant and solid glory is founded upon his talents as a composer. His compositions are principally admired for the amazing fertility of the ideas, the clear and happy designs, and systems followed up with much dexterity, but in which the most profound science is never destructive of grace. His works are also remarkable for a new and ingenious arrangement of the orchestra and wind instruments. He had an extraordinary talent for introducing into his accompaniments the richness of symphony combined with unrivalled expression, energy and fancy."

"He invariably considered and proclaimed, that the great object of music was,[1] not to astonish by its difficulty, but to delight by its beauty. Some of his own compositions are difficult as well as beautiful, and in some, the beauty may be too transcendental for senses less exalted than his own. But the production of pleasure, in all its varied forms and degrees, was his uniform aim and effort; and no master has been more successful. And with all his genius, he was a laborious and learned musician; and the monument to his own fame which he has completed in his works, was built upon the most anxious, heartfelt, and humble study of all the works of excellence that then

[1] *Blackwood*, XXI. 590.

existed, and without knowing and understanding which, he truly felt that he never could have equaled or surpassed them."

Mozart died ere he had attained his thirty-sixth year, under circumstances as singular as his life had been eccentric. A stranger had called and engaged a requiem to be ready in one month. He had declined giving his own name, or that of the person for whom it was desired, but paid down the large sum required, one hundred ducats. Mozart worked upon it night and day, exhausted his health, and in a state of nervous excitability, began to entertain the idea that he was composing the requiem for himself. The month expired and found the requiem not completed, but the stranger suddenly reappeared. Learning from Mozart that it was not completed, and that an additional month would be required, he readily acquiesced, and voluntarily paid down fifty ducats more. Mozart in astonishment exclaimed: "And who are you, then?" "That," replied the stranger "has nothing to do with the subject. I shall return within the month." He departed, and Mozart in vain sent a servant after him to find out who he was. He now became convinced that the stranger was a being of another world, and that he was really at work upon his own requiem. He redoubled his diligence, fast sinking by his exhausting efforts. The unknown returned at the end of the month, but Mozart was no more. This effort was his last farewell to his art. He had departed amidst the expiring notes of his own requiem.

The last great musical composer to which allusion can be made, is Ludwig Von Beethoven, who was born at Baun, in 1770. He also early displayed a taste for music, but was at first more distinguished for his performance than his composition. While all united in praise of the former, many objected to the latter a harshness of modulation, melodies more singular than pleasing, and an evident struggle to be original, from the latter of which, the former

difficulties may have arisen. All agreed that his greatest power consisted in extemporary performance, and in the art of varying any given theme without the least premeditation. He ultimately became a great composer. It is said his practice was not to write down a single note of his compositions till he had mentally completed them. In most of his works, his style inclines to the solemn and melancholy. He disdained to copy his predecessors in the most distant manner, and accomplished much by his energetic, bold, and uncommon style of composing. In the loftier strains of composition, in which the greatest master can most fully develop both the fertility of his imagination in the invention of melodies, and his dexterity and learning in the construction of harmonies, Beethoven has attained a very eminent rank. In many of his orchestral symphonies, overtures, quartettes, for the violin; concertos, trios, and sonatas for the pianoforte, he may rank with Haydn and Mozart. His peculiar beauties have been thus summed up: "Originality of invention; uncommon passages; a very energetic manner; imitative passages almost innumerable; and abstruse scientific modulation." It is principally to the first as a prominent feature in all his works that his fame is chiefly owing. The frequent employment of discords unresolved with a full harmony; the apparent sombre cast of expression by a continual richness and depth of the bass, the evident preparation for some beautiful allegro, or vivare movement, all these serve to keep alive the attention, and proclaim the art and skill of the composer. Beethoven died in great poverty near Vienna, in 1827.

With Beethoven expires the last great composer of modern times. Haydn and Mozart had raised instrumental composition in Germany to an astonishing elevation; and Beethoven may be said not only to have maintained the art in that stupendous attitude, but even in some respects to have brought it to a still higher degree of perfection.

POETRY.

Poetry, as an art, may be defined to be a metrical composition, owing its production or embellishment to a creative imagination, and having for its object the giving of pleasure by exciting, elevated, agreeable, or pathetic emotions. It has intimate relations with its sister arts, the most intimate, perhaps, with those that like it are subjective in character. It has been called the parent of music. It furnishes the material which harmony and melody present to the ear under so many atractive forms. With eloquence its associations are also intimate. Both appeal largely to the ideal. Both often make use of highly figurative language. Both frequently seek to touch the same hidden springs and by almost the same means. In the world's early youth eloquence has been accustomed to borrow of poetry its garb and garniture.

With the arts of design, those that are objective in their character, especially with that of painting, poetry has been claimed to have a strong affinity. "Painting," it is said, "is dumb poetry, and poetry speaking painting." There have not been wanting those who, like Count Caylus, would make their usefulness to the painters the touchstone of poets,[1] and allot them their rank, according to the number of pictures with which they furnish him. In the estimation of Caylus it is only those poets that are highly descriptive, who are of much account. There is no doubt but the vividness of word painting with which many poets are gifted, would present pictures which the pencil of the painter could make to glow upon his canvas. In the merely descriptive, perhaps the merit of the first may be tested by his ability to present to the mind images so perfect that the last may readily transfer them to canvas, and thus through form and color enable them to address

[1] *Laocoon*, 96.

directly the eye. So also might the reverse of this be practiced.

On close examination, however, there are marked differences observable between the painter's and the poet's art.[1] In that of the painter, the execution appears to be more difficult than the invention; while in that of the poet, this is reversed, and execution seems easier to him than invention. Another more marked difference is found in the fact that the poet develops his art in that succession of events which constitutes time,[2] while the painter is limited simply to space. The former, therefore, presents the parts that constitute his whole, not as coexistent, but successive; while the latter presents the parts together, as coexistent, as a whole made up of parts. In the former, our minds are occupied by the several parts as they succeed each other; and we get, therefore, the relations that mark their succession. The aggregated whole lies in fancy land, among the wonders of the unknown, until the successive presentation of parts brings it within the domain of knowledge. A result of this, which we cannot fail to notice, is that the successive presentation of these facts is due to some active cause, and hence that poetry deals in action, and its causes, while painting is made use of to present us with its results. Homer, for instance, is true to the principles of his art when he describes the shield of Achilles, not as finished and complete, but in its act of being wrought and completed.[3] He changes that which in his subject is coexistent, into that which is consecutive. We see not the shield, but the craftsman who executes it. We hear the strokes of his hammer upon the anvil, and the figures designed for its ornament grow, one after another, out of the bronze, under our eyes, beneath the finer strokes of this hammer. We are altogether absorbed in the force, power, ingenuity, and cunning of his workmanship, as part after part, and figure after figure,

[1] *Laocoon*, 78. [2] *Idem*, 120. [3] *Idem*, 126.

comes successively into being, until, when completed, we gaze with wonder on the perfect work as it bursts upon our vision, and our astonishment is heightened by the fact that we have all along stood by as an eye-witness, and seen it while in the act of being produced. It is thus that poetry, while creative in its nature, delights in revealing to us creative energies while in their very act of creation. The painter's art could not, in this respect, rival that of the poet without a multitude of pictures, a number sufficient to exhibit every marked change in the line of progress towards completion. Although this in some great historical paintings, like the History of Alexander by Lebrun, has been attempted; yet generally the painter contents himself with exhibiting the result, as in the instance supposed, the shield of Achilles, when fully completed.

The mission of the poet has ever been one of brightness and beauty. Its importance to our world can never be fully appreciated. Clothed in robes apparently borrowed from another sphere, he alights amongst us in different countries and ages, cheering the disconsolate, elevating the depressed, holding up everywhere the great facts of life mirrored in his own ideal, and evoking from everything around him, whether on earth or in heaven, or in the actions of men, gods, or infernals, the spirit of beauty and sublimity. Baptized with the child-like spirit, he carries the simplicity, sincerity, earnestness, and single heartedness of the child into the man, and everywhere diffuses the same spirit among those by whom he is surrounded. The myths and traditions of the olden time he weaves into graceful forms, and thus preserves the golden tresses of the world's youth for the adornment of its maturer years. The ideal in which he revels is ever new and ever young, and while he sips at the springs of Helicon, a perpetual youth plays around his features. It is true, he may travel so far into the ideal world, and revel so much in its beauties and glories, as to render the real little less than misery and torture to his acute sensibilities. But that can only be regarded as a punishment for neglecting his mission, which is to invest

the realities of the actual world with the graces and beauties and glories of the ideal. The hearts of men in all countries and ages have bade him welcome. The boisterous attendants upon the barbaric chief have been hushed in the midst of their wine and wassail to listen to the song of the bard. From the world's early battle-fields his song ascended as the incentive to effort and the precursor of victory. He was equally at home amid Scandinavian snows chanting the praises of Odin, as in the smiling vales of Provence inditing the amorous epistle of the armed knight to his lady love. Older than the printing press, mightier than the steam engine, he has been constantly lifting the world's thought and feeling into higher and loftier and purer regions, as old father time with lumbering nations and races at his back has been running his continuous cycles. It must be now our pleasing privilege to follow the footprints of his art as he has traversed the centuries and impressed them upon the countries of modern Europe. In so wide a field, occupied by so many races, for so many centuries, all that can be done is to notice briefly the most prominent points of poetic development as they present themselves in the history of modern Europe. These will be best considered under the following heads of inquiry:

I. Poetry of the Celtæ. Advent of the bard. Culmination in the poems of Ossian.

II. Poetry of the Goth or Teuton, and of this there are two branches: 1. The Scandinavian. Advent of the scald. Culminates in the elder Edda. 2. The German. Advent of the Bard. Culminates in the Nibelungen Lied.

III. Provençal poetry. The troubadour, trouvere, and minnesinger.

IV. The schools of poetry. 1. In Spain and Portugal. 2. In Italy. 3. In Germany. 4. In France. 5. In England.

I. Poetry of the Celtæ

The Celtæ are placed, first because their location at the earliest historic period, in the extreme west of Europe indicates that they were the advance guard of that great Indo-European race who early left their primitive homes in the east to seek their more permanent abodes in western Europe. The poets of the Celtic nations were universally called bards by the ancient writers. These really constituted an institution, composed of a body of men who had their duties and their privileges. It was one of their agreeable duties to sing the brave actions of illustrious men in heroic song, and their poems on these subjects were accompanied by the sweet modulations of the lyre. They were a different order from the Druids, and also from the eubates or vates, a kind of prophets who made deep researches into the noblest and most sublime properties of nature,[1] and their speculations they endeavored to express in verse. The bards and eubates, however, were nearly allied. Both laid claim to inspiration, and the conceptions of both rise to the grand, marvelous, and pathetic; their language is strong, animated, magnificent, eminently figurative, and essentially removed from prosaic diction. To the latter belonged heavenly themes, the hymn, the anthem; while to the former all the things of earth, and the ghost machinery of another world, were presented as their appropriate sphere.

The occasions requiring the song of the bard were many and various. One was the battle-field. "Go, Ullin, go, my aged bard," began the king of Morven. "Remind the mighty Gaul of war. Remind him of his fathers. Support the yielding fight with songs; for song enlivens war." The war song was the prosnacha cath, or incentive to battle, which was chanted both before the commencement

[1] *McPherson's Dissertations*, 201-203, etc.

and in the heat of battle. These songs were composed in a quick measure, were rapidly repeated, and had a most spirit-stirring effect, for, as was said, "the strife was kindled with the songs of the bards." The subjects of these songs were principally "the valorous deeds of worthy men composed in heroic verse." It has also been asserted that the bards had power to prevent an engagement,[1] and hence the shaking "the chain of silence" was the signal to prevent or put a stop to the battle. So also the "song of victory" was chanted by the bards, who preceded the army on its return from a successful expedition. The coronach, or lament, was in the elegaic strain on the death or misfortunes of some distinguished individual.

Another occasion was the meals of the chiefs. Each was attended by a number of bards, who entertained him at his meals, and roused his courage and that of his followers, by their powerful recitations. So after the fatigues of the day, and during the hours of darkness, the "mouths of song" were an ever ready and delightful solace.

The profession of the bard was by no means of easy acquirement. A long course of study, and a life of continual practice were essential for proper qualification and due success. The faculty which required to be specially strengthened and improved was the memory. In the memory of the bard was an immense store house in which was gathered up the accumulated traditions and legendary lore of former times. In the poems of Ossian allusion is frequently made to "the songs of old," and bards of other years. "Thou shalt endure," said the bard of ancient days, "after the moss of time shall grow in Temora; after the blast of years shall roar in Selma." These traditions, and this lore, did not exist in shapeless fragmentary masses, but in the poems of earlier bards. The bardic office was hereditary, and although the son might not be the inheritor of his father's genius, yet he possessed the earliest and most extensive means of storing his mind with the lore

[1] *Scottish Gael*, 384.

of other days. The bardic compositions commemorating the worth and exploits of heroes, thus transmitted from one generation of bards to another, constituted a sort of national annals, which served the double purpose of preserving the memory of past transactions, and of stimulating the youth to an imitation of their virtuous ancestors. In these the Celtic statesmen and heroes, with their great actions, stood forth in the light of poetry; and the appeals thus coming up from the past and urged upon the tender susceptibilities of the young with all the force and power which the bard could derive from his own ideal, had the effect to excite in the hearer the most daring heroism. The sublime strains in which the virtues of the chiefs of Morven are celebrated in the poems of Ossian, continued to animate the Gael until the decline of bardism, and subversion of their institutions.

But the bard did not content himself with simply remembering the tales of other times. The immense stores at his command were fructified by the touch of genius. New poems issued from his prolific brain. His chief aim was to compose his pieces in short, simple, and forcible sentences or stanzas, so that they might be easily learned and retained in the memory, and in this he succeeded wonderfully well. The language, from its simplicity, was admirably calculated to assist recollection, and the ingenuity of the poets added greatly to the effect. "Each verse was so connected with those which preceded or followed it, that if one line had been remembered in a stanza it was almost impossible to forget the rest. The cadences followed in so natural a gradation, and the words were so adapted to the common turn of the voice, after it is raised to a certain key, that it was almost impossible, from a similarity of sound, to substitute one word for another. This excellence is peculiar to the Celtic tongue, and perhaps to be met with in no other language." The popular mind was in sympathy with the bards. The genius of the people was poetical, and hence the secret of bardic influence. Hence the great veneration in which the genuine

bards were ever held. Their persons, houses, and villages, were deemed sacred. They were everywhere received with great respect. They were the cŏunsellors of their chief. They preserved the genealogies and descent of the chiefs and the tribe, and these were solemnly repeated at marriages, baptisms, and burials.

The poetry of the Celtic bards found its culmination in the poems of Ossian. He was the Homer of the Celtic race,[1] and flourished, as nearly as can be ascertained, about the end of the third century. His immortal poems descended from generation to generation, locked up in the Gaelic language, and limited to the Highlands of Scotland until the middle of the eighteenth century, when Mr. McPherson translated several of them and published them in English. A sensation deeper and stronger was created than when they were originally addressed to their Gaelic auditors. What had the world been doing for fifteen centuries, and how could poetry of such beauty and power have issued from the last decades of the third century, and for the fifteen succeeding ones remain hidden from the world? The authenticity of these poems was denied, and they were pronounced by many to be an impudent forgery.

Mr. McPherson, by his silence, at first, seemed almost willing to concede the truth of a charge that would render him their author. But not so the Highlanders. They rallied in defense of their immortal bard. The Highland society, to put an end to the controversy, finally published the originals of the poems, and thus established the existence and works of their sublime bard.

These poems present two main characteristics: tenderness and sublimity.[2] They offer little of gayety and cheerfulness. Their air is solemn and serious. The great Celtic poet prefers ever to move in the lofty region of the grand and the pathetic. Treating all mere ornament as the tinsel and trappings resorted to by less elevated minds to commend topics that might fail upon their own intrinsic

[1] *Scottish Gael*, 390. [2] *Ossian*, I, 113.

merits, he recorded events that were grave and serious, and placed them amid scenery that was wild and romantic. Such are the "extended heath by the sea shore;" "the mountain shaded with mist;" "the torrent rushing through a solitary valley;" "the scattered oaks, and the tombs of warriors overgrown with moss." His was emphatically "The poetry of the heart." His sentiments were noble, his passions tender and sublime. He wrote not to please readers and critics. His motive power was the love of poetry and song. He dwelt upon his past wars, loves, and friendships, until, as he says: "There comes a voice to Ossian and awakes his soul. It is the voice of years that are gone; they roll before me with all their deeds." His style is concise, and crowded with imagery.

A parallel has been run between him and Homer. The latter is more vivacious, the former grave and solemn. "The sublimity of the former is accompanied with more impetuosity and fire;[1] that of the latter with more of a solemn and awful grandeur. Homer hurries you along; Ossian elevates and fixes you in astonishment. Homer is most sublime in actions and battles; Ossian in description and sentiment. In the pathetic, Homer, when he chooses to exert it, has great power; but Ossian exerts that power much oftener, and has the character of tenderness far more deeply imprinted on his works. He must be conceded the preeminence in dignity of sentiment."

Ossian's works, besides several shorter poems, consists of two great epics, Fingal and Temora. His machinery, instead of being gods and goddesses, consist mostly of the ghosts of the departed. This was in accordance with the popular belief, and was the only machinery he could with propriety employ, as the bard had nothing to do with matters of religion, which, among the Celts, belonged exclusively to the Druids. These departed spirits are represented not as purely immaterial, but as thin, airy forms, which can be visible or invisible at pleasure.[2] Retaining the same

[1] *Ossian*, I, 116. [2] *Idem*, 129.

dispositions which animated them here, they ride on the wind, bend their airy bows, and pursue deer formed of clouds. Their voice is feeble, their arm weak, but their knowledge more than human. He thus describes the ghost of Crugal: "His face is like the beam of the setting moon. His robes are of the clouds of the hill. His eyes are like two decaying flames. Dark is the wound of his breast. The stars dim twinkled through his form; and his voice was like the sound of a distant stream." Spirits of a superior nature to ghosts, having power to embroil the deep, to call forth winds and storms, to overturn forests, and send death among the people, are occasionally introduced. Among these was the spirit of Loda, a Scandinavian god, whom Fingal fearlessly encounters, and inflicts upon him a severe wound, causing him to utter a terrible shriek, "as rolled into himself, he rose upon the wind."

A mournful and peculiar interest attaches to the conclusion of his songs. Berrathon, "the last sound of the voice of Cona." Everything is full of the invisible world. "He sees the cloud that shall receive his ghost; he beholds the mist that shall form his robe when he appears on his hill. The thistle shakes its beard to the wind. The flower hangs its heavy head; it seems to say, I am covered with the drops of heaven; the time of my departure is near, and the blast that shall scatter my leaves."

It is worthy of remark that Ossian observes strictly the proprieties of time and place, and when the development of his epic leads him to the islands of Inistore, a Scandinavian region, new objects make their appearance. There he presents us with the stones and circles of Loda, that is, Odin, the great Scandinavian deity; and also with the divinations and enchantments which in early times characterized those northern nations. "There," says he, "mixed with the murmur of waters, rose the voice of aged men, who called the forms of night to aid them in their war."

Ossian is found to excel in the three great qualifications of the poet: description, imagery, and sentiment. His descriptions are concise, as they should be in dealing with

grand, solemn, and pathetic subjects, In these, energy is above all things required. The imagination, deeply impressed by one strong image, desires nothing farther. All amplification would serve only to distract and weaken. He describes Oscar when standing alone and surrounded by his foes as "growing in his place, like the flood of the narrow vale." In describing Agandera, he says: "The daughter of the snow overheard, and left the hall of her secret sigh. She came in all her beauty; like the moon from the cloud of the east. Loveliness was around her as light. Her steps were like the music of songs."

The imagery of the poet consists largely in his employment of comparisons or similes. Ossian derives his imagery mostly from the face of nature as he saw it, the mountains and valleys, the mists, clouds and storms of the northern regions. "The soul of Nathos was sad, like the sun in the day of mist, when his face is watery and dim." "The darkness of old age comes like the mist of the desert." "The face of a ghost is pale as the mists of Cromla." "The gloom of battle is rolled along as mist that is poured on the valley, when storms invade the silent sunshine of heaven." "The little soul is like a vapor that hovers round the marshy lake." "The groan of the people spread over the hills; it was like the thunder of night, when the cloud bursts on Cona, and a thousand ghosts shriek at once on the hollow wind." "He rushed in the sound of his arms, like the dreadful spirit of Loda, when he comes in the roar of a thousand storms, and scatters battles from his eyes." "The music of Carril was like the memory of joys that are past, pleasant and mournful to the soul." He also abounds in metaphors. "She was covered with the light of beauty; but her heart was the home of pride." "Thou art to me the beam of the east, rising in a land unknown." "In peace, thou art the gale of spring; in war, the mountain storm."

His sentiments are not only natural and proper, but also sublime and pathetic. He rests on their majesty, not on mere pomp of expression. Simple, plain, without super-

fluous decoration, he reaches the sublime and pathetic, seemingly without an effort. Witness the conclusion of the songs of Selma. "But age is now on my tongue, and my soul has failed. I hear, sometimes, the ghosts of bards and learn their pleasant song. But memory fails on my mind; I hear the call of years. They say as they pass along: Why does Ossian sing? Soon shall he lie in the narrow house, and no bard shall raise his fame. Roll on ye dark brown years! for ye bring no joy in your course. Let the tomb open to Ossian, for his strength has failed. The sons of the song are gone to rest. My voice remains like a blast that roars lonely on a sea-surrounded rock, after the winds are laid. The dark moss whistles there, and the distant mariner sees the waving trees."

"Ossian," says Schlegel, "seems like a melancholy echo from the voice of a ruined nation, the last vanishing shadow of man's departing faith in ancient mythology." [1]

II. Poetry of the Goth or Teuton.

The wave of population next succeeding the Celtic, which brought from their eastern homes another mighty aggregation of families of the same Indo-European race, brings to our view the Goth or Teuton. This race divides itself into two branches. The one finds its home in the wilds of Scandinavia, the other in the forests of Germany. The first is more purely Gothic, the second Germanic. We can trace these streams of population with great distinctness in the early poetry of each.

The first is signalized by the advent of the scald, and finds its highest point of culmination in the elder Edda.

The second by the advent of the bard, and finds its culminating point in the Nibelungen Lied.

For the full development of the first we are to look to Iceland. This island was discovered, and colonized by

[1] *Æsthetics*, 354.

Scandinavians, mostly Normans, in the last half of the ninth century. As the Highlands of Scotland, in a manner isolated from the rest of the world, nourished the Celtic bards until their power of song reached its culminating point in the poems of Ossian, and preserved those poems until, through the agency of printing, they could be handed down to future generations, so also the island of Iceland seems to have been reserved for a similar destiny in reference to the early poetry of the ancient Scandinavians. There, amid strange desolate valleys, and dreary yokuls, or ice mountains, and by the side of yawning craters lighting up long freezing arctic nights with the glare of volcanic flames, and amid the roar of geysers, or boiling fountains, and a horrible wilderness of lava streams and morasses, the Scandinavian scald invoked the power of song. It would seem as if the roughness, desolation, and fearful severity of external nature, had compelled him to look within himself; and to seek in the resources of his own mind, and amid the kindling fires of his own intellect and feeling, those higher compensations which outward nature had denied him.

The scald of the Scandinavian answers to the bard of the Celtæ. Until the twelfth century, when the scaldic art was terminated by the monks and the art of writing, this race of poets was nourished in Ireland, and found their way into different countries. They were the most enlightened men of their times, and living libraries of history and the maxims of experience. They were similarly regarded with the bards of the Celtæ.

With the introduction of Christianity into Scandinavia perished the religion of Odin, and also the hymns and poems containing its history and doctrines. All were supposed to be lost when, about the middle of the seventeenth century, the world was astonished to learn that there existed still in Iceland the most extraordinary productions of the early Odin period. . These were contained in the edda rhythmica, or edda of Saemund, and in the younger edda or prose edda of Snorre Sturleson. The

former, generally known as the elder edda, is supposed to have been collected by Saemund the wise, in the eleventh century from the lips of the scalds.

The elder edda is not, like the poems of Ossian, the outpouring of a single mind; nor are the subjects in general similar to those embraced in the works of the Celtic bard. It is valuable not so much for the beauty of its poetry, as for its being the grand depository of the doctrines of the Odin mythology, and of the lives and acts of the old Scandinavian Gods. It gathers up and presents us with a view of the mythological world of the north, much as Homer does of that of Greece. But there is this difference between the two, and the same also applies to the works of Ossian. The elder edda presents us with the works of different bards, as they were handed down by tradition from one generation to another. The Iliad of Homer gives us one great poem, all its parts bearing the impress of one mind, although its materials have been collected from many different sources. "No Homer ever arose in Scandinavia to mould all these sublime lyrics into one lordly epic."

All the poems of the elder edda remain "huge, wild, and fragmentary, full of strange gaps rent into their very vitals by the accidents of rude centuries; yet like the ruin of the Colosseum or the temples of Pæstum, standing aloft amid the daylight of the present time,[1] magnificent testimonies of the stupendous genius of the race which reared them.

The elder, or rhythmical edda, consists of twenty-eight poems. These are on various subjects, but they have been divided into two parts, the one of which adopts the very common practice of the early poets in dealing with the heroic element, and setting forth the exploits of heroes. The other is cosmogonic and mythological, containing whatever relates to the Scandinavian ideas of the creation of the world, the origin of men, and the stories of the gods. Thus the field is sufficiently ample, and the topics sufficiently interesting and sublime, to afford full scope to the

[1] *Howitt*, I, 27.

loftiest genius. Some of these songs are very ancient, "and bear all the traces of the remotest age. They carry the mind back to the east, the original cradle of the Gothic race.[1] They afford glimpses of the gudahem, or home of the gods, and of the sparkling waters of the original fountain of tradition. They bear one on in that direction towards the primal period of one tongue and one religion, and in the words of the edda, of that still greater God whom no one dared to name."

We cannot attempt to particularize these poems. It has been said that there is nothing besides the Bible, and the poem of Homer, which can compare in all the elements of greatness with the edda.[2] That "there is a loftiness of stature, and a growth of muscle about it, which no poets of the same race have ever since reached. That the very obscurity which hangs over some parts of it, like the deep shadows crouching amid the ruins of the past, is probably the result of dilapidations; but amid this stand forth the boldest masses of intellectual masonry. We are astonished at the wisdom which is shaped into maxims, and at the tempestuous strength of passions to which all modern emotions appear puny and constrained. Amid the bright sunlight of a far off time, surrounded by the densest shadows of forgotten ages, we come at once into the midst of gods and heroes, goddesses and fair women, giants and dwarfs, moving about in a world of wonderful construction, unlike any other worlds or creations which God has founded or man has imagined, but still beautiful beyond conception.

The mysterious vala, or prophetess, seated somewhere unseen in that marvelous heaven, sings an awful song of the birth of gods and men, of the great Yggdrasil, or tree of life, whose roots and branches run through all regions of space to which existence has extended, and concludes her thrilling hymn with the terrible Regnarok, or twilight of the gods, when the dynasty of Odin disappears in the fires which devour creation, and the new heavens and new

---

[1] *Howitt*, I, 29. [2] *Idem*, 28.

earth come forth, to receive the reign of Balder and of milder natures. Odin himself sings his high song, and his ravens, Hugin and Munin, or mind and will, bring him news from all the lower worlds, but cannot divest his soul of the secret dread that the latter will one day fail to return, and the power which enabled him to shape the sky and all the nine regions of life beneath it shall fall from his hands. A strange mixture of simplicity and strength, of the little and the great, the sublime and the ludicrous runs through this ancient production, or rather collection of productions."

The early and uncultivated mind appears not well balanced ; certain powers and faculties shoot out in all their native strength and vigor, and become developed with a power and energy superior to anything met with in the more civilized forms of life. Other powers and faculties became dwarfed, and hence are but little manifested in the action of the mind to which they belong. The constitutional energies which should have been developed through them have gone to strengthen the stronger ones, which are thus enabled to become powerful at their expense. This disproportion in the different powers and faculties leads to inequalities in their display, and thus to a want of equal balance. It is the work of education of higher and larger culture, of an advancing civilization to develop all the mental powers and faculties in due proportion, and thus prevent strangeness and singularity of display.

No one can fail to observe the strong contrast between the poetry of the Celtæ as contained in the poems of Ossian, and that of the Scandinavian scalds as collected in the elder edda. It would hardly seem as if the infancy of nations, and of races, could have exhibited such mighty differences in the development of their poetic element. The contrast prevails alike in their subjects, modes of treatment and most of the elements that enter into and constitute the life of poetry. The one is heroic, the other in great part cosmogonic and mythologic. The one rises to the dignity of the epic, and is marked as the outpouring

of a single mind; the other consists of songs of a very diversified character, that have descended through vast ages, growing, like all traditions, continually darker, and accumulating lower matter, and more divergent and more pagan doctrines, until, in the eleventh century, they were gathered by Saemund from the mouths of the people and committed to writing for after ages. The one exhibits more of beauty, the other more of grandeur. The one is the flow of a placid stream: the other the onward rush of a tumbling cataract. The one will ever charm by the clear flow of its imagery, and the brightness and beauty of its conceptions; while the other will amaze and astonish by the strangeness of its ideas, and the dim and distant shadowings forth of a power and an energy that lie amidst the profound depths of nature's first causes.

The other, or Germanic stem, of this Gothic or Teutonic branch from the great Indo-European trunk, carries us to the wilds of Germany. There again, the first one that meets our vision coming up out of the darkness of the past, into the first auroral blush of Europe's opening morn is the bard. And he comes bearing with him the legends and traditions of an elder time. Substantially the same mission that was confided to the scald of the Scandinavian, and the bard of the Celtæ, was also entrusted to him of Teutonic lineage. Tacitus, in his Manners of the Germans, does not fail to mention that they "abound with rude strains of verse, the reciters of which,[1] in the language of the country, are called bards. With this barbarous poetry they inflame their minds with ardor in the day of action, and prognosticate the event from the impression which it happens to make on the minds of the soldiers, who grow terrible to the enemy, or despair of success, as the war song produces an animated or a feeble sound." Of the bard sufficient has already been said, and we therefore hasten on to the consideration of that culminating point of old German poetry, the Nibelungen Lied, or Lay of the Nibelungen.

---

[1] *Tacitus*, 532, 533.

The Nibelungen Lied seems not to have been reduced to its present form before the beginning of the thirteenth century. It was then the old singer opened with:

> I sing of loves and wassailings, if ye will lend your ears,
> Of bold men's bloody combatings, and gentle ladies' tears.

But his themes or subjects have been carried far back into previous centuries; some claiming that "in the Nibelungen, under more or less defacement, lie fragments, scattered like mysterious runes, yet still in part decypherable, of the earliest thoughts of men." That its fiction grew out of a religious or philosophical mythus, which, in subsequent ages mingling with vague traditions of real events, was wrought into a story or narrative of earthly transactions. It embodies the oldest traditions of modern Europe, and unless we except the songs of the Celtic bard, Ossian, is the oldest European poem. Its roots reach far back even to the great northern emigrations, and are "ramified through successive layers of centuries, drawing nourishment from each." It seems to be the a great prerogative of a legend that, "instead of being a grand artistic composition, the creation of an individual mind,[1] its operation extends through many varying periods of time, and many generations of men and poets, like the spirit of undying nature, not owning any single earthly master, nor formed to bend beneath his arbitrary will. The German poet, in this hallowed grove of early poetry, has gathered for himself a crown of undying verdure, twined of the oak leaves of his fatherland."

The Nibelungen has been styled the great northern epic, although it has much of the dramatic in its character. It consists of thirty-nine adventures, which resemble so many scenes in a tragedy. It presents us with a youthful hero, who is represented as invested with all the attributes of beauty, magnanimity, and victory; but all these are

[1] *Schlegel's Æsthetics*, 264.

dearly purchased by the certainty of an early and a predicted death. He presents the living type of the splendor and decline of the heroic world. The poem closes with the description of a terrible catastrophe; and one which is dimly prophesied from the beginning. Slowly and certainly it becomes more and more distinctly shadowed forth, becoming strongly and inevitably a part of destiny as the tramp of events are hurrying onward. "A shadow of coming fate, as it were, a low inarticulate voice of doom falls, from the first, out of that charmed Nibelungen land."[1] It is the early outpouring of the dreamy mind of the German. It is a poem which has a basis and an organic structure. A principle of growth runs through it. It has a beginning, middle, and end. It is obviously, in its present form, the work of a single mind; although that mind has felt at liberty to gather up its materials from the traditions and legends of earlier times. These it has brought into unity, and marshaled into coherence and completeness, each event, each adventure, is made to tell on the future, and to play its part in the system of development. Towards the close, the discord of two women arising out of the events that preceded it, becomes ultimately enlarged into a crime, which engenders murder, and leads on to a terrible catastrophe, which lays a whole land in ashes, and sweeps a whole race away.

The machinery employed by the poet differs both from that of Ossian, and of the elder edda. The ghosts of the departed have no part assigned them, nor is there aught cosmogonic or mythologic in its composition. And yet the resources of the supernatural world are brought to bear directly in the events of this life. The marvelous is appealed to and with marked effect. "The whole story of the Nibelungen is fateful, mysterious, guided on by unseen influences, and yet the actual marvels are few, and done in the distance. Those dwarfs, and cloaks of darkness, and charmed treasure-caves, are heard of rather than

[1] *Carlyle's Miscellanies*, II, 843.

beheld, the tidings of them seem to issue from unknown space.[1] Vain were it to inquire where that Nibelungen-land specially is. Its very name is Nebel-land or Niff-land, the land of darkness, of invisibility. The Nibelungen heroes appear little different from children of the air. The Nibelungen song, though based on the bottomless foundations of spirit, and not unvisited of skyey messengers," is yet a song of earth-born heroes, and of human loves and hatreds.

All that properly constitutes the machinery of the poem is embraced in the hoard or treasure bequeathed by king Nibelung to his two sons, whom Siegfried slew and thus came into its possession. Beside gold and jewels there was the sword Balmung, of great potency, a divining rod, which gave power over every one, and a tarnkappe, or cloak of darkness, which not only rendered the wearer invisible, but also gave him twelve men's strength. And yet this hoard or invaluable treasure, proves fatal in the end to all its possessors. The two sons of Nibelung were slain while quarreling over its division. Siegfried, its conqueror, while its owner, was assassinated.[2] The Burgundian royal house to whom it passed, are splitting into fragments. The discords which threaten to arise lead Hagen, of the "rapid glances," to sink it in the Rhine, first taking oath of Gunther and his brothers that none of them shall reveal the hiding place, while any of the rest is alive. But the curse that clave to it could not be sunk there, and the terrible catastrophe finally sweeps off all who have had anything to do with it, leaving its unknown resting place in the bed of the Rhine. Does the singer of this old song thus mean to intimate that when the powers of darkness become allied to man, although they may aid him in the performance of heroic exploits, yet by a sure and unerring agency, they ultimately accomplish his destruction?

[1] *Carlyle's Miscellanies*, II, 342. [2] *Idem*, 360.

III. Provencal Poetry.

The contrast is indeed striking to turn from the early poetic embodiments of the Teutonic traditions and fancies, to the light, gay, and blithesome song of the troubadour. Under his influence, life, during the middle ages, in some portions of Europe, gives itself up to enjoyment. Rallying its energies, as in the period of its youth, it bursts the fetters of its long constraint, and escaping from the castle of the baron, and the cloister of the monk, asserts its own rights, and unseals for itself new fountains of joy and gladness, after reveling in the sweets which are kindly offered for its acceptance; and becoming itself animated with a new and joyous principle, it returns to the baronial hall, and gives new pulsations to its imprisoned inmates, and would almost seek the solitude of the cloister to pour upon the darkness of the ascetic monk the brightness and beauty of its new light.

The part in which this new development took place was in that part of France lying south of the Loire, whose early history differs very essentially from that lying on the north of that river. It had never been subjected to Norman devastation. The Teutonic sceptre which had ruled the northern part of France had influenced very little the southern part.[1] While the northern part had been subject to many invasions, the southern part had enjoyed comparative quiet from the foundation of the kingdom of Arles and Provence by Boson in the ninth century. The Roman institutions, and the Roman language, had struck their roots deeper, and exerted a longer and more pervading influence among the people. In process of time, however, the Romance — Provençal had displaced the Latin, and had become itself a language admirably adapted for certain kinds of poetry.

[1] *Lays of Minnesingers*, 69.

An institution which seems to have been cotemporaneous with Provençal poetry, and to have imparted to it much of its life and peculiar character, was that of chivalry. This possessed a double devotion, viz: to woman and to honor. This was heightened and sometimes carried to an extreme degree by the poetical notions which ascribed to knights and ladies so many virtues, and such absolute perfection. The song of the troubadour was in return the animating principle that kept alive the spirit of chivalry. It contributed to do this more especially by its praises of the beauty, grace, and virtues of distinguished ladies. This served to fan the flame of passion in the knight, and thus to excite him to valorous deeds, and daring exploits. During the most brilliant period of this species of poetry many of the knights themselves, as well as distinguished princes, were troubadours. The warm passions of these knights and princes gushing forth found an embodiment in amatory and martial songs. These all belong to the lyrical style of composition. The production of rhyme, it is said,[1] is derived from the Armorican language. That language, at an early period, resembled the British, and subsequently the Welsh, to the poetry of which rhyme is essential, and from which it may have passed into other European tongues.[2]

The poems of the Provençals were divided into chanzos and sirventes, the former being devoted to gallantry; and the latter to war, politics, or satire. The structure of both was the same. The Provençal songs were generally composed of five stanzas and an envoy. The form of the stanza had great regularity, and was frequently so uniform that the same rhyme was repeated in the same place in each stanza. Great efforts were made to secure harmony, to attain which the troubadours imposed upon themselves rules in regard to the return of the same rhymes, or of the same words at the termination of the verses, by which means they acquired the habit of

[1] *Tayler's German Poetry*, I, 120. [2] *Simondi*, I, (

playing with words. They displayed a correct taste in the employment of their different metres, as also in the mixture of long and short verses, and in the skillful use of the regular terminations in the stanza. They, in fact, were the inventors of those varied measures of the stanzas which afterwards were employed to give so much harmony to the canzoni of Petrarch.[1] The forms of the French ode were also derived from the poetry of the troubadours. So also the ballad, in which the return of the same thought produces such a graceful and pleasing effect, is of Provençal origin.

There is, however, no real depth in Provençal poetry. It also lacks force and power. Its great merit consists in a certain harmony and simplicity of expression. It evokes little from the empire of thought. It is the product of an early stage in civilization; one in which happy and gladsome sentiments become clothed in beautiful language, in a pleasing lyrical form. The Provençals were a young nation, and drew their ideas and illustrations rather from the beautiful nature by which they were surrounded, than the unexplored depths of the human mind. We have here nothing of that creative energy, sublimity of thought, and powerful conceptions of genius, which afterwards gave to the world the drama and the epic. We have a simple expression of sentiment, a tender and delicate inspiration seizing on the beauties of outward nature, and again presenting them under lyrical forms.

One thing has been remarked, and that is the sameness, uniformity, among all the productions of the troubadours. They are all monotonous, presenting similar features, and little, therefore, of individuality of character. No commanding genius has ever appeared among them. Their poetry had no depth of resource, no mythology, no classical allusions, no romantic imagination. It was a beautiful flower growing in an arid soil. It contained within itself a principle of decay, as its professors were ignorant, and

[1] *Sismondi*, 69.

could not give to their poetry a character which they did not themselves possess. It was not left, however, to perish through internal decay. In the beginning of the thirteenth century the storm of war burst over Provence. The crusade against the Albigenses involved the south of France in one of the most exterminating wars upon record. The language and poetry of Provence were extinguished in blood. Thus this early school of poetry, arising as a light amid the darkness of universal barbarism, and the bond which, combining noble minds in the cultivation of high sentiments, formed so long the common link of union among different nations, perished from the earth possibly at the very period when it was about to be developed.

But the gay science, as it was termed, was not limited to Provence or to the south of France. It crossed the Pyrenees and found a home in the provinces of Catalonia and Arragon. The language early spoken in Catalonia bore great affinity to that of Provence, being the genuine Romance tongue evidently deduced from the Latin by the same process as the Provençal. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Provençal poetry was very prevalent in this part of Spain. So also the kingdom of Arragon had preserved the Provençal language, and placed her fame in the cultivation of that literature. And thus we find here, as well as in Catalonia, "passionate feelings breathing in a now forgotten language; tender attachments and fond regrets, confided to the custody of poetry, for which posterity has little regard." "These old Catalonian poems," says Sismondi, "have always seemed to me like inscriptions upon tombs."[1]

But here the fortunes of the troubadour paled before the rising power of Castile and on the union of the two crowns of Castile and Arragon the language of the former became that of literature, and the Spanish heroic romances engendered or sustained by the perpetual contests with the Moors supplanted the genial song of the

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 134

troubadour. That song must come from the heart or its influence must be powerless. For thus he sings:

> Little can sweetest song avail,
> If from the heart it do not come,
> And from the heart it cannot spring,
> Unless there first be love at home.
> And thus is love the soul to me,
> Of all my song and all my joy,
> Entrancing eyes and lips, heart, soul, in harmony.

So also the troubadour spirit crossed the Alps, and when fading and dying out in its own beloved Provence was adopted, fostered, and perhaps it may be said ultimately matured, by the poets of the Petrarchian school. Previously, however, to the age of Petrarch, the native Italian poetry of the troubadour kind was cultivated in Sicily and some other parts of Italy, more especially under the sovereigns of the houses of Swabia and Anjou. It sang of love, however, rather as of a principle, a platonic abstraction, than as a tender or glowing feeling.[1] It had no childhood of romantic poetry, in which to nourish its peculiar spirit, but it finally adopted the spirit of the new school, mixed with a peculiar, affected and metaphysical turn of thought, which has resulted in giving to the earlier works of the Italian poets a coldness and conceit addressing rather the wit than the heart.

The gay science, also crossed the Loire and claimed to establish its empire in some of the northern provinces of France. Its professors here acquired the name of trouveres. The language spoken north of the Loire contained far more of the German in its composition; and the separation politically for a long time from the south, left it to go through its formative processes without being much influenced by its southern neighbors. In the last half of the twelfth century the marriage of Eleanor of Guienne,[2] first with a French, and afterwards with an

[1] *Lays of Minnesingers*, 54. [2] *Idem*, 71.

English monarch, brought into notice the Provençal poets, and kindled a taste for that species of poetry in northern France and England. The language of the former was long in an unsettled state, and so late as the close of the twelfth century it in some pieces nearly approaches the Provençal in inflection and melody, while in others it has more the structure of modern French.[1]

A prolific school of lyric poetry among the northern French poets occurs about the age of Philip Augustus. Many of the French nobility courted the gay muse. The lyrics of this period are alleged to possess much of the sprightliness of heart which sparkles in the songs of the troubadours. "The same devotion to the female sex, the same zeal in their service, the same curious blending of religious and amatory feelings and associations, alike distinguish both.

The trouveres were, however, something more than troubadours. While some excelled in the lyrics of the troubadour, others were the reciters of tales, and invented or perfected the ancient romances of chivalry. The language they made use of was the Romance-Wallon, or Langue-d'Oil, which ultimately ripened into the French language, while that of the Romance Provençal, or Langue d'Oc, dwindled into a mere dialect. The trouveres in this phase of their character were Teutonic, and their poetry more epic than lyric. It is to them we are indebted for the origin of the chivalric poems, the tales, the allegories, and the dramatic compositions, which fill a large space in the literature of the middle ages. Of the former were the exploits of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, and Charlemagne and his Paladins. Of the allegories was the Romance of the Rose, which dragged its slow length through twenty thousand verses, crowding on to the stage all human virtues and vices under the cover of allegorical personages. Of the last mentioned, the dramatic fablieaux

[1] *Lays of Minnesingers*, 78.

of the Faucon, the Myre and some others, have furnished the material out of which modern operas and comedies have been manufactured. All these, together with legends, miracles, and licentious anecdotes constituted the immense store-house out of which were obtained the materials to enliven the long winter evenings in courts and castles and even in private houses. Freighted with such a valuable cargo, the trouveres were ever welcome visitors.

The same light, gladsome, pleasure-loving spirit that animated, and lent a charm to the effusions of the troubadour, is also found imparting a kindred inspiration to the German minnesinger. We are here in the land of the Teuton, where the epic of romance, and all and more than the trouvere has accomplished, may be reasonably expected to take the place of the lyric of love, and the gay song of the troubadour. But the Teutonic head and heart are many-sided in capacity, and they have proved themselves not wanting in this phase of poetic art.

The minnesinger, singer of love songs, tuned his lays under the rule of the Swabian emperors. These emperors of the house of Hohenstauffen, commencing with Conrad III, in the first half of the twelfth century, and continuing one hundred and thirty years, until the accession of the house of Hapsburg, encouraged this peculiar style of literature. This was a stormy period in the history of the empire, and one which saw it split up into a great many principalities over which petty princes presided, upon whom the weighty cares of state did not press so heavily but that they were enabled to procure for their courts the ornaments of music, poetry, and the arts. In these they could seek distinction, and obtain it. These were the patrons of German literature. Even the emperors were some of them minnesingers, and others, as Frederick II, their ardent patrons. The vicinity of Swabia to France favored the literary intercourse of the people, and in the Swabian were composed the first imitations of Provençal songs. Swabia and German Switzerland seem to have been the

principal sources whence flowed the poetry of the minnesingers.

The songs of the minnesingers that have come down to us are highly prized. There is, pervading the whole, a subdued and delicate tone of feeling. They breathe more clearly than the troubadours, the sentiments of innocent and tender affection. They are also diversified by the varied attractions of natural beauty, as well as the impassioned tones of feeling. "Admiration of his lady's perfections,[1] joy in her smiles, grief at her frowns, and anxiety for her welfare, are expressed by the poet in a thousand accents of simplicity and truth." They communicate a joyous hilarity and festivity of spirit, as they revel in the charms of nature, and present themselves clothed in her most smiling forms. "The gay meadows, the budding groves, the breezes and flowers sparkle in the song; and the buoyant effervescence of youthful gayety is often in delightful keeping with the bounding rhythm, and musical elegance of the verse." There is observed to be less of extravagant devotion to the female sex in the minnesinger, than in the troubadour, possibly because with the former the feeling of exaltation of the sex seized on the mind with all the ardor of novelty, while with the former, it was more a rule of action founded on social principles. The poetry of the former is more chaste, tender, and delicate, and is also less metaphysical and spiritualized; less abounding in scholastic subtleties and casuistries. Their songs of joy are often found "floating along in buoyancy of spirit, and glowing with general delight in natural objects, in the bursting promise of spring, or the luxuriant profusion of summer." The Provençal poets, preserving more of the Roman taste and feeling, are more classical in their illustrations.

In the system of versification the minnesingers differ from the troubadours. While the Iambus is the only foot of the latter, the former have almost as many as the classical

[1] *Lays of the Minnesingers*, 123.

writers. The dactylic measure used by some of them was peculiarly adapted to their hymns of joy. It was carried to great perfection and resulted in the production of an agreeable harmony. The songs were frequently sung, and were accompanied by musical instruments, and dancing.

The lay of the minnesinger practically ceased with the imperial house that called it forth. It had survived the song of the troubadour, and was the last in the development of this phase of poetic life; a phase that seems kindly to have been sent at the right period to rally the energies of the mind and heart, and summon them back to life and enjoyment. The main instrument through which this was effected was the Provençal language, and, having accomplished its mission, that also, for all practical purposes, passed away. It is still spoken in the south of France, but so broken up into dialects, that the people of Gascony, of Provence, and of Languedoc, no longer suspect that they are speaking the same tongue.[1] It is thus that the scaffolding used in the erection of beautiful structures, is found to decay and perish with the structures themselves which they were made instrumental in uprearing.

Having briefly alluded to those great original features that mark the early development of the poetic art in Europe we are now prepared to glance at the different schools of poetry that have arisen in its different countries.

IV. The Schools of Poetry.

The Schools of Spain and Portugal.

The Spanish peninsula in its literature exhibits the same strange anomalies as its history; and both are about equally instructive. The Spanish language, the instrument

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 186.

of its literature, is the outgrowth of many different races of men, each bringing the contribution of its own language. The understratum is from the old Iberians, upon which was subsequently engrafted the Celtic, Phœnician, and Hebrew admixtures. These, prior to the fourth century, retreated before the Roman into the hill and valley country of the Basque, leaving, however, their ineffacable impress behind them. Next came the advent of the Goths, building up the old compounded Latin with Teutonic cement. Then came the Moorish invasion about the beginning of the eighth century, which drove the Gothic element into the Alpine Asturias, as the Roman had more than four centuries before driven the Celtiberian into the Basque. Amid the Asturian mountains was nurtured the Spanish language, the eldest child and heir to the Latin, a language aggregating the old Iberian, Celtic, Phœnician, and Hebrew, "based on Roman majesty, buttressed by Gothic force,[1] and enriched with Arabian filagree, a language regular in construction, solemn and sonorous, nervous and emphatical." Spain, in its language, literature, and legislation, as well as in its system of law, and spirit of freedom, took precedence over the rest of Europe. In its rise, prosperity and fall, it furnishes a lesson to the nations.

The first school of Spanish poetry is of the heroic order. It is the Poem of the Cid. This poem consists of over thirty-seven hundred irregular Alexandrines, of a rugged character, and of which the rhyme alone enables the reader to discover that the composition is in verse. The date of this poem is assigned to the middle of the twelfth century, and about fifty years after the death of the hero. It is, therefore, one, if not the earliest epic of Christendom. It belongs to the infant period of versification, of poetry, and of language in Spain, but it was the manhood of national spirit and of heroism. The subject is the glorification of

[1] *Eclectic for* 1851, 3.

the Cid, his exile, triumph, and return. The name of this hero was D. Rodrigo Laynes, while the appellation Cid is a title derived from the Moorish el seid, or my lord.

The name of the author of this old epic has not come down to us. It is obvious, however, that the poem was not the stringing together of floating ballads, and thus the work of many different minds. It bears internal evidence of being an organism; a composition in which the parts are subservient to the whole, and hence the work of one and the same person, like the Iliad, and Nibelungen Lied. The Cid was the Achilles of Castile, the impersonation of implicit faith and loyalty, of soldierly sentiments, and indomitable will. He is made to shine out through the mists of centuries, an exponent of the grand and heroic in character. The poem itself is no biography; it gives but a fragment of his history, beginning and terminating abruptly, as if the author were conscious that he was addressing those who knew its connection with previous and subsequent parts.

The poem itself is without pretension and without art;[1] full of the finest nature, and gives an excellent idea of the people of that age. We are enabled by it to live among them, and almost to participate in the scenes with which they were familiar. His incidents that so strongly strike our minds, are related by the author as possessing no extraordinary character. The simplicity of representation supplies the place of talent.

The martial poetry of Spain was the most completely national,[2] and the most strictly in accordance with the manners, habits, hopes, and recollections of the people. It was inspired by an enthusiasm, which, in return, it contributed to nourish. We may not, therefore, be surprised, in finding that the great poem of the Cid was followed by others of a similar character. This species of poetry was so popular, that monkish legends were

[1] *Sismondi*, II, 86. [2] *Idem*, 92.

reproduced, the cloister coming forward with rival spiritual poems, which no doubt produced a humanizing effect on a rough and violent age. Another humanizing effect resulted from their adapting their verses to music in order to render them more popular. Hence the redondillas (roundelays).

This leads us to another interesting school of Spanish poetry, that embraced in the Spanish ballads; those "wild flowers of the native soil," which have, as they ever will, germinate, blossom, and bear fruit in the hearts of the common people. They were often "hymns mingled with battle cries," and in a plain, simple language, embodied thoughts that burnt in the bosoms of thousands, becoming thus the "mouth-piece of the age." The oldest are the simplest and finest. The series relating to the Cid is the most complete, his ballads occupying a place proportionate to the hold he has on the hearts of his countrymen. Another class extends down to the period of Charles V, which is more strictly authentic, being based on historical chronicles, and from which the common people of Spain have derived most of their historical knowledge.

In its lyrical poetry Spain also took the lead of other nations. Poems of this character are to be found of the fifteenth century, very brief, and generally the expression of a single sentiment, a single image, or a single witty idea, which is conveyed with an air of gallantry. They resemble, but are not imitations of, the songs of the troubadours, the causes producing that resemblance being traceable to that spirit of romantic love which pervaded the whole south of Europe. The Spanish love singers were more passionate than tender in the expression of their feelings.[1] Burning passions and despair, the most stormy feelings, and not simply ecstacies, lie at the foundation of the Spanish love songs. True to the national war feeling, these ballads, or many of them, describe the combats

[1] *Sismondi*, II, 126.

between reflection or reason, and passion. Few poets have ever equaled the Spanish in describing the power of love over the heart. Thus sings one, afterwards archbishop of Burgos:

> Oh! fierce is this flame that seizes my breath,
> My body, my soul, my life, and my death;
> It burns in its fury, it kindles desire,
> It consumes, but alas! it will never expire.
>
> How wretched my lot! no respite I know,
> My heart is indifferent to joy or to woe;
> For this flame in its anger, kills, burns, and destroys,
> My grief and my pleasures, my sorrows and joys.

The Spanish poems of this period strangely mix up the amatory with the devotional, in their subjects and methods of treating them. Thus we have the Seven Joys of Love, in imitation of the Seven Joys of the Virgin Mary. So also the Ten Commandments of Love, and the Testament of Love, whimsically imitating the style of the notaries in making the final disposition of the soul.

Spanish poetry divides itself into two epochs; the one covering the period anterior to the reign of Charles V; and the other, that which is subsequent to the commencement of his reign. The authors, in these periods, stand opposed to each other in the sources of their inspiration, the ends proposed, and the means employed. During the first period, the nation was poetic. There was a general diffusion of romance and song. No foreign models were sought. Spain furnished her own models, and an intense nationality pervaded the whole, The main current of its stream was Romano Teutonic, while the lighter, gayer, more sparkling Arabic Moresque, was ever animating the circling eddies that were playing on its margin.

With the reign of Charles V came a change the most marked that has occurred in the history of any literature. The Spanish nation, so far as regards its poetry, may here

be almost said to terminate. Thereafter the poetry of impulse, of nature, was abandoned for that of art. Inspiration gave place to rules; creating to translating; originality to imitation; the Spanish nationality to Italian models. "We pass from the infancy of Spanish poetry to the age of Charles, as through a long vista of monuments without inscriptions, as the traveler approaches the noise and bustle of modern Rome through the lines of silent and unknown tombs that border the Appian way."[1]

And yet the Italian models of poetry were in almost every respect unlike the Spanish. The essence of the latter was activity, that of the former repose.[2] The former devoted itself to the celebration of its national glories, for it then had such to celebrate. In the latter, all allusion to national events was avoided after the period of Dante and Petrarch. Its poetry was occupied with an ideal world, and was contemplative, dreamy, and unsubstantial.

The two great agents who were the most instrumental in effecting this mighty change, were Juan Boscan Almogaver, and Garcilasso de la Vega, both distinguished by their correct and graceful style, and both equally bent on reforming Spanish poetry, although at the expense of its nationality.[3] They even overthrew the laws of Castilian versification to make way for the introduction of new canons founded upon a different system. The former wrote sonnets and songs in the Italian style. Although an obvious imitation of Petrarch, yet he exhibits much of the spirit of a Spaniard. He has infused that spirit into the precision of Petrarch's language, but not always into the sweetness of his melody. The latter exhibits much of delicacy, sensibility and imagination, occasionally abandoning himself to refinement and false wit, mistaken for the language of passion.

There is also another who ranks among the Spanish classical poets of this period. That is Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, the tyrant of Sienna, detested for his

[1] *Edinburgh Review Selections*, I, 381. [2] *Idem*, 385. [3] *Sismondi*, II, 187.

Machiavelian policy and relentless cruelty, and yet in his sonnets interweaving noble and correct language in such a manner as to be productive of grace and harmony. There is still another Portuguese, viz: George de Montemayor, who, during the same period, is distinguished for the introduction of pastoral poetry.

These have been termed the classics of Spain. They were all soldiers, and actively engaged in the terrible wars of that period, and yet their poetry displays a sybaritic softness and a Lydian luxury more becoming the effeminate Italians than the indomitable warriors of Charles V. It is these who, in the midst of wars and revolutions, and while the nations of Europe were awaking to the sense of a higher and more pervading civilization, found the time, talent and inclination to change the versification, the national taste and almost the language of Castile; to give to the poetry of that country its most graceful, its most elegant, and its most correct form; and to become the models of all those who from that period have had any pretensions to classical purity.

The inquiry has been made how it was possible for these men to change entirely the national taste, and to create a new epoch in its poetry. A cause adequate to the production of such an effect can hardly be expected to be found in a few individuals, however greatly gifted they may be. We should rather look for it in the history of Spain, and in the fact that her national character had been silently undergoing a complete change under the operation of new political relations, new principles of government and new views of religious toleration.[1]

Charles V found Spain a nation of soldiers. Uniting these with Austria, the Netherlands and Germany, he indulged the dream of universal empire. The first step to accomplish it was to become absolute in his own hereditary dominions. Hence the first cause; the abolition of political liberty at home; the seeking of distinction only

[1] *Selections*, I, 387.

through military service abroad; thus dissipating the Spanish nationality in the effort to give it universality. But perhaps a still more efficient cause was in the establishment of the inquisition, the terrors of which rendered the national heart still to its own music, and as its pulsations must continue, enabled it to beat responsive only to that of another and a foreign land. Again, the languages of Spain and Italy were cognate. It was in the latter that the pope held his spiritual supremacy, exhibiting a sort of ghost of the Roman empire. And at this epoch Italy was the guiding star of Europe in arts and letters, when Lorenzo spread a passion for the antique, and the classical under Leo X was asserting everywhere its claim to guide and control the world of taste. Again, the horrors of those times may have led the minds of the Spanish poets to look away from them. The despotism of the period precluded them from censure, and what they could not censure they would not celebrate; and hence they were led to seek a refuge from life's terrible realities,[1] in the innocent delights of an ideal Arcadia. The Spanish muse, therefore, exchanged her ancient lyre for the lute, and sung only the strains of love or pastoral idleness.

The Spanish poets were in many respects inferior to the Italian. Herrera possesses the loftiest and most elevated style of expression of all the Spanish poets.[2] He endeavored to distinguish and set apart phrases fitted for poetry from those adapted to prose.[3] He also endeavored to imitate harmony by selecting words whose sounds agreed with their sense. But a much greater poet, and the creator of the Spanish ode, is Luis Ponce de Leon, a monk, who was bred in the silence and solitude of the cloister, a profound scholar, and deeply versed in the Grecian philosophy. Notwithstanding a marked tendency to mysticism, no poet seems ever to have subjected the creations of an enthusiastic imagination more strictly to the or-

[1] *Selections*, I, 389. [2] *Idem*, 392. [3] *Eclectic*, 1851, 14.

deal of a severer taste;[1] or to have imparted to the language of rapture so deep an air of truth and reality. Many of his lyrics are employed in depicting "the shortness of life, the flight of time, the fading of flowers, the silent swiftness of the river, the decay of happiness, and the mutability of fortune." The poets of this period have been generally described as "leaving no strong traces on the mind; as filling our memories with no splendid passages;[2] as animating us by no spirit-stirring appeals; as presenting us with little that speaks to the heart, or comes home to the business of life; but rather as soothing us into an intoxicating sybaritic softness; as giving dignity to indolence, and pleasing by a gentleness and melancholy, which, without questioning too minutely their reality, we love to contrast with the stormy agitation of the period which gave them birth."

The poetic art in Portugal may be summed up in the Lusiad of Camoens. This remarkable work is the first great epic of modern Europe. It appeared in the last half of the sixteenth century. Its author was through life a disappointed adventurer. Banished from his country, but fighting nevertheless its battles; traveling to the remote east, driven by stress of poverty from one expedient to another, he at last found a release from this troubled life in a public hospital in the year 1579, the Lusiad having appeared seven years previously.

This poem was a marked advance upon all that had preceded it in modern Europe. Trissino, and several of the Castilians, had written histories in rhyme, and dignified their works by the title of epics, but unlike them Camoens considers the epic poem as a creation of the imagination, and not as a history in verse. But this poetical creation he considered should form a consistent whole, the ruling principle and object of the poet being always present to the imagination of the reader. He also infused into it a

[1] *Selections*, I, 393. [2] *Idem*, 395.

degree of tenderness, passion, and love of pleasure, which the ancients deemed beneath the dignity of the epic muse.

Camoens had been led to regard the mythological system of the ancients as essential to their poetic art. Hence his employment of the agency of Venus, Mars, Minerva, Neptune, etc., in the march of his epic. But his real heroes, Vasco de Gama, and the commanders of the Portuguese fleet, could only pray to the Almighty Father, to the Saviour, the virgin, and the saints. Hence he finds himself constantly embarrassed with two contradictory machineries, the one essential to his poetry, the other to his faith. It was not without difficulty that they could be reconciled, but while prayers were, and must be, offered to the one, the relief generally came from the other. Thus at the time the Portuguese fleet, under Gama and his crew, all good catholics, are pursuing their course to India on the coast of Ethiopia, the deities of classical mythology assemble in council, to deliberate on the fate of the fleet, on which occasion both Venus and Mars are eloquent for the Portuguese, and the decision goes forth that they shall be successful. At another time the sea gods, excited by Bacchus, let loose the winds and waves upon the daring navigators; upon which Gama addresses his prayers to the god of the Christians; but it is the nymphs of Venus who, at her bidding, adorn themselves with garlands of the freshest flowers, and by their charms and blandishments seduce into quiet the boisterous winds.

The great object of the epic was the grand idea that was then stirring the depths of all minds, viz: the sea passage to India, the establishment of an empire there, and the monopolization of the commerce of the east. Vasco de Gama, the commander of the Portuguese fleet, is the Æneas of his poem. He obviously proposes Virgil rather than the chivalric romances for his model, and has conferred on his poem an eminently classical character. But, like his own Gama, he soon leaves the servile coast sailing of his predecessors, ventures into the wide expanse of ocean, and makes his triumphant progress through rich

and undiscovered lands. As the mariner in the midst of the troubles and tempests of the sea,[1] perceives, by the spicy gales that he is approaching to his Indian haven, so over the latter cantos of the Lusiad there is diffused the rich air and resplendent sun of the oriental skies. The language is indeed simple, and the purpose serious; nevertheless in coloring and fullness of fancy, Camoens here surpasses even Ariosto. But he does not confine himself to Gama and the discovery of India, or even to the sway and achievements of the Portuguese of his day; whatever of chivalrous, great, beautiful or noble, could be gathered from the traditions of his country has been inweaved and embodied into the web of his poem. It embraces the whole poetry of his nation; among all the heroic poets either of ancient or of modern times, there has never, since Homer, been any one so intensely national, or so loved and honored by his countrymen as Camoens." It is thus that he has reared an everlasting monument of his own and his country's glory, and has perpetuated through all time the history of that country whose conduct towards him while living was most oppressive and relentlessly cruel.

The Schools of Poetry in Italy.

The Italian language is derived probably from more sources than any other in Europe or possibly in the world. These are: 1. The original ancient dialects of the different peoples of Italy, all which had attained to quite a strength of development at the period of Roman supremacy. 2. The Roman development everywhere modifying or supplanting these dialects by the Latin. 3. The barbaric inundation, that swept away the Roman dominion, and planted the Gothic dialects in almost every part of the Italian peninsula. Out of all these slowly emerged the

[1] *Schlegel's Lectures*, II, 101–2.

Italian language. Its progress was indeed slow, owing in part to the strength and vitality of the Latin language, and in part to the fact that the different Italian states were each striving for a separate existence, and hence became antagonistic to the speedy formation of a national language. It required the sixth, seventh, and eight centuries to consummate the destruction of the ancient order of things, and the ninth, tenth and eleventh, to gather up the fragments of anterior systems, and mould them into a form from which resulted the present living language of Italy.[1] For a long period subsequent to this, all the works which their authors designed for immortality were written in Latin. This continued with some exceptions down to the time of Petrarch, who flourished near the middle of the fourteenth century.

The writing of poetry in the vulgar tongue had its birth among the Sicilians, and in a very short time spread over the whole of Italy. When we reach the last half of the thirteenth century, the year 1265 is marked by the birth of Dante, styled "the heir of all the ages." He is the first great poet of modern times, and was destined to exert a wonderful influence over the coming ages. He may be almost said to have created the national thought, and brought Italian literature to perfection. Born and reared amid the factions and feuds of Florence; driven in middle life from his native city, and compelled to spend the remainder of his days in exile, a hapless wanderer from one Italian court to another, until he finally laid down the heavy burden of his life in 1321, in the fifty-sixth year of his age. His early sorrows of the heart, his thorough mastery of all the learning of his time, his early acquaintance and friendship with Giotto, the father of the modern art of painting; his crushed hopes and disappointed ambition; his years spent in wandering over Italy in exile; all were instrumental in fitting him for his high mission, the conception and development of the Divina Comedia.

[1] *Eclectic*, 1858, 332.

The fact is worthy of notice as tending to show that all art is kindred in its character, and mutually assistant; that the art of painting in modern Europe, and also the ars poetica, both started on their glorious career at the same time, and in the same city, viz: that of Florence. Like two streams from contiguous fountains, they have coursed they way onward, mutually lending to each other their kindly aid, widening and enlarging, and everywhere diffusing their bright and happy influences. Thus, the first, starting from Giotto, becomes developed by Massaccio and Leonardo, until it reaches its highest point of attainment in Raphael and Michael Angelo; while the last, commencing with Dante, receives fresh accessions from Petrarch and Ariosto, until it culminates in the splendid epic of Tasso. Nay more, the terrible conceptions of Dante, as they have been embodied in his Inferno, have since found but a too faithful representation on the canvas, and have stood forth in the Last Judgment of Michael Angelo. It is thus the two great Tuscans, blending together their mighty intellects, seek to work out, each in his own way, the same fearful problem of human retribution.

Dante took for the subject of his poem, the three kingdoms of the dead; hell, purgatory, and paradise; thus seeking to lay open the secrets of the invisible world. By a decree of the most high, and accompanied by Virgil, he is enabled to enter the realm of shadows, passing through the gate on which are inscribed these terrific words:

All hope abandon, ye who enter here.

His conception of hell was of an inverted cone of the size of the earth, which consisted of nine circles, each being lower and narrower than the one which preceded it. At the bottom, and in its centre, was chained the arch-fiend, Lucifer, who waves his six gigantic wings over a frozen ocean, in which he is half submerged. He and the other spirits of darkness, are constantly exercising their diabolical malignity on the reprobate souls.

Each narrowing circle contains various cavities for the infliction of punishments, and these vary in proportion to the guilt, the intensity increasing as the circles descend and contract. From the first circle only ascend the eternal sighs of those who have never received Christian baptism. In the next, are those whom love seduced into crime, and who died unrepentant. In the third circle are the gluttons, extended upon the fetid mire, and eternally exposed to showers of ice. In the fourth are the avaricious and the prodigal, who attack each other with mutual reproaches. A disgusting slough swallows up those who have abandoned themselves to their choleric passions, and in the last circle are found those who betrayed their native land, entombed in everlasting ice.

After traversing the infernal regions they enter upon purgatory, and this again consists of an immense cone divided into seven circles, each being devoted to the expiation of one of the seven mortal sins. Purgatory, according to Dante, is in many respects, only a fainter picture of hell. The same species of crime is here subjected to the same kind of punishment, only lighter and limited in duration, proofs of penitence having been given previous to death. Thus the proud are overwhelmed with enormous weights; the envious clothed with garments of horse hair, their eyelids being closed with an iron thread, the choleric suffocated with clouds of smoke, the indolent compelled to run without ceasing, the avaricious prostrated with their faces to the earth, the epicure tormented with hunger and thirst, and the incontinent compelled to expiate their crime in fire.

On the summit of purgatory is situated the terrestrial paradise, forming the connecting link between heaven and earth. Here he enters the celestial regions, which constitute the third portion of the universe, ascending in spiral rings, from sphere to sphere, to the throne of the eternal. In paradise he meets Beatrice, his first and only love, who died in early life, and who now supersedes Virgil as his guide. When the poet enters heaven, he presents us with supernatural appearances very similiar to those of our wildest

dreams. He even summons up faculties with which we have no acquaintance, neither awakens our associations nor revives our habits. We fail thoroughly to comprehend him. His attempts to delineate the scenery of the skies lack the distinctness and appalling sublimity that attach to his sketches of the infernal realms. It is in these latter that he has shown himself the master.

This poem is written in the measure termed terza rima, which was probably the invention of Dante, and consists of three verses,[1] disposed in such a manner, that the middle line of each couplet rhymes with the first and third verses of the succeeding.

This poem has no prototype in any existing language. It is novel both in its parts and their combination into a whole. It stands alone as the first great monument of modern genius. It possesses unity of design and of execution. It is referable to no particular class of composition. Dante himself entitled it a comedy, without any reference, however, to what is understood by that term. His countrymen added the Divine, hence we have the Divine Comedy. His style was then the most elegant of any in the Italian language, and when he is himself affected, and wishes to communicate his emotions, that language of the thirteenth century, in his powerful hands, displays a richness of expression,[2] a purity, and an elegance, which he was the first to elicit, and by which it has ever since been distinguished. Amid all the gloom of his subject we find such a luxuriance of poetic imagery, such a fund of the sublime and beautiful,[3] such a display of learning and knowledge of mankind, as to rank him, in the estimation of some, next to Homer himself.

The next great Italian poet in the order of time was Petrarch, born at Arezzo, in 1304, and died at Arqua, near Padua, in 1374. For more than half of the fourteenth century, he was the centre of Italian literature. This was a great century for Italian poetry. The great poem of

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 206. [2] *Idem*, 212. [3] *Revolutions in Literature*, 95, 96.

Dante, the first which, since the dawn of letters, could bear a comparison with the ancient epic, heralded its opening. During its progress the lyric muse strung her lyre at the call of Petrarch. The lyrical style of poetry appears to be the first which is cultivated in every language, on the revival of its literature.[1] It is that which is deemed the most essentially poetical, and in which the poet can abandon himself most freely to his vivid impressions. The most perfect model of the lyrical style in the form in which it existed among the ancients and also among most of the moderns,[2] is the ode. Petrarch, however, has clothed all his lyrical inspirations in two measures, both of which are far more strict and fettered, viz: the sonnet, borrowed from the Sicilians, and the canzone of the Provençals. The former is essentially musical and is founded on the harmony of sound, from which its name is derived. It acts upon the mind rather through the words than by the thoughts. The richness and fullness of the rhymes constitute a large portion of its grace.

Petrarch, it is well known, based his hopes of glory and immortality on his voluminous Latin compositions. His lyric poems were composed for his mistress, or for the amusement of his friends and acquaintance. And yet it is to these latter to which his immortality is due. "So correct is the diction of his sonnets," says an Italian writer,[3] "that in the space of four hundred years, these pieces have never been taxed with the smallest inaccuracy, nor can they while the Italian language retains its purity. Nay, so justly has he been accounted the infallible standard of our style, that there is perhaps no author of any nation, whose expressions may be so freely adopted in prose or verse, as those of Petrarch, though he flourished so long ago; and the language, as a living one, has been always subject to change. But besides this excellence, Petrarch has entirely exhausted that species of poetry which he cultivated. His principal subject is Platonic

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 216. [2] *Idem*, 319. [3] *Revolution in Literature*, 96–7.

love, in which the affections of the heart have a greater share than the pleasures of sense. Upon this he composed about three hundred little poems, in which he has happily united the majesty of the ode, with the tenderness of the elegy, and charms us with novelty in every line. I want powers to express with what copiousness, spirit and delicacy, he has described the passion of love, not only free from the smallest tincture of licentiousness and obscenity, but seasoned with moral sentiments equally refined and unaffected."

The Italian language made a sensible advance between the times of Dante and Petrarch.[1] Poetry became more elegant, more melodious, and more pleasing to the ear of taste, losing, however, much of the expression of truth and nature. In Petrarch, the poetry of the troubadour, or the spirit that produced it, finds its culmination.[2] "His sonnets strike us most vividly from the superexcellent and wondrous objective art employed in the treatment of themes so entirely and remarkably subjective. The beauty and harmony of both arrangement and material appear to depend on the objective and subjective tendency being combined in due proportions, together with that exquisite skill in mechanism and imagery, which each Italian poet so earnestly strove to attain. In Petrarch, both are harmoniously blended."

The elder poetry of the Italians divides itself into two classes,[3] the one of which is founded on the philosophy of the middle ages, and is illustrated by the allegorical comedia of Dante. The other approaches the faultless models of antiquity, standing in intimate relation with the study of the ancient languages. The true exponent of this class is Petrarch, who is distinguished from the other love poets of the middle age, by greater skill in composition, and by a more intellectual and Platonic turn of sentiment. The first mentioned was master of allegorical, the second of lyrical poetry.

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 218. [2] *Schlegel's Æsthetics*, 220. [3] *Schlegel*, II, 2.

There still remained another class or species of poetry to be developed by the Italian poets. This had its root in the romances of chivalry. The Italian peninsula was never so effectually subjected to the reign of chivalry as most of the other countries of Europe. It was never so Teutonic as many European countries. It contained all or most that remained of ancient Rome; and its civilization, which had been the growth of centuries, long resisted the successive inundations from the north, that from time to time poured over the Alps. With its strength and classical beauty, and thorough possession of the Italian mind, it was slow in yielding to the new ideas and forms of civilization which were borne along by the Teutonic wave. It was, therefore, late in producing any of the fruits of chivalry; so late that it was difficult, if not impossible, to revive its spirit. Those adventures which the ancient romancers could recount with an invincible gravity, could not be repeated by the Italians without a mixture of mockery.

The Italian school, devoted to the development of this species of poetry, commenced with Luigi Pulci, in the last half of the fifteenth century, in his Morgante Maggiore; made an additional progress in the Orlando Innamorato of Count Boiardo, of about the same period; and finally culminated in the Orlando Furioso of Lodovico Ariosto, near the commencement of the sixteenth century. Ariosto was born at Reggio, in 1474, commenced the Orlando Furioso in 1505, was eleven years in its completion, and died in 1533. This poem exhibits the highest reach of this school of poetry, and its author ranks as one of the four great Italian poets. He does not seem to have intended to write an epic poem. The object of it was to portray the great struggle between the Christians and the Moors,[1] which began with the invasion of France, and terminated with her deliverance. It has little unity, except in its subject; commences in the midst of combats, and gives the lives and adventures of his several heroes, in

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 259.

subordinate episodes. As one of the most exalted of human enjoyments is found in the full development of energy and power,[1] so the great art of the poet of romance is, to awaken a proper confidence in human resources, by raising against his hero all the forces of nature and the spells of magic, and ultimately of rendering him triumphant over all these combined.

The world into which Ariosto introduces us, is essentially poetic, where love and honor are the only laws, and the only motives to action; and where all ordinary pains, disquietudes, and inequalities of rank are forgotten. No instruction can be derived from it, because the two worlds of poetry and reality are so entirely unlike, that whatever applies to one will not to the other. This world of the poet, is not, however, the creation of Ariosto.[2] The representation of these ancient manners, and of the spirit of past times, was the work of several successive poets; yet it was reserved to Ariosto to complete this elegant and ingenious edifice, and thus to enable chivalry to shine forth in all its dignity, delicacy, and grace.

A prominent feature of this poem is the magic and sorcery which pervades so large a portion of it. This was borrowed chiefly from the east, the tales of Arabia. These genii, however, have nothing about them of terror. Their power is exercised in splendid creations, in a taste for the arts, and in a love of pleasure. It is a heightening of the energies of man, which embodies the dreams of the imagination, the development of the passions of the living, not the unnatural apparition of the dead.

Ariosto has exhibited in this poem, the most brilliant imagination, and the most fertile invention. The stories of his knights form a tissue of agreeable adventures which awake curiosity and excite interest. In these are found many dramatic subjects for succeeding poets. He also greatly excels in powers of description. His management of incidents, unraveling of plots, shifting of scenes, and

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 260. [2] *Idem*, 261.

arrangement of circumstances, all evince great tact and skill. He represents a character better in act than in speech. His versification is more distinguished for grace,[1] sweetness, and elegance, than for strength. The language he employs is perfectly harmonious. Every description is a picture. He always sports with his subject, with his readers, and with his style, rarely soaring, or attempting that majestic flight which belongs to the epic muse.

Italy had now produced three great poets, and three styles of poetry. Dante had developed the allegorical, Petrarch the lyrical, and Ariosto the romantic or chivalric. It still remained for Tasso to develop the epic. To this species of poetry has been assigned the first rank. It is styled the noblest of all harmonious creations. In the epic, the directing all parts to one object serves to produce in each the pleasure and perfection of the whole. The combination of unity with variety can only be successfully done,[2] by grasping the single idea which rules the most dissimilar actions and the most opposite interests. This unity in combination is the essence of epic poetry.

Torquato Tasso was born eleven years after the death of Ariosto, and in the year 1544. The Italian mind, in all the freshness of its opening powers, was still absorbed in the beauties of the romantic and chivalric poetry of Ariosto. With this it was apparently satisfied without making any higher demands. But Tasso, while yet a young man of twenty-one years of age, fully impressed with the higher splendor and loftier beauties of the epic, commenced his Jerusalem Delivered, which after sixteen years' labor was given to the public. Its gifted author illustrated in his own personal history the fact that the world has little regard for those to whom it is the most largely indebted. While repeated editions were called for and issued, and the name of Tasso was on every tongue and in every heart, the poor poet himself was either immured in a dungeon, or a houseless, homeless

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 263. [2] *Idem*, 307.

wanderer, until worn out by the battle of life he finally expired at Rome, at the age of fifty-one years. Whether he purchased immortality at too great a price is perhaps a problem incapable of solution.

This great poem was published in 1574. Its subject illustrates the struggle between the Christians and Saracens during the wars of the Crusades. These wars were based on the conflict of ideas and principles between those who had attained the highest point of Arabian civilization, and those yet barbarous, but possessed of the germs of European civilization. It was the east, with its deeper and broader learning, its more perfect arts, but its already waning glory, resisting the west with its fresher spirit, its chivalric enterprise, and its indomitable energy; all inspired with the one animating principle of religious faith, and the fixed determination to wrest from the dominion of the infidel the sacred spot where the divine founder suffered death and the mysteries of redemption were accomplished.

The subject chosen was in all respects fortunate, and one affording full scope to all the powers of the epic muse. The period in Italian poetical history was that just succeeding the life of Ariosto, and was, therefore, one in which the chivalric and romantic spirit, although perhaps of waning proportions, was yet possessed of great strength and power. In this point of view the Jerusalem Delivered was the great crowning poem of chivalry. In its loves, and gallantry, and the high chivalrous bearing of its knights and heroes, it carries us fully into the heroic ages. From its commencement, sentiments the most tender are combined with actions the most heroic, and a nobler part has been assigned to love than has been given to it in any other epic poem. This was its concession to the age of chivalry; for love, enthusiastic, respectful and full of homage, was an essential character of chivalry. It was the source of action, and gave inspiration to its poetry. It is for this cause that so much interest attaches to his heroines, as these assimilate better with the chivalrous

romance than with the epic. Hence the delight experienced in the coloring given to his Clorinda and Erminia, and the terrible interest attached to the fatal combat between the latter and her lover Tancred. True to the spirit of romance and chivalry, Tasso loses no opportunity of weaving the golden thread of love into that mighty web made up of the daring deeds of the Christian and the infidel. The episodes in which these frequently occur are among the most beautiful parts of the poem.

The whole period of time covered by the poem will not exceed forty days. It is comprised in that part of the campaign of the year 1099, in which the Crusaders assembling on the plains of Tortosa, commenced their march towards Jerusalem, arriving before that city at the beginning of July, and taking it on the 15th after a siege of eight days. This resulted in the founding of the kingdom of Jerusalem, over which Godfrey of Bouillon ruled for about one year. The review, the march, the siege, the terrible contests, the numerous incidents arising, the final triumph, are all portrayed with a master's hand.

The machinery evoked by the poet is such as the occasion and the times seemed to demand. It is the deity that calls the Crusaders to arms on the plains of Tortosa. Next we are introduced to the councils of the powers of darkness, and Satan assembles his sable bands to resist the conquests of the Crusaders.[1] In depicting the ruler of hell the prevailing superstition would have described him as mean and despicable. Tasso, however, rises superior to this prejudice, and in the portrait which he has drawn of him, inspires terror rather than disgust. His speech to the infernal spirits is of the same sombre eloquence assigned to him by Milton. The hatred by which he is fired permits him to consider only the means of revenge. The demons at his command separate, taking their flight to different regions of the earth, air, and water, to exercise their power over the elements for the discomfiture of the Christian armies.

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 288.

And here is brought to view another set of machinery, employed by the subordinates of the arch-fiend, a resort to which was not inappropriate to the period of the Crusades. This consisted in sorcery and enchantments, which gave to the imagination the exercise of the most unlimited powers, as the subtle arts and operations of the sorcerer were at a distant remove from the chain of causation by which, in human experience, the events of the world are linked together. The use, however, of these powerful agencies was not limited to the powers of darkness. The Christian magician is also introduced to combat by similar means the sorceries of the adversary; and, when fully enlisted, his enchantments are the most powerful, and prevail. The enchantments of the forest, produced by the power of Ismeno, interpose a terrible barrier to the progress of the Christian in the siege, until they are subdued by Rinaldo; but unfortunately he has been transported by the sorceress Armida far away from the scene of action. But the Christian magician proves more powerful than the sorceress, and by his agency the return of Rinaldo is effected, who overcomes the enchantments of the forest, and the Christians are enabled ultimately to prevail.

The world has hitherto produced but five great epic poems. These are the Iliad, the Æneid, the Jerusalem Delivered, the Paradise Lost, and the Lusiad. Of these the third place is given by many to Tasso's Jerusalem Delivered. It follows on in the track of the Iliad and the Æneid, in going back to the heroic ages, and in seeking in them the ideal of the succeeding ones. They are thus made to serve as the model for those which come after. It is the primary object of poetry to transport from the real into an ideal world. "All the fine arts seek to retrace those primitive forms of beauty which are not found in the visible world,[1] but the impression of which is fixed in our minds, as the model by which to regulate our judgment." In this process of retracing, the epic poet goes back to the heroic

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 309.

ages, which lying on the undefined margin between the known and the unknown, occupying a region where the dim light of tradition has not yet brightened into history, offers to the imagination a wider field and a fitter opportunity for supplying from its own stores what it may deem wanting in the perfection of its models. Hence the romantic form of Tasso's great epic harmonizes with the sentiments, passions, and recollections of Europeans. Celebrating as it does, heroes whose types exist in their hearts, a whole people cherish his memory, and in the nights of summer, the mariners interchange the sorrows of Erminia and the death of Clorinda.

Three centuries have now elapsed since the production of the Jerusalem Delivered, but except in the dramatic department, Italy has produced no great poet. In her Dante, Petrarch, Ariosto and Tasso she exhausted her poetic capacity, and it may require centuries to come before she can supply the material to furnish such another.

The Schools of Poetry in Germany.

The German nations occupy central Europe from the Adriatic to the Baltic. These are one in race, although split into a great number of different nationalities. They were originally called Teutons, and were of the Indo-European stock. Their languages consist of two branches: the northern or Scandinavian, and the southern or German. The latter again is subdivided into the eastern or Gothic, the high German or German proper, and the low German, which includes the Frisian, old Saxon, Anglo-Saxon, Dutch and Flemish. The high German is the literary language of Germany, and a language containing within itself vast resources. No modern language equals it in its productiveness and capacity. It borrows little or nothing from the Latin or Greek, but finds expressions for new combinations of ideas in the development of its own resources, more particularly by compositions of its own roots, words

and particles. Unlike many other European languages, it is homogeneous in its growth and character, and is their superior in originality, flexibility, richness, and universality.

We have already glanced at the old Nibelungen Lied, and the lays of the Minnesingers. With the death of Frederick I, set the star of the Swabian dynasty, and the sweet sounds of the minnesingers, expired with the last breath of Conradin on the scaffold at Naples, in 1268. The downfall of the Hohenstauffen dynasty, and the accession of the house of Hapsburg in the person of Rodolph, proved unfavorable to poetic development, as to every other literary enterprise. From this period the German muse slumbered for some centuries. While the Italian poets, Dante, Petrarch, Ariosto and Tasso, were astonishing and charming the world with the highest specimens of poetic art evoked from the depths of the sublime, the beautiful, the loving, the heroic, and the chivalric; the Teutonic spirit in its poetic relations, seemed locked in slumbers so profound that scarce a dream even disturbed its deep repose. The popular song, it is true, never entirely died out in Germany. This species of poetry was of two kinds: the one consisting of songs, the solitary fragments of the age of heroism and chivalry, which had lived through many revolutions and changes in social life; the other the productions of the vulgar themselves, this latter being the most striking division of the popular poetry of Germany.[1] It arose from the encouragement to versification given by some of the inferior princes; but the prizes proposed were of so little value that the knights and nobles left the field to inferior competitors. A rage for rhyming seemed to prevail among all classes, chaplains, doctors, schoolmasters, weavers, blacksmiths, and shoemakers. The muse was easily courted and won, but with a corresponding diminution in value. Finally in about the middle of the fourteenth century, when the guild spirit was so thoroughly prevailing in the various departments of industry, it also invaded

[1] *Schlegel's Lectures*, II, 255.

the domains of poetry, and the votaries of the muse sought and obtained acts of incorporation for their singer guilds. They had their master singers, being twelve of the most distinguished poets of the guild, who met on certain days to criticise each others productions. He who had the fewest faults was entitled to the prize, and allowed to take apprentices in the art. After serving the apprenticeship, the poet was admitted to the corporation and declared a master. Nuremberg was the chief seat of these singer guilds, where, in 1650, was manufactured the "poetical funnel, professing within six hours, to pour in the whole essence of this difficult art into the most unfurnished head.[1] The idea was that poetry could be taught and practiced like any other handicraft, as the common people could not understand why labor, which manufactured so many things, could not also grind out poetry. These corporation guilds must have contained within them a strong vital principle, as they continued during the fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth and even feebly the seventeenth centuries, lasting even through the thirty years' war. One of the most notable of these guild singers was Hans Sachs, the son of a tailor, who was himself a shoemaker, and who learned the poetic art from a weaver. He flourished about the middle of the sixteenth century, and wrote no less than six thousand and forty-eight poetical pieces, among which were included two hundred and eight tragedies and comedies. His best piece was the Shrovetide farce, where the doctor cures a bloated and lethargic patient by cutting out half a dozen fools from his interior.[2]

The thirty years' war, which desolated Germany from 1618 to 1648, followed by the conquests and conflagrations of Louis XIV, had a most disastrous effect upon every branch of German literature. In the very midst of it, however, the first Silesian school of poetry arose under its founder, Martin Opitz, born in 1597, dying in 1639. His immediate models were derived from Holland. He also

[1] *Carlyle's Miscellanies*, I, 34, note. [2] *Idem*, 35, note.

imitated the French and Italian, but in his works are found true German songs, the tones of which remind us of the old minnesingers.

It is not, however, until we get to the middle of the eighteenth century that we find the German muse really awaking from its profound slumbers into a state of conscious existence. This brings us to the era of Klopstock and Wieland, an era second to no other in importance in the development of German poetry, except that which immediately succeeds it, and to which belong the names of Herder, Tieck, Schiller and Goethe.

Friedrick Gottlieb Klopstock was born in 1724, and died in 1803. He has been called by some the father of German poetry. He has ever exhibited himself intensely national, and transferred the true German feelings into his poetry. He may be said to have established the doctrine that Christianity on the one hand, and Gothic mythology and antiquity on the other, must be the main elements of all new European poetry and inspiration.[1] He unwisely sought to banish rhyme, but failed in that attempt, as rhyme appears to be founded in the very nature of Teutonic speech. His most successful poetry is that conceived in the spirit of elegy. He appears almost equally at home in every gradation, blending, and depth of elegiac feeling. In his earlier odes he is admitted to have attained to the true tone of bardic inspiration, to the simple sublimity of Hebrew poetry,[2] and to the genuine spirit of classical antiquity. He does not lose himself in mazes of description, nor does he cluster together that bewildering variety of imagery, which usually constitutes the essence of an English ode.[3] "His feelings are strong, his images lofty, his diction bold; and his thoughts stride as it were on stilts, so as to elude for a time the detection of their starting place, without deviating, however, from their proper

[1] *Schlegel's Lectures*, II, 269. [2] *De Stael's Works*, I, 211, note. [3] *Taylor's German Poetry*, I, 246.

path." His odes are his best productions, and constitute his strongest claims on fame.[1] Their form is unique, and without any parallel in modern literature.

He also wrote the Messiah, an epic poem of twenty books, in hexameter verse. "With the Messiah," says Schlegel, "the new literature of our country may be said to begin;[2] so immeasurable have been the benefits derived from it, particularly in respect to style and expression, that the poem is now admired principally upon trust, or has not at least become a work of true power and living feeling in our hands." One charge against it is, that his rhetoric is verbose and elaborate, so much so as often to destroy the effect of his feeling. He has, however, the reputation of having known best how to personify the spirituality of Christianity, by situations and pictures the most analogous to its nature.

In Klopstock we have a representative of German idealism. Poets derive their material from nature, from art, or from idea. Observation gives them the first, reading the second, and reflection the third. The poet of observation gives us the phenomena of his experience,[3] the one of reading, the treasures of his study, and the one of reflection the creations of his fancy, the materials of which have been drawn from his senses, his books, or the reflex action of his own mental faculties. Klopstock is the poet of reflection. He copies idea, drawing from the picture in his own imagination. The result of that is that his sketches want the solid, his scenery the touch of reality. He lives in dreamland and looks within for his objects or at least the coloring which he gives them. His mountains seem like clouds, his groves empyreal palm, his cities the new Jerusalem. He lacks the life and vividness of actual nature transplanted into poetry.

Klopstock felt and seized only the two extreme points of German poetry: Christianity, and the feeling and mythology of the north. Between these two, and extending

[1] *Taylor's German Poetry*, I, 264. [2] *Schlegel*, II, 264. [3] *Taylor's German Poetry*, I, 292.

from Attila to the peace of Westphalia, lies a middle age of one thousand years or more.[1] To this belongs all the romantic and the chivalric, to which so much of the poetry of modern times is indebted. All this was untouched by Klopstock. This great blank, however, subsequent German poets have filled up, and among these, one, not the least important, is :

Christopher Martin Wieland, born at Biberach, in 1733, and dying at the advanced age of eighty, in 1813. During a long life he manifested a love of truth, exercised goodness, and delineated beauty. He has the reputation of furnishing models of didactic poetry, such as no other nation can exhibit. He also introduced the romantic epopee, and has hitherto been unequaled by any imitator. He has improved and polished the language, and "led the graces into Gothic halls."

As in Klopstock was found a representative of German idealism, so in Wieland we find one of German realism. While the latter is more sensuous, rational, didactic, and ruled by history and philosophy, the former is more supersensuous, sentimental, lyrical, and influenced by religion and by music. Wieland gives a preference to the later classics, to the French and Italian poets; Klopstock to the northern and English. While the former was gay, the latter was earnest. In carrying out the principles of German realism, the characters of Wieland are said to be less the creation of a plastic genius,[2] than the mouldings of an accomplished artist; that "he does not animate his figures like Prometheus, by putting fire within, but, like Pygmalion, by external touches of the chisel." He, however, imitates general, rather than individual nature.

Wieland occupies the middle age left vacant by Klopstock. In this respect another strong contrast is afforded between the two. The poetry of Wieland was entirely devoted to the romantic. He loves to "detain the imagina-

[1] *Schlegel*, II, 266. [2] *Taylor's German Poetry*, II, 294.

tion beneath groves gay with a thousand flowers, peopled with happy lovers sacrificing to Cupid, or haunted by choirs of nymphs,[1] whose thin drapery is the sport of the zephyrs, and whose charms are the pursuit of fauns or the prize of river-gods."

Wieland, equally with Klopstock, has tried his hand at the epic, and has produced the Oberon, a poem extremely popular in Germany, and which, during the author's lifetime attained there all the honors of a sacred book. This has been reckoned the masterpiece of Wieland, "the child of his genius, in moments of its purest converse with the all-beauteous forms of ideal excellence; the darling of his fancy, born in the sweetest of her excursions amid the ambrosial bowers of fairyland." This poem is founded on a tale of French chivalry. The first main action consisting in the adventure undertaken by the hero at the command of Charlemagne is mostly derived from an old story book of chivalry, which furnished to Shakespeare the name, but not the character, of Oberon. The elves, the subjects of his empire, are mythological personages of Gothic origin. The second main action, consisting in the adventures of Huon and Rezia after their union, is in part borrowed from the French romances; while the third main action brings to view the machinery of the poem, and occurs among its mythological personages, the principal of whom are Oberon and Titania, whom a rash oath unwillingly separates, until some mortal pair should set such an example of insuperable infidelity as Huon and Rezia at length realize. Thus the powers and forces that constitute his machinery are linked with the acts and movements of men; and hence the mechanism of their providence, while it guides by an irresistible necessity the conduct of the human agents, has still a motive for every interposition, and never stoops from heaven either to inflict or to reward from capricious tyranny or vague curiosity. To the elves are ever preserved that "diminutive agency, powerful but lu-

[1] *Taylor's German Poetry*, II, 237.

dicrous,[1] that humorous and frolicsome controlment of nature," and that care of chastity, which their received character among the fathers of song required them to sustain.

The long life of Wieland stretched into the succeeding and higher age of German poetry. He was the contemporary of the master spirits of that age. He even survived Herder by the period of ten years.

John Gottfried Herder was born in Prussia, in 1741, and died in 1803. He has given us Voices of the Nations, Scattered Leaves, and Spirit of Hebrew Poets. Herder possessed the gift of transporting himself into the spirit and poetry of every age and people. He directed his attention to the original nature of the character of each nation, and to the deep poetical peculiarity visible in the idiosyncrasies of nations. He looked upon the world as an organic whole, and with him progress, evolution, was the element of the universe. He regarded individuals and nations as the matter,[2] and circles and institutions of life as the form in which that evolution is to be realized. In his Voices of the Nations, he "mingles up the fairest and most characteristic popular songs of all countries into one great minstrelsy of the human race."[3]

One distinguishing feature of his genius,[4] was the perception and feeling of the poetical in the character of natural legends. He most delighted in the poetry of the Hebrews. He possessed great power of entering into all the shapes and manifestations of fancy. His mind was cast in so universal a mould as to enable him to attain almost equal eminence either as a poet or a philosopher. He has been characterized as the Plato of the Christian world.

Herder looked upon the legends in a serious and national light; affirming the existence of a profound meaning in the jocular and sportive fairy poetry.[5] He claimed it to

[1] *Taylor's German Poetry*, II, 407. [2] *Menzel*, III, 292. [3] *Idem*, 297. [4] *Schlegel*, II, 283. [5] *Menzel*, IV, 116.

be of invaluable worth, as voices of the nations, as remnants of a wonderful past. It appears not as the artificial work of man, but as a direct revelation of nature. These ancient legends, coming from the minds and feelings of the people, are directly connected with their history. They are, therefore, an inexhaustible fountain of poetry.

A domestic tone was first introduced into this species of poetry, by Ludwig Tieck, who was born in Berlin, in 1773. He thus linked the legends with what the Germans esteem of priceless value,[1] and drew from their silent depths, what would make the most secret chords of feeling resound with affecting and long forgotten melodies. He has thus built up a new and genuine German poetry upon the foundation of the old. His poetry is intensely German, and hence marks an era in the history of German poetry. The classic models had previously borne it off into the realm of idealism,[2] but Tieck has again rooted it in the pure German peculiarities, so as to render its products national creations. He has led the way back to that unconscious innocence and luxuriance of power, which characterized the early ages of Germany. He was himself a product of the romantic reaction of the age. He made himself master of the whole ancient magical kingdom of the popular legends, and purifying it from modern rubbish, has reproduced it in a higher and purer form. The antagonism between it and the classic models will undoubtedly continue, and perhaps ultimately unite in the formation of a style of poetry that will be both lofty and pure, and at the same time essentially German.

The two great lights of German poetry are Schiller and Goethe. They were contemporaries, and intimate friends.

Frederich Schiller was born at Marbach, in 1759, and died at Weimar in 1805. He has been called emphatically, the poet of the young, as all his feelings seem fully to correspond to the first aspirations of the youthful mind

[1] *Menzel*, IV, 119. [2] *Idem*, 121.

yet uncorrupted. Schiller's original destination was for the medical profession. His first studies were in that direction. But the internal workings of his spirit were little in harmony with the theory or practice of medicine. Carlyle remarks that "every poet, be his outward lot what it may,[1] finds himself born in the midst of prose; he has to struggle from the littleness and obstruction of an actual world, into the freedom and infinitude of an ideal." This, however, notwithstanding its difficulties, was accomplished by Schiller. At the early age of seventeen, he composed his tragedy of the Robbers, which he gave to the world at the age of twenty-two. It electrified the German mind. Its success in the German theatres was unparalleled. Schiller was appointed poet to the theatre at Manheim, and subsequently professor of history in the University of Jena. The closing years of his life were spent in Weimar in intimate association with Goethe. Besides the Robbers, he wrote Fiesco, Cabal and Love, Don Carlos, Wallenstein, Maid of Orleans, Wilhelm Tell, Marie Stuart, the Bride of Messina, and the celebrated ode called the Song of the Bell, which seeks successfully to unite poetry with industry and the interests of daily life. He also wrote in addition many ballads, didactic poems, and lyrical pieces.

Schiller distinguished himself the most as a dramatic author, but he has also experimented in almost every species of poetry, the drama, the ode, the elegy, the narrative, the didactic, in all which he has excelled. The epic he seems never to have attempted. With that single exception, "wherever the genius of his age was astir, we see the flight of his wing and the print of his footsteps." He had great depth of mind, and attained great breadth of culture. He is distinguished from many other poets by firmness of purpose, a philosophical aim, and a thoughtful conception. One distinct mental characteristic was great earnestness, and this was one of the secrets of his greatness. His

[1] *Carlyle's Miscellanies*, II, 271.

mental faculties were well nigh equipoised, the reasoning and imaginative being nicely adjusted to each other. Hence philosophy claimed, equally with poetry, to guide and control the movements of his mind. He did not, therefore, sing as the bird sings, from any tuneful impulse, but educated himself into the different styles of poetry, selecting that as the form best fitted for the expression of noble fancies and lofty thoughts. Thus his poetical excellence grew out of his intellectual, and he reversed the old maxim, "Poeta nascitur non fit." In accordance with this his poetic faculty of expression and description is found to ripen and become more perfect, as his powers of intellect become stronger and more cultivated. Hence the remark of Carlyle that, "sometimes we suspect that it is the very grandeur of his general powers which prevents us from exclusively admiring his poetic genius. We are not lulled by the siren song of poetry, because her melodies are blended with the clearer, manlier tones of serious reason, and of honest, though exalted feeling."

Schiller's adoption of the drama as the vehicle of the most of his poetic effusions, enabled him to speak in a variety of characters, and thus to exhibit all the diversity of poetic talent that lay in his composition. In the representation of man, he concentrated all his poetical energies. It was not the vulgar man that he introduced on to the stage, but man idealized; man full of moral beauty and sublimity. In the ideals of Schiller "we meet with no dead mechanical law,[1] no theory, no dry moral system; but a living organic nature, an active life of active men. This genius alone can create." Schiller himself says:

> The intellect can repeat what has already been;
> Thou alone, genius, can'st invent new forms.

His heroes are also distinguished by a certain nobleness of nature. They are never found belying that pride and dignity which are the mark of a higher nature, and all their

[1] *Menzel*, IV, 100.

expressions are only the natural outgrowths of such a nature.

He has also infused into his characters the fire of noble passions, without which neither life nor poetry can furnish anything either great or ennobling. Every genius is interpenetrated by this celestial spark, which animates and energizes everything into which it enters. As a remarkable instance, in illustration, has been cited the love which Schiller felt and breathed into the souls of his lovers. "From its softest charm, from the first mutual glance, from the first gentle beating of the heart,[1] to the tempest of feeling which shakes the whole heart, to the awe-striking heroic deed of virgin valor, to the sublime sacrifice of two loving souls, love here unfolds before us the boundless richness of its beauty, like a holy music, which rises gradually from the softest tones to the full tempest of pealing chords." The characters he introduces are also often the embodiments of great principles and great truths, and hence are valuable as exhibiting Schiller's conceptions as to the form under which they exhibit themselves, and their different modes of display. He has had great influence over modern schools, and not only the iambus, but also the style,[2] euphony and peculiar phraseology which he introduced, are become quite universal, and superabundant in German tragedy.

Johan Wolfgang von Goethe was born at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, in 1749, and died at Wiemar in 1832, at the advanced age of eighty-three years. While, therefore, Schiller had the misfortune to be called away before he could fully develop all his powers, or give birth to the wonderful creations which his genius fully demonstrated its capacity to produce, Goethe, by reaching a limit beyond fourscore years, had the fullest opportunity to bring out all within, and to round off his life and character in a manner complete and satisfactory.

[1] *Menzel*, IV, 107. [2] *Idem*, 111.

As a poet, Goethe is chiefly known by his domestic epic, Herman and Dorothea, his lyrical and occasional poems; and his dramas, Tasso, Iphigenia, Egmont, Faust, etc. Although the first mentioned has in Germany attained the name of an epic poem, yet the personages and events are of too little real importance to give it that dignity. The characters, or actors in an epic, should possess a dignity and importance corresponding with the elevation and loftiness of the poetic vehicle, in and through which their acts are made known. But in his elegies, ballads, lyrical, and occasional poems, he stands unrivalled. His merits largely consist in his awakening the the soul, by a few slight touches, impressions the most profound and contemplative. He has also a most remarkable faculty of transporting himself to new climates and situations; of imbuing himself with the spirit of different peoples, and of singing the songs of different nations. Thus while he appears pervaded with the melancholy and meditation which seems to be the birthright of northern poets, he exhibits also, many traces of character peculiar to those of the south, and like them, awakes to the pleasures of existence, and a lively enjoyment of nature.[1] Thus he shows that depth and vivacity are not inconsistent with each other, but that each may be exhibited in a different phase of the same mind. He follows his imagination wherever it leads him, and his occasional poems often contain the germ of a fine fiction. He wishes his genius to conduct him into an untrodden path, and almost always disappoints the expectation that may be formed of him. His elegies composed at Rome do not describe Italy. They portray the effect produced by Italy on his own mind and soul. He possesses a singular faculty of compelling us to feel the mysterious power which may proceed from the phenomena of nature.[2] In this respect he proves himself the true German poet. Like those peculiarly sensitive persons who possess the power of discovering

[1] *De Stael*, I, 228. [2] *Idem*, 231.

springs hidden under the earth, by the nervous agitation which they cause in them, the German poetry reveals a miraculous sympathy between man and the elements. "The German poet," it is said, "comprehends nature, not only as a poet, but as a brother;[1] and we might almost say that the bonds of family union connect him with the air, the water, flowers, trees, in short, with all the primary beauties of the creation." "The soul of nature," says Madam De Stael, "discovers itself to us in every place, and under a thousand different forms. The fruitful country, and the unpeopled desert, the sea as well as the stars, are all subject to the same laws;[2] and man contains within himself sensations and occult powers, which correspond with the day, with the night, and with the storm; it is this secret alliance of our being with the wonders of the universe, which gives to poetry its true grandeur. The poet knows how to restore the union between the natural and the moral world. His imagination forms a connecting tie between the one and the other." As an illustration of this, Goethe's ballad of the Fisherman is made to express the increasing pleasure derived from the contemplation of the pure waters of a flowing stream; the measure of the rhythm and harmony being made to imitate the motion of the waves, thus producing an analogous effect on the imagination.

Every poet is said to be the revelation of some peculiar æsthetical power, and that which peculiarly characterizes Goethe is alleged to be talent, understanding by this the faculty of poetical representation in general.[3] The exercise of it does not depend upon any poetry in the object, because it can cover with a poetical garb things that are essentially unpoetical. It takes as its motto, "The beautiful is the result of a fortunate treatment." A musician claimed that everything, even a handbill, could be set to music; so the poet by his talent, or power of representation can evoke from every object the spirit of poetry. The ex-

[1] *De Stael*, I, 231. [2] *Idem*, 232. [3] *Menzel*, III, 327.

tent to which this peculiar talent is possessed measures the poetical capacity of every poet. Its workings are ever revealing glimpses of the unseen but not unreal world, and endeavoring so to modify the relations between the actual and the ideal, as to unite them together.[1]

Goethe attained great mastery as to all matters relating to his art. His intellect was singularly emblematic, his tendency ever being to give life and shape to the ideas and feelings with which he became possessed. This may be regarded as the natural endowment of the poet. With him everything has form and visual existence.[2] His imagination in its own living action, bodies forth the forms of things unseen, clothing them with shapes to suit its own purposes. Another characteristic of the mind of Goethe was its great variety and universality. He has ever enjoyed the reputation of being many sided. His great talent enabled him to recommend every object, whether pleasing or the reverse, by a pleasing form, and to adorn to the utmost everything he touched. No poet ever had more command over the charms of language; and he possessed in the highest degree the talent of making his reader his accomplice, and of imparting to him a sympathetic feeling.

Goethe was the great poet of his age. He might perhaps be styled a reflex, or embodiment of his age. He bridged over the whole period in German literature from the time of Lessing down to his own demise. In early life he rose almost at a bound into the highest reputation over all Europe. Thus he continued during half a century to reign almost supreme in the hearts of his countrymen over the world of letters. The moral and religious results, however, of his teachings have been severely questioned. It may besides be doubted whether he has not placed the beautiful above the true, instead of making it subservient to the great ends of the latter. He was ever an intense worshiper at the shrine of beauty. He had a wonderful faculty in detecting significancies in

[1] *Carlyle's Miscellanies*, I, 231. [2] *Idem*, 271, 272.

common things, and in so developing, and bringing them home as to excite a lively interest in the reader.

The poem which stands at the head of all Goethe's productions,[1] in which his deepest feelings, as well as his views of the world, are the most comprehensively expressed, is his Faust. This is a poem in a dramatic form, but not written for representation. It is founded upon the old and popular legend of Faust, the magician. Tradition says of him that, for the more effectual exercise of his magical powers, and to give him a greater control over spirits, he entered into a contract with the devil for twenty-four years, and that a spirit, called Mephistopheles, was given him as a servant, with whom he traveled about, enjoying life in all its forms, and surprising many people by working wonders. Goethe has infused into Faust an ever active and urgent thirst for knowledge, but presumptuous and ungovernable, and reckless of the means of obtaining it, or of the results of its exercise when obtained. Having spent years of abstruse study in mastering the sciences, and found them empty and illusory, he is about putting an end to his existence, when Mephistopheles persuades him to abandon philosophy, and give himself up to the pleasures of the world. This he does, and after many adventures, finally ends his career in crime and misery.

The poem depicts the yearnings of the human heart, and the career of mere intellect unregulated by principle. Faust quits the ways of common men, but without light to guide him on a better way. He sees the great vulgar herd of mankind happy, but only so in their baseness and degradation. He feels himself to be with them, but not of them; to be peculiar, and the victim of a strange, incomprehensive destiny. One, and perhaps the principal source of his misery is that he is cut off from all companionship with his fellow men. All the sources of sympathy are dried up.[2] He stands alone, and to all doubts and "questionings of destiny" cannot make answer, "others do and suffer

[1] *Menzell*, III, 304. [2] *Carlyle's Miscellanies*, I, 177.

the like." Regarding himself alone, he is not merely a riddle, but a terror to himself. While pride and self-love are the mainsprings of his conduct, a ravenous hunger for enjoyment everywhere haunts him; regarding the stinted allotments of this life as a bitter mockery; chafing at every environment, and rebelling against the iron law of force; feeling within himself the buddings of the infinite, and yet bound to the finite by a resistless power; struggling with all his energies towards infinitude, and yet hopeless of reaching it; a stranger to that law of self-denial, by which alone man's narrow destiny may become enlarged; and finally, abandoning all hope, and under the sole promptings of unmitigated despair, he unites himself with the fiend, as with a stronger, although a more wicked agency; and in his companionship, reckless of all issues, seeks to unravel, or at least to forget, the dark secret of destiny. Such is Goethe's Faust, commencing with the conflicting union of the higher nature of the soul with the lower elements of human life; exhibiting the son, orginally of light and free will, in conflict with the influences of doubt, denial, and obstruction; finally sealing up all human sympathies, allying himself to the spirit of evil, and seeking to find the greatest good in knowledge and physical enjoyment, to drown doubt in disbelief, and to silence forever those songs of the soul, which, properly attuned, might unite their choral symphonies with those ever arising around the throne of the eternal. It was a high and mighty problem, fitting for the first of German poets to present and illustrate, but one which no mere poet can ever solve. He has thus raised a spirit which he cannot lay, introduced mysteries which he cannot explain, shadowed forth a destiny which he cannot unravel. Even the tomb of Goethe furnishes no clue towards solving the problem of Faust. The solution of that problem lies in a sphere beyond that of the poet, and which, although accessible to common men, it is to be feared Goethe never entered.

The German poetry can look for its proper appreciation only in the German mind. That mind has its own pecu-

liarities. It has produced a peculiar philosophy, the critical, and those other systems which are its outgrowth. Its view of art in poetry is thus expressed by one of its own poets:

As all nature's thousand changes
  But one changeless God proclaim,
So in arts' wide kingdoms ranges
  One sole meaning, still the same.

This is truth, eternal reason,
  Which from beauty takes its dress,
And, serene, through time and season,
  Stands for aye in loveliness.

The German muse of modern times seems never to have aimed at creating or dwelling in a purely ideal world apart from the real. It has neither gone back to the antique fairyland, nor to the mythologies of ancient days, nor to witchcraft or magic nor even to the periods of chivalry. It has not imported its heroes from remote oriental climes.[1] It has rather preferred to make its home in the real, and to assume that as the basis, the foundation of everything else. It has chosen to delineate sharply the actual aspects of life, and to find its embodiments in the forms among which men live and move. Its object has been to seize upon the significancies of real things, to invest them with all that poetic art can furnish, and thus to lead forth the spirit of the age embodied in fair imaginations. The spirit of their criticism from Lessing downward is peculiar. According to it, poetic beauty is not derived from anything external, or of merely intellectual origin, nor from association, nor any reflex or reminiscence of mere sensations.[2] On the contrary, it is assumed as underived, as being born and dwelling in the inmost spirit of man, as being there nurtured and strengthened upon principles peculiar to itself, and as lending a charm

[1] *Carlyle's Miscellanies*, I, 71. [2] *Idem*, 60.

to all those intellectual creations from which according to the critics of other nations, it derives its origin. Thus the German muse differs in its starting point from that of other nations. How the progressive development of its full powers through the coming centuries will compare with that of other nations, it will be the business of time to make known.

The Schools of Poetry in France.

We have before had occasion to remark on the difference and distinctness in respect of language, perceivable between that part of France lying north and that on the south of the Loire. Each seems to have had its own peculiar mission. That on the south culminated in the song of the troubadour, and subsequently dwindled into a dialect. That on the north finally matured into the French language.

If we exclude the drama we shall be compelled to admit that the French mind has fallen below the Italian, German and English in the development of almost everything that goes to constitute the true poetic element. While these nations have produced poets, the French have, with few exceptions, produced only versifiers. It has been remarked of Voltaire, the great French poet of the eighteenth century, that his view of poetry was radically different from that entertained by the English. "That with him a tragedy, a poem, is not to be a manifestation of man's reason in forms suitable to his sense; but rather a highly complex egg-dance, to be danced before the king to a given tune and without breaking a single egg."[1] This, however, will only exhibit one phase of it, but that the French muse has never yet sounded all the depths of the poetic element can admit of little doubt.

The age of Francis I is remarkable as giving new powers to thought, and lending new charms to many of

[1] *Carlyle's Miscellanies*, II, 65.

the arts. There were many versifiers of this age. Some rose to the height of satirizing the vices of mankind, while others, in little songs, expressed their ideal love with more of conventional gallantry than of passion or tenderness. French poetry at this period was distinguished by a style of lightness and gracefulness, a style which has ever been its strong characteristic.[1] Of the poets of this period Clement Marot ranks the highest. His peculiar excellence consisted in a naivete, or pretended simplicity, in which respect he was the model of La Fontaine. This style of humor, sprightly and diverting, seems to have been indigenous in French poetry.

The last half of the sixteenth century has been called the age of verse in France. A change in the character of French poetry occurred about the commencement of this period. The allegorical personifications, which distinguished the Romance of the Rose, gave place to an inundation of mythology and classical allusion. This rendered the opening up of new resources necessary, and, accordingly, all antiquity was ransacked for analogies, and images common place and far fetched were hunted up. Among those the most conspicuous in the introduction of this change was Pierre Rousard, the first of seven contemporaries in song under Henry II, then denominated the French Pleiad. He was capable of conceiving strongly, and of presenting his conceptions in a clear and forcible light, but his allusions are pedantic, and his style cumbered with Latin and Greek derivatives.[2] These faults are less intolerable in his odes than in his amatory sonnets. This style afterwards gave place to that of Malherbe, and the purer correctness of the age of Louis XIV. This last named poet, who belongs to the first half of the seventeenth century, is celebrated as giving a polish and a grace to the lyric poetry of France. His versification was accurate and regular; his style was purer; he was less mythological, less affected, and less given to frigid hyperboles than his

[1] *Hallam's Introduction, etc.*, I, 332. [2] *Idem*, II, 182.

predecessors. The poet of kings and courtiers, he displays some felicity and skill in his panegyrical odes.

In satire Regnier ranks as the old Juvenal of France. He belongs to the age of Henry IV. His tone is vehement and somewhat rugged and coarse. But the rude, though somewhat animated, versification of the older poets could not be endured by the taste of that more highly cultivated nobility who formed the court of Louis XIII. Voiture with apparent ease and grace, and with a style artificial and elaborate, exercised considerable influence over French taste.

In the middle of the seventeenth century flourished La Fontaine and Boileau, the former born in 1621, and the latter in 1636. La Fontaine was slow in maturing. He did not develop any poetical faculties until he was more than twenty-two years of age. On hearing read an ode of Malherbe his sense of the poetic sprang into life with all the power and vividness of a new revelation. He turned his attention to fables, which had come to be regarded as beneath poetry, but to which he gave an importance and significancy never before realized. He commenced by confining himself to the brevity of Æsop and Phædrus, but ultimately gave more scope to his own genius, which was attended with greater success. His fables have a charm in them which at once adapt them to the people, and also to persons of refined taste. He exhibits playfulness, felicity and artlessness, instructing while he sports, persuading men to virtue through the tongues of beasts, and exalting the most trifling subjects to the sublime. Death overtook him while applying his poetical powers to the hymns of the church. He died at the age of seventy-three. Boileau began with satires, the first seven of which appeared in 1666. They mark the earliest poetry in the French language where the mechanism of its verse was fully understood, where the style was always pure and elegant, and where the ear was uniformly gratified. His Lutrin is the most popular of his poems. He lived to the age of seventy-five.

In the seventeenth century, language, in France, like everything else, came under the yoke of authority. It was reduced to the terms and turns necessary to express the ideas peculiar to the civilization of the period.[1] It became the language of the court. It was the language of politeness. It borrowed but few terms from the different spheres of human life. The literature the most prevalent during the century was the drama, and eloquence.

The connecting link in French poetry and literature between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was Fontenelle, born in 1657, and who, although so weak at birth that his survival was unexpected, yet attained the full period of one hundred years, and in his last moments when asked what he felt, answered, "I feel only the difficulty of existing." Living through the last half of the seventeenth, and the first half of the eighteenth century, he formed the point of transition,[2] and the continuity of these two periods, of each of which he was the representative to the other. His poetic representation is of the seventeenth century, for his poetry was all written within that century. His writings in the eighteenth are on scientific and philosophical subjects.

He wrote some fugitive pieces of which the most agreeable is the sonnet on Daphne. He also composed operas. He wrote pastorals. He even composed tragedies, but none that had any great success. He brought to all his poetic efforts that which in France is so essential to render any and everything admissable, viz: wit. It has been asserted as one of the errors of the French mind that it mistakes wit for talent and sometimes even for eloquence.[3] It was by force of this same wit that Fontenelle was able to succeed, in appearance at least, in various kinds of writing which were quite distinct and remote from each other.

The France of the eighteenth century presents us with Voltaire. This personification of his century was born in 1694, and he was continued in existence down to his eighty-fourth year. The literary activity of Voltaire was immense.

[1] *Vinet*, 10. [2] *Idem*, 132. [3] *Idem*, 138.

The collection of his works forms not a book, but a library; and long the only library of a great number of men. His life has been divided into two parts, or periods; the first reaching to the year 1746; and the second extending from that time to the year 1778. The first is the poetical period. Most of his great masterpieces in poetry are crowded into it. The second is prosaic, philosophical, controversial.

Voltaire commenced with poetry, and by means of it laid the foundation of his fame. He was almost the only poet of his time. The seventeenth century had bequeathed to him a poetry particularly social, that is, that which attaches itself to man such as society has made him. The more this tendency exists in poetry, the more man's views are turned from the depths of his being, and from the greatness of his destiny. In becoming more social it comes to possess less of human nature, and especially less of those peculiar connectives that link man's being and destiny with a higher and mightier power. Hence Voltaire always appears a stranger to the greatness and vastness of the infinite, and ignorant of the mysteries of existence, in which are to be found the highest possible conditions of poetry.[1] He was not, however, deficient in the sentiment of nature, and in that lies much of the power he exercised. Again, his strength was largely derived from his entire conformity to the age in which he lived; from the fact that his views, ideas, opinions, all found their warrant in those of the age upon which his utterances fell. In the reciprocal relations established between each he found the great source of the power he was enabled to exercise.

Voltaire has tried his hand at almost every species of poetry. His excellence in all is chiefly intellectual, rarely if ever descending to the depths of feeling, or the ideal. Everything is well calculated for a given end.[2] There is in all things the utmost logical fitness of sentiment, of incident, and of general contrivance. He has written many tragedies, and manifests a clear fellow feeling for

[1] *Vinet*, 257. [2] *Carlyle's Miscellanies*, II, 62.

the personages he introduces upon the stage. He has a happy faculty of taking some hue from every object, and of at least plausibly enacting it if he cannot become the object itself. He is the most intelligible of writers, has a clear, quick vision, seizes intuitively upon those bearings of a subject that are the most exposed to observation, and evolves them in accordance with an order or method which the reader easily and readily appreciates. This order is not beauty. It can assert no higher claim than regularity. Everything is precise and rightly adjusted. There is always a much stronger manifestation of wit than of wisdom, and is wanting in pathos, loftiness and earnest eloquence. The deeper portion of the soul sits silent and unmoved. It recognizes in the poetry of Voltaire no universal everlasting beauty,[1] but only a modish elegance, which it looks upon as less the work of poetical creation than a process of the toilette. It is, therefore, far from satisfying the deeper poetical wants of the Anglo-Saxon.

There is a resemblance between Voltaire and Horace.[2] Their philosophy is the same, a mitigated epicurism. They resemble each other also in manner. Both have a graceful and witty carelessness, and a negligence which, however, rarely descends to trifling. Of the two Voltaire is the most brilliant, and has more the charm of an expansive sensibility.

Voltaire always appears most at home in satire. His great instrument is ridicule. This he ever treats as if it were the test of truth. He has attempted comedy, but this first of satirists is the last of comedians.[3] He sinks comedy into the grotesque. The genius of comedy and of satire seem to be inconsistent with each other. Neither has Voltaire been successful in the ode. He has neither the principle nor the form of this style of writing. He never rises to enthusiasm. His poetry is altogether objective. It is to be found in the object not in the subject. It is merely talent, and this in Voltaire runs in the satiric vein

[1] *Carlyle's Miscellanies*; II, 62. [2] *Vinet*, 286. [3] *Idem*, 278.

which is quite opposed to lyric poetry. Besides lyric poetry in form is more inflexible, and requires a sustained perfection, which was not one of Voltaire's merits. His poetic graces reveled in negligence and perfect liberty.

Voltaire, to justify his claim to universal genius, could hardly repose in quiet without attempting the epic. Hence the Henriade, the League, or Henry the Great. But the execution of such a work was beyond the highest powers of Voltaire.[1] The epic poem must be essentially religious. It must contain lessons as well as stories. In the commemoration of a great event it must consecrate a great truth. It presents history idealized, and is insignificant without the intervention of the deity. It must also be animated by some great fact referring to human nature. Voltaire possessed no enthusiasm, no religion, no sense of the connecting links between the seen and the unseen, none of those deeper, profounder elements that are essential to compose the great masters of epic song. Hence his Henriade, as an epic, could not be otherwise than a failure. The higher essentials of the epic are entirely wanting.[2] It wants even precision. It has a defective arrangement, and the parts are not well connected. There is no real unity, either historical or poetical. There are in it no well drawn characters. They, like the entire poem, lack something to render them complete.

The Henriade has been called not so much a poem as a series of little poems, some of which are very charming. There are also in it a great number of fine verses which gem the surface of the poem, and which if taken up singly, produce a very pretty effect.[3] Voltaire excels in the writing of fine verses, those which contain a beautiful thought, set off by the general turn of the phrase, or by the elegance of the expression. In all these his coloring was poetical, his versification harmonious, his touch bold and easy, his comparisons admirable. They are always new, striking ingenious, and set off by a good execution.

[1] *Vinet*, 268. [2] *Idem*, 265. [3] *Idem*, 267.

A great number of Voltaire's productions are comprehended under his philosophic poetry. These include many of his fugitive pieces.[1] His great poetical excellence mainly consisted in throwing out, with the happiest negligence, a number of natural, judicious, accessible, and agreeable thoughts, clothed in a very striking and easy style, which engraves them indelibly on the memory. This species of poetry seems to be his peculiar gift, in which he is rarely if ever excelled. It seems to have been conceded that into the fugitive poetry he put more poetry and more thought than any of those who preceded him.

Voltaire, with all his merits and demerits, was a French poet. He wrote for Frenchmen, and the kind of poetry which they of that age required. In any judgment passed upon him it should not be forgotten that French poetry has, in general, had a different aim from the English; that it has possessed a splendor; but to the Anglo-Saxon eye a dead artificial one, and one that rather resembles a cold statue than a living reality.

The French poet of the nineteenth century is Victor Hugo, who, in his Legend of the Ages, has produced a very wonderful poem. Commencing with biblical history and traditions, and steering clear of the Orient and the Brahmanic legends, he travels through Rome in its downfall, through the superstitions of Islamism, through the Carlovingian period, until he reaches and revels in the dark legends of the middle ages. He is the poet of horrors, dealing with the huge and shapeless, and dashing his strokes of color through the mighty creations of his imagination. A sample of this may be found in his piece on the Parricide. Canute was accessory to the death of his father, and afterwards, by a long and prosperous reign, secured the highest opinions among men who accounted him a saint. But death at last overtook him, and he was followed to the tomb. At night he is represented as wandering forth, wrapped in his white shroud, and traversing the northern

[1] *Vernet*, 278.

countries in pursuit of forgiveness for his crime. Suddenly he is made to start as a drop of blood falls upon his white shroud. He is chilled with horror, and taking a turn another drop falls, and then another, and thus at every turn, fall the crimson drops upon his shroud of snowy whiteness. And thus he is made to wander solitary and cheerless through a long rayless night, the unbroken silence only interrupted by the pitiless blood drops as they fall thicker and faster upon his shroud. He is seeking the deity for forgiveness, but when he has reached the threshold, and the gleams of a mysterious light strike upon his vision, his shroud upon which the dripping blood had so long descended, becomes one sheet of crimson, and is such fearful testimony against him that he dares not enter to ask for pardon. "Therefore it is that Canute has remained in the darkness, unable to regain his primitive purity, and feeling, at every step he takes towards the light, a drop of blood raining upon his hand, he roams forever under a huge black sky." This is certainly a doom sufficiently awful, and a picture presented with all the vividness of coloring of which Victor Hugo is so successful a master. This poet, however, is something more than a versifier. He possesses in some respects the elements of greatness as a poet, and he may perhaps contribute to the opening of deeper and richer veins in which the future poets of France may feel and exhibit those deeper revealings which belong to a higher and a purer poetry than any that has yet inspired the Gallic muse.

The Schools of Poetry in England.

It is to the poetry and eloquence of a people that the perfection of its language is mainly owing. It is these two that most effectually search out all the hidden treasures of a language, that test its strength, that explore its possibilities, and bring out all its beauties. The language, however, must possess originally, capacities for poetry

and eloquence. The first germs of romantic poetry came from the Normans. They found the Saxon language prevailing in England, and they brought to it a wealth and compass of expression which otherwise it might have never possessed. The influence of the Norman conquest upon the language of England has been beautifully described as like that of a "great inundation,[1] which at first buries the face of the landscape under its waters, but which, at last subsiding, leaves behind it the elements of new beauty and fertility." Thus the old Saxon framework was still allowed to remain, while the Norman brought to it those accessions which, without detracting from its strength, rendered it flexible, and gave to it a new power of development.

From the fusion of the Saxon and Norman, including, of course, those elements that were derived from the Celtic of the early Briton, and the Latin of the Roman, came out, in process of time, the English language. It was amidst the early growth of her commerce, literature, and civilization, that this language was born, and started on its career of progress. In the region of poetry, more especially, the Norman muse was the first to display its powers. According to some it is to that muse that we are indebted for the use of rhyme,[2] and for most or all the forms of our versification. The earliest versifiers were employed in transplanting, and naturalizing in the English language, the fictions of the Norman school.

We perceive on the distant boundary of English literature, so remote that were it not for the light of his own creation he would remain imperceptible, old Geoffrey Chaucer, born in 1328, and expiring with the first year of the fifteenth century. His appearance in our language has been compared to a "premature day in an English spring,[3] after which the gloom of winter returns, and the buds and blossoms, which have been called forth by a transient sunshine, are nipped by frosts and scattered by storms."

[1] *Campbell's Essay*, 1. [2] *Idem*, 9. [3] *Idem*, 34.

The principal works of Chaucer were the Flower and Leaf, Troilus and Cresseide, the House of Fame, and the Canterbury Tales. These last were the crowning work of Chaucer's genius. A company of twenty-nine pilgrims meet together at the Tabard Inn, Southwark, all bent on a pilgrimage to the shrine of Thomas à Becket at Canterbury. These pilgrims possess almost every variety of character, and the plan of the poem, in making each tell his story, brings out in strong relief, all those different varieties. Chaucer's great excellence consisted in his power of describing. His men and women are not paste-board figures, but rise before us "minutely traced, profusely varied, and strongly discriminated." He links their casual manners with their moral characters. English life in the fourteenth century stands before us in its bold reality, not as revealed in the "cold light" of antiquarian research. He lived in a picturesque age, one admirably adapted to the poet. It was one "in which the differences of rank and profession were strongly distinguished, and in which the broken masses of society gave out their deepest shadows and strongest coloring by the morning light of civilization."[1] "He has," say sthe poet Campbell, "a double claim to rank as the founder of English poetry, derived from his having been the first to make it the vehicle of spirited representations of life and native manners, and also from having been the first great architect of our versification." His verse is, almost without exception, the ten-syllabled couplet, the same kind of verse in which a large proportion of English poetry has since been written. It has hence been the best adapted to the character of English speech. He has given to the English language the foundations of "its still enduring constitution, and has infused into English poetry much of its peculiar and characteristic spirit." Few have surpassed him in the entire assemblage of the qualities that make the great poet. He has been described as possessing the sportive fancy, "the keen, observant, matter of fact spirit

[1] *Campbell*, 133.

that looks through whatever it glances at;" "the soaring and creative imagination;" "the unrivalled tenderness and pathos;" and "the wisdom and the wit," that so largely enter into the composition of the great poet.[1] His genius was fed from many different sources. "The Provençal troubadours, the Norman romancers, the bright array of the stars of the young poetry of Italy, were all sought out by him, and made to yield light to his golden urn."[2] Accordingly, "no writer has taken a wider range in respect of subject and manner, or has evinced a more triumphant mastery over the whole compass of the lyre. His Canterbury Tales alone include nearly every variety of gay and serious poetry. In this crowning work his matured genius revels in the luxuriance of its strength,[3] and seems to rejoice in multiplying proofs of its command over all the resources of its art."

Old Geoffrey Chaucer, like other great geniuses, was greatly in advance of his age. He was scarcely appreciated by his countrymen in that early morning of English poetry. It required the style and character of mind produced by a new era of civilization to come fully up to his lofty standpoint. It required, accordingly, the lapse of two hundred years before his mantle could fall upon a proper successor.

That successor at last appeared in the person of Edmund Spenser, who was born about the middle and died in the last year of the sixteenth century. He belongs therefore to the Elizabethan era, the great era of English poetry, literature, industry, and arts. It was an era of loyalty, adventure, and generous emulation. The age of chivalry was yet lingering among men, and could not gracefully depart until its last homage had been paid to a lady sovereign. Its mission being now fully completed, it made its retiring bow to the lady ruler. Its influence is seen in the romantic fancy still lingering in the manners and superstitions of the people. It originated adventure, but of a more practical character than former epochs. It gave rise to the allegori-

[1] *Pictorial History of England*, I, 822. [2] *Idem*, 822. [3] *Idem*, I

cal in poetry, and the visionary in philosophy; to "high thoughts seated in a heart of courtesy."[1] Classic literature now revived, foreign books were imported, translations multiplied, romance came with its warming power from the south, and the growth of poetry became profuse and luxuriant, but irregular.

Among those who presented strongly an embodiment of the spirit of the age, was the poet Spenser. His smaller poems were the Tears of the Muses, Mother Hubbard's Tale, Daphnaida, Elegy of Astrophel, etc.; but the great work which gave his name to posterity was the Faëry Queen, of which he completed the first and second parts, but only fragments of the remaining six books. This work stands out as one of the great landmarks of English poetry, having as its predecessor, the Canterbury Tales, and as its successor, the Paradise Lost. It has been styled the "most poetical of all poetry,"[2] although not entitling its author to rank as the greatest of all poets. It proclaims the most fully, the wonder workings of the imaginative faculty, presenting "vision unrolled after vision, to the sound of endlessly varying music." Taking the fable of his great poem from the style of the Gothic romance, he pervaded it with the deep sense of beauty derived from classic origin, and diffused through it a strong religious feeling. He proves himself at once the most luxuriant and melodious of English descriptive poets. "His lofty rhyme has a swell and cadence, and a continuous sweetness, that can nowhere else be found." He is almost the equal of Shakespeare in richness of fancy and invention. While there are links that obviously connect him with the great Italian poets, Ariosto and Tasso, we are still indebted to him alone for "his great moral design;" for "the conception of his allegorical characters;" for "his exuberance of language and illustration;" and "for that original structure of verse, powerful and harmonious, which he was the first

[1] *Campbell*, 50. [2] *Pictorial History*, II, 809.

to adopt," and which has ever since been termed the Spenserian. His intellect was both ingenious and subtle, and while he pours along the stream of his allegory, and delineates his personified passions sometimes with a tedious minuteness, he is ever "sowing dark meanings and obscure allusions," along the whole course of its track. One great difficulty with the poem is that the "shaping spirit of the imagination" has been so all prevailing that the interest of real life is greatly wanting. The world in which Spenser moves, and over which he pours his lofty song, is purely an ideal one of his own creation. It is one, however, which, although remote and abstract, yet affords in its multiplied scenes, scope for those noble feelings and heroic virtues, which, in their extreme of idealization, hardly belong to human nature, and yet serve greatly to elevate and ennoble it. It is thus that Spenser, standing on the confines of a poetic region which was to open up in the future with greater idealizations of life and the practical, invokes from the wonders of his own fairyland one strong gush of those spirit-stirring influences to carry along the whole track of that future their powers of control and modification. The coming generations were indebted to him for the pathos and richness of his strains:

> Hither as to their fountain, other stars
> Repair, and in their urns drew golden light.

The Elizabethan era covers the last quarter of the sixteenth and first quarter of the seventeenth century, extending into the reign of her successor. This was the great period of the English drama, and distinguished by the advent of Shakespeare. The poems of Shakespeare are not so generally known, and have been variously estimated. The most considerable of these are his Venus and Adonis, his Tarquin and Lucrece, his Passionate Pilgrim, and several minor poems. They seem to be the utterance of a spirit of high invention and sweet song, before it had found its more appropriate place in the drama. Aside from the drama and the poems of Spenser there is no great English

poet that distinguishes this era. Its spirit possessed a romantic character, its style was unshackled, and its genius fresh and fertile.

The poetry of this period, and also that of the first and second of the Stuarts has been divided into two schools: the classical, and the metaphysical.[1] In the former are included Denham, Waller, and Carew, all of whom cultivated melody in numbers, correctness of imagery, together with polish and elegance of expression. In the latter we find Donne, Herrick, and Cowley, who were more loose and rugged in their versification, with less appropriate and judiciously selected imagery.[2] The poetry of this era exhibits a good deal of false wit, or a disposition to substitute strange and unexpected connections of sound, or of thought, for real humor, and even for the effusions of the stronger passions. This may, perhaps, have come down from the court in which it was conceived necessary to adopt forms of expression and systems of manner differing from those of the common people.

About the middle of the seventeenth century, perhaps the outgrowth of the revolution, appeared two great poets, and also a third great in his particular line. These were John Milton, born in 1608, and dying in 1674; John Dryden, born in 1632, dying in the first year of the eighteenth century; and Samuel Butler, born in 1612, dying in 1680. Of these three, the most prominent name, and one which in some respects is the most exalted in English literature, is that of John Milton.

A very general impression prevails that a poet requires, and generally possesses, no other education than that which he derives from the study of nature and the workings of the human heart. But it was far otherwise with Milton. He was a man of thorough culture. Whatever the University of Cambridge could give of learning, of science, or of discipline in logic or philosophy, he possessed. He was also a proficient in the ancient and modern lan-

[1] *Campbell*, 95, 96. [2] *Chambers's Encyclopædia*, I, 809.

guages and literatures. Nature had endowed him with that most exquisite of her gifts, the ear and the passion for harmony. He early studied music and practiced it as an art. He also perfected himself by foreign travel, and in Italy familiarized himself with the works and minds of the great masters. He was one of those who early felt the consciousness of power, and of his leaning towards the poetic, for at a very early period he says, "whether aught was imposed upon me by my masters and teachers that had the overlooking, or betaken to of mine own choice, in English or other tongue,[1] prosing or versing, but chiefly this latter, the style, by certain vital signs it had, was likely to live."[1] Thus indicating that before his three and twentieth year, he knew himself to be a poet.

The literary life of Milton had three periods: the first extending from his seventeenth to his thirty-fourth year, in which his literary exercises were chiefly in poetry. The second extended from his thirty-fourth to his fifty-second year, in which his labors were as a controversialist and prose writer, producing little in poetry except a few sonnets. The third extends from his fifty-second to his sixty-sixth year, the time of his death, in which he returned again to the poetic and produced those greater poems, the Paradise Lost, the Paradise Regained, and the Samson Agonistes, which he meant as his great bequests to the literature of England. The earlier poems, the Hymn on the Nativity, the Arcades, Comus, Lycidus, L'Allegro, Il Penseroso and others, are written in a style modeled upon classic forms of thought, and everywhere displaying extreme sweetness and musical charm of expression. They have been beautifully described as resembling "the precious gum of certain forest trees,[2] small and exquisite in production rather than impressive by reason of intellectual quantity, and yet they are the gum precisely of one of these great forest trees, elaborated out of its whole substance, leaf, trunk, bark, and root."

[1] *Eclectic*, January and April, 1852, 436. [2] *Idem*, 443.

The great poem upon which his fame rests, is the Paradise Lost, one of the world's great epics, and the only one to which the English language has given birth. The idea seems to have been long floating in the mind of Milton, that he was to give to the world an immortal work. The first thing was to get a subject; and in his search after this, he went back gradually through the ages, weighing the claims of one heroic epoch after another, until he reached that primeval point of time where history stood ready to commence its record, and coming events were garnered up in the creative acts of God, and the volitions and acts of the first pair. His first resolve was to cast it in the form of a drama, and he even made some progress in carrying out that purpose. But he fortunately made the discovery that the dramatic faculty of depicting men and women individually, peculiar and distinct, was not his. His selection of subject in this respect, was fortunate; as there were at that early period but two human beings that could be objects of description, and these the representatives of the race, and the embodiments of what belonged to it. They could be represented simply as man and woman, and not as distinctive from others of the same species.

The character of the poetry varies somewhat from the products of his earlier muse. There is more generally wanting those "labyrinthine windings," those "delays of sensuous imagery," those "bouts of linked sweetness," which afforded so many early proofs of his poetical genius. But other themes now engaged his attention. The rebellion in heaven, the fall of the rebel hosts, the origin of evil in our world involved in the loss of paradise, demanded the full organ-blow of sound in the portrayal of mighty events. Pictures of unrivaled splendor and magnificence are presented to the eye of the mind. The following have been aptly presented as some of the most striking: "Satan rearing aloft his mighty stature from the rolling billows of the lake of fire;[1] the mustering of the infernal squadrons, at

[1] *Eclectic Magazine*, September and December, 1853, 369.

the call of their commander, and the unfurling of their ten thousand meteor banners; the rising like an exhalation of the Temple of Pandemonium, with its Doric pillars and golden architraves; the speeches of the princes of hell in their council hall, so eloquent and grand, that every demon seemed more than a Demosthenes; the gryphon-like flight of the master-fiend through the wild abyss of chaos and ancient night; the glorious apparition of Uriel standing in the sun; Satan's sublime address to that luminary on the top of Niphate's mount; the descriptions of Eden, with its palmy hills, and crisped brooks; of Adam, with his hyacinthine locks, and Eve with her dishevelled tresses; the morning hymn of our first parents in their innocence, and swelling up at intervals over all the hallelujah chorus of heaven; the flight of the faithful and dreadless Abdiel from the ranks of the rebels to the mount of God; the terrible avatar of the avenging Son, in his chariot of careering fire; the uprising of the world from the unapparent deep, and the song of acclamation that concluded the creation-work, and followed the triumphal ascent of the Son; the aspect of the infernal serpent, with his crested head and neck of verdant gold rising above the maze of surging spires; and Michael, from the mountain top, unfolding to Adam, in successive magnificent pictures, the future history of the world, and all our woe." It is scenes and sights like these that burst upon the inner sense of Milton, while his outer rayless orbs turned unavailingly towards the light.

Milton deals in remote associations. He acts upon the mind not so much by what is expressed as by what is suggested.[1] It is therefore a necessity that the mind of the reader should cooperate with that of the writer. While the latter strikes the key note, it is for the former to make out the melody. While the one starts new forms of beauty into existence, to the other they become so many visions of creative power calling upon all the burial places of the memory to give up their dead.

[1] *Macaulay's Miscellanies*, I, 26.

The character of Milton's devils have been much dwelt upon, as also the great contrasts between hell and paradise. There is a terrible harmony between hell and its awful ruler. The flames without are nothing to the raging fires that burn unceasingly in the demon's soul. There are found revenge, hate, consuming wrath, pride humbled and yet unconquered, each in the extreme, so that hell itself is made to yield to the spirit it imprisons.[1] The intensity of its fires serves only to reveal the intenser passions of its terrible inmates. The fallen archangel, with a spirit unbroken, a will unsubdued coveting a diadem which scorches the brow it rests upon, presents a spectacle of most terrible sublimity. His legions are "mighty and melancholy forms, their materialism shaded off and sublimized into a spiritual structure, while the boldness of their bearing in opposition to omnipotence clothes them with a garment of grandeur." The lingering remnants of the lost state, the occasional touches of better feelings that are thrown in to fringe the dark picture, only serve to add to the intensity of the anguish as the arch-fiend utters the cry:

> To be thus, having been better.

In Milton, paradise strongly contrasts with hell. Its loveliness with that of the new beings that adorn it in all their innocence and mutual love ere:

> Earth felt the wound, and nature from her seat,
> Sighing through all her works, gave signs of woe,
> That all was lost,

With their occupations and modes of life, are beautifully depicted in the pages of this glowing epic. And although his descriptions occur at a time of life when images of beauty and tenderness are apt to fade from the memory, yet he has adorned them with all that is most lovely and delightful in the physical and in the moral world. While

[1] *Channing's Discourses*, 15.

he has invested the ruggedness of Alpine scenery with the embosomed nooks and dells of fairyland, "his conception of love unites all the voluptuousness of the oriental harem, and all the gallantry of the chivalric tournament, with all the pure and quiet affection of an English fireside." This great poem was so far in advance of its age that it was little appreciated, or even read, by his contemporaries.

Another remarkable writer, a little later than Milton, but occupying nearly the same age, and who is said to occupy the first place in the second rank of English poets, was John Dryden. He was educated at Cambridge, and devoted a long life to literature. He wrote plays, satires, translations, didactic poems, fables and odes. His earlier productions, down to 1678, more especially his rhyming tragedies, would never have given him a permanent reputation. He was one in whom the period of imagination follows, rather than precedes, that of observation and reflection.

In Dryden the course and current of English poetry experienced a change. The great English poets, including Milton, had derived principally from the middle ages the spirit and character of their poetry.[1] Gothic manners and feelings had entered largely into it. The imagination was the great predominating faculty. It shadowed forth its conceptions by images. It was the era of symbols, when moral and spiritual ideas sought to find their lodgment in the hearts of men through such forms of matter as were supposed to embody their essence. Thus the lion was the symbol of courage, the fox of cunning, the cross of redemption. This obviously belongs to an early era in poetry, one in which the unseen seeks to render itself known through the things that are seen. The entire physical creation is laid under contribution to enable mind to convey adequate conceptions of the moral and spiritual powers. For this purpose it assumes that a knowledge of the physical universe is sufficiently possessed. All the

[1] *English Pictorial History*, III, 852.

powers, processes and agencies of nature, already known, are seized hold of by the imagination, and while they are made the agents to adumbrate an unseen power, are themselves enlarged, or otherwise so modified by it, as to properly symbolize what they are designed to represent.

But in the progress of mind and of man, these powers, processes and agencies are found to possess a value beyond that of mere symbols. They were ascertained to contain within themselves elements essential to man's enjoyment and progress, and hence became, on their own account, objects of attention, study and research. What had previously been borne to the mind on the wings of the imagination, and was thus imperfectly comprehended, now commenced gaining access to it through observation, study, experiment, and analysis. The Baconian philosophy had inaugurated a new order of things, and the process of induction was producing its legitimate fruits in a more thorough knowledge of the physical world.

This great fact could not but work its appropriate change in the domain of poetry. Indeed, its work in its highest sphere may, perhaps, be said to be finished. That splendid symbolization by which the forces and energies of the unseen world were proclaimed through the powers and processes of a nature itself heightened and colored by imagination, had received its death-blow. Symbols, instead of being employed to convey images, became of so much importance as to be substituted for them. Men awoke to the conviction that the realities of the present life were to be found among the things of time and of sense, and hence the resources of the spiritual world, and all the moral powers were called into requisition the more fully to develop and illustrate the powers and processes of nature. This gave rise to the critical school of poetry, which from its classical dress and allusions has been sometimes termed the classical school. This school found its highest representative in Dryden. In him wit, sense, science, and judgment controlled the imagination. The latter in him has

been compared to the wings of an ostrich, enabling him to run, although not to soar.

Dryden was thus eminently qualified to found, or successfully to carry forward, a good critical school of poetry. He even went too far for his age. Under his skillful management the scientific vocabulary fell into natural and pleasing verse. He possessed in a preeminent degree, the power of reasoning in verse, and on points of criticism he always reasons ingeniously. He harnessed his muse into the work of treating theological and political questions, and although his arguments are far from being conclusive, yet his manner of stating them is admirable. His style is clear and transparent, the topics following each other in a natural order. In him strong judgment gave force, as well as direction to a flexible fancy, and his harmony is generally the echo of solid thoughts. He had no intense or lofty sensibility, and could give no deep or varied delineations of the passions. He was far less the poet of the heart than of the head.

Dryden possessed in rather an eminent degree the power of satire. In 1681 appeared the satire of Absalom and Achitophel which was applicable to the Duke of Monmouth and the Earl of Shaftesbury. It was a bold political satire, vigorous and elastic, with a varied and beautiful versification; and has been styled the noblest portrait gallery in poetry. The attacks of rival poets only served to develop new energies. His keen trenchant blade never makes a thrust in vain, and never strikes but at a vulnerable point.

Dryden also developed excellence in the lyric style of poetry. His ode to St. Cecilia, commonly called Alexander's Feast, with one exception, was his last great work, and the loftiest and most imaginative of all his compositions. It is reckoned the masterpiece of the second class of poetry. Later still, and in his sixty-eighth year, he published his Fables, imitations of Boccacio and Chaucer, which affords the finest specimens of his happy versification. In these his fancy appears brighter and more prolific than ever. It has been compared to a brilliant sunset, or a river that

expands in breadth, and fertilizes a wider tract of country ere it is finally engulphed in the ocean.

The third poet, great in his particular line, an outgrowth of the revolution, was Samuel Butler, the renowned author of Hudibras. His individual history is little known beyond a few leading points. He first became an author after having passed his fiftieth year, and at first under the most favorable circumstances, and with the most brilliant prospects. His one great work, Hudibras, was the reaction during the first years of the restoration against the excesses of puritanical fanaticism. The first part it of was given to the world in 1663, the second in 1664, and the third not until fourteen years afterwards, and near the close of the poet's life.

Butler was the direct opposite of Milton. While the latter was transcendental in his character, moving in the loftiest ideal, the former takes his stand upon the hard fact of things, undervaluing whatever is high, extreme, and unusual, either in thought or action. Such was Butler. Reared up amidst the hardships of adverse fortune, with a pride that scorned to ask for favors, and a temper and disposition that led him to sympathize little with his kind, he was inclined to look for defects rather than virtues, and thus to become a satirist of the severest character. His Hudibras is accounted the best burlesque poem in the English language. In it we have learning, wit, shrewdness, ingenious and deep thought, felicitous illustration, and irresistible drollery. The original idea of the knight, Sir Hudibras, and his squire, Rulpho, starting out on their adventures, was undoubtedly taken from the Don Quixote of Cervantes. But the filling up is entirely different. His object was to ridicule the English puritans, and to debase them by low and vulgar associations. He seized upon the salient and peculiar points of their character, and with his inimitable powers of burlesque and ridicule gibbeted them up to the curious gaze and laughter of all succeeding generations. Their higher qualities, their indomitable courage and lofty zeal, which carried the English name

and fame over every land and every sea, were entirely overlooked. It was the mere cropping out of those foundation stones of English greatness, which by their unseemly projections, wounded the delicate feet of the English royalists, that he seized hold of and held up to his merciless ridicule. It was this that rendered the work so immensely popular. A presbyterian justice with his clerk or squire sallies out to redress superstition and correct abuses.[1] The adventures of these notable parties are served up in the finest style of wit and pasquinade. The dialogues held between them are highly witty and ludicrous, while the adventures that befel them, such as their attack on the bear and the fiddler; their imprisonment in the stocks; the flagellation to which the knight was to submit as the condition of his winning the hand of the widow whom he was courting for her money; the reasonings to which this gave rise between the knight and squire; the Skimmington procession attacked by the knight and squire as a heathenish show; the discomfiture from rotten eggs; the consultation with the Rosicrucian astrologer; and the lusty fight consequent thereupon; are so many ridiculous exhibitions, which, seasoned as they are, with the highest style of wit, could not fail to affect deeply a generation of men in whose memory floated the prototypes of the ludicrous pictures so ridiculously presented. And yet the interest has not died out with that generation. So felicitous was the versification, so keen the ridicule, so intense the wit, that this poem still retains its place amongst the classic productions of the English muse.

We now arrive at the opening of the eighteenth century, and the first half of it has been regarded as the Augustan age of English literature. The reign of Queen Anne, extending from 1702 to 1714, has been regarded as the central point of that age. This is the period of Pope, Swift, Gay, Parnell and Ramsay. It is the period when

[1] *Chambers's Encyclopædia*, I, 347.

the critical school of poetry may be said to have attained its highest degree of development. The poets and literary men of this period shone with a lustre they had never before attained. They were everywhere regarded with a respect bordering on reverence. The fashionable world were proud of their acquaintance, and felt honored by their attention. Their works were no longer confined to the libraries of the studious, but found their way to the tables of the great. Their names were in everybody's mouth, and their smart sayings were found leaping from every tongue. Their books were everywhere in demand, the patronage from being private became public; in the place of the aristocracy there came the republic of letters. Literature became a passport to honors and distinctions. The poets felt their importance and emerged from their garrets into the light of day. They even became wealthy by their vocation, and the waters of Helicon were found flowing over golden sands. The greater the number of readers, the more numerous became the critics; the greater the variety of tastes to satisfy, the more active, refined, and discriminating the public mind; and all this furnished new stimulus to effort, and led to a stronger competition among the aspirants to public favor.

Amidst the galaxy of poets that adorned this period, Alexander Pope, born in 1688, and dying in 1744, shines as the most central and conspicuous light. He mainly educated himself in winds or forest, reading books for their thoughts and taking them as models for his imitation. Among the moderns, Dryden undoubtedly contributed the most to the formation of Pope's mind. He was deformed in body, had many peculiarities, and his whole life was called a continuing disease. He possessed in early life about equal proclivities towards poetry and painting, but finally decided on the former. He always believed himself a genius, and ever acting undoubtingly and persistently upon that belief, finally brought the world to entertain the same opinion. There was a precocity in his genius. His pastorals were written at the age of sixteen,

and at twenty appears to have been written, although not published until some years afterwards, his Essay on Criticism, which has been pronounced the finest piece of argumentative and reasoning poetry in the English language. "It exhibits every mode of excellence that can embellish or dignify didactic composition, selection of matter, novelty of arrangement, justness of precept, splendor of illustration, and propriety of digression." It is one of the marvels of literature that he produced this piece at twenty, and in that style of writing never afterwards excelled it. His style of versification he modeled upon Dryden, but gave the heroic couplet a peculiar terseness, correctness, and melody.

Next followed the Rape of the Lock, the stealing of a lock of hair from the head of a celebrated beauty by her lover, in which he has blended the most delicate satire with the most lively fancy, and produced the finest and most brilliant mock-heroic poem in the world. Next followed the Temple of Fame, the Elegy on an Unfortunate Lady, and Windsor Forest. He next conceived the idea of introducing Homer to the modern world in an English dress. For his translation of the Iliad he realized $26,600, but his Homeric labors upon that and the Odyssey occupied a period of twelve years, from 1713 to 1725. It was the Iliad that enabled him to build his villa at Twickenham, the first home of genius erected by the independent support of the English nation. He came there a self-taught, study-worn, crooked-bodied, sickly man of thirty, and made it during the remainder of his life the literary centre of England, whither resorted all who were noted either for wit, valor, or even beauty. His remaining works of the most importance are the Epistle from Eloise to Abelard, the Essay on Man, the Miscellanies, and the Dunciad. The first of these has been much celebrated for the delicacy evinced in veiling the circumstances of the story, for the beauty of his imagery and descriptions, and the exquisite melody of his versification. This and the Elegy on an Unfortunate Lady have been referred to as evidence that Pope possessed something besides satire and critical

acumen; that he could display the richest hues of imagination, and did experience the higher impulses of the human mind. The Essay on Man, although it has been extensively read, and parts of it have been ever since floating in many minds, is nevertheless little more than the Leibnitzian philosophy clothed in most beautifully flowing numbers. It is read, however, far more for its poetry than its philosophy; and its splendid passages, striking incidents, and glowing numbers, exert a far wider and deeper influence than its metaphysics.

It is a humiliating fact, and one which may be perhaps cited in demonstration, that the influence of the world and of life upon the sensitive nature of a poet is unfortunate in its tendencies, that quite a number of the last years of Pope's life were devoted to satire. In 1727, in conjunction with Swift, he published three volumes of Miscellanies. These were of such a character, and touched to the quick so many sensitive minds that they drew down upon their authors a torrent of invective, lampoons and libels. These called forth from Pope the Dunciad, a most spirited satire, drawing its length through four books, and displaying throughout great fertility of invention, variety in illustration, and unrivaled force and facility of diction. But a critic has added that "this is now read with a feeling more allied to pity than admiration — pity that one so highly gifted should have allowed himself to descend to things so mean, and devote the end of a great literary life to the infliction of retributory pain on every humble aspirant in the world of letters." It may perhaps have been from his close intimacy and connection with Swift that the last years of his life was so much given up to unsparing satire, the vindictive personality of which must be deemed the fault rather of the man than the poet.

The merits of Pope as a poet have been variously estimated. He cannot rank with the great masters of the lyre. The deep things of nature, the sublimities of creation, the master passions that hold sway over human movements, failed to awake in him a power adequate to reach

and portray them. And yet he was not deficient in a certain species of originality and power. He has enriched the language with many new and original terms of speech. His discrimination lay in the lights and shades of human manners. He was a nice observer, and an accurate describer of the phenomena of the mind, and of all the varying shades and gradations of vice and virtue. He was a poet of the school of those who rely for their success on the practice of correct elegance. Scarcely an elegant turn is to be found in our language, which may not be somewhere found in his writings, and many such he has naturalized from foreign authors. It would be, perhaps, difficult to name the poet of modern time who has been more extensively read, or who has contributed more to mould the mind of the young in its poetical aspects in England and America, than Alexander Pope.

Among the contemporaries and particular friends of Pope, was Jonathan Swift, who was born in Dublin, in 1667, and died in 1745. He excelled the most as a prose writer, and as a political controversialist, wielded a powerful pen. He was admirably adapted to party warfare, as he carried along with him, irresistible and unscrupulous satire, steady hate, and a dauntless spirit. As a poet, he certainly developed no power in the higher forms of poetry. His muse trod a very prosaic path, aiming no higher than to express plain English in rhyme. His vein was satirical, and his muse was commissioned to lash the frivolities of the age, and to depict its absurdities. He draws characters with great truth and vividness. His verses upon his own death afford the finest specimen of his own peculiar poetic vein. They consist in describing what his friends will say when informed of his illness and death, and how they will dispose of his reputation. The style and topics are varied to suit each one of the parties. The versification is in his usual easy and flowing style, the expressions being the most familiar and common place. There are occasional touches of homely pathos, and a profound knowledge of

human nature everywhere displayed through it. It is the best poetical production of the celebrated Dean Swift.

The most easy, artless and best beloved of all the Pope and Swift circle of wits and poets was John Gay, born in 1688, and dying in 1732. His first work was entitled Rural Sports, published in his twenty-third year. Next followed his Shepherd's Week, in six pastorals, containing much genuine comic humor, and many entertaining pictures of country life. From the country he turned to the city,[1] and produced his Trivia, or the Art of walking the Streets of London, which was executed in mock heroic style, and enumerates graphically the dangers and impediments then to be encountered in traversing the thoroughfares of the metropolis. City life in its lower aspects is vividly and forcibly drawn. He also tried his hand at the drama, producing the Wife of Bath, Three Hours after Marriage, the Captives, and the Beggar's Opera, some of which met with considerable success. He also wrote Fables, the best we possess, the subjects being light and pleasing, and the versification smooth and correct.

Thomas Parnell, born in 1679, and dying in 1718, also the friend of Pope and Swift, was considered by Goldsmith as the last of that great school of poets that had modeled itself upon the ancients. His works are principally translations, songs, hymns, and epistles. His piece, entitled the Hermit, is that which renders him most familiar to modern readers, recommending itself by its sweetness of diction and picturesque solemnity of style.

It was at this same period that the Scottish muse awoke to a consciousness of life in the person of Allan Ramsay, born in 1686, and dying in 1757. He is the very impersonation of Scottish scenery and manners. His poetical works are quite various, being of a character serious, elegiac,

[1] *Chamber's Encyclopædia*, I, 571.

comic, satiric, epigrammatical, pastoral, lyric, epistolary, fables and tales. He is the well-spring of Scottish song, and some of his effusions are conceived in that fine strain that a century later shone forth so bright and beautiful in the poetry of Burns. Such for instance as

How joyfully my spirits rise,
When dancing she moves finely, O;
I guess what heaven is by her eyes,
Which sparkle so divinely, O.

His great work by which he has become best known to posterity is the Gentle Shepherd, a pastoral drama which appeared in 1725, and which takes rank as one of the finest of the kind ever written. It is a genuine picture of Scottish life as developed in simple rural employments. It has few features in common with the general pastoral poetry of modern Europe, having no satyrs, nor featureless simpletons, nor dull, drowsy landscapes. It deals in life and amusing incidents. The secret of his art lay in the careful and judicious selection of his materials, and in the grouping together of his well defined characters. His plot is both romantic and natural. Every speech and auxiliary incident is appropriate to the main design. He delineates manners rather than passions, and contrives to heighten the display of rustic character without giving it vulgarity; and to refine the view of peasant life by exhibiting it in situations of sweetness and tenderness without departing from its simplicity. Thus rural nature and rural life in Scotland found a tongue in Allan Ramsay, who withal was a very prudent Scotchman, for he tells us "he gave over poetry before the coolness of fancy that attends advanced years should make me risk the reputation I had acquired."

There were also other poets of distinction besides those enumerated, who flourished during this era. But they, for the most part, belonged to other schools of poetry.

Among these was James Thomson, born the first year of the eighteenth century, and dying in 1748, four years only after Alexander Pope. His principal works are the Seasons, the Castle of Indolence, and Liberty. Although living contemporaneously with Pope and his associates, yet he did not belong to the critical school, but chose rather to revive the spirit of the elder muse by calling man back to nature, and asserting the dignity of genuine inspiration. It has been thought singular that the world should have waited till the eighteenth century for a poet of the seasons; that no ancient lover of nature should have made these his theme. It may be that the power of landscape painting must first present on canvass those scenes which are appropriate to the seasons before the muse can be prepared to present them to the mind's eye bathed in all the varied hues of the imagination. A Claude Lorraine may have been necessarily a precursor of Thomson. Even with the poet of the Seasons himself the idea was not born at once. When he penned his Winter, it never occurred to him that there was also a summer and a spring.

Thomson presents one exception to many other poets, and that is the improvement manifested in the succeeding editions of his poem. If poetry proceed from inspiration, the poem as first conceived, moulded, formed, and finally completed under its all guiding power, would not be likely to be benefited, in anything that constitutes it poetry, by subsequent emendation. Accordingly, where radical changes have been introduced into later editions by the author, as in Jerusalem Delivered by Tasso, and the Pleaures of the Imagination by Akenside, they have turned out to be failures. This does not seem to have occurred in the case of Thomson. He continued to improve his Seasons by the introduction of many alterations for the period of sixteen years, and to so great an extent were these carried, that so far as his act is concerned, the last corrected edition is a new work.

Thomson regarded the creation with an eye of unqualified pleasure and ecstacy, and carries our associations

through a wide circuit of speculation and sympathy. The life of the year is made by his muse to give to the casual phenomena of nature a beautiful harmony of succession. There is in his style great exuberance and fullness of description. "It is the flowing vesture of the Druid." The Castle of Indolence was his last work, and, more fully than any other, evidenced the perfection of his art. Deriving the materials originally from Tasso, he framed and shaped them in the spirit of the Faëry Queen of Spenser.

William Collins, born in 1720, and dying a lunatic in 1856. Although a vast amount of misery was crowded into his brief life of thirty-six years, yet of him it is asserted "that he partook of the credulity and enthusiasm of Tasso, the magic wildness of Shakespeare, the sublimity of Milton, and the pathos of Ossian." "Like Milton, he leads us into the haunted ground of imagination; like him, he has the rich economy of expression haloed with thought, which by single or few words often hints entire pictures to the imagination."

His Oriental Eclogues were his first published poetical productions. "They charm by their figurative language and descriptions, the simplicity and beauty of their dialogues and sentiments, and their musical versification." The only other species of poetry which he attempted was the ode, and in this he attained a high degree of excellence. The Ode to the Passions is the most celebrated, and has been termed "a magnificent gallery of allegorical paintings," while the poetical diction is equally rich with the conception. His power in personification, and in the use of the metaphor, has been exceeded by no other poet. "He carried sensibility and tenderness into the highest regions of abstracted thought. His enthusiasm spreads a glow even amongst the 'shadowy tribes of mind,' and his allegory is as sensible to the heart as it is visible to the fancy."

Edward Young, born in 1681, and dying in 1765, exhibits many anomalies, if not contradictions in his life and poetry.

He commenced with a satire on Love of Fame the Universal Passion, which preceded the satires of Pope, and made a very near approach to them. In his youth he was gay and dissipated, entered the church when upwards of fifty, and was during his whole life a courtier. In his poetry he is a severe moralist and ascetic divine. The work which has rendered him the most universally known is his Night Thoughts, which, although defective in producing a collective effect, and in keeping up a progressive interest, nevertheless exhibits throughout short, vivid, and broken gleams of genius. There are in it "many and exquisite touches of sublime expression, of profound reflection, and of striking imagery." His apostrophe to night rises almost to the loftiest strain of Milton. He works out individual passages "which philosophy might make her texts and experience select for her mottoes." His figures are sometimes very impressive as

> When final ruin fiercely drives
> Her ploughshare o'er creation.

But the complaint of the critic is that he so frequently slides off into "oblique associations;" that he often encircles the most awful truths "with innumerable sinuosities of fancy;" and that he everywhere manifests too strong a desire to say witty and smart things, and to load his picture with supernumerary horrors. Nevertheless his startling denunciations of death and judgment, his solemn appeals, his piety and his epigram, have worked an effect upon the human mind of which it is hardly possible now to calculate the extent.

Thomas Gray, born in 1716, and dying in 1771, is another poet whose productions, although not numerous, have, nevertheless, exerted a very salutary influence upon the human mind. His poetry is all comprised in a very few pages, and is either lyrical or elegiac. His two great odes, the Progress of Poesy, and the Bard, are the most

splendid compositions we possess in the Pindaric style and measure. They excel in fire and energy, in boldness of imagination, and in condensed and brilliant expression. His stanzas, notwithstanding their varied and complicated versification, flow with lyrical ease, and perfect harmony, each presenting rich personifications, striking thoughts, or happy imagery. His lyrical pieces have been compared to paintings on glass, which must be placed in a strong light to give out the perfect radiance of their coloring. He is claimed to have been the inventor of a new lyrical metre, in his own tongue, the peculiar formation of his strophe, antistrophe, and epode, having been unknown before him.

But the corner-stone of his glory is his Elegy Written in a Country Church-yard. His lyrical productions have occasioned different opinions as to their merits; but "his Elegy," says one, "pleased instantly and eternally." The sweetness and the beauty of this immortal production will render its popularity coextensive with the English language.

Another English poet, whose reputation rests upon a single poem, is Mark Akenside, born in 1721, and dying in 1770. He was a physician of some distinction, and as a poet, first wrote his Hymn to Science, and afterwards, his Hymn to the Naiads; but his great work, which has rendered him known to posterity, is entitled, the Pleasures of the Imagination. His object in this work, was "to trace the various pleasures which we receive from nature and art, to their respective principles in the human imagination, and to show the connection of those principles with the moral dignity of man, and the final purposes of his creation." His aim, was, therefore, rather philosophical than poetical, and hence his leading speculative ideas were mostly derived from the philosophers. His blank verse is free and well modulated, and so distinctive, that it may be claimed as his own. His highest flights have a flow and energy of expression, with appropriate imagery, which mark the great poet. His style, while chaste, is

also elevated and musical. "The sweetness which we miss," says Mr. Campbell, "in Akenside, is that which should arise from the direct representations of life, and its warm realities and affections. We seem to pass, in his poem, through a gallery of pictured abstractions, rather than of pictured things." Poetry, he contends, should rather make us feel over again, than contemplate existence; and that the functions of the true poet, are rather to renovate, than to explain emotions.

He undertook in maturer life to remodel or recast his poem, feeling that there was too much leaf for the fruit. But in lopping off these luxuriances, he sacrificed some of the finest blossoms, rendered the whole more dry and scholastic, so that this last effort of his maturer life has been almost wholly disregarded by posterity.

We now come to Oliver Goldsmith, born in Ireland in 1728, and ending his days in London in 1774. He was also bred a physician, but never did much in the practice, making literature his chief occupation. There is much about the individual history of Goldsmith, taking into consideration his travels and adventures, his waywardness, his seemingly persistent efforts in balking all the kind acts of his friends to get him established in business, his finally dying $10,000 in debt. Was ever poet, says Dr. Johnson, so trusted before? that is of interest to the general reader.

Goldsmith was a voluminous writer especially in prose, being a historian, novelist, poet and dramatic writer, and what is more remarkable excelling in each. His poems are the least numerous, consisting of the Traveler, the Deserted Village and a few fugitive pieces, and yet their popularity continues unabated and probably always will. There is nothing in his poetry that is great or gigantic, nothing that astonishes, electrifies, or strikes one by its grandeur or sublimity. It is the pure outgushing of nature in her simplicity. "He is refined without false delicacy, and correct without insipidity." His numbers flow like the perennial stream, gladdening the vale through which it

runs, sparkling in the sunbeam, refreshing the atmosphere around it with its coolness, and furnishing to the flowers upon its banks the aliment of their growth and beauty. It is thus that when the fountains of his own poetic nature were unsealed, there issued forth those refreshing streams that forever delight and brighten and gladden the successive generations of mind. It is true there was not much variety to his poetical character, and he appears to have made no effort to attain it. The great, the sublime, the varied were not among the things he sought for. He has no redundant thoughts, or false transports, but appears always to have weighed carefully the impulse to which he surrendered himself. "His whole manner has a still depth of feeling and reflection, which gives back the image of nature unruffled and minutely." He may well challenge for himself a high place among England's gifted poets.

Another holding a high rank among English poets is William Cowper, born in 1731, and dying in the first year of the nineteenth century. Descended on both sides from the English arristocracy, he is nevertheless preeminently the poet of common life and common things. His personal history offers little variety, and yet the record of his mind in its occasional aberrations, its depths of depression, its scintillations of wit, its Platonic attachments, and its fine views of common things as developed in his poetry, affords much to instruct and interest. He turned poet at fifty, and during the little more than ten years of mental life that remained to him developed to a wonderful extent the poetic element.

His great original poem, the Task, was undertaken at the suggestion of a lady. In this the public recognized the true voice of poetry and of nature, and in its rural descriptions and fireside scenes, they caught the features of English scenery and domestic life as they were there faithfully delineated. His graphic touches have been considered more close and minute than those of Thomson. Looking at life through his theological glasses he saw its

great and little things standing on the same level, and regarded all "in the light of toys spread on the lap of nature for the childhood of our immortal being." Hence his contentment and fellowship with humble things. English poetry under the lead of Pope and his school had become fastidious, timid, and limited as to models and treatment. A refined taste, while it polished, had weakened the force of genius. Cowper looked to nature rather than to poets for his themes and subjects of imitation, and he regarded everything that God had made as worthy the attention of the poet. Passing, therefore, the charmed circle which poetry had drawn around her domain, he called man back to real life and simple nature, and giving to these a tongue, enabled them to develop his own earnest feelings in behalf of moral and religious truth. His habit of viewing all created things upon the same level, enabled him to bring together and easily to associate in his own mind, those of a trivial and solemn nature, and hence resulted the nice art of passing, by the most delicate transition, from one class of subjects to another with which they would seem little if at all allied. He everywhere discloses the true poet "in the clearness, sweetness, and fidelity of his scenic draughts,[1] in his power of giving novelty to what is common, and in the high relish, the exquisite enjoyment of rural sights and sounds which he communicates to the spirit."

Born the same year with Cowper, and living two years longer, was the celebrated Dr. Erasmus Darwin, a physician, who, also, at the age of fifty, published the first part of his Botanic Garden, adopting the Rosicrucian doctrine of gnomes, sylphs, nymphs, and salamanders, as affording a proper machinery for a botanic poem, and the novelty and ingenuity of which attracted much attention, and, for a time, rendered him highly popular. Eight years later followed the second part, the Loves of the Plants, and shortly

[1] *Campbell*, 425.

after his death, in 1802, appeared the Temple of Nature. His attempt to wed poetry and science was a bold experiment, and at first was apparently successful. But this success was of short continuance, being as transient almost "as the plants and flowers that formed the subject of his verse." His example illustrates a law in poetry thus expressed by Sir Walter Scott: "There is a fashion in poetry which, without increasing or diminishing the real value of the materials moulded upon it, does wonders in facilitating its currency while it has novelty, and is often found to impede its reception when the mode has passed away." Thus the muse of Darwin, although failing to render him immortal, has nevertheless, by its failure, served to give to a law or principle the coveted immortality.

George Crabbe, characterized by Byron as "nature's sternest painter," was of humble origin, born at Aldborough in Suffolk in 1754, and died in 1832. His principal poems are the Village, Parish Register, the Borough, and Tales in Verse. Crabbe is a great painter of English scenery, and delineator of English life. His power of observation was unrivaled, and his descriptions so forcible and true to nature that they appear more like transcripts than imitations. His pictures have all the force of dramatic representation; or even like models from which the painter or sculptor works from. They are even too true, for nature in her roughest forms wants softening and idealizing to be acceptable. His own early experiences of life were of a sad and painful character, and hence when he brings before the mind's eye the Village, the Borough, or the Parish, his mind naturally returns to Aldborough, and its early unpleasant associations "to the parish workhouse, where the wheel hummed doleful through the day, to erring damsels and luckless swains, the prey of overseers or justices, or to the haunts of desperate poachers and smugglers, gipsies and gamblers, where vice and misery stalked undisguised in their darkest forms." The very dregs of human society are thus worked up, and all their

blackness and deformity exhibited in poetry. His anatomy of character and passion is done with great skill, and is exquisite and searching, and is accompanied with occasional touches of tenderness and of the pathetic, that mingle strangely with the minute and humble of his details.

A poet belonging to an entirely different class, style, and school, is Samuel Rogers, born only a few years later in 1762, and diffusing the benefits, and carrying on the burdens of life until he had attained his ninety-third year, thus forming the connecting link between the poets and literary men of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He led the unpoetical life of a banker, was wealthy, and hence his poetry was the outgrowth of his taste, and not of his necessities, the practice of his leisure, and not his stern life employment. His principal productions are Pleasures of Memory, Voyage of Columbus, Human Life, and Italy. His is the poetry of taste, which is relished more especially by the intellect. It is everywhere classic, everywhere full of graceful beauty. Pictures of soft and mellow lustre are ever present to the eye. With no forcible or original invention, "no deep pathos that thrills the soul, and no kindling energy that fires the imagination," his trains of thought and association are such as conduct the mind by easy transitions through an agreeable succession of scenes which delight more by their steady beauty than by their startling sublimity. Polish and power, felicity and force, are seldom found in intimate companionship.

Intermediate in birth between Crabbe and Rogers, and also belonging to a different school is Robert Burns, "the Shakespeare of Scotland," born in 1759, and dying in 1796, at the early age of thirty-seven years. His birth was humble. His aids in education were of the most slender kind. He listened to old ballads sang by his mother at her wheel. An ancient woman in the neighborhood instructed him in the lore of spirits and witches. "His inspiration grew up like the flower, which owes to heaven, in a barren soil, a natural beauty, and wildness of fragrance that would be

spoiled by artificial culture."[1] In 1786, while in his twenty-seventh year, his first volume of poems issued from the obscure press of Kilmarnock. Although unheralded, and unaided by friendly critics, or other adventitious means, yet his strains fell upon the ear of Scotland with tremendous effect, and the heart of Auld Scotia beat in hearty response to their delightful music. His poetry became instantaneously and universally popular. A new realm seemed to be added to the domains of poesy; a new creation to arise fresh from the hand of nature.

The poetry of Burns, both in his earlier and maturer years, is characterized by a spontaneity rarely ever witnessed in any other poet. He has thrown off more than two hundred songs, which embraced poetry of all kinds. with little or no technical knowledge of music, his soul was full of the finest harmony. His sympathies were genial, and the good and beautiful in nature ever awoke in him the sweetest strains of lyrical melody. He never attempted any great work or poem. His genius was not fitted for it. His was not the steady inspiration, but the fitful transport of genius; not the regular stream, but the sudden jet d'eau. His Tam O'Shanter, Cotter's Saturday Night, Mountain Daisy, Mouse's Nest, Address to the Deil, and Jolly Beggars, will scarcely find their equals for truth, nature, beauty and sly humor in any language. His command of language and imagery is always appropriate, musical, and graceful. "He brings back old Scotland with all her homefelt endearments, her simple customs, her festivities, her sturdy prejudices, and her orthodox zeal, with a power that excites, alternately, the most tender and mirthful sensations."

Twenty years later, or 1779, bring us to the birth of the great poet of Irish melodies, Thomas Moore, whose life continued till 1852. His first appearance was as an amatory poet under the name of Thomas Little. Next he

[1] *Campbell*, 387.

became a satirist, lively, pungent, humorous and witty, giving us his Twopenny Post Bag, the Fudge Family in Paris, Fables for the Holy Alliance, etc. In 1813 appear his Irish Melodies and as early as 1817 his Lalla Rookh, an oriental romance, the poetry of which is brilliant and gorgeous, rich with excess of imagery and ornament, and whose sunny eastern scenes, so accurately described as to be welcomed in India as "native to its clime," were called up by the imagination of the poet while living solitary in a lone cottage among the fields,[1] amidst the snows of two or three Derbyshire winters. To do all this required that concentration of thought which solitude and retirement can only give.

It is his Irish melodies, those beautiful lyrics for the ancient music of his native country, that will carry his name to posterity. These are full of true feeling and delicacy. They are to Ireland what the songs of Burns are to Scotland. The old airs were consecrated to recollections of the ancient glories, the valor, beauty, or sufferings of Ireland, and became inseparably connected with such associations. He was led, however, to the composition of these melodies by a different road from that taken by Burns. The latter was no musician, and hence derived little or no aid from music. Moore was an accomplished musician, and was first led to the composition of the melodies by attempting to translate into language the emotions and passions which music appeared to him to express. Thus he says "I have always felt, in adapting words to an expressive air, that I was bestowing upon it the gift of articulation, and thus enabling it to speak to others all that was conveyed, in its wordless eloquence, to myself." Hence these melodies are "musical almost beyond parellel in words, graceful in thought and sentiment, often tender, pathetic, and heroic,[2] blending poetical and romantic feelings with the objects and sympathies of common life in language chastened and refined, yet apparently so simple that every trace of art has disappeared."

[1] *Chambers Encyclopædia*, II, 365. [2] *Idem*, 366.

In 1770, was born William Wordsworth, the greatest of metaphysical poets, and head of the Lake school of poetry, who bore up under the burden of life for eighty years. He has made poetry the main business of his life. He started with the theory that the poet's function is limited to an exact representation of the real and the natural, and that hence the fine fabric of poetic diction must be destroyed, and the language of humble and rustic life, arising out of common experience and regular feelings must be substituted in its place. His first essays under this theory were unfortunate, and drew down upon him the lash of the critics. It was, however, soon perceived that he possessed a vein of pure and exalted description and meditation, by whatever theory he proposed to be guided. His influence upon the poetry of his age has been both extensive and beneficial. The great fact that appears to underlie all the efforts of his muse is the influence exerted by nature upon man. This led him to an ennobling and impressive worship of nature, and a no less earnest inquiry into the modes by which it acts upon and influences the human mind and heart. The peculiar bent of his genius is more especially perceptible in that beautiful ode entitled Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood. One of his most extended and noblest productions is the Excursion, which contains passages of sentiment, description and pure eloquence, rarely excelled by any poet. His works are very numerous. Among these may be mentioned Laodamia, Dion, the White Doe of Rylstone, Sonnets on the River Duddon, Peter Bell, The Waggoner, Ecclesiastical Sketches, Yarrow Revisited, and Lines on Tintern Abbey. His own idea was that his poems should be read in a certain continuous order, to give full effect to his system. Hence he has arranged them according to their respective subjects, as those referring to the period of childhood; those founded on the affections; those of the fancy; those of the imagination, etc.

The influence of Wordsworth upon the poetic world has ever been a growing one. He is eminently a poetical

philosopher, and viewing man, as he does in connection with external nature, and thus blending his metaphysics with pictures of life and scenery, he is thus the better enabled to build up and strengthen the powers of the mind, in contrast to the operations of sense. In his view the intellect should be nourished by the feelings, and these latter are like so many strings in a well toned musical instrument, which being touched by the powers of nature, either as exhibited in her scenery, or as felt in her phenomena, give forth through the medium of the former, the sweetest and the most varied music. Hence the impassioned love of nature which is so thoroughly interfused through his entire system of thought; which fills up all its interstices, penetrates all its recesses, colors all its media, supports, associates, and gives coherency and mutual relevancy to it in all its parts.

Two years after the birth of Wordsworth came Samuel Taylor Coleridge, whose life was much more varied, and whose death occurred earlier in 1834 at the age of sixty-two. He was the intimate friend of Wordsworth and also of Southey, with whom and another he early in life resolved on emigrating to America, and there, amidst the wilds of the Susquehanna, of founding a pantisocrasy, or state of society in which all things should be in common. This idea was rendered inconvenient of realization by the want of funds. Another small circumstance may have had some practical effect in modifying their notions of community, and that was, they all three got married, marrying three sisters.

The poetical works of Coleridge exhibit quite a variety, embracing ode, tragedy, and epigram, love poems, and strains of patriotism and superstition. Of these the most celebrated are his Genevieve, Ode on the Departing Year, Tears in Solitude, France, Frost at Midnight, Christabel, and the Rime of the Ancient Mariner. His odes are highly passionate and elevated in conception. His Genevieve is a gem of beauty, a pure and exquisite love poem.

His Christabel, which was left unfinished, is filled with the wildest imagery, and the most remarkable modulation of verse. In regard to the latter it is founded on the counting in each line the number of accentuated words, and not the number of syllables, resulting in the production of irregular harmony. This he called a new principle in versification, but it seems to have been in use by Chaucer and Shakespeare. The most original and striking of his productions is the Ancient Mariner. It is written in the style of the old ballads with an irregular versification, and while a vein of the supernatural runs through the whole narration and tinges every part of it, yet the poem is full of vivid and original imagination, replete with touches of exquisite tenderness and energetic description. A sea of wonder and mystery flows around the sensitive reader, keeping him spell-bound, and yet the sounds and touches of earth so often intermingle as to keep him mindful of man and the things of nature that surround him.

The works of Coleridge, all that remains of him, serve rather to impress one with the idea that he was fragmentary, or rather that he has left us nothing but fragments; that his brightest gems are only so many brilliant scintillations flashing out from the great mass of his being. That he contemplated much greater things is well known, and also that he came to view all he had done, in his own language, to be

> But flowers
> Strewed on my corse, and borne upon my bier,
> In the same coffin, for the self-same grave.

Two years later still, in 1774, was born Robert Southey, who devoted his entire life to literature, and died in 1843. His works are very numerous, both in poetry and prose, commencing with Wat Tyler and going through Joan of Arc, Thalaba the Destroyer, an Arabian fiction of great beauty and magnificence, Metrical Tales, Madoc, an epic poem, founded on a Welsh story, until in 1810 appeared the greatest of his poetical works, the Curse of Kehama,

a poem in rhyme, the story of which is founded upon the Hindoo mythology. In it Kehama, a Hindoo rajah, obtains and sports with supernatural power. We are carried by it to the land of the east, and treated to the manners, sentiments, scenery, and costume of the Hindoos. It is a wonderful display of imagination and invention. Afterwards appeared his Roderick, the Last of the Goths, and some other productions, such as his Carmen Triumphale, and the Vision of Judgment, the last of which brought him under the scourge of Lord Byron, whose witty and merciless castigation of him in his Vision of Judgment, has of itself given him a species of immortality.

Southey's poetry, although made up of magnificent creations, yet seems to want the elements of permanent life. His fictions, although splendid, are yet too wild and supernatural to take any lasting hold on the human affections. They belong rather to the region of shadows, being too remote and fanciful ever to claim kindred with realities. Hence all attempts to render him popular among the public at large have ever failed of success.

Three years previously to the birth of Southey, and in 1771, was born at Edinburgh, Scotland, Walter Scott, whose death occurred at Abbotsford in 1832. He was destined for the law, but circumstances led him into the walks of literature. The earlier portion of his literary career was given to poetry, the latter to novel writing. In 1802, appeared his Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border; and in 1805, in his thirty-fourth year, the Lay of the Last Minstrel, which placed him almost instantaneously among the greatest of living poets. This gave evidence of the possession of great descriptive powers, was full of legendary lore, and also abounded in the chivalrous and supernatural. The success of this poem determined him to prefer literature to law. In 1808, appeared the most magnificent of his chivalrous tales, Marmion, and in 1810, the Lady of the Lake, which was still more popular.

Then followed in 1811, the Vision of Don Roderick; in 1813, Rokeby, and the Bridal of Triermain; in 1814, the Lord of the Isles; in 1815, the Field of Waterloo; and in 1817, Harold the Dauntless. It had, however, come to be apparent either that his later works were inferior to his earlier ones, or that the reading public familiarized with his style, and attracted by a new star, Byron, were less attentive to his works, and then commenced that long and wonderful series of prose fictions, known as the Waverly Novels which were poured forth for seventeen years, from 1814 to 1831, almost unceasingly.

Scott really formed by himself and his imitators a school of poetry. His style was novel and original; no one since Spenser and Chaucer had so well succeeded in the delineation of antique manners and institutions. With unequaled powers of description; great picturesqueness, fancy and invention; fertile in incident; fascinating in narrative; and all in a style clear and transparent, it can surprise no one that he attained so mighty a sway over the public mind, particularly the Scottish. Scott had no great power of portraying the passions, except as their effects were contrasted with different situations where his powers of description were called into requisition. His great strength lay "in the prolific richness of his fancy, and the abundant stores of his memory, that could create, collect, and arrange such a multitude of scenes and adventures; that could find materials for stirring and romantic poetry, in the most minute and barren antiquarian details; and that could reanimate the past, and paint the present, in scenery and manners with a vividness and energy unknown since the period of Homer." [1]

The peculiar versification of Scott added to his power. He adopted the wild rhythm and harmony of Coleridge, as developed in his Christabel, joining to it some of the abruptness and irregularity of the old ballad metre. He made it both a powerful and a flexible instrument, both for

[1] *Chambers's Encyclopædia*, II, 381.

light narrative and pure description, as well as for the portrayal of scenes of tragic wildness and terror.

Another Scotch poet of great distinction, is found in Thomas Campbell, born at Glasgow, in 1777, and living until 1844. He, also, was originally destined for the law, but fortunately was diverted into the fields of literature, where he gathered many laurels. In 1799, in the twenty-first year of his age, he published his Pleasures of Hope, which, by its varying and exquisite melody, its polished diction, and its lofty sentiment, immediately captivated all readers. His pieces are some of them short, but of exquisite beauty. Among the much admired of his productions, are Gertrude of Wyoming, Lochiel's Warning, the Last Man, Exile of Erin, Pilgrim of Glencoe, Ye Mariners of England, On Visiting a Scene in Argyleshire, and the Battle of Hohenlinden. He is one of the few poets who has caused the expression of universal regret that he had not written more.

Campbell is not boldly original or inventive. "The general tone of his verse is calm, uniform, and mellifluous, a stream of mild harmony and delicious fancy flowing through the busy scenes of life; with images scattered separately, like flowers, on its surface, and beauties of expression interwoven with it, certain words and phrases of magical powers, which never quit the memory." His style varies with his subject, rising at times to the highest flights, and then subsiding into a more equable and regulated harmony. He sympathized deeply and extensively with nature, to which he was, perhaps, in part indebted to an early residence in the Highlands. But his sympathies were not less warmly enlisted with human affairs, and the hopes and prospects of society. He displays great delicacy and purity of sentiment, and a vivid perception of beauty and ideal loveliness; also great sweetness and gentleness of pathos. His war songs are everywhere the chant of patriotism, and constitute one of the richest offerings ever made by poetry at its shrine.

A poet of singular fortunes, and whose life was included within three decades of years, was Percy Bysshe Shelley, the son and heir of a wealthy English baronet, and who was born at Field Place, in Sussex, England, in 1792. He was drowned in the bay of Spezzia in 1822. In his youth he was about equally inclined to poetry and metaphysics, and seems to have effected a compromise between them by uniting them together. While one of the most harmless and benevolent of men, he entertained opinions subversive of all religious belief, and not at all in harmony with submission to established authority. He was a visionary, and was led to entertain schemes of high intellectual excellence and supremacy. The cardinal point in his system is a belief that man could be so perfectionized as to be able to expel evil from his own nature, and from the greater part of the creation, and hence the most agreeable subject was the image of one warring with the evil principle, and ultimately accomplishing a hard earned triumph.[1]

Shelley commenced the writing of poetry early. At eighteen he produced his Queen Mab, a poem wild and full of atheism, but abounding in passages of great power and melody. Next came his Master, or the Spirit of Solitude, which excels in description, picturesqueness of language, and in boldness in imagination. Next his Revolt of Islam, in which the allegorical features and peculiarities of thought and style are such as pretty effectually to remove all adequate comprehension of the poem beyond the stoutest efforts of the common class of readers. Then follows his classic drama of Prometheus Unbound, which is also of the same mystical, metaphysical and skeptical character. Afterwards came the Cenci, Hellas, the Witch of Atlas, Adonais, Rosalind and Helen, and a great number and variety of other shorter productions.

[1] *Chambers's Encyclopædia*, II, 396.

Shelley was a very remarkable man. Possessing a spirit within him

> So divinely wrought,
> That you might almost say his body thought.

His poetry, especially in his larger pieces, is so extremely abstract, and partakes so largely of his mystic idealism, as to awaken few sympathies in the human heart. His smaller pieces are more universally read and much more popular than his larger ones. "He has single thoughts of great depth and force, single images of rare beauty, detached passages of extreme tenderness, and in his smaller pieces, where he has attempted little, he has done most." In these minor pieces he is free from the entanglement of his system, and at liberty to speak the genuine feelings of nature. His Address to a Skylark is one of the most lovely poetic gems in the English language.

Another, the great bard of the nineteenth century, Lord Byron, was born at London in 1788, and died in Greece in 1824, at the early age of thirty-six. Lord Byron's life experiences, and inner history so far as outwardly developed, were probably more varied and extraordinary than those of any other in the century. These have largely entered into, and essentially qualified the effusions of his muse. At the age of nineteen he commenced poet publishing his Hours of Idleness, which being severely criticized in the *Edinburgh Review*, drew forth from him a severe satire in English Bards and Scotch Reviewers. In 1812, at twenty-four commenced the appearance of his Childe Harold, and for the ten succeeding years his poetry flowed forth as from an exhaustless mine. His Giaour, Bride of Abydos, Corsair, Lara, Siege of Corinth, Parasina, Prisoner of Chillon Manfred, Lament of Tasso, Beppo, Mazeppa, Vision of Judgment, Don Juan, besides several dramas, and many smaller pieces, astonished, and almost electrified the Anglo-Saxon world. Never had poet so large an audience.

He was read and admired on the banks of the Thames, the Ganges, the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi. His name and fame followed the "English drum-beat" as it "encircled the globe daily with the martial airs of England."

One thing is particularly noticeable in Byron, viz: the pains taken, and care exercised, in the collection of his materials. For these he never drew on his imagination. Before he would venture to pen a shipwreck he would consult the narratives of actual occurrences. His Grecian pictures, feasts, dresses, and holiday pastimes, are literal transcripts from life. His grand descriptions of Greek statues at Florence and Rome, all he describes in Greece and Italy are transcripts of what he saw in those cradles of ancient and modern art. Amid the ruins of the Palatine and the Coliseum his dreams of love and beauty, of intellectual power and majesty, were fully realized, and the lustre of the classic age seems reflected back in his glowing pages. We cannot well avoid feeling that "in his intense appreciation of ideal beauty and sculptured grace, in passionate energy and ecstasy, he outstrips all his contemporaries."

Byron's command of the English language was not exceeded, or probably equaled by that of any other poet. At his skillful touch it would warble its sweet notes as in the Hebrew Melodies, exhibit all its playful antics as in Beppo and Don Juan, or sink to its deep-toned organ swell when, as in Childe Harold, he "laid his hand upon the ocean's mane." Whether he desired to touch the human heart by his tenderness, or probe to the quick human sensibilities by his satire and irony, or summon the depths of the ideal to a new sense of beauty or sublimity, or kindle in the human soul new passions or desires, hopes, fears, or horrors, he knew exactly what chord would vibrate to his own wonder-working touch. And, with the exception of his Manfred, he deals very little with the mysterious or the supernatural, or with things that are not of earth.

The Childe Harold and Don Juan are the greatest poetical works of the present century. While the former exhibits the greatness of his genius, the latter proclaims its rich and almost infinite variety. A more brilliantly resplendent garland perhaps never encircled a poet's brow, and yet the fadeless flowers of hope and virtue are fatally wanting. Unfortunately his knowledge is more of evil than of good. In his Childe Harold he traverses the fairest portions of the earth in a spirit of bitterness and desolation, dealing out his scorn and defiance of man and his pursuits. In his Don Juan, his epicurean philosophy is mixed up with wit, humor, the keenest penetration, the almost infinite variety of expression, as it opens up scenes and passions in human life and society, disclosing their most secret workings, and stripping them of all conventional allurements and disguises. In his wonderful moral anatomy he exhibits and dissects generous emotions and moral feelings, and then seasons them with a dash of burlesque humor, wild profanity, and uproarious merriment. Having in his own mind broken down the barriers between virtue and vice, he leads others all the more easily into those seductive regions, where, having once entered, return is among the most difficult things of life. It may be the highest in intellect, the most brilliant in wit, the most lively in imagination, the most idealized in beauty and sublimity, but it cannot be the purest in morals, that worship at the shine of Byron.

We here close our brief notice of the development of the poetic element in modern Europe. Its importance required even a brief notice to be somewhat extended. Poets have been termed "the hierophants of an unapprehended inspiration;[1] the mirrors of the gigantic shadows which futurity casts upon the present; the words which express what they understand not; the trumpets which

[1] *Chambers's Encyclopædia*, II, 256.

sing to battle, and feel not what they inspire; the influence which is not, but moves." The question may here be asked whether the poetic element is developed in accordance with certain fixed laws; or whether like its sister, fiction, "it travels on lighter wings,[1] scattering the seeds of its wild flowers imperceptibly over the world, till they surprise us by springing up with similarity in regions the most remotely divided." Some contend that poetry is destined to complete a certain cycle, or great revolution, accompanying and dependent on a correspondent cycle of the feelings as well as of the manners of society. But whether this be so or not, it may well be doubted whether the experience of the race thus far has been sufficient to warrant a clear deduction of the laws presiding over such a development, even if the existence of such laws were conceded.

ELOQUENCE.

We have before, and while on the subject of Grecian eloquence, had occasion to ascertain the elements that enter its composition. Our first inquiry here is, what should enter into the composition of the orator? His first quality should be earnestness. He must himself feel deeply the truths he seeks to enforce. Otherwise it would be only the pomp and parade of eloquence without its force, the "nodosities of the oak without its strength, the contortions of the sybil without the inspiration."

He must in the second place have clearness, the power of stating. This embraces not only the stating of facts in a lucid manner, but also in a natural order in accordance with the logical tendencies of the mind. It is said of Lord Mansfield, that "when he had stated a case he had half decided it."

[1] *Campbell*, 13.

In the third place this clearness must also be accompanied with logic. Little of progress can be made in persuasion unless based on previous conviction. This requires logic, the use of which is rendered effective in virtue of that consecutive character that is ever impressed upon all the great movements of mind.

A fourth quality of almost or quite equal importance is imagination. This is important because: 1. It interests, and thus enlists other minds, or induces their surrender to that of the speaker. 2. It ranges into the regions of the ideal, and culls there the flowers of beauty, which are ever yielding a new delight. 3. It furnishes all the illustrations which are so necessary in bringing great general truths home to the apprehension of the hearers.

As a fifth, and perhaps most important quality, we would name persuasiveness, as eloquence has been sometimes termed the art of persuasion. Its great end is to induce action, to move masses of men in obedience to the impulse of the speaker.

There were two fields among the ancients for the display of eloquence, and three among the moderns. The two first referred to, were the court of justice and the popular assembly; and the three last, the pulpit, the court of justice, and the popular assembly. The last is susceptible of a subdivision into the senate and the assembly of the people; and the court of justice, into the jury and the court. These divisions, however, would only be rendered necessary where it was proposed to give to the subject a minute consideration.

Notwithstanding the additional field of the pulpit which eloquence is privileged with occupying in modern times, it seems generally conceded that it rose to a more daring height, and exercised more extensive powers in ancient than in modern times. Neither the mantle of Cicero nor Demosthenes seems ever to have fallen upon the shoulders of any modern. Why is this? It must be conceded that the mind in modern times has made vast advances upon the ancients. In everything that relates to knowledge

whether of mind or matter, the moderns are greatly in the advance. In regard to matters of science generally there can be no comparison; and even in the walks of literature, especially of criticism, the moderns are greatly in advance. Why is it that the advance of knowledge clips the wings of eloquence? Is it not for the same reason that the rising of the luminary of day reveals in perfect certainty those things that lay enveloped in shadows behind the blushes of Aurora? Light annihilates shadows, and knowledge dispenses with all those enlivening efforts to banish the obscure that cluster around the unknown. Eloquence seeks by enlightening to convince, and then to persuade. Perfection of knowledge not only renders the former a more easy task, but also exposes all the machinery by which the latter in ancient times was sought to be effected.

Eloquence, however, may be said rather to have changed its character than to have suffered a diminution in its power. An effective speaker is still required to be earnest, clear, logical, imaginative, so far as illustration is concerned, and persuasive. He may enter the realm of the ideal, and enrobe himself in beauty. He may even assume to himself the wonders and terrors of the sublime, provided he do it cautiously, and within such limits that the light of knowledge will not render its machinery ridiculous. But the higher flights, the loftier soarings, the bold and extravagant figures of the ancient orators, cannot be employed by the modern without sinking the sublime into the ridiculous. No one, for instance, could now venture upon such an apostrophe as that made use of by Demosthenes, when justifying the unsuccessful battle of Chæronea, he breaks out: "No, my fellow citizens. No: You have not erred. I swear by the manes of those heroes, who fought for the same cause in the plains of Marathon and Platæa." So also of the bold and figurative language employed by Cicero after describing the crucifixion of a Roman citizen: "Should I paint the horrors of this scene, not to Roman citizens, not to the allies of our state, not to those who have ever heard of the Roman name,

not even to men, but to brute creatures; or, to go further, should I lift up my voice in the most desolate solitude, to the rocks and mountains, yet should I surely see those rude and inanimate parts of nature moved with horror and indignation at the recital of so enormous an action."

These remarks apply more particularly to the eloquence of popular assemblies. That of the bar was also called into requisition as well among the ancients as the moderns, but under different circumstances. The object, however, was the same in both, the dispensation of justice. But in the ancient tribunals, as in the areopagus of Athens and the judices selecti of Rome, the number of judges was much greater than in those of the moderns, thus giving to the former many of the qualities of the popular assembly, and rendering them more exposed to the arts of eloquence. Another very wide difference between the two is found in the fact that the laws of ancient times were few, simple, and very general in their character, leaving very much to the equity and common sense of the judges. The study of the advocate was not so much the law as the method of pleading it successfully. Hence all the arts of eloquence came into full play, and the advocate at the bar was also usually the orator before the people, the same kind of eloquence answering both purposes.

With the greater advancement of the moderns in all the elements of civilization, their systems of jurisprudence have become more extended, varied, complicated, and complete. The ultimate decision, instead of reposing on reasoning and argument, has sought the shelter of precedent. The maxim, stare decisis, embodies doctrine the most favored by the law. It is, therefore, learning, the results of severe research and investigation, that prevails with courts rather than eloquence. As a natural result of this we have seldom in modern times seen the mere lawyer whose habits have been formed in his practice at the bar to succeed well in the popular assembly. He may succeed in the senate, but his eloquence very seldom possesses happy adaptations to the assemblies of the people. A

man's mental habits impose upon him fetters extremely difficult to be overcome.

The pulpit has furnished a new theatre for eloquence unknown to the ancient world, and one that would appear well adapted to call into exercise some of its highest powers. It proffers to the tongue of the eloquent the machinery of three worlds to assist in its reasonings and to aid in its appeals. It furnishes an exuberance of illustration, and comes home with a strength of motive, elsewhere rarely furnished. Many of its great topics, it is true, are so far removed from the things of time and of sense, and lead so far into the depths of the spiritual world, as to be of difficult apprehension to those whose feelings, thoughts, and experiences are all bound up in this world. Besides, it deals more in abstract qualities, such as virtues and vices, and less with persons. The great effort of the preacher is to realize the abstract in the concrete.

The direction which the style of pulpit eloquence has taken has varied with the character of the religion it has sought to promulgate and enforce. There is in this respect a very wide difference between the catholic and protestant forms of faith. In the catholic it is well known that every point of doctrine is an article of faith. The church itself prescribes what shall be believed, and hence precludes all reasoning upon such subjects. Catholics are simply believers, never reasoners. Whatever of eloquence is embraced in argumentation has no place in their pulpit performances.

The protestant has also canons to which his faith must conform, but these are to be found only in the scriptures. And who or what shall interpret, or establish as the infallible canon where it admits of difference of opinion? With the catholic it is the church. With the protestant, it is human reason. This is appealed to as an umpire to decide. Every one is responsible for exercising his reason aright in the formation of his own opinions. The protestant pulpit must, therefore, necessarily be much occupied in the exposition and elucidation of the scriptures. For these purposes reasoning and argument are to be employed.

The two different styles are well exemplified in the French and English modes of preaching, although a new element is to be found here in the different character of the Anglican and Anglo-Saxon mind. A French sermon is a warm, animated exhortation, and as such addressed chiefly to the imagination and passions. An English one is a piece of cool, instructive reasoning, addressed almost entirely to the understanding. A French audience is to be moved, an English to be convinced. In accomplishing the first all the reasonable arts of eloquence are appropriately employed. In that of the last, earnestness, clearness, and logic are the most essential qualities called into requisition.

The most celebrated pulpit orators of France were of the era of Louis XIV. The two most celebrated of these were Bourdaloue and Massillon, whose excellencies have divided between them the French critics. While to the former has been attributed more solidity, to the latter has been generally conceded more grace, more sentiment, and more genius. He had more knowledge of the world and of the human heart; exhibits more of the pathetic and persuasive; and has been called the most eloquent preacher of modern times. He understood well how to give eloquent utterance to a great sentiment on a great occasion. Louis XIV, the Grand Monarque, whose reign created an era in European history, had descended to the tomb. The flower of the French aristocracy had convened at his funeral obsequies. In the midst of that bowed assembly, and in the presence of all that remained of that monarch whom death alone could conquer, Massillon arose, and as he extended his arms and eyes towards heaven slowly gave utterance to the sentiment, "God alone is great." The occasion, the assemblage, the sentiment, were all in harmony. The effect may be better conceived than described.

Another instance of a very eminent French protestant divine is found in Saurin, of an era a little later than the two preceding, whose sermons are very much in the French style of eloquence. He lived during the period of the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and rises almost to

the level of Demosthenes, when he speaks of the emigration of the protestants, and when he thunders against Louis XIV. His utterances are sometimes singularly figurative and bold. Thus in his sermon entitled God's Controversy with Israel, he introduces a dialogue between God and his auditory: "My people," saith the Most High, "My people, what have I done unto thee?" "Ah, Lord! how many things hast thou done unto us! Draw near ye mourning ways of Zion, ye desolate gates of Jerusalem, ye sighing priests, ye afflicted virgins, ye deserts peopled with captives. * * * Answer, and bear witness here against the Eternal." There was here a longer enumeration of the afflictions of the protestants than that above given, which precedes these last words, giving them an energy which causes one to tremble at the very moment when Saurin pauses, in order to vindicate the ways of providence.

The English style of sermonizing has in it little of animation, or passion, or indeed of almost anything which is included under the term eloquence. It seldom rises beyond the strain of correct or dry reasoning. The sermon in its composition is accurate and rational, addressed entirely to the understanding, and designed to fasten conviction upon the minds of the hearers. Each style thus appears to contain just what the other wants, and thus becomes its complement. Could both be united, a very perfect style would be the result. The warm, animated, passionate eloquence of the French, delivered with a corresponding vigor and life, would then find a solid foundation in the calmer, firmer, more deliberate, and well considered style of the English, seeking first thoroughly to convince the mind of the great truths which were sought to be enforced. And so, also the latter, after first dealing with intellection, and establishing its strong foundations by reason and argument, would render itself much more complete by enlisting the imaginative and persuasive, and thus to induce a corresponding action as a realization of the fruits of conviction.

The eloquence of the senate and the popular assembly, has, at almost all periods of the world's history, wherever free governments have been in existence, commanded respectful attention, and enlisted the strongest efforts to secure its attainment. This species of eloquence is limited to governments actually free, or that are making the effort to become so. The senate possessing the power to deliberate and decree, and the popular assembly can only exist in such a government. The establishment of this fact renders it apparent that there are few countries in modern Europe, which have as yet been privileged to furnish a field for this species of eloquence. France and Great Britain are the only ones worthy of any extended notice, and the former only during the reign of the national assembly and the national convention. It was in these, more especially, that the peculiar eloquence which characterizes the French mind, found a full and perfect opportunity for its display. As the embodiments of these assemblies during the remarkable period in which they sat, we shall take Mirabeau, Vergniaud, Danton, and Robespierre.

The great orator of the national assembly was Mirabeau. In his appearance he presented a massive figure, a broad, prominent forehead, arched eyebrows, an eagle eye, cheeks flat and flabby, features full of pock holes and blotches, an enormous mass of hair, a lion-like face, and a voice of thunder.[1] His previous history had eminently fitted him for the position he was to occupy. Born a noble, but expelled from the ranks of the nobility, living a life of study, and of suffering in exile and in prisons, he now stepped upon the stage to lead to battle the *tiers-état* against the nobility, announcing in his opening speech, the great truth, "that privileges must have an end, but the people is eternal."

The forum presented by the national assembly partook more of an assembly of the people than of a senate. The whole Parisian population mingled in the discussion. Tens

[1] *Orators of France*, 2.

of thousands of citizens filled the Tuileries, the Place Vendome, the adjacent streets; and copied bulletins were passed from hand to hand, circulated, thrown among the crowd, containing the occurrences of each moment of the debate.[1] All were in expectation of great events, and every moment brought with it a terrible fullness of interest. It may be true that reckoning life by events and expectations, the men of Paris lived its ordinary length notwithstanding the guillotine.

Mirabeau usually premeditated his discourses. In such case his eloquence has been thus described: "His manner as an orator is that of the great masters of antiquity, with an admirable energy of gesture and a vehemence of diction which perhaps they had never reached.[2] He is strong, because he does not diffuse himself; he is natural, because he uses no ornaments; he is eloquent, because he is simple; he does not imitate others, because he needs but to be himself; he does not surcharge his discourse with a baggage of epithets, because they would retard it; he does not run into digressions, for fear of wandering from the question. His exordiums are sometimes abrupt, sometimes majestic, as it comports with the subject. His narration of facts is clear. His statement of the question is precise and positive. His ample and sonorous phraseology much resembles the spoken phraseology of Cicero. He unrolls, with a solemn slowness, the folds of his discourse. He does not accumulate his enumerations as ornaments but as proofs. He seeks not the harmony of words, but the concatenation of ideas. He does not exhaust a subject to the dregs, he takes but the flower. Would he dazzle, the most brilliant images spring up beneath his steps; would he touch, he abounds in raptures of emotion, in tender persuasions, in oratorical transports, which do not conflict with, but sustain, which are never confounded with, but follow, each other; which seem to produce one another successively, and flow with a happy disorder from that fine and prolific

[1] *Orators of France*, 8. [2] *Idem*, 14, 15.

nature. When he comes to the point in debate, when he enters the heart of the question, he is substantial, nervous, logical as Demosthenes. He advances in a serried and impenetrable order. He reviews his proofs, disposes the plan of attack, and arrays them in order of battle. Mailed in the armor of dialectics, he sounds the charge, rushes upon the adversaries, seizes and prostrates them, nor does he loose his hold till he compels them, knee on neck, to avow themselves vanquished. If they retreat, he pursues, attacks them front and rear, presses upon them, drives them, and brings them inevitably within the imperial circle which he had designated for their destruction; like those who upon the deck of a narrow vessel, captured by boarding her, place a hopeless enemy between their sword and the ocean."

Such was Mirabeau in his premeditated flights. In his extemporaneous effusions, his improvisations, he did not repress his natural vehemence. These were brief but terrible. His breast would dilate, his face become contorted, his eyes shoot forth flame. He would roar, stamp, shake the fierce mass of his hair, and tread the tribune with the air of a master.[1] Now he would deal in measured notes of declamation, grave and solemn, then go off in broken exclamations, tones of thunder, and accents of heart rending and terrible pathos. And yet while apparently abandoning himself to the torrent of his eloquence, while transporting the assembly, he would not wander from his course, nor would he, for a single moment, lose his own self-control.

He would sometimes throw a whole volume of meaning into a single sentence, as when he described France as "an unconstituted aggregation of disunited people." He was quick and extremely felicitous in the repartee, and would sometimes dispose of a matter by suddenly calling up some vivid scene from the past, as when the assembly was

[1] *Orators of France*, 19.

about to plunge imprudently into religious quarrels, he cut short the matter by saying: "Recollect that from this place, from the very tribune where I now speak, I can see the window of the palace through which factious miscreants, uniting temporal interests with the most sacred interests of religion, had fired by the hand of a king of the French the fatal gun, which was to be the signal of the massacre of the Huguenots."

Of all the orators of modern times Mirabeau most resembled the elder Pitt, Earl of Chatham. He accomplished less by long set speeches than by sudden bursts, seeming like inspiration. "Short sentences which came like lightning,[1] dazzling, burning, striking down everything before them; sentences which, spoken at critical moments, decide the fate of great questions; sentences which at once become proverbs; sentences which every body still knows by heart; in these chiefly lay the oratorical power both Chatham and of Mirabeau."

Mirabeau perished suddenly by an unknown malady, inquiring what epitaph should be inscribed on his tomb. Poor man, that body of his that all Paris by the light of a thousand torches bore in sadness to the Pantheon, only two years afterwards was removed to the cemetery of Clamart, the place of interment for persons who have been executed, among whom the undistinguishable remains of the great orator lie mixed and confounded.[2]

Mirabeau was the orator of the national assembly. That was succeeded by the national convention, and here we meet with the terrible contests between the Girondists under Gaudet and Vergniaud, and the Mountain under Danton and Robespierre. The former were the moderate party, who sighed for the return of ancient republicanism. The latter were Jacobins, whose trade was revolution. Of the two leaders of the former, Guadet was the boldest, and perhaps the more generally recognized as leader; but Vergniaud had most of the spirit of eloquence.

[1] *Macaulay's Miscellanies*, II, 155, 156. [2] *Idem*, 34, note.

He was a man of great flexibility and compass of intellect, a very sincere patriot, and possessed of much oratorical power. But the style of his eloquence was very different from that of Mirabeau. It was not the eloquence of force but of beauty. He presented, in fact, a strong contrast with the vehement speakers of that stormy period. He did not excel in solidity or power of argument, or in the exercise of that force which sways popular assemblies. He had in his composition far less of logic than of rhetoric. His great excellence consisted in the use of appropriate and beautiful imagery. "If," said he, "our principles are propagated but slowly in foreign nations, it is that their splendor is obscured by anarchical sophistries, by disorderly movements,[1] and above all by a blood-stained crape. When the peoples of the earth fell prostrate for the first time before the sun, was it, think you, while he was veiled with those destructive vapors which engender the tempests? No, doubtless, it was when, in the full effulgence of his glory, he was advancing through the immensity of space, and shedding on the universe fertility, life and light."

On one occasion he made use of this apostrophe: "Take care that, in the midst of your triumphs, France do not resemble those Egyptian monuments which have withstood the ravages of time. The stranger, as he passes, is astonished at their grandeur. But if he would enter them, what does he find? Heaps of inanimate ashes, and the silence of the grave."

The first conspiracy of the Jacobins against the Girondists was defeated, and in his memorable speech on that occasion he gave utterance to the following pregnant apothegm: "The revolution is like Saturn, it devours its own children," a saying that proved too fearfully true in his own case, for he also, with the last of the Girondists, fell a prey to the guillotine. On the night preceding their execution their friends furnished them, while in prison, with a splendid entertainment, and on that last night of

[1] *Orators of France*, 51.

his life he addressed his fellow prisoners on the sad fate of the French republic. Never before or since did the gloomy walls of a prison ring with such thrilling words. He poured forth such strains of impassioned eloquence that they all fell in tears into each others arms.

The destruction of the Girondists left the Mountain alone in its terrible grandeur. Looming up on its awful brow appear two forms that stand forth in fearful distinctness, and who are soon destined to illustrate still further the great truth announced by Vergniaud that the revolution was to devour its own children. These were Danton and Robespierre, the great Jacobin leaders, whose eloquence was rather that of demons than of men.

Danton reminds one much of Mirabeau, but with far less of intellectual power. Like him he had a sallow complexion, sunken features, a wrinkled forehead, and a repulsive ugliness in the details of the countenance. He was a head taller than all the other members of the convention. He came from the ranks of the people, understood their character, was thoroughly imbued with their passions. He was coarse in his manners, impetuous in his gestures, enthusiastic in his feelings, terrible in his denunciations, with a thundering voice, and often colossal in the imagery introduced into his discourses. He was governed by his impulses, and these were in the main honest, and intended for the public good. He made no set speeches nor long harangues. He gave himself up to the inspiration of the moment, kindled as he went by the force of his own voice and gesture, and scattered hyperboles through his speeches. He proceeded forward, not by regular steps, but by bounds and gambols, being fiery and petulant in his exordiums, presumptuous in every bound of his progress, and generally ending with some rhetorical flourishes, but without coming to any conclusion. No other man reflected so thoroughly the wants, wishes, waywardness, versatility, and passions of the people. His motto was, "boldness, boldness, boldness," and this, with his severity, was the great secret of his strength. He never stopped to calculate, or hesitated

in his course. He was the chief orator of the reign of terror, and the principal in originating the committee of public safety, the dread revolutionary tribunal, which finally brought his own head to the block.

Very little remains to us of the eloquence of Danton. "What we need," says he, "in order to conquer, is, audacity, again audacity, always audacity." And again a figure quite striking: "A nation in a state of revolution is like the brass which simmers and sublimates itself in the crucible. The statue of liberty is not yet cast, but the metal is boiling." Again, "Marseilles has declared itself the mountain of the republic. That mountain will expand its proportions; it will roll down the loosened rocks of liberty, and crush beneath them the enemies of freedom." And again this apothegm, so true, and so well illustrated by the French people themselves: "When a people passes from a monarchical to a republican form of government, it is carried beyond the end by the projectile force which it has given itself."[1] And this menace; "It is by cannon balls that the convention must be made known to our enemies."

Danton on his way to execution passed the residence of Robespierre, and turning about as he did so, exclaimed in a voice of thunder: "Robespierre, I summon thee to appear within three months upon the scaffold." The summons was substantially obeyed. The revolution did devour its own children.

Robespierre, the great leader of the Jacobins, presents a marked contrast to Danton. He was ever cool and calculating, never impulsive. Patient, taciturn, dissembling, full of himself and his own doings, he never lost his own self-control, never the mastery of the subject under discussion. As an orator he possessed considerable fluency, and became well practiced in the harangues of the clubs and the contests of the tribune. His speeches were generally written and recited. He seldom extemporized except

[1] *Orators of France*, 63, 64.

in his replies. He was a singularity, if not a monstrosity. He had in a higher degree than his colleagues the views of the statesman. He was a man of more study and labor, and favoured unity and strength in the executive arm.

His speeches and reports were often in very bad taste, stuffed up with illusions to the heroes of Greece and Rome, and full of denunciations against serpents, demons, hydras, monsters, tyrants, and aristocrats. He would often stop suddenly in the midst of his discourse and interrogate the people as if they were present before him. He would run off into long tirades about virtue, patriotism, and sacrifices for the public good. His images, however, would occasionally be clothed in much eloquence of form. "Do we," says he, "calumniate the luminary which gives life to nature, because of the light clouds that glide over its effulgent face? And again, "Man's reason still resembles the globe he inhabits. One-half of it is plunged in darkness, when the other is illuminated."

French liberty ran riot, degenerated into license, and order was compelled to seek a shelter under the empire of Napoleon. The eloquence of the popular assembly in France may be said to have died with the national convention. Little display of it was found under the directory, and still less under the empire. The restoration brought back the Bourbon, and the old order of things, which continued until July, 1830, when the Orleans dynasty was inaugurated in the person of Louis Philippe. During the eighteen years of his reign, the French parliament has been more under the guidance of the politician than of the orator. Guizot and Thiers have occupied the the most prominent place in the public eye, but they have governed more by management, and the strategy of parliaments, than by the exercise of eloquence. The revolution of 1848 threw for a brief period to the surface, the brilliant Lamartine, Odillon, Barrot, and a few others, but everything again became hushed under the iron sway of Louis Napoleon.

British eloquence differs from the French, as much in the senate and popular assembly as in the pulpit. The vehemence, power, force and energy of gesture, as well as the antitheses, sudden transitions, strong condensations of thought into single sentences, terrible denunciations, words that blister where they strike, and imagery that stands out to the view with all the distinctness that marks the practiced art of the painter; all these characterize the French much more strongly than the English style of eloquence. The Anglo-Saxon mind seems cast in an entirely different mould from the Gallic. Slower and more cautious in its movements, mastering, fortifying, and garrisoning every important position as it advances, looking at all its aids, appliances, and exhibitions through utilitarian glasses, regarding all reconnaissance and skirmishing as of no importance in themselves, and as only aiding in a safer and steadier progress, and finally, having reference alone to the great results sought to be attained, and to the means the best calculated to secure such attainment, it marches on, husbanding its resources, submitting its activities to the guidance rather of logic than of rhetoric, caring little for the high wrought figure, the pungent apothegm, the sudden flash of its powers, or dash of its forces, and heeding little the effect produced, provided it can succeed in attaining the great objects had in view at the commencement, and never lost sight of during its progress. The eloquence, therefore, that characterizes its exhibitions is not of a flashing, dashing, high wrought, or dazzling character. Its exhibitions are always manly and energetic, and whether it attempts to carry by the sudden storm, or the more protracted siege, its efforts are well sustained, and well adapted to success. As a result of this it is curious to remark with what steadiness and persistency the great principles that lie at the foundation of national prosperity have been adhered to and carried out in British history. Revolutions, instead of overturning and destroying, leaving only a waste and desolation, have always stopped short, or if they have momentarily surged beyond, have receded until they reached the

great barriers of truth, right, and justice. Beyond these they could make no permanent lodgment, and, their effect has always been to weed out and destroy those principles that had become effete and useless, or positively noxious, and to originate and engraft in their place those which are new, and adapted to meet the demands of a slow but never permanently receding progress in all things that pertain to civilization.

No greater, more permanent, or more splendid theatre has ever been presented for the display of eloquence than the British parliament. The house of commons, the popular branch of parliament, has, for more than two centuries, presented assemblages of men very numerous, very varied, with large privileges of debate, and discussion, all but unlimited in its range, theoretically and practically devolving the action of the government upon the result of measures there discussed and decided, and thus offering, it would seem, the highest prizes to successful competitors in public speaking. And yet no Cicero or Demosthenes has ever appeared there. England has had its revolutions, its times of high excitement, its period when its parliament ruled the realm as the national assembly and convention ruled France on the fall of the Bourbons, and yet no Mirabeau or Danton was thrown up from its centre to its surface, to fill the world for the moment with wonder, amazement, and awe. We shall not be surprised at this when we reflect that the orator must adapt himself to his audience; that, to a large extent, it is the qualities of mind in the audience that call out the powers of the orator, and thus contribute largely to make him what he really is. Mirabeau in the British house of commons, and in the midst of one of his high impassioned speeches!! It is surmised that neither he nor the house would ever desire a reunion. It would probably be impossible for a succession of Mirabeaus to tone the house up to such a key as to render that species of eloquence appreciable.

There have been, however, great speakers in the British parliament. As the majority there decides the fate of mea-

sures, and consequently that of administrations, it is of the first importance to know how votes are to be secured. Three modes have been employed for this purpose, viz: 1. Management. 2. Purchase. 3. Eloquence. We shall not discuss the relative importance of these respectively. It is enough for our purpose that eloquence is presented as one of the means, and hence may be ranked as one of the elements of success. The British ministry must always have its leader in debate in the house, and the opposition those whom they look to as leaders. The latter are ever keenly on the watch for opportunities in which they can make war successfully on the measures of the administration, and by obtaining a majority of the votes compel the ministers to resign, and the appointment of themselves or their friends to occupy their places. The mode of obtaining votes both by management, and by purchase, more especially by the latter, is more resorted to by the administration, or party in power, as the government is under its control, and hence the means and appliances are with it much more extensive and varied. The opposition, although relying considerably on management, has also always placed great reliance upon eloquence, and among its ranks and in its school, the great parliamentary orators have been reared.

The term eloquence, however, as applied to the British parliament, has a different meaning from what it has when applied to the French national assembly, or convention, or to the Roman senate, or to the assemblies of the people at Athens. It is rarely high wrought or impassioned. Its play of imagination, figures, and creations of imagery, are all subsidiary to the main design, which is that of convincing the understanding, and not of inflaming the passions.

The earliest and the greatest of parliamentary orators, and one who has been called the greatest orator of modern times, was the elder Pitt, the Earl of Chatham. Born in 1708, and living to reach his seventieth year, he passed through stirring periods of modern European history. He was an orator by nature. With a figure

tall and erect, an attitude imposing, with gestures energetic, yet tempered with dignity and grace, he possessed a power of eye that, by a single glance of scorn and contempt, would strike with withering effect upon antagonist in the midst of his speech. His countenance would glow with animation, and would reflect with peculiar force all the strong emotions of the soul. His voice is spoken of as possessing peculiar charms.[1] "His lowest whisper was distinctly heard; his middle notes were sweet and beautifully varied; and, when he elevated his voice to its highest pitch, the house was completely filled with the volume of sound. The effect was awful, except when he wished to cheer or animate; then he had spirit-stirring notes which were perfectly irresistible. The prevailing character of his delivery was majesty and force."

Never was so distinguished an orator less indebted to culture, education and industry. He had very little learning, little even of political knowledge, but his great aim seems to have been to acquire a thorough knowledge of the English language. With this view he twice went through the folio dictionary of Bailey,[2] examining the most important words, their peculiar import and modes of construction. He read and reread the sermons of Dr. Barrow, and familiarized himself with Spenser's Faëry Queen. He thus attained to a thorough mastery of the English language, so that it required little effort to clothe his ideas in their appropriate words.

Lord Chatham's style and power of oratory was a larger embodiment of what in the common estimation is covered by the term eloquence than occurs in any other parliamentary speaker. He proceeded most upon the Demosthenean model, but his speeches lacked the elaboration of the Athenian orator. His thoroughly prepared discourses were few, and most generally were failures. In his great speeches his preparation was limited to the general subject. The main ideas, the great leading topics alone

[1] *British Eloquence*, 71. [2] *Idem*, 52.

possessed his mind. The matter to be brought forward was thoroughly matured, but the arrangement seems to have been little studied, and the language, imagery, and illustrations still less. The bones he brought along with him, but their arrangement, the muscles and tissues with which they were clothed, and still more the breath of life that gave them a living power, were left to the inspiration of the hour.

And well and faithfully did that inspiration serve him in his time of need. "A bold, brief, and pointed mode of expressing daring truths, sometimes by metaphor, and sometimes by antithesis, is the characteristic of his most stirring appeals. He put what he had to say into the strongest words the English tongue would afford, and, possessing a spirit as dauntless as his language, the attempt to check him invariably drew from him an indignant and defiant repetition of the offense. Hence he was a terrible antagonist, who awed his opponents by the fierceness and courage of his invectives,[1] and on popular questions roused enthusiasm by the short and vehement sentences in which he embodied the feverish passions of his hearers. It required the utmost energy of style to sustain the commanding tone he assumed, and he would have been ridiculous if he had not been sublime. Of his manner we can with difficulty form an idea from the descriptions that have come down to us, but all are agreed that every art of elocution and action aided his imposing figure and his eagle eye."

He has been accused of speaking without arguing, a thing very unusual in the British parliament. The charge is, in some respects, true. His speeches do lack the usual styles of argument, and yet they may not fail to carry conviction to the minds of the hearer. He did not move forward encumbered with the trammels of formal reasoning.[2] He presented his conclusions rather as intuitive truths than the results of logical deduction. He reached

[1] *Eclectic*, May, August, 1858, 319. [2] *British Eloquence*, 73, 74.

his point at a single bound, and could place the subject at once under such aspects and relations, as to carry its own evidence along with it. He struck on the results of an argument like a bomb-shell, that explodes when it strikes, scattering destruction around it, although no one has seen its course through the air.

This species of unpremeditated eloquence possesses obvious advantages over every other. It renders the orator armed at all points, and enables him to meet any contingency that may arise. Some of the most celebrated bursts of Lord Chatham's eloquence were called forth by an unguarded word, a laugh or a cheer. He could turn upon his adversary with the most sparkling ridicule, or burning invective, or withering sarcasm. Sometimes his wit and humor would accomplish his purpose. When the subject of the excise bill, that carried with it the right of search, was up in parliament, Mr. Pitt strongly opposed it. Mr. George Grenville on the other side claimed that the tax was unavoidable; and, looking directly at Mr. Pitt, "Why," said he, "does he not tell us where we can lay another in its stead. Tell me," and rising into a still higher strain, "tell me where you can lay another tax! Tell me where!" Mr. Pitt immediately answered him by quoting from a popular song of the day, "Gentle shepherd tell me where." The effect was irresistible, and the house baptized Mr. Grenville the Gentle Shepherd amidst the most uproarous peals of laughter that continued for several minutes. In his discussion on the same bill Mr. Pitt gave utterance to the following eloquent language: "The poorest man in his cottage may bid defiance to all the forces of the crown. It may be frail, its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storm may enter it! but the king of England cannot enter it! All his power dares not cross the threshold of that ruined tenement."

To sustain this species of eloquence, so spontaneous, and at the same time high toned in its character, two things at least are necessary, both which existed in the case of Lord Chatham. One was great depth and power of feeling in

himself. His eloquence floated upon the surface of those intense feelings that came welling up from the very depths of his soul. Their sources were exhaustless, and as long as their intense action continued, the tongue could not refuse its noble utterances. The other was found in the ascendancy which he acquired over the minds of his countrymen. "There was a fascination for all hearts in his lofty bearing; his generous sentiments; his comprehensive policy; his grand conceptions of the height to which England might be raised as arbiter of Europe; his preference of her honor over all inferior material interests."

The eloquence of Lord Chatham burst out with peculiar splendor towards the close of his life; when the "great commoner," as he was called in Europe, appears in the house of lords an old man, weak, decrepit, gouty, bowed down by years and infirmities, with a body worn out by the unceasing activities of his soul, and yet battling at the very height of his power against that narrow minded British policy that would commit the egregious error and wrong of taxing the American colonies without their consent. His brave words: "I rejoice that America has resisted," although they fell upon leaden ears in the British parliament, yet rang through the valleys of the new world and found their echoes in the heart of a young people. The proposition to let loose the savages with the scalping knife upon the North American colonists called forth from old Chatham such a burst of fervid eloquence as can hardly be equaled in the English language; and finally, it was on a question deeply affecting England and America that the old man made his last speech, falling in the field of his fame, his light shining bright at the moment of its final extinction.

The last quarter of the eighteenth century was signalized by the efforts of three giant minds in the British parliament. These were Edmund Burke, born in 1730, dying in 1797; Charles James Fox, born 1749, dying in 1806; and William Pitt, born in 1759, dying also in 1806. These three were rival statesmen and orators, and their destinies were for-

tunately cast in one of the most stirring eras in the world's history, that which was convulsed by the French revolution, and the rise of the first Napoleon. Of these three, each had a mental character, and a style of eloquence peculiar to himself.

Edmund Burke was the earlier, and when considered in every point of view, the greater, of this illustrious trio. The whole cast of his mind was eminently philosophical. He was a deep and profound scholar in everything relating to government and general law. His stores of learning were immense, and yet of all he seemed to have the most perfect command. In debate, he could pass the most rapidly from one exercise of his powers to another. He possessed the power of readily and happily transferring the results of the most laborious research, to the most familiar and popular topics. His mind was "many-sided" in its composition, and in the variety and extent of his powers, he is claimed by his admirers, to have been the greatest orator in ancient or modern times. Says one:[1] "No one ever poured forth such a flood of thought; so many original combinations of inventive genius; so much knowledge of man, and the working of political systems; so many just remarks on the relation of government to the manners, the spirit, and even the prejudices of a people; so many wise maxims as to a change in constitution and laws; so many beautiful effusions of lofty and generous sentiment; such exuberant stores of illustration, ornament, and apt allusion; all intermingled with the liveliest sallies of wit, or the boldest flights of a sublime imagination." The following was his own idea of a truly fine sentence: "It consists," said he, "in a union of thought, feeling, and imagery; of a striking truth, and a corresponding sentiment, rendered doubly striking by the force and beauty of figurative language." Thus he would draw something from the intellectual, moral, and æsthetic natures, and blend what he derived from each

[1] *British Eloquence*, 237.

into a harmonious whole. His pages afford many instances of such sentences. His style was very different of description, and even of apprehension, so subtle and evasive were its elements, and so strange the compound in it of matter of fact, speculation, and poetic eloquence. The pure, clear intellection of the philosopher, and the strong, exuberant, but generally chaste imagination of the poet, formed together its two main elements. To the largest comprehensiveness of intellect, bringing within the ken of its vision everything relating to man, and his interests, he united a subtlety so quick and delicate, that he could traverse the most complicated relations, following out the finest thread of thought through their most perplexing intricacies. The relations of agreement in things appear to have been more open to his mind, than those of difference. The great object of his life seems to have been to unfold the relations of man as a creature of society; to trace out the working of political institutions; to establish the principles of wise legislation, and to lay open the sources of national security and advancement. In the midst of debates on temporary subjects, he never altogether lost sight of his high calling, as "an orator of the human race." His great powers of generalization were derived from the amplitude, and philosophical character of his intellect. The brilliancy of his imagination, and the ceaseless play of his ingenuity, were such as sometimes to conceal the solid depth and practical bearings of his wisdom. Men, it has been said, are apt to doubt the solidity of a structure which is covered all over with flowers. Of Burke's style, Mr. Fox said: "Reduce his language,[1] withdraw his images, and you will find that he is more wise than eloquent; you will have your full weight of metal, though you melt down the chasing." In some instances his imagery stands out in too bold relief, the primary idea being lost sight of in the image; but many of his figures are so finely wrought into the texture of his

[1] *British Eloquence*, 240.

style, that they hardly appear as figures at all. In his reasonings he did not generally play the dialectician, but in most instances presented a full and complete enumeration and clear display of all the facts and principles, the analogies, relations, or tendencies, which were applicable to the case, and were adapted to settle it on the immutable basis of the nature and constitution of things.

Burke himself always claimed that he was indebted to industry rather than talent, and it is quite possible that his industry was so steadily and persistently applied, that it came finally to supply the place of talent. By this incessant labor he was at last enabled to soar at any moment to his highest elevation, as though it had been his natural level. "His very answers," says Horace Walpole, "that had sprung from what had fallen from others, were so pointed and artfully arranged that they wore the appearance of study." His conversational powers are said to have been very great and varied, which, taken in connection with his impromptu speeches, would appear to furnish evidence that he had weighed and digested his thoughts, and prepared and adjusted his language on all subjects, at the same time that impulse and excitement were ever ready to sprinkle splendid impromptus upon the stream of his speech.

It seems, however, that Burke produced a greater effect upon the readers than the hearers of his speeches. Erskine it is said, crept under the benches to escape a speech of his, which, when published he thumbed to rags; and Pitt and Grenville decided not to answer another, which when published they regarded as one of his noblest efforts. This arose from several causes. His gestures were awkward: his countenance, though intellectual, was severe; his enunciation was vehement and rapid; his accent was decidedly Irish; his voice in his calmer moods was harsh, but when he became excited so hoarse as to be hardly intelligible. He pursued a mode of treating subjects entirely different from the ordinary one.[1] A speaker ordinarily unfolds his

[1] *Electic Magazine*, August, 1858, 319.

ideas and opinions in the same manner in which he himself arrived at them and enforces upon others the same arguments which were convincing to his own understanding. But Burke drew his conclusions from a wide survey of history and human nature, from enlarged principles which looked beyond the expedients and the passions of the hour. Upon bases like these he founded his views of present policy. His hearers, wholly absorbed in the passing events, naturally disliked anything so out of harmony with their own habits of thought.

This deficiency, if it may be called so, in the oratory of Edmund Burke, was entirely supplied by that of his great rival, Charles James Fox. He was the second son of the first Lord Holland, and in his training for public life his father aimed to make him a leader in fashionable dissipation, and also an orator and a statesman, and, surprising as it may be, succeeded very well in both.

Of all the orators of modern times who have raised their voices in the British parliament, Fox was the most thoroughly English. Nothing of the classical entered into his composition. His make was English; thick set, broad shoulders, capacious chest, bushy hair and eyebrows, and dark countenance, every lineament of which could work with emotion. His intellect was English in all its workings. It was plain, practical, dealing in facts as its great staples; moving with prodigious force towards certain definite ends and objects. To that strong common sense view which was the work of his intellect, he added the genuine emotions of a heart capable of infinite tenderness. His countenance could lighten up with more than mortal ardor and goodness, and his voice be suffocated with tears. His feeling, says one, was all intellect, and his intellect was all feeling. He had thus strong bonds of sympathy with his fellow men.

His style of eloquence grew out of the elements of his character. It was plain, simple, direct, strong, bold, and severe. His words were the homely Saxon, but they were words of power. He seldom resorted to the labor of

devising a method, or prearranging his thoughts, having made himself familiar with the topics which he was to discuss. He had mastered his facts, he had studied his arguments, and was at home in his subject; but everything appeared like the instantaneous outpouring of his mind. His opening speeches were almost always bad. He hesitated and stammered until he got warmed with his subject. His style always lacked polish and exactness, but never vigor or power. When fairly launched, he appeared forgetful of himself and everything around him. He imparted to his audience a portion of the energy which himself possessed. There is a rough vigor and animation in his phraseology, a force or plausibility in his reasoning, and a fertility in his counter arguments, which would be very effective during the raging of the contest. He spoke to partisans for present effect, and rarely failed in producing it. He was very fortunate in hits, or abrupt and startling turns of thought, which serve to electrify an audience. He also dealt with great effect side blows, consisting in dashes made at his antagonist while passing. He had also a habit at times of enlivening his oratory by exercising a dramatic faculty, personating the character of his opponents, and then carrying on a dialogue between them.

He dealt much less in the abstract than Burke. His great force lay in the concrete. His discussion of principles was always in direct connection with the matters then before the house. He went directly to the point at issue. No circumlocution, no feints or skirmishing. He struck at the heart of his subject at once, fully aware that if the citadel surrendered the out-posts would inevitably follow. He had not the teeming knowledge, the enlarged views, the prophetic vision, the exuberant imagination, or the lofty eloquence of Burke; but he surpassed him as a party leader, or rather as a party debater.[1] He originated no grand strategic movements; his fights were hand to hand

[1] *Eclectic Magazine*, August, 1858, 32.

with his opponents, and hence the interest which attached to them at the time, and the gradual failure of it since. He had a habit of returning again and again to the strong points of his case. He was deemed the most formidable in reply, his habit being to state one by one the arguments of the opposition, and this he would do with such clearness, and place them in such an advantageous light, that his friends were often alarmed lest he should fail to answer them.

In almost every respect the antipode of Fox was his great antagonist, William Pitt, sometimes called the younger Pitt, to distinguish him from his father, the "great commoner," afterwards Earl of Chatham. He was carefully educated by his father, and early became master of the Greek and Latin tongues. These languages, together with the historical, poetical, and oratorical treasures they contain, became early his favorite study. He attributed his readiness of speech to the practice enjoined on him by his father of reading a book in some foreign language, turning it into English as he went along, and pausing when he was at a loss for a fitting word until the right expression came. He had to stop often at first, but acquired fluency by degrees; so that finally when he entered public life he seldom or never hesitated in the choice of a word:

The younger Pitt was bred an orator. He early practiced himself in debate; was, when a boy, an attentive listener to the debates in parliament, and when he entered the arena in earnest, he was immediately hailed as a champion. His first triumph came with his first speech. In appearance he was very different from Fox. He was tall and slender, with features somewhat harsh, but lighted up with intelligence by the flashes of an eye which with him was an instrument of great power. His gestures were animated but devoid of grace. His articulation was remarkably full and clear, filling the house with the volume of sound.

Mr. Pitt's great reputation, that for which he is principally known, rests upon a foundation entirely different from that either of Burke or Fox. It is upon his ministe-

rial course. He entered the ministry at the early age of twenty-three, and his influence there continued to be felt during the whole of his after life. During quite a portion of it he presided at the helm, and the ship of state was under his guidance. His financial policy inaugurated a new era in European politics. It might, perhaps, not be too much to say that the commencement and prosecution of that policy saved Europe from being submerged beneath the surging outbursts of the French revolution, as subsequently guided and directed by the first Napoleon. True, it has left entailed upon the British empire a national debt of such gigantic proportion as to render its ultimate payment a problem of difficult solution. But even that may have some advantage in consolidating and binding together more indissolubly, the different interests of that great empire.

We have, however, to do with Pitt only as an orator, and here he was quite the reverse of Fox, and differing very considerably from Burke. Instead of losing himself in the vehement action of his own powers, he was cold, formal, artificial, and always fully self-possessed. In his speeches there are no sallies of passion, no vehement apostrophies. His very simplicity was studied, and his energy was an educated one. He supplied the place of repetition, so frequently practiced by Fox, by a redundancy in his style. Unlike Burke he presented few images, and scattered few flowers of rhetoric through his speeches. They were, however, always animated, elegant and classical. He lacked the brilliancy and occasional flashes of eloquence of old Chatham, but his speeches were logical and argumentative. His style was well regulated, firm, and reasonable. When he desired to be explicit he unfolded his statements with perfect lucidness and distinctness. He never indulged in the colloquial manner of Fox, and deemed the fanciful imagery of Burke unsuited to the business of debate. He did occasionally indulge in the sportiveness of irony, but usually sought no other aid than such as could be derived from a well arranged and

extensive knowledge of his subject. With an understanding bold and comprehensive, his eloquence, occasionally rapid, electric and vehement, was always chaste, winning and persuasive.

Contemporary with these three was Richard Brinsley Sheridan, who was superior to Pitt in the comedy of debate. He had many accomplishments. The ridiculous, pathetic, and sublime, each reached a climax in him. But his powers of mind exceeded his acquisitions. He had a great reputation for wit, yet no one ever arrived at it more laboriously. He never attained the parliamentary influence exercised either by Burke, Fox or Pitt; but his speech on the impeachment of Warren Hastings is one of great eloquence and power.

Coming down to a period more recent in the history of British eloquence, we encounter George Canning and Lord Brougham. These two have been contrasted with each other in the following beautiful and forcible manner:

"Canning was airy, open, and prepossessing;[1] Brougham seemed stern, hard, lowering, and almost repulsive. Canning's features were handsome, and his eye, though deeply ensconced under his eyebrows, was full of sparkle and gayety; the features of Brougham were harsh in the extreme. While his forehead shot up to a great elevation, his chin was long and square; his mouth, nose and eyes seemed huddled together in the centre of his face, the eyes absolutely lost amid folds and corrugations; and while he sat listening, they seemed to retire inward, or to be vailed by a filmy curtain, which not only concealed the appalling glare which shot from them when he was aroused, but rendered his mind and his purpose a sealed book to the keenest scrutiny of man. Canning's passions appeared upon the open campaign of his face, drawn up in ready array, and moved to and fro at every turn of his own oration, and every retort in that of his antagonist. Those of Brougham remained within, as in a citadel which no

[1] *British Eloquence*, 888, 889.

artillery could batter and no mine blow up; and even when he was putting forth all the power of his eloquence, when every ear was tingling at what he said, and while the immediate object of his invective was writhing in helpless and indescribable agony, his visage retained its cold and brassy hue; and he triumphed over the passions of other men by seeming to be without passion himself. When Canning rose to speak, he elevated his countenance, and seemed to look round for applause as a thing dear to his feelings; while Brougham stood coiled and concentrated, reckless of all but the power that was within himself.

"From Canning there was expected the glitter of wit and the glow of spirit—something showy and elegant; Brougham stood up as a being whose powers and intentions were all a mystery, whose aim and effect no living man could divine. You bent forward to catch the first sentence of the one, and felt human nature elevated, in the specimen before you; you crouched and shrunk back from the other, and dreams of ruin and annihilation darted across your mind. The one seemed to dwell among men, to join in their joys, and to live upon their praise; the other appeared a son of the desert, who had deigned to visit the human race merely to make it tremble at his strength.

"The style of their eloquence, and the structure of their orations were just as different. Canning arranged his words like one who could play skillfully upon that sweetest of all instruments, the human voice; Brougham proceeded like a master of every power of reasoning and the understanding. The modes and allusions of the one were always quadrupled by the classical formula; those of the other could be squared only by the higher analysis of the mind; and they soared, and ran and pealed, and swelled on and on, till a single sentence was often a complete oration within itself; but still so clear was the logic, and so close the connection, that every member carried the weight of all that went before, and opened the way for all that was to follow after. The style of Canning was like the convex mirror, which scatters every ray of light that falls upon it,

and shines and sparkles in whatever position it is viewed; that of Brougham was like the concave speculum, scattering no indiscriminate radiance, but having its light concentrated into one intense and tremendous focus. Canning marched forward in a straight and clear track; every paragraph was perfect in itself, and every corruscation of wit and of genius was brilliant and delightful; it was all felt, and it was felt all at once. Brougham twined round and round in a spiral, sweeping the contents of a vast circumference before him, and uniting and pouring them onward to the main point of attack.

"Such were the rival orators who sat glancing hostility and defiance at each other during the session of eighteen hundred and twenty-three. Brougham, as if wishing to overthrow the secretary by a sweeping accusation of having abandoned all principle for the sake of office; and the secretary ready to parry the charge and attack in his turn. An opportunity at length offered. Upon that occasion the oration of Brougham was disjointed and ragged, and apparently without aim or application. He careered over the whole annals of the world, and collected every instance in which genius had prostituted itself at the footstool of power, or principle had been sacrificed for the vanity or the lucre of place: but still there was no allusion to Canning; and no connection, that ordinary men could discover, with the business before the house. When, however, he had collected every material which suited his purpose, when the mass had become big and black, he bound it about and about with the cords of illustration and argument; when its union was secure, he swung it round and round with the strength of a giant, and the rapidity of a whirlwind, in order that its impetus and its effects might be the more tremendous; and while doing this, he ever and anon glared his eye, and pointed his finger, to make the aim and the direction sure. Canning was the first that seemed to be aware, where and how terrible was to be the collision; and he kept writhing his body in agony and rolling his eye in fear, as if anxious to find some shelter

from the impending bolt. The house soon caught the impression, and every man in it was glancing fearfully, first toward the orator, and then toward the secretary. There was, save the voice of Brougham, which growled in that undertone of muttered thunder which is so fearfully audible, and of which no speaker of the day was fully master but himself, a silence as if the angel of retribution had been flaring in the faces of all parties the scroll of their personal and political sins. The stiffness of Brougham's figure had vanished; his features seemed concentrated almost to a point; he glanced toward every part of the house in succession; and, sounding the death knell of the secretary's forbearance and prudence with both his clinched hands upon the table, he hurled at him an accusation more dreadful in its gall, and more torturing in its effects, than had ever been hurled at mortal man within the same walls. The result was instantaneous, was electric. It was as when the thunder cloud descends upon the giant peak; one flash, one peal; the sublimity vanished, and all that remained was a small and cold pattering of rain. Canning started to his feet, and was able only to utter the unguarded words, 'It is false!' to which followed a dull chapter of apologies."

The British bar would probably present Thomas Erskine as its ablest and most eloquent representative. Lord Campbell holds him as an advocate in the forum to be without an equal in ancient or modern times. He had about equal power with the court and with the jury. It was said "he had invented a machine by the secret use of which, in court, he could make the head of a judge nod assent to his propositions; whereas his rivals, who tried to pirate it, always made the same head move from side to side." "He always grasped a cause so firmly, that he never forgot a principle or a decision, an analogy or a fact which made for his client, while he showed infinite dexterity in avoiding the difficulties of his case, and turning to his own advantage the unexpected disclosures which sometimes came out in the progress of the trial." His speeches in the case of the "Dean

of St. Asaph," of Stockdale," and in the case "of Hadfield,"[1] may be referred to as being in the highest and best styles of forensic eloquence. He did not succeed equally well as lord chancellor, or in the British parliament.

There are three Irish orators of distinguished note, besides those like Burke of Irish descent, but whose forum of effort was England. These were Henry Grattan, born in 1746, and dying in 1820; John Philpot Curran, born in 1750, and dying in 1817; and Daniel O'Connell of our own day. The eloquence of each one of these had its own peculiar forum.

That of Henry Grattan was the senate, the Irish and British parliament. While a boy he listened to the eloquence of Lord Chatham, which charmed his mind, determined his destiny. In personal appearance he was short and unprepossessing, his arms disproportionately long, and his person having a pendulum-like swing. But his speeches give evidence of a powerful intellect, and an original genius. His mind gave birth to its own creations, exhibiting both condensation and rapidity of thought. His reasoning was strong, forcible and striking. It has been termed "logic on fire," and his eloquence characterized as a "combination of cloud, whirlwind and flame." His style abounds in metaphors, and is full of antitheses, which give it great point and brilliancy. It presents the following excellencies. His language is select, terse, and expressive. His periods easy and fluent, made up of short clauses, having few qualifications all uniting in the expression of some one leading thought, while his rhythmus is often uncommonly fine.

Curran was a most wonderful man. He was short, swarthy, with a countenance singularly expressive, gestures bold and impassioned, articulation distinct and deliberate, voice of varied power of modulation, and "an eye that glowed like a live coal."[2] He was a natural orator. "In splendor of imagination, richness of fancy, and creative power; in exuberant humor, melting pathos,

[1] *British Eloquence*, 634. [2] *Eclectic Magazine*, September, December, 1857, 43.

caustic irony, cutting sarcasm, and brilliant wit; in exquisite perception of character, and deep knowledge of human nature, in the witchery of his manner, and absolute mastery over the varied passions of the human heart; in capability of adapting himself to the capacity of his audience, and command over their attention; in promptitude, dexterity and force; in the variety, versatility, and extent of his powers, he excelled all his contemporaries, Grattan not excepted." He greatly distinguished himself in the Irish parliament, but the bar witnessed the highest and noblest efforts of his oratory. There his pleadings were called forth by times of great excitement. Rebellion was in arms. Society seemed falling in fragments around him. He defended the criminals in the great state trials of that period. He went to dungeons for his instructions from his clients. In his pleadings he stood on the threshold of the scaffold. His batteries were unmasked in the very jaws of death. In his defense of Rowan his burst of eloquence upon universal emancipation has no superior in the English language. That, and other bursts upon like occasions, will bear the name of Curran down to a late posterity.

It may not be out of place to remark here that Ireland is the favored land of eloquence. The Irish parliament, and bar, and popular assembly, stand next to the bema at Athens and the rostrum of Rome. The warm impulses, easily excited feelings, and glowing thoughts of the Irish people lead very naturally to this result.

This brings us to the great agitator, the tribune of the people, Daniel O'Connell, the man of our own times, who is not indebted to tradition for his splendor, but to the broad daylight of our own vision. He has achieved great distinction in the British parliament, but it is in the vast assemblages of the Irish people, when he stands forth the impersonation of that people, with an action, and an eloquence, and a power, all Irish in its character, and overarched by the skies of his own beloved Erin, that he reveals the elements of a power never before witnessed in the Emerald isle. Greater than the old Irish kings from

whom he derived his descent, carrying about with him not even the semblance of any authority, we have seen him wielding a power over the people of Ireland, greater than any monarch or legislative assembly ever exercised. Keeping himself strictly within the limits of the law, appealing solely to moral force doctrine, which asserts the subordination of the physical and brutal to the spiritual and rational in human nature, he has left behind him no blood-stained record, but one which eminently entitles him to the gratitude of posterity.

If the question is asked why modern eloquence has not come up to the ancient, why no Athenian bema, and no Roman rostrum has been upreared in modern times, it may perhaps be replied that no occasion for them has really existed. The eloquence which is great and overpowering has proceeded from the disasters of society. The light which it sheds is upon society in terrible commotion if not in incipient dissolution. No Demosthenes ever trod the bema of Athens, until the corruscations of his eloquence were required to shed their light upon the liberties of Greece, just upon the point of utter and hopeless extinction. No Cicero ever mounted the Roman rostrum, until his eloquent accents could mingle with the wail that went up on the extinction of Roman virtue, and Roman liberty. When Great Britain shall have performed the mission assigned to her in history; when her people shall have become steeped in a corruption deeper than that which has sometimes tainted her rulers; when the pillars of her social and her political edifice are giving way under the weight that oppresses them, and her rights and liberties, of which she now so proudly boasts, are becoming the prey of the spoiler; then may we expect an eloquence more fervid and glowing than that of Demosthenes, more beautiful and flowing than that of Cicero, to pour one beam of unclouded reason, to emit one gleam of undying radiance upon the struggles that precede the extinction of life in the state and the people.

MIXED ARTS.

THE DRAMATIC ART.

Of the two mixed arts the first is the art dramatic, which appeals both to the eye and the ear. To the former by its scenic representations, and the arts of its living personages, with their costumes, masks, and mimicry; to the latter by the sentiments they utter, and the characters they are made to assume. This is strictly not only a mixed, but a double art; the one part of it relating to the construction and development of the drama, which is the work of the poet; the other to the scenic arrangements, and the faithful impersonation of character involved in style and manner of utterance and gesture, which is the work of the actor. Both are developments of the art principle. Our attention will be confined to the former, dismissing the latter with the single remark, that its perfection consists in the complete exercise of the imitative faculty combined with the power of mentally transforming themselves into the very characters they are endeavoring to represent.

The drama is the outgrowth of social life as developed in large cities. The wants and necessities of society there call it into existence, and exert great and even controlling influence over its direction and development. In that view it constitutes a very correct barometer, by which the social progress of a people in some points may be very readily ascertained. It is, therefore, only in the metropoles of great nations, and those continuing such for some period of time, that the drama may be expected to arrive at its higher stages of development. It is for this reason that the theatres of Madrid, Paris, and London, revelled in a full century of splendor; arriving each in its own way to

perfection, long before those of Italy or Germany had achieved much distinction. In those great cities was found the aliment so necessary so call out the drama with all its necessary accompaniments. The scenic arrangements require both money and taste. The full power of the drama can only be exerted where the influence and results of the most advanced civilization are the most strongly felt. This has always occurred in large cities, the capitals of great kingdoms or empires.

The origin and development of the drama in modern Europe, have constantly brought to view two systems of ideas which have been designated as the classical and the romantic.[1] The former has, by common consent, been bestowed upon every literary production belonging to the Roman or the Grecian school. The Grecian drama served as a foundation for the Roman. The overthrow of the political power of Rome did not destroy the arts which had grown up under its protection. These commanded the respect and reverence, and served as models of imitation for the barbarians. In the drama they took such firm hold of the Italian and French mind, as seemingly to acquire a perpetuity in the literature of each. The laws prescribed to the drama by Aristotle, more especially the three unities of time, place, and action, have ever since maintained their sway in the theatres of Italy and France. The term classical conveys the idea of great purity and perfection of taste. So far has this been carried by the French critics more especially, that such purity and perfection have only been conceded within their own canons, rules, and laws.

The romantic is a term derived from the Romance language, the language of the troubadours, that which the civilization of the Romance nations first appropriated as the organ through which to make their utterances known to the world. These nations, deeply imbued with the ideas and the feelings of the middle ages, chose rather to

[1] *Sismondi*, II, 235.

seek in their own antiquities for what should constitute their drama, than to go to those of Greece or Rome. We include within these the Teutonic nations, and thus Spain, England, and Germany have invoked each its own old popular traditions, formed its own style of chivalric poetry, and enacted in its own dramas those representations which were dearest to the popular heart, in accordance with those rules, canons, and laws, which met the approval of the popular taste.

The earliest dramatic exhibitions proceeding from the romantic system of ideas were those termed mysteries, or miracle plays. These were especially under the management of the clergy, and are supposed to have had their origin in the representations given by the pilgrims on their return from the Holy Land. The subjects taken for these representations were mostly taken from the Bible, and were the principal supernatural events of the Old and New Testaments, and of the history of the saints. These representations were performed in the open street as early as the twelfth or thirteenth century. Finally they were represented in a theatre composed of an elevated scaffold,[1] divided into three parts, heaven, hell, and the earth which was located between them. Jerusalem was sometimes represented in this central portion, whither angels were made to descend or devils to ascend, according to the parts they were respectively called upon to perform. The higher and lower parts of the theatre were given respectively to the deity and Lucifer for their separate performances.

Among the most celebrated of these mysteries was the Passion of our Saviour,[2] which was the most ancient dramatic work of modern Europe, and comprehended the whole history of our Lord from his baptism to his death. It was continued from day to day, the labors or the representations of each being comprised in one journée, which term continued to retain its place in the Spanish language after its abandonment in France. In this mys-

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 184. [2] *Idem*, 177.

tery appeared no less than eighty-seven characters, among whom were the three persons of the trinity, six angels, or archangels, the twelve apostles, six devils, Herod and his whole court, and a host of other personages. Many of the scenes were recited to music. Choruses seem also to have been present, and no doubt the grand and the imposing were largely exhibited in this terrible drama. Out of it issued both the tragedy and the comedy.[1] The latter was derived more especially from the dialogues of the devils, who were made to fill all the comic parts of the drama. The pungency with which these latter give each other a wipe always largely excited the laughter of the assembly.

The mystery of the passion was followed by that of the conception, that of the nativity, and of the resurrection. Then follow the legends of the saints also dramatized and prepared for the theatre, so that in its turn almost all the Old and New Testaments were brought upon the stage. In dramatizing the legends of the saints the most ample scope was given for gratifying the strong desires of the men and women of that era in witnessing the endurance of pain. Various styles of martyrdom were exhibited on the stage. The art of the machinist was also called into requisition. An immense dragon, with eyes of polished steel, in a mystery exhibited at Metz in 1437, sprung out from hell, and spread his wings so near the spectators as to create among them the greatest consternation.[2] One of the English mysteries called "the harrowing of hell" has been termed "the most ancient production in a dramatic form in our language," and is referred to as early a period as the reign of Edward III.[3] No less personages than the Lord, Satan, Adam, Eve, etc., figure in it. The Chester mysteries have been referred to the year 1327. These have not much dramatic merit, some of them being in the lowest style of buffoonery.

Next to the mysteries or miracle plays, came the moralities. These originated with the clerks of the

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 182. [2] *Hallam's Literature*, I, 170. [3] *Idem*, 169.

revels, an incorporated society in Paris, who, being charged with the duty of regulating the public festivities, resolved to amuse the people with dramatic representations. as the fraternity of the passion had previously received the royal license to represent mysteries, and the clerks were, therefore, compelled to refrain from that kind of exhibition,[1] they set to work and invented the moralities, which were also borrowed from the historical parts, or the parables of the Bible. In these, persons representing sentiments and abstract ideas, such as mercy, justice, truth, were introduced upon the stage, and chiefly or wholly composed the dramatis personæ. These endeavored to convey sound moral lessons, and at the same time they gave occasion to poetical and dramatic ingenuity, in the getting up of appropriate characters, and assigning to each the proper action and speech. These in England fall within the period of Henry VIII, and the following are the names of some of the plays, viz: The Cradle of Security, Hit the Nail on the Head, Impatient Poverty, Marriage of Wisdom and Wit. Acting about this time first became a distinct profession,[2] clergymen, school-boys, and members of trading corporations, having previously been the performers.

These clerks were also the inventors of comedy. They were not ecclesiastics, and they did not, like the fraternity of the passion, consider themselves limited to the exhibition of matters serious and solemn. They, therefore, mingled with their moralities, farces,[3] having it for their sole object to excite the laughter of the spectators. The versification of these was managed with great care, and one of them, the Avocat Pathelin, first represented in 1480, is still regarded as a model of French gayety and comic powers. With some remodeling it is represented at the present day.

The moralities were deemed an improvement upon the mysteries, but these latter could not long maintain their

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 185. [2] *Chambers's Encyclopædia*, I, 163. [3] *Sismondi*, I, 185.

interest. As the actors represented mere notions of the mind, it was soon found that although they might be valuable vehicles for the conveyance of moral truth, yet they failed to awaken the sympathies, and keep alive the attention of an audience. To do this required a real human being, with a human name, and the conviction of this truth once thoroughly entertained, led to a new era in the history of the stage, and to the origin and devolopment of the different kinds of drama. We shall now briefly consider the development of the dramatic art among the different peoples and nations of Europe, viz:

1. Among the Italians.
2. Among the Spaniards.
3. In France,
4. In Germany.
5. In England.

The Italian Drama.

The ruins of the Roman empire kept the arts entombed until the beginning of the twelfth century. The dramatic art was still later in starting into existence, but for quite a long period the mysteries or moralities, performed either by the clergy or under their direction, were the only exhibitions of this art with which the people were indulged. The father of Italian tragedy was Trissino, who was born at Vicenza in 1478, and died in 1550. His Sofonisba, published in 1524, is considered as the first regular tragedy since the revival of letters. Trissino had thoroughly imbibed the spirit of the Greek drama, and this work while it marks the point of revival of the dramatic art, may also be regarded as the last of the tragedies of antiquity. It was formed upon the Greek model; not divided into acts and scenes; but the chorus, who constantly occupy the stage, and mingle in the dialogue, sing when left alone, odes and lyric stanzas, which, by dividing the action, give repose to the piece. He has even preserved the variety of

the Greek metres, "the usual language of his heroes is in verso sciotto, blank verse; but according to the passions which he wishes to express, he soars to the most varied forms of the ode, or canzone, and by this more poetical language, he proves that the pleasure of the drama consists not wholly in the imitation of nature,[1] but also in the ideal beauty of that poetic world, which the author substitutes for it." This tragedy crossed the Alps and found its way into France, and from it the French learned to practice the rules of dramatic art. Contemporaneously with this tragedy appears the Rosmunda of Rucellai, a tragedy in the Italian language, and also constructed on the ancient model.

After these first tragic lispings of the Italian muse, a long period seems to have intervened in which the dramatic art scarcely made itself felt in the Italian peninsula. The rules of Aristotle were strictly observed, and the tragical abortions are described "as distorted, complicated, improbable plots, misconception of scenic regulations, useless personages, double actions, inconsistency of character, gigantic or childish thoughts,[2] feeble verses, affected phrases, the total absence of harmonious and natural poetry; and all this decked out with ill-timed descriptions and similes, or idle, philosophical and political disquisitions, in every scene some silly amour with all the trite insipidity of common place gallantry, of tragic strength, of the conflict of passions, of overpowering threatrical catastrophes, not the smallest trace."

The Italian comedy originated nearly at the same time with its tragedy. Two of these were written by Ariosto as early as 1495, which were also in imitation of the ancients. The one of them, the Gli Intrichi d'A more crowds so large a number of events within the narrow limit of five acts, that one incident is made to tread closely upon the heels of another without the least development, which gives an extreme degree of hardness to the whole.[3] About the

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 326. [2] *Schlegel's Dramatic Literature*, I, 300. [3] *Lectures on Dramatic Literature*, I, 315.

same time Machiavelli, the illustrious Florentine, produced three comedies, which by the novelty of the plot,[1] by the strength and vivacity of the dialogues, and by their admirable delineation of character, have equaled if not surpassed anything Italy has produced in the comic line. A little later Aretino, although a man of infamous character, yet possessed the power of infusing into his comedies a genuine dramatic talent, an originality, and often a gayety, rarely met with in the early dramatic writers of Italy.[2] His great merit lies in depicting human nature just as he saw it, with all its vices and all its deformity as displayed in a corrupted age.

Machiavelli and Aretino wrought a change in comedy. Abandoning the rules which critics pretended to deduce from the ancients, and following the promptings of their own genius, they delineated modern manners and vices, and thus gave a new impulse to comic exhibitions.[3]

To Maffei born at Verona in 1675, Metastasio born at Rome in 1698 and to Goldoni born at Venice in 1707, the dramatic art in Italy is largely indebted for its development. The first is the most celebrated for his Merope, a tragedy composed in blank verse, and written without a syllable of love, and without adopting the romantic taste which prevailed in the drama of France.[4] He creates and sustains throughout a lively interest, by the danger to which a mother exposes her only son, under the the idea that she is about to avenge him.

Metastasio was not strictly a tragedian. He was the poet of the opera. He possessed a vivid imagination, and united great refinement of feeling with every charm of versification and expression. He composed twenty-eight grand operas,[5] borrowing his subjects almost indiscriminately from mythology or history, and bringing upon the stage most of the different people and different countries, belonging to the ancient world. He attained among Italians the celebrity of a classic by the great purity, clear-

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 343. [2] *Idem*, 345. [3] *Idem*, 347. [4] *Idem*, 410. [5] *Idem*, 384.

ness, elegance, and sweetness of his language, and more especially by the softness of his melody and the loveliness of his songs.[1] The songs with which his characters make their exit are almost always the purest musical extract of their state of mind which can possibly be given.[2] He is musical throughout, possessing, however, only that part of music termed melody, without any knowledge of harmony, or the effects of counterpoint. His melodies are light and pleasant, and repeated with small variation. He rendered himself the delight of his contemporaries by a certain melting effeminacy in feeling and expression. He seldom has choruses, and his airs are almost always for a single voice. The emotions he wished to excite were all in reference to music, and were never intended to leave violent or painful impressions on the mind. His dramas open with imposing effect, and are full of magnificence and attractions.

Goldoni brings us back to Italian comedy of which he appeared as a reformer, He found two styles of comedy occupying the Italian theatre, viz: the classical and the art comedies. The former were the productions of the closet, and were constructed upon Aristotelian rules. The latter were produced by the comedians, and were chiefly extemporary, or had presented originally a very slight outline, which the actor himself was intended to fill up at his pleasure.[3] This could be traced back to the sixteenth century, and from being at first only an extempore dialogue between a quack and his fellow, assumed by degrees the form of a comedy. The pieces were not written before hand, but a certain character was assigned to each actor. This gave rise to the invention of the masks of pantaloon, the doctor, and harlequin, and columbine,[4] who, as they always preserved the same characters, found them all the more easy to support. An actor who was always a pantaloon or a harlequin, was habitually prepared to play his part, so

[1] *Dramatic Literature, Schlegel*, 304. [2] *Idem*, 304. [3] *Sismondi*, I, 348. [4] *Idem*, 414, 415,

that a mere sketch, a bare outline, was all he required, with the liberty of putting a finish to his natural humor in his own way. These outline performances prevailed during the whole of the seventeenth, and the greatest part of the eighteenth century, and were carried from Italy into France.

The reform introduced by Goldoni consisted in substituting his own written productions in the place of the extempore performances of the actors, but at the same time contriving to approach as near to the comedies of art as he possibly could.[1] He retained in many of his plays all the masks of Italian comedy, leaving each in the possession of the character assigned to him by tradition. The Italians regard him as having carried the dramatic art in Italy to its highest point of perfection. He remained almost exclusively in possession of the comic stage. He had sufficient fertility of invention to supply him with subjects for his comic muse, and also great facility of composition. His dialogue was animated, earnest, and full of meaning. He possessed a very complete knowledge of the national manners, and the rare faculty of giving a lively representation of them on the stage. His pictures of manners, although true, are not much elevated above the range of every day life. He had also an exquisite relish of Italian humor, which delights in amusing pictures of absurdity, and in the genius of the buffoon.

Other comedians subsequently appeared in Italy, but none whom it seems necessary to mention. The tragic muse that had scarcely taken a step in advance since the Merope of Maffei, at length found in Alfieri a person worthy of her full inspiration. This remarkable man wrote from the impulse of his own soul. His vivid emotions flowed from his feelings not from his imagination. He did not substitute himself in the place of his hero, and then write and act in accordance with the various impressions by which he felt himself impressed. On the contrary, he

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 416.

remains always himself, and hence has less variety of incident, and often degenerates into monotony.

He has, nevertheless, done a great work for Italian tragedy. He found the Italian drama inferior to that of any other European nation. He invoked the spirit of the great French tragedians, and seizing upon the properties of the French drama, art, unity, singleness of subject, and probability, he united them to the sublimity of situation and character,[1] and the important events of the Greek theatre, and to the profound thought and sentiment of the English stage. Rescuing tragedy from the saloons of courts, he aimed to give it perfect freedom in the development of all its hidden resources. He regarded the gallantry of romances,[2] the effeminacy of pastorals, the point of honor of chivalry, as so many masks imposed upon nature, which concealed from view all true feelings and passions. These masks he tore away, and has attempted to exhibit man on the stage in his real greatness and true relations. He also rejected most of the machinery that had found employment upon the stage, such as departed spirits, thunder and lightning, celestial interference, love letters, crosses, funeral piles, locks of hair,[3] and other things of a similar character, that had so often appeared upon the stage. He introduced the action by lively and passionate dialogue, and, where it was possible, placed the catastrophe under the eyes of the spectator, terminating the action on the stage. His tragedies are monotonous, characters of the same class being mingled together, and many times those of different classes bearing a strong resemblance to each other. This could not easily be avoided, as every character was a transcript of his own mind. His method of explaining events and the passions and views of his characters, was by soliloquies, which afford us an insight into the hearts of the personages.

One great feature observable about all his tragedies was uniformity. The structure of one afforded a specimen of

[1] *Sismondi*, I, 456. [2] *Idem*, 457. [3] *Idem*, 461.

that of all, as they all appear to be formed upon the same model, which he seems to have had constantly before his eyes. He observed generally the unity of place, and always that of action with the most scrupulous rigor.

He differed from all his predecessors in his style. Instead of being harmonious, soft, and flexible; abounding in ornament and brilliant images, his was characterized by harshness, hardness and abruptness. He avoided ornament and figurative expression; was sententious and laconic; the most close and concise of poets, never admitting an inefficient line. His style, however, was not uniform throughout. His dramas have been distributed into three classes, distinguished by the period of their publication, as also by the various alterations made to suit the successive changes in his system.

Alfieri effected a great change in the Italian drama. Before his time the theatre in Italy had long been considered the school of intrigue, of languor, of effeminacy, and of servility. It was too much like the French drama under Louis XIV. "Superficial splendor without depth; prosaic sentiments and thoughts decked out with a choice poetical language; a courtly moderation in everything, in the display of passion,[1] and in the exhibition of misfortune and crime; the pomp of noble sentiments closely followed by traits of baseness, perpetrated with levity." The sudden appearance of Alfieri awoke the Italian mind to the consciousness of a higher life. He attempted to throw off the yoke under which the human intellect had labored, and every high minded Italian felt united to him by the bonds of mutual sympathy. He inspired a taste for the noblest species of tragedy,[2] and mingled with it the love of glory and liberty. He struck a chord in the Italian heart, and its response was cheering. The first Italians now regarded the theatre as the muse of mental vigor, honor and public virtue. They united in applauding the elevation, nobleness

[1] *Lectures on Dramatic Literature*, I, 306. [2] *Sismondi*, II, 5.

and energy of Alfieri's sentiments, and opinions burst forth like the long suppressed voice of public feeling.

The Spanish Drama.

The riches of the Spanish drama contrasts strongly with the poverty of the Italian. Spain, however, could boast a capital city, a class of nobility and at one period a national prestige second to no other in Europe. It was not until the sixteenth century, the reign of Charles V, that the Spanish drama began to flourish.[1] In the beginning of that century appears Torres Naharro, the inventor of the Spanish comedy. He wrote in the romance style, and endeavored to establish the dramatic interest on an ingenious combination of intrigues, without much reference to the development of character, or the moral tendency of the story. He first divided plays into three acts, called jornadas, being regarded as three days' labor in the dramatic field. The Spanish national drama not only derived from him its commencement, but also traveled onward in the direction which he gave it until its culmination in the works of Calderon.

There was in the Spanish drama no servile imitation of the ancients. A new course in dramatic literature was struck out.[2] What particularly distinguished the Spanish drama was invention, grace, ingenious arrangement, and a certain art of involving and unraveling the plot. To satisfy the popular taste was required the most varied mixture of the serious and the comic, of intrigues, sallies of the imagination and ingenious thoughts, of surprises and animated situations. But the taste of the grave Spaniard demanded nothing of moral effect from their drama.[3] Why was this? Because the ecclesiastical fetters which bound down the conscience, afforded so little freedom to the mind, that he could not endure moral reflection on the stage.

[1] *Bouterwek*, I, 277, 285. [2] *Idem*, 291. [3] *Idem*, 295.

As a good catholic Christian, he could submit implicitly his understanding to the doctrines and mandates of the church; but as a man, he longed for amusements in which his heart might revel unconfined, with no moral thought to remind him of the inquisition.

It may be owing to this strong reaction and protest of the human mind against the slavery thus imposed upon it, that everything in the way of amusement, whether it be a bull fight or a theatrical performance, has been so greedily seized upon by the Spaniard. Possessed of an ardent and enthusiastic temperament, which a genial climate was ever constantly increasing, he was always eager to partake of pleasures which no king or grand inquisitor could disturb. Hence he demanded a dramatic entertainment in which the wildest revels of the imagination and a succession of joyous and luxuriant forms could agitate and interest the mind,[1] and free it from all the fetters of maxims and rules of art. He sought in the theatre a variegated ideal world, a diversified picture of romantic existence, and one in which the sterner realities of the life he was leading had very little, if anything, to do.

The first advances of the dramatic art in Spain were made in the last half of the sixteenth century; and it ceased to flourish with the end of the seventeenth. The various epochs of formation and development of the Spanish drama may be designated from the names of three Spanish writers, Cervantes, Lope de Vega, and Calderon.

The first mentioned of these, more celebrated as the author of Don Quixote, was born in poverty and obscurity in 1549. He had witnessed in his youth the commencement of the dramatic art in Spain; its poverty and want of theatrical decorations. Before giving to the world his Don Quixote he wrote several plays from twenty to thirty in number, of which his Numantia and Life in Algiers are the principal. The conception of the former is in the style of the boldest pathos, while the execution is vigorous

[1] *Bouterwek*, I, 296.

and dignified. In the fall of Numantia he sought to unite the tragic with the marvelous. He formed his idea of tragedy upon the models of the ancients, but he felt no inclination to imitate the Greek forms. Accordingly, the Numantia is written in conformity with no rules except those which he prescribed to himself.[1] It is divided into four acts, and is without the introduction of a chorus. The dialogue is in tersets, redondillas, and octaves, and the tragic interest is gradually heightened to the close of the piece.

Cervantes claims to have been the first to represent the phantoms of the imagination,[2] and the hidden thoughts of the soul, by introducing figures of them upon the stage. These allegorical personages were intended by him as a substitute for the chorus of the ancients, and like it were designed to represent the course of providence or fate, as linked with human actions. Thus famine and sickness appear in the Numantia, and occasion or necessity in the Life in Algiers. These allegorical figures, being mere metaphysical abstractions, are entirely contrary to the taste of the present day, as they destroy at once the illusion, vivacity, and interest of the drama; but he sought by means of giving them the most elevated language, and by the magic of lyrical poetry,[3] and the employment of the boldest figures, to give us an idea of the corresponding progress of the universe, and of the designs of providence.

A little later than the birth of Cervantes, and in 1562, was born at Madrid, Lope de Vega. The former had originated the idea of a grand and severe style of tragedy,[4] but after the appearance of the latter, neither tragedy nor comedy, properly speaking, were to be found. Their place on the Spanish stage was usurped by novels and romances. A Spanish comedy is properly a dramatic novel. Its interest may be either of a tragic, comic, or historical nature, or it may be purely poetical. While the spirit of the Italian drama was conventional, that of the

[1] *Bouterwek*, I, 353. [2] *Sismondi*, II, 184. [3] *Idem*, 204. [4] *Idem*, 256.

Spanish was intensely national. As the liberty which the Spaniard had once enjoyed was lost, he invoked chivalry in its place, and became romantic when it was no longer in his power to be heroic. Hence the point of honor came to supply the place of patriotism, and romance that of reality.

Although the Spanish comedy was not created by Lope de Vega, yet his inexhaustible fancy and the fascinating ease of his animated composition gave to it that character by which it was long distinguished. He fixed for a century and a half the spirit and style of the different varieties of the Spanish drama,[1] his successors merely improving on the models which he had created. The Spanish taste required something constantly exciting to keep up an interest. Hence the dramatic works of Lope de Vega exhibit in the first place a character of great changeability.[2] In them, stories of country and city life are clothed in romantic poetic colors, and blended with the interesting inventions of a bold and irregular fancy, without any distinction between the gay and the serious, or the comic and the tragic. His writings are divided into heroic and historical comedies which were mostly taken from the annals and traditions of Spain, his spiritual plays, and his comedies of real life, or as they were called "of the cloak and the sword." It is in these last that we find a second peculiarity by which he was enabled to satisfy the Spanish taste. Being selected from the sphere of fashionable life, they exhibited the manners of the age, and were performed in the costume of the times. What peculiarly distinguishes them is great complication of plot, and a spirit of intrigue which thoroughly pervades them. The different scenes are made to succeed each other in rapid succession,[3] with very little reference to their probability. Ingenious complication is with him the central point in the interest of his situations. He seems to set himself afloat upon a sea of intrigue, without having in advance unraveled all the intricacies of his

[1] *Bouterwek*, I, 364. [2] *Idem*, 365. [3] *Idem*, 375.

plot, and trusting to the resources of his ingenuity to carry it satisfactorily through. Accordingly intrigues are twisted and entwined together, until, to bring his piece to a conclusion, he is often obliged, without ceremony, to cut the knot which he is totally unable to untie. In the end he usually brings as many couples together as he can by any possible contrivance match. The Spanish maxim then was that "love excuses everything," and hence the intrigues into which his heroes and heroines are made to plunge, allow free scope to be given to the basest artifice and perfidy. His characters in this class are generally the same, the old man, the lover, the young lady, with a suitable number of servants and waiting women, are the standing characters which are constantly introduced with no variety, except in the situations. But they are always drawn in such animated colors as to keep alive the interest. The Widow of Valencia is cited as an instance in illustration.

His spiritual comedies afford a picture of the religious notions of the Spaniard in the age in which he lived. In these the purest piety, according to catholic ideas, is widely blended with the most contradictory chimeras, and all ennobled by the boldest flights of imagination. In these, miracles keep alive the interest, and supply the place of intrigue in his comedies of real life. His lives of the saints are the most irregular. Here are allegorical characters, buffoons, saints, peasants, students, kings, God, the infant Jesus, the devil, and all the most heterogeneous beings that the wildest imagination could bring together.

The scenes in the drama of Lope de Vega are always opened by some imposing events,[1] which forcibly attracts and captivates the attention of the spectator. His performers proceed to action immediately on their entering the stage, and he discloses their characters more fully by their conduct than by a recital of anterior occurrences. Our curiosity is awakened and kept up by the rapidity of action,

[1] *Simondi*, II, 259.

the muliplicity of events, the increasing confusion, and by the utter impossibility of foreseeing the development. His historical dramas do not resemble those of Shakespeare. They are not selections from the great events of the state so as to form a political drama; but romantic intrigues are connected with the most glorious occurrences in the records of Spain, and in them romance is so interwoven with history that eulogies on the heroes of his nation become an essential and inseparable part of his poems.

In his pictures of Spanish manners, two things are observable: The one is the extreme susceptibility of Spanish honor.[1] The slightest coquetry of mistress, wife, or sister, can only be obliterated by blood. This extreme of jealousy was of eastern origin, and derived through the Moors. The other is the consecration of their lives to gallantry. Every individidual is enamoured of some woman who is not in his power, and is ever entering into the most indelicate intrigues to gratify his passions. The age of chivalry has not passed away. The most virtuous heroines made assignations in the night-time, at their chamber windows; they receive and write billets, and go out masked to meet their lovers in the house of a third person. His plays discover in the national character a disregard for the life of others, and a criminal indifference for evil, since it can be so easily expiated by the church.

The age of Lope de Vega seems specially devoted to the rise and progress of dramatic art. It was during this period (1562-1635) that the only dramatic attempts of which Italy has reason to boast before those of Alfieri,[2] appeared. In France appeared Garnier, and in 1606 the great Corneille. In England, Shakespeare was born two years after Lope de Vega, and died nineteen years before him.

Another great name in the dramatic art of Spain is that of Calderon, who was born in 1600, thirty-five years before the death of Lope de Vega, whom he survived more than half a century,[3] laying down the burden of life in his eighty-

[1] *Sismondi*, II 260. [2] *Idem*, 262. [3] *Bouterwek*, I, 502.

seventh year. He was not behind his great competitor in the invention of new combinations of intrigue,[1] ingenious complexities of plot, and interesting situations. Although the invention of Lope may be bolder, yet that of Calderon was more refined both in conception and execution. He gave the last polish to the Spanish drama with delicate art without changing its nature.

The dramas of Calderon have been divided into four classes, viz: pictures of social life and manners; historical pieces; mythological, or drawn from some poetical source; and representations of sacred history, from scripture or legends. In those of the first class, especially those of the "cloak and the sword," the plots are usually of a very complicated nature, rendering it extremely difficult to follow the various threads of the intrigue, by the artful entanglement of which the principal characters of the piece are repeatedly plunged from one unexpected embarrassment into another.[2] He particularly excelled in the accumulation of surprises, in connecting one difficult situtation with another, and in maintaining undiminished the strongly excited interest to the close of the piece. He appears to have estimated the merits of his dramas of intrigue by the effect produced by the situations, and hence he was the more an inventor the less he introduced variety into his characters. The motives on which he makes the plot to turn are a licentious gallantry, in which no moral interest is permitted to mix, and a point of honor which gives rise to incessant contests. The latter in all these dramas is very delicate, and supplies the place of morality.

Calderon undoubtedly should be placed among the poets of the richest and most original fancy,[3] and of the most attractive and brilliant style. He was, however, the true poet of the inquisition, and too often disfigures Christianity by assigning to it ferocious passions and corrupt morals. He lived to see a mannerism predominate in the arts and a prosaic direction given to literature.[4] He reached the

[1] *Bouterwek*, I, 503. [2] *Idem*, 505. [3] *Sismondi*, II, 328. [4] *Idem*, 321.

highest pinnacle of romantic poetry, but "seems affected with that malady of genius which forms an epoch in every literature on the extinction of good taste, an epoch which commenced in Rome with Lucan,[1] in Italy with the poets of the sixteenth century; which distinguished in France the Hotel de Rambouillet, which prevailed in England under the reign of Charles II, and which all persons have agreed to condemn as a perversion of taste."

With Calderon expires the progress of the Spanish drama. Other dramatic writers appeared and wrote plays for performance at the theatre. But in a brief sketch they are undeserving of notice. When in the commencement of the eighteenth century the power and the arts of Louis XIV imposed a Bourbon upon the Spanish throne in the person of Philip V, the French drama furnished models for the Spanish, and the old national spirit died out in the efforts made by the Spanish theatre to equal, as far as possible, the foreign models.

The French Drama.

The period at which the French theatre attained its highest point of culmination, was that of Louis XIV, in the last half of the seventeenth century. There are four great names upon which the character and fame of the French drama principally repose, viz: Corneille, Racine, Voltaire, and Moliere. The three first have developed the tragic, and the last the comic features of that drama.

Pierre Corneille was born at Rouen in 1606, and in 1635, appeared his first tragedy, Medea, in which a single passage of intense power and simple expression, "announced the advent of Corneille." The year following appeared the Cid, which constituted an era in the dramatic history of France, and established forever the reputation of Corneille. Several others, as Horace, Cinna,

[1] *Sismondi*, II, 323,

Polyeuete, followed in rapid succession, and carried the fame of Corneille to its highest pinnacle. He has been called the father of the French drama, and has been assigned the same position in France that Shakespeare occupies in England. He excelled not so much in tenderness, in dramatic construction, or in the art of moving the passions. But he surpassed in grandeur, in distinct identity of character, and in compressing a vast amount of matter into a very few words. His reputation rests exclusively on his tragedies, and in these he is quite unequal, suffering more, it has been said, by comparison with himself, than when viewed in conjunction with any other writer. Of his thirty-two dramas, not more than four or five retain possession of the stage.

The tragic muse in France next found an embodiment in Jean Racine, who was born in 1639, and whose glory commenced with his Andromache, in 1667. This showed that he had great skill in the management of a plot, as also in the display of emotion, and in the exercise of power over the sympathy of the spectator. Next appeared his Britannicus, in 1669, in which the twin sisters of tragedy, terror and pity, are invoked, to contribute their aid to the outpouring of the tragic muse.[1] It is to these that Aristotle has assigned the great moral office of purifying the passions. Then follows Berenice, Mithridates, Iphigenia, and some others, until, after a temporary retirement from the drama, he reappeared in 1691, with his Athalie, which, by general consent, exceeds all his other tragedies in the grandeur, simplicity, and interest of the fable, in dramatic terror, in theatrical effect, in clear and judicious management, in bold and forcible, rather than in subtle delineation of character, and in sublime sentiment and imagery.[2]

Racine gave the greatest beauty to his female characters. He endowed them with the ideal grace and harmony of ancient sculpture. In his Andromache, Monimia, and

[1] *Hallam*, III, 259. [2] *Idem*, 263.

Iphigenia,[1] are exhibited the ennobling and purifying of human passions. They are clothed with the highest forms of excellence.

While the strength, power, and impetuosity of Corneille have distinguished him as the Homer of France, the accuracy and serene majesty of Racine have secured to him the appellation of the French Virgil. In refinement, in delineating the passion of love truthfully, and in harmony of versification, Racine is unequaled. It is said that no one has enriched the language with a greater number of turns of phrase, that no one is bold with more felicity and discretion, or figurative, with more grace and propriety.[2] That no one has better understood delicacy of style, or better managed the variety of cadence, the resources of rhythm, and the association and deduction of ideas.

After Corneille and Racine the theatre had remained vacant. At length appears the last of the great tragic writers, Voltaire. Born in 1694, he put forth his first tragedy Œdipus at the age of twenty-four, which brought forth the exclamation from La Morte, that "Corneille and Racine had found a successor." Afterwards followed Brutus, the Death of Cæsar, Zaire, Alzire, Mahomet, Merope, and several others.

Voltaire is unequal to Corneille in dramatic invention and sublimity,[3] and inferior to Racine in the judicious management of the action, in justness of thought, and in perfect execution. He follows the maxim of striking vigorously rather than justly, and endeavors to comprehend everything in emotion. Instead of entering into his characters, like Corneille and Racine, he substitutes himself for them. He does not excel in truly representing manners.[4] His diction wants purity of thought. His style is often inflated, but it is admirable for its copiousness, freedom, and easy and noble manner. Its rhythm is not skillful, and its harmony little studied, but his fancy is

[1] *Hallam*, III, 264. [2] *Idem*, 265. [3] *Vernet*, 270. [4] *Idem*, 472.

brilliant, his progress easy and rapid, and coloring possesses magical charms. His ease has been termed the "grace of genius."[1] He has a free and flowing eloquence, and a pathos which penetrates the heart, and is painful even to the feelings. He draws from its greatest depths the feeling of pity. He succeeds well in inspiring sympathy for his characters. Although, as we shall presently see, he introduced many changes which may be claimed as improvements in the French theatre, yet he is now neglected and unknown, his laurels having withered, while those of Racine are still fresh and green.

An important inquiry here arises in relation to the system of tragic art followed by these great tragedians, and the sway which it has exercised over the French drama. This system is derived essentially from the ancients. The French commenced the imitation of the ancients at a very early period, and adopted the principle that in order to succeed, they must observe the strictest outward regularity of form, and this form they derived more from Aristotle, and from Seneca, than from the Greek models themselves. In this the far-famed three unities, of action, time, and place, were required to be strictly observed. Corneille, however, both knew and loved the Spanish theatre, and borrowed from it the subject of one of his best tragedies, the Cid. This is not only animated throughout by the spirit of chivalrous love and honor, but it violates considerably the unity of place, if not also that of time. But his contemporaries were very uniformly of the opinion that a tragedy must be framed accurately according to the rules of Aristotle. These rules embodying the three unities have always been adhered to by the French tragedians, and have proved a bed of Procrustes to French tragedy. The unity of action has always been admitted, but the difficulty has been to settle upon its meaning.[2] Action in its higher proper signification means an activity dependent on the will of man. "Its unity will consist in the direction to-

[1] *Vernet*, 273. [2] *Schlegel*, I, 338.

wards one sole aim; and to its completion belongs all that lies between the first determination, and the execution of the deed."[1] Thus Corneille assumed that this unity consists "in comedy, in the unity of the intrigue, or the obstacle to the views of the principal persons; and in tragedy, in the unity of the danger, whether the hero sinks under or extricates himself from it." He maintained that several dangers in tragedy, and several intrigues or obstacles in comedy, may be allowable when necessarily connected with each other. There is another deeper and more comprehensive idea of unity, viz: that all the separate parts of a tragedy, like the mechanical unity of a watch, or the organical unity of a plant, are subservient to one common aim, namely to produce a joint impression on the mind.[2] Thus by means of comprehensive generalizations the unity of action is very little restrictive in its influence upon dramatic genius.

The unities of time and place were more difficult to comply with. Aristotle intimates with respect to the former, that it seeks as far as possible to circumscribe itself within one revolution of the sun, or to exceed it very little. That appears to have been the limit of the Greek tragedians. Corneille finding the rule inconvenient was for extending the duration of the action to thirty hours. Others have insisted that the representation of the action,[3] and the time of its actual performance should be identical. This is on the supposition that it is necesary to create an illusion on the part of the hearer, thus confounding the representation with the reality. But in that case the terrors of tragedy would be a torture which the hearer could not endure.

The ancients generally had a continuous course of action in the constant presence of the chorus. When in modern times the chorus was excluded, the division into acts, usually five in number, was adopted. In the modern tragedy the lyrical part,[4] which created a pause in the action was

[1] *Schlegel*, I, 342. [2] *Idem*, 344. [3] *Idem*, 347. [4] *Idem*, 358.

also omitted. The gaps arising from the leaving out of the lyrical parts must now be filled up by intrigue. With the Greeks the action rolls on without interruption to its determination, but the French are obliged to introduce secondary characters, whose opposite views may give rise to a multitude of impeding incidents, in order that our attention may be kept up to the close. As intrigues are in their nature expeditious, the chances of failure being increased by their continuance, their use was well calculated to effect the short duration of an important action. But it is obvious that in adhering to the unity of time, the French tragedians must renounce all those effects which proceed from the gradually accelerated growth of any object in the mind, or in the external world, through the course of time. The slow developments of history but ill accord with the rapidity with which events must succeed each other on the French stage. Hence the historical element so largely entering into the composition of the British drama is almost, or entirely, excluded from the French.

The unity of place is very unsatisfactorily observed by the French tragedians, as well as by all who follow the same system of rules.[1] The scene, it is true, is not changed, but things follow one another which do not usually happen in the same place.

Corneille and Racine flourished during the reign of Louis XIV. In his time "the traditionary belief respecting the most important concerns of humanity remained undisturbed; and in poetry, the object was not so much to enrich the mind, as to form it by means of a free and noble entertainment."[2] But the demand for novelty presses strongly on the French mind, and hence the advent of Voltaire. His first appearance on the theatre in his early youth, followed close upon the age of Louis XIV, and heralds a new epoch in French tragedy. His predecessors, Corneille and Racine, had thrown their whole soul into dramatic poetry. Their specialty was the drama. Voltaire

[1] *Schlegel*, I, 367. [2] *Idem*, II, 2.

laid claim to universality of talent. He was not alone a dramatist, but also a philosopher, historian, rhetorician, sophist, wit and buffoon. This universality of his genius, while it may have increased his resources, at the same time rendered him more superficial. He was perpetually making experiments in the dramatic art, and at different times availed himself of totally different means for effect.

Voltaire introduced upon the French stage some real improvements.[1] He extended the domain of the tragic affections. Previous to his time, ambition and love almost solely occupied the stage. He introduced the experiment of composing tragedies without love, such as Merope, and the Death of Cæsar.

Another one of his merits is that he extended the field of ideas peculiar to tragedy. His predecessors, Corneille and Racine, had had no higher beau ideal than the court. With them the highest style of man was reared and nurtured amid the gay circles of the Grand Monarque. Voltaire was a philosopher, and viewed man from a different stand point. He regarded him as man, as being above the prince, above society, as being, in fact, the author of both. He introduced into tragedy the idea of humanity, and in that respect did an essential service to the drama.

Another change introduced by him was to consecrate the tragic stage to national remembrances. Corneille has made a favorable commencement in selecting the Cid as the subject of his first tragedy. But both he and Racine had very universally gone back to classic lands both for their rules and subjects. Voltaire brought to the stage the middle age and France. He introduced subjects never before attempted, as in his Zaire, Alzire, Mahomet, Semiramus, and Tancred.[2] And on these his fame as a dramatic poet principally rests. He could not, however, proclaim his independence of the unities, nor could he escape from the sustained pomp of language, nor the theatrical manners so effectually domiciled upon the French stage.

[1] *Vinet*, 270. [2] *Schlegel*, II, 32.

While the French appear to have considered their tragedy as the most brilliant part of their literature, it is remarkable that few of their numerous tragical attempts have succeeded. While about a thousand tragedies have been acted or printed since the death of Racine,[1] about thirty only, besides those of Voltaire, have kept possession of the theatre.

The French have one great comedian to present in the person of Moliere, who was born in 1620, and died in 1673. He was the ornament of the reign of Louis XIV, in whom he found an unfailing friend and protector from the many assaults of his bitter enemies. Born and educated in an inferior rank, he enjoyed early opportunities of learning the modes of life and expression among the common people, while his later experiences in the service of Louis XIV, enabled him to observe narrowly those of the court.

One of the great objects of comedy is to expose vice and folly by means of ridicule. Its perfection does not consist so much in the mere reproduction of the scenes of common life as in the selection of the ludicrous traits so as to develop, with the greatest effect, either a character or a plot. The ridiculous, which is the material of comedy, has existed more or less in all ages, and Moliere in his time found it in great abundance. He possessed great acuteness of observation and power of discrimination, with a knowledge of the human heart, and great accuracy in painting it. He had also a fund of good sense, and an exquisite perception of the ridiculous. In Le Tartuffe, which is generally considered his masterpiece, he depicts in more brilliant colors than ever before, the oily, sanctimonious, sensual hypocrite, the consummate villain under the disguise of religion. His Les Precieuses Ridicules was leveled at a coterie of women of rank, who were in the habit of meeting daily or nightly at the Hotel de Rambouillet, and from thence to issue those bulletins which

[1] *Schlegel*, II, 5.

were to guide all those who made any pretensions to bon ton. They spoke unlike others in a way extremely affected, and presented so many ridiculous points, that Moliere was enabled to set all Paris laughing at them.

The great excellence of Moliere lay in the delineation of character rather than in the expression of passion, and this it was that contributed to give him his superiority in the comic department of the drama. Of the characters he introduces, those are the best which make the least departure from native simplicity. Love is an agent the most universally introduced in his plays, sometimes pure and unmixed, at other times superinduced upon some other passion, but almost always the ruling one. He does not appear to devote much study to the probability of occurrences, and in this respect shows himself a true comedian, for the drama has been called a "fairy land where we willingly submit to the wand of the enchanter, rather expecting what is wonderful, than requiring what is true."

Moliere has furnished admirable portraits of the men and women of the age of Louis XIV. It is true his art reached no further than to furnish admirable delineations of the characters of those by whom he was surrounded. He presented things as they really were, but he was wanting in that creative ideality "which bodies forth the forms of things unknown." He not only painted truthfully individual character, but he also grouped it on the canvas with great dramatic effect. He ranks second only to Aristophanes and Shakespeare in the comic literature of the stage.

As Voltaire was the last great French tragedian so was Moliere the first and last great comedian. Either from the fact that the French drama has been so hedged round by rules, or so fettered by restrictions, as to prevent its free and natural development, or from other causes, neither its tragic nor its comic part has found any illustrious name under whom it could flourish, since the period of Voltaire and Moliere.

The German Drama.

The German theatre in all that properly constitutes the drama, is the youngest of any in Europe. It is true there were rude beginnings of the drama in Germany as in other parts of Europe, and the works of Hans Sachs, printed as early as 1578, and reprinted in 1606, contain one hundred and ninety-seven dramas. These were both tragedies and comedies, the latter being mostly coarse satires on the times. The want of originality in the German muse led to translations from the French, and also, to some extent, from the Danish of Holberg. These, with a few German imitations of a feeble nature, constituted the dramatic literature of Germany, until the appearance of Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller. These are the three great names contributed by Germany to dramatic art. Of these three, Lessing was born in 1729, Goethe in 1749, and Schiller in 1759. But Goethe enjoyed much the longest lease of life, continuing until his eighty-third year.

Lessing was largely instrumental in diminishing the French influence, and in giving to his countrymen a national theatre. This he accomplished more by his criticism than by his dramatic writings. In the year 1767, he commenced the publication of a journal entitled Dramaturgie, which was devoted to theatrical criticism, and in which he examined most of the pieces translated from the French, which were then acted in Germany. This afforded him an opportunity of entering more closely into the consideration of the theatre. He displayed great wit and acuteness in his criticisms, and so bold and successful were his attacks upon the French taste in the tragical department, that shortly after its publication commenced, the translations of French tragedies, and the German tragedies modeled after them, disappeared from the stage. He was acquainted with the works of Shakespeare, and recommended them to his countrymen. He believed that the strict regularity of the

French tragedies was an obstacle to the adoption of a great many simple and affecting subjects, and that new dramas, constructed more upon the principles of Shakespeare, must be invented to admit them.

Lessing did not profess to be a poet, and produced but few dramatic works. In those produced he shows the originality of his character. The form was not essentially variant from previous dramas, although he troubled himself little about the unity of time and place. The Minna Von Barnhelm in point of form holds a middle place between the French and English manner, while the spirit of the invention, and the social tone portrayed in it, are peculiarly German.[1] There have been observed in the principal characters of his dramas a certain family likeness, thus creating the impression that instead of entering into his characters and painting them, he has painted himself.

The drama which is in form more free and comprehensive than any other of the works of Lessing, and one of the most nearly approaching the drama of Shakespeare, is that entitled Nathan the Wise. He wrote it with a view to laugh at theologists, and the principles of religious toleration are distinctly and strongly set forth.

Lessing seems unacquainted with the rights of poetical imitation, and wished in dialogue, as well as everything else, a naked copy of nature.[2] He failed to discover the principle in the theory of dramatic art, that the more nearly the forms of imitation employed by the poet approach to real life, the milder should be the distress, and the more probable the incidents.[3] "It is only," says one, "when verse or recitative is employed for the dialogue, when the heroes or divinities of remote ages and countries are introduced as interlocutors; when the sublimities of poetry are omnipresent; that deeds of a bold enormity, and atrocities at which madness would shudder, can be securely copied. That in proportion as the means of imitation intercept illusion may be the force of the emo-

[1] *Schlegel*, II, 374. [2] *Idem*, 374. [3] *Taylor's German Poetry*, I, 389.

tions portrayed. For want of this precaution, Lessing has adapted violent situations to ordinary manners, and disappoints sympathy by the very means intended to push it to the utmost."

Schiller and Goethe have been so fully considered while on the subject of German poetry, that but little is required to be said in this connection. Of these two Goethe was the earlier, and his works and influence probably had an effect upon the mind of Schiller. The former at a very early period wrote and published his Gotz Von Berlichingen, in which he practiced Lessing's principles of nature and broke away from all the restraints of arbitrary rules[1] by which dramatic poetry had previously been governed. It was not so much an imitation of Shakespeare as it was the outgrowth of an inspiration excited in a kindred mind by a creative genius. He never seems to have had the representation on the stage in his eye. He wished to have no circumlocution, but to exhibit the very thing itself. He thus brings to our ear the tone of a remote age in a manner which carries with it a sufficient degree of illusion. He brings strongly before our minds the old German cordiality, and in a few powerful strokes, represents the conflict between a departing and a commencing age; between that of rude but powerful independence, and the succeeding one of political tameness.

It would seem to have been the great object of Goethe to give new poetical animation to his age, and in doing this, he was indifferent as to the form, although he has generally signified his preference for the dramatic.[2] At a subsequent period he endeavored to effect a reconciliation between his views of art and the common dramatic forms. In his Iphigenia he expressed the spirit of the antique tragedy, more especially with relation to repose, perspicuity, and ideality. In his Tasso he applied a historical anecdote to mark the general signification of the contrast between a court and a poetical life. His Egmont is a

[1] *Schlegel*, II, 380. [2] *Idem*, 381, 382.

romantic and historical drama, the style of which steers a middle course between his first manner in Gotz, and the form of Shakespeare. His Triumph of Sentimentality is a very ingenious satire upon his own imitators. Goethe's Faust has been already mentioned.[1]

Goethe is admitted to have possessed the dramatic talent in a high degree, but the theatrical in a much less degree. He was more successful in effecting his object by tender development than by rapid external motion. His delight was in the play of those internal forces that instinctively shun the public gaze, rather than in those powerful passions that seek the largest theatre of exhibition. Hence he was dramatic without being theatrical. "The strongest and most overpowering pathos is to be found in Egmont, but the conclusion of this tragedy is altogether removed from the external world into the province of an ideal music of the soul."[2]

Before the advent of Goethe, familiar comedies, melodramas, and grand spectacles were represented in Germany, which were filled with horses and knights. Goethe seems to have been desirous of bringing back literature to the severity of ancient times, and his Iphigenia may well be regarded as the chef-d'œuvre of the classical style of drama among the Germans.[3] "This tragedy recalls the sort of impression which we receive in contemplating Grecian statues; the action of it is so commanding, and yet so tranquil, that even when the situation of the personages is changed, there is always in them a sort of dignity which fixes the recollection of every moment on the memory."

Almost all the works of Goethe are alleged to have been composed on different systems.[4] Sometimes he abandons himself wholly to passion, as in Werther and Count Egmont; at other times his fugitive poetry sets all the chords of imagination in vibration; again he gives as historical facts with the most scrupulous truth, as in Goetz Von Berlichingen; at another time he has all the simplicity of ancient

[1] *Schlegel*, II, 383. [2] *Idem*, 386. [3] *De Stael's Germany*, II, 351. [4] *Idem*, 360.

times, as in Herman and Dorothea. In fine, he plunges himself with Faust into the stormy whirlwinds of life; then, all at once, in Tasso, the Natural Daughter, and even in Iphigenia, he considers the dramatic art as a monument erected among tombs. His works have then the fine forms, the splendor and dazzling whiteness of marble, but like it, they are also cold and inanimate."

Schiller was possessed of qualities enabling him at once to produce a strong effect on the multitude, and on minds of a nobler description. His earliest works were composed while he was yet young and unacquainted with the world. While bold and daring he was influenced by the models of Lessing, and by the earlier labors of Goethe and Shakespeare. These early works were the Robbers, Cabal and Love, and Fiesco. These are all three works which the principles of art as well as those of morality may condemn. The first mentioned first appeared on the stage at Manheim, and the sensation produced by it was immense. It embodied a fiery rebellion of thought which became more startling and animated by the art of the greatest actors of the time, and hailed by the enthusiasm of spectators in whose breasts stirred the revolutionary spirit of the period. It was in 1782. The head of youthful enthusiasts were turned by it.

Fiesco is an improvement on the Robbers, although there is much that is distorted and exaggerated. The language is chaster and more severe, the descriptive passages lack only the rhythm to invest them with the charm of poetry. The characters move in a higher atmosphere. The men are drawn on the scale of heroes. Cabal and Love has an excess of sentimentality, but affords promise of real and permanent excellence. The idealization of common life can never be effected except by him who is familiar with truths that lie in the highest realms of poetry. One other drama still belongs to the earlier period in the life of Schiller, viz: that of Don Carlos; but this marks the era of transition between his earlier and his later life. This, in part, exhibits a great depth in the delineation of

character, and yet the old and tumid extravagance was not altogether lost, but is clothed with choicer forms. "The situations have a great deal of pathetic power, the plot is complicated even to epigrammatic subtlety;[1] but his dear-won thoughts on human nature and social institutions were of such value in his eyes, that he exhibited them with circumstantial fullness, instead of expressing them by the progress of the action, and made his characters philosophize more or less on the subject of themselves and others, by which means his work swelled to a size altogether incompatible with the prescribed limits of the theatre." It has been made as a general allegation against Schiller that he failed to animate his characters with the life and the sentiments specially belonging to them; that he could not transfer himself into them and lose his own individuality by assuming theirs; but that he was constantly placing in their mouths the ideas and sentiments he was himself desirous of enforcing upon the world.

The composition of his later tragedies was preceded by historical and philosophical studies, which enlarged and enriched his mind with various knowledge, and enlightened him with respect to his objects and means. He was thus enabled to return to his art with a riper mind, and with larger stores of thought. He now applied himself wholly to historical tragedy, and endeavored, by divesting himself of his personality to rise to truly objective exhibitions. Historical subjects exercise the genius in a different manner from that in which it is exercised by subjects of invention. History requires to be combined in an artistic manner, in order to produce its effect on the stage, and we must have at once united in tragedy, the talent of painting the truth, and that of rendering it poetical. The Germans seem to prefer those historical tragedies in which art displays itself "like the prophet of the past."

Schiller, in investigating and writing the history of the thirty years' war, conceived the idea of introducing a part

[1] *Schlegel*, II, 388, 389.

of it upon the stage. This resulted in the production of Wallenstein, which is divided into three distinct plays the Camp of Wallenstein, which represents the effects of war on the mass of the people, and of the army; the Piccolomini, which displays the political causes which led to the dissensions between the chiefs;[1] and the death of Wallenstein, which resulted from the enthusiasm and envy which his reputation had excited. In these plays Schiller conscientiously endeavored to adhere to historical truth, so much so that he found great difficulty in becoming master of his materials. In forms he follows closely upon Shakespeare, but endeavors to confine the change of place and time within narrower limits. He also ties himself down to a more sustained tragical dignity, bringing forward no persons of mean condition, or at least not allowing them to speak in their natural tone.

Lessing in censuring the French taste had gone to the other extreme in his manner of conceiving dramatic art, had banished poetry from the theatre, leaving nothing there but romances in dialogue, which were little more than a continuation of ordinary life. Schiller brought back poetry upon the stage, and the beauty of the verses in his Wallenstein, together with the grandeur of the subjects, rendered it the most national tragedy ever represented on the German stage. "This work," says Tieck, "at once rich and profound, is a monument for all times of which Germany may be proud; and a national feeling, a native sentiment is reflected from this pure mirror teaching us a greater sense of what we are, and what we were."

After Wallenstein follows Mary Stuart, which is planned and executed with great skill in art, and also with great solidity; the Maid of Orleans, in which the plot is looser and greater liberties are taken; the Bride of Messina; and last of all, Wilhelm Tell, in which he returns wholly to the poetry of history, and which in the opinion of many is the best of his works.

[1] *De Staël*, I, 280.

A writer remarks that "in glancing over the riper performances of Schiller, his grandest in point of intellect is Wallenstein; in point of verbal poetry, the music and the expression, the Bride of Messina is the loveliest; in point of feeling and conception, the Maid of Orleans most engrosses the heart, and enlists the fancy. But the one in which Schiller, with the fullest success, emancipates his art from himself, in which his own individuality the least moulds and influences his creations, is his Wilhelm Tell. * * * * * * * * * * * His characters are, for the most part, embodiments of great principles and great truths, rather than the flexile and multiform representations of human nature, which, while idealized into poetry, still render the creations of Shakespeare so living and distinct."[1]

The English Drama.

The miracles and moralities appear to have had their early run in England as well as in other European countries. In the first were representations of the principal supernatural events of the Old and New Testaments, and of the history of the saints. In the second, allegorical characters, persons representing abstract ideas, such as mercy, justice, truth, appeared upon the stage, each uttering speeches in its appropriate character, and conveying sound, moral lessons. These representations were brought upon the English stage as early as the reign of Henry VI. The intervening space between these and the modern drama was bridged over by the interludes of John Heywood who flourished during the reign of Henry VIII. He excelled in representing some ludicrous familiar incident in a style of the broadest and coarsest farce, and yet with a considerable amount of skill and talent. Thus the Four P's turns on a dispute between a Palmer, a Pardoner, a

[1] *Schiller's Works*, I, 43.

Poticary, and a Pedlar, as to which shall tell the grossest falsehood; and one happening to say he never saw a woman out of patience in his life, all chimed in at once with the unanimous declaration that it was the greatest lie they ever heard.

In these early rude entertainments may be found both the elements of tragedy and comedy, but the latter seems to be the earlier of the two. It was an improvement upon the interludes, and may be traced through them to the more ludicrous parts of the moral plays. The two earliest comedies appear about the middle of the sixteenth century.[1] The one is styled Ralph Royster Doyster by Nicholas Udall, and the other Gammer Gurton's Needle by John Still, which turns entirely upon the loss and recovery of a needle; both of which are written in long and irregularly measured rhyme.

The English drama has two periods in its history. The first commences with the ascension of Elizabeth, in 1558, and closes with the reign of Charles I. Then occurred the ascendancy of the puritans, through whose influence the theatres were closed for the space of six years. The second begins with the restoration of Charles II, and includes the subsequent history of the stage. The second period bears the impress of a great change which had taken place in the manners and modes of thinking of the people, and is also characterized by the influence of French literature which was very flourishing at the time of the restoration. This gave a different character to the plays subsequently written.

The first period possesses much the greatest interest with the student of the drama. It is the only period that is worth much attentive study, and to that we shall principally confine our attention. The great monarchs of the drama are found here and here only.

It seems to be a law of development, as deduced from the history of the English drama, that there are periods

[1] *Chambers's, Encyclopædia*, I, 164.

when the human mind makes all at once gigantic strides in an art previously almost unknown. It would seem as if the preceding quiescent state had been like the period of sleep, in which the mind had been gathering its energies, and collecting its strength, with a view to such an effort. In the English drama the period of Elizabeth is that which affords the most remarkable instance of rapid advance in all that constitutes its greatest elements.[1] This queen during her long reign of forty-five years, from 1558 to 1603, witnessed the first infantine attempts of the English theatre, and also the time when it had advanced to its higher glory. It bridges over the period which intervenes between Sackville and Shakespeare, and closes when the star of the latter was in the ascendant. Shakespeare himself seems to have had a perception of this rapidity of development, as in one of his minor poems he calls his age, these time-bettering days.

The reign of Elizabeth and the first James would fairly include the most brilliant period of the British drama. Within this period no less than seventeen playhouses were built or fitted up in London, whereas the capital of the present day with five times the population is satisfied with two.

In the earlier history of the English theatre a few feeble attempts were made to introduce the form of the antique tragedy, together with the choruses and other incidents. This was even attempted in the third year of the reign of Elizabeth in a play entitled Tragedy of Ferrex and Porrex, the joint work of Thomas Sackville, afterwards Earl of Dorset, and Thomas Norton. It is written in regular blank verse, consists of five acts, and observes many of the rules of the classic drama of antiquity. All that happens is previously announced in consultations, or subsequently stated in narratives.

In the year 1546, was established the office of master of the revels, in whose province it lay to regulate, among

[1] *Schlegel*, II, 273.

other amusements of the court, the dramatic representations.[1] These were performed both in the royal palace and in the inns of court. In 1574, a patent was granted to the Earl of Leicester's servants to act plays in any part of England, and in 1576, they erected the first public theatre in Blackfriars.

Among the precursors of Shakespeare, were Marlowe, Peele, Greene, Lily, Lodge, Kyd, and Nash. These have been ranked among the founders of English drama. Of these, Christopher Marlowe ranks the highest, as he first imparted consistent character and energy to the stage, in connection with a finely modulated and varied blank verse. His principal plays were Tamberlaine the Great, Life and Death of Dr. Faustus, and Life of Edward the Second. Neither Marlowe, nor either of the others, have been successful in transmitting a living memorial of their works to posterity. They introduce us through the porch into the inner temple, and there leave us with the great masters of the drama. These were the following: William Shakespeare, born 1564, died 1616, aged 52; Ben Jonson, born 1574, died 1637, aged 63; John Fletcher, born 1576, died 1625, aged 49; Francis Beaumont, born 1585, died 1615, aged 30; Philip Massinger, born 1584, died 1639, aged 55.

Thus it will be seen that these great dramatists, who have carried the English drama seemingly to its highest point of possible attainment, were all contemporaries with each other. The four last mentioned, however, were the younger contemporaries and competitors of Shakespeare; and two of these, Beaumont and Fletcher, in their literary character, make but one person. These, it will be perceived, were all born and died within the same three-quarters of a century, and their average of life reached not quite fifty years. They all flourished within the last two decades of the sixteenth, and the four first of the seventeenth century, the brightest period being perhaps the first quarter of the latter century. The effect each one of

[1] *Hallam*, II, 230.

these had upon the others, in stimulating to intellectual exertion, and in striving to meet the constantly increasing demands of the public, rendered every day more imperative, as each made a more rapid advancement, cannot well be over estimated. Leaving Shakespeare for the present, we commence with him who lies buried in Westminster Abbey under the terse and well known epitaph:

O, rare Ben Jonson!

He was a large man, massive and unshapely; solid, but slow of performance; his countenance "rocky," or harsh and rugged; his intellect strong, aggressive, and capacious, and stored with a vast variety of learning.[1] He came to the drama while it was it its formative state, and when the mass of the plays were equally regardless of scenic proprieties, as of place and time. Rules derived from classical models were little known or heeded. Each followed the bent of his own taste, and the suggestions of his own genius. He was thoroughly versed in the ancient drama, and its critical rules. He adapted them to modern conditions, and made it the business of his art to construct well proportioned plays, and to manifest skill and judgment in arrangement of scene, and in choice of fable, action, and language. He had a peculiar manner of introducing into many of his plays, a special set of personages, who should appear in the intervals of his acts, and discuss what had gone before. Thus he invented critics of his own to appear on the stage, and rebuke and inform those in the body of the theatre. These formed a sort of modern chorus, not uncommon in the plays of the time, and used generally for the explication of the story; but by him devoted to his own vindication and glorification. It is in his later plays more especially, that he uses his prologues to anticipate judgment, and assert a scornful independence of his audience.

[1] *Eclectic Magazine*, August, 1850, 2.

Jonson's masterpieces are proclaimed by the following distich:

> The Fox, the Alchymist, and Silent Woman,
> Done by Ben Jonson, and outdone by no man.

All his plays evidence great constructive power. His plots are generally good, well knit and skillfully developed. In the three plays named in the distich, the denouement is concealed until the last scene, and then bursts upon us with singular sharpness and clearness. The unities are observed with considerable strictness, but still he departs, as he sees occasion, from the ancient rules, and many of his plays are models of careful and ingenious construction. One scene supports another; each speech forwards the action, and the folds of the plot are complicated without confusion, and smoothed without force.

His constructive talent enabled him to write masques, and his power of scenic display, as also his ingenuity and fertility in getting up devices, were all made available in that direction. His mind was not naturally inclined to poetry, but was powerful and energetic, and rich in the resources accumulated by a vast memory and an unflagging industry. He wrote his poetry by first setting down his ideas in prose, and then translating them into verse. His language is copious and discriminating without being very felicitious; his imagination is subject to his will, and when he creates a character or a situation he exhausts all the elements of satire and ridicule that can be found in it. His excellence lies in comedy, his strength in wit, and it is difficult to say in what department of the latter he excelled the most. The fox is said to be the most witty, the Silent Woman the most humorous, and the Alchymist the most grotesque of his plays. He develops largely that element of the ridiculous which lies either in the native disproportion, or in the voluntary distortion of real things. His works present numerous instances of his unbounded power of imagining ludicrous situations. He dealt not so much with men as with what

he calls the "humors" of men. Every character he creates he endows with some special humor, and arranges all his situations and actions with a view to show off this humor the most advantageously. He has been described "as a mere sponge; nothing but humors and observation; he goes up and down sucking from every society, and when he comes home squeezes himself dry again." In some of his plays the eccentricities he introduces are united to a body of personal character, but in others they are presented as mere bundles of oddities. Nature made him a satirist, and he has, through the agency of comedy, held up to ridicule the manners of his age. He had more keen and accurate observation than power of invention, and is called one of the best and completest authorities we have for ascertaining the manners of the court and city in the time of James I. The free and powerful use of satire demands something of vulgarity of mind and recklessness of temper, as it is a matter of extreme difficulty to strike hard, and at the same time to strike with discrimination. The more profound and comprehensive the knowledge of the complex intertangling of good and evil, the more cautious and timid will be the blow aimed exclusively at the latter.

Jonson took a mechanical view of art, and his characters are mostly drawn with sense and judgment. When one was once conceived by him in its leading idea, he possessed so methodical and consecutive a mind, that he followed it out with the utmost strictness. His characterization is better suited to serious satire than playful ridicule. He could not "play on the edge of his subject, and pursue it along the infinite threads which unite it with other things," but his excellence lay more in concentration, and in isolating his character from every other. He has nowhere depicted the passion of love with nature or delicacy, and has nowhere drawn a female character that can inspire another with interest. He marches on with great stateliness of style, his rhythm like his matter, having a lumbering elephantine motion, full of stops and sudden changes. His wit, however, is keen and incisive, and keeps up a constant

play amidst even his most stately exhibitions. His pieces are defective in point of intrigue, and his means of conducting a plot, and disentangling it from its complications, are often improbable and constrained.

Jonson has the reputation of having founded a style of regular English comedy, massive, well compacted, and fitting to endure, yet not the most attractive in its materials. His works, altogether, consists of about fifty dramatic pieces, but the greater part of them are masques and interludes. To Jonson has by many been conceded the second name in the dramatic literature of this period, but others have claimed that honor for

Beaumont and Fletcher, the Dioscuri of the drama. An instance is here presented, and the only one of so permanent a character on record, of a literary partnership formed between two young men of high genius, good birth and connections, and which continued for ten years until the death of Beaumont. During this period they wrote together a series of dramas, passionate, romantic and comic, thus blending together their genius and their fame in indissoluble connection. Something more than fifty plays have been published under the joint names of Beaumont and Fletcher, but the publishers not having distinguished the share which belonged to each, it is now impossible to make any distinction, although from the fact that Fletcher survived his partner for almost ten years, the presumption is that half of them may be considered as the work of Fletcher alone. We have even little information respecting the diversity of their talents. Some have attributed boldness of imagination to Fletcher, and a mature judgment to Beaumont, the former furnishing the inventive talent, and the latter directing the channel into which it should run. But all speculation on that subject seems now to be useless, and it is observed that all the pieces ascribed to them, whether they proceed from one alone or from both, are composed in the same spirit, and in the same manner. It may have been, therefore, the great resem-

blance of their way of thinking, rather than supplying the deficiencies of each other, which led to their continuing so long and so inseparably connected with each other. They were young men of distinguished talents, and commenced their course when the genius of Shakespeare was in its meridian splendor, and their works show clearly the effect of his influence. They had to choose, in the form of their plays, between those of Shakespeare, and the principles of Ben Jonson and the imitation of the ancients, and they wisely preferred the former. They also followed the example of Shakespeare in obtaining the materials of their plays mostly from novels and romances, and in the mixing up of pathetic and burlesque scenes with each other, endeavoring by concatenation of the incidents, to excite the impression of the extraordinary and the wonderful.

Beaumont and Fletcher are the proper founders of the comedy of intrigue which prevailed through the seventeenth century. The sources of their humorous plays are some of them historical, while much is derived from the Spanish stage of Lope de Vega and his contemporaries. They also founded a new school in comedy, the vestiges of which still remain, which is marked by the regard to dramatic effect which influenced the writer's imagination, While their incidents are numerous and striking, the characters are often slightly sketched, taking their hue rather from the course and current events, and not like those of Jonson, drawn from a preconceived design. They exhibit not much variety of character. A few types, such as an old general, a voluptuous and arbitrary king, a supple courtier, a high spirited youth, a lady fierce, and not always excessively modest, are constantly returning upon us, and form the usual pictures for their canvas. Superadded to these in the lighter comedy are an amorous old man, and a gay young spendthrift. The best of their characters are female, as a much larger sweep of reflection and experience is required for the greater diversity of the other sex.

The tragedies of Beaumont and Fletcher are not numerous, and have never contributed much to their reputation as dramatic writers. The reason assigned for this is, that their feeling is not sufficiently drawn from the depths of human nature, and their bestowal of too little attention on the general consideration of human destinies. They employ their whole strength in depicting passion, and yet fail in producing a secret history of the heart. The reason assigned for this is, that they pass over the first emotions and the gradual heightening of a feeling, only to seize it in its highest gradations, and then to develop its symptoms with an exaggerated strength and fullness. Thus everything good and excellent has the appearance of arising more from transient ebullition than fixed principle. The mere selfish impulses and instincts are too nearly akin to the virtues. They viewed human nature too much on the vulgar side, throwing no veil over some of its coarsest exhibitions. They open to the full view of the spectator all that more noble minds endeavor to hide, even from themselves. This licentiousness in the language, in the scene, in the plot, in the idea, might commend them to that period, and also to a later, that of Charles II; but they furnished to the puritans and independents under the sway of Cromwell the most unanswerable arguments against the continuance of the theatre with its corruptions. Thus they lowered themselves to the taste of the public, rather than to endeavor to elevate the public to their own standard.

There was also another difficulty in the way of their arriving at the highest perfection. "Poetry was not for them an inward devotion of the feeling and imagination, but a means to obtain brilliant results." Their great object was to produce effects, and in that they expended all their force and energy. Besides they lacked both seriousness and depth, and the regulating judgment which prescribes the due limits in every part of composition. The titles of some of their plays are the Two Noble Kinsmen, Rule a

Wife and have a Wife, the Faithful Shepherdess and the Knight of the Burning Pestle.

Philip Massinger was the greatest tragic poet produced during the reign of James I. His life was spent in obscurity and poverty. He died almost unknown, and was buried with no other inscription than the note in the parish register: "Philip Massinger, a stranger." And yet as a tragic writer he has been ranked by Hallam as second only to Shakespeare, and in the higher comedy not inferior to Jonson. But in wit and sprightly dialogue, as also in the knowledge and treatment of theatrical effect he falls much below Beaumont and Fletcher. He is, however, far more intelligible than the last named dramatists,[1] his text having been less corrupted, and his general style fully as conspicuous as in any of the dramatic poets of that age.

Massinger's most striking excellence consists in his conception of character, in which he was placed above Beaumont and Fletcher, and even Jonson. He has neither the hard outline of the latter, nor the negligent looseness of the former. He has no great variety, and often repeats, with slight modifications, the type of his first design. The subjects chosen by him are sometimes historical, while others appear to have been taken from French or Italian novels; the latter having been a frequent practice with the early English dramatists. So fully is this in some instances apparent in their dramas that they are little other than novels in action, the models being but little varied from except in the introduction of lower and lighter episodes.

Several of the plays of Massinger are said to have perished in manuscript, and only about sixteen have been preserved to us. Five out of this number are tragedies, and of the rest no one belongs to the class of mere comedy. Their general elevation of style, and depth of interest sustained throughout, rank them with the serious drama, or what is called tragi-comedy.

[1] *Hallam*, III, 350.

A shade of melancholy tinges the writings of Massinger, and every one is struck with the peculiar beauty of his language. A charm is felt in the harmonious swell of his numbers, and in his pure and genuine idiom. His poetical talents were very considerable, his taste superior to that of his contemporaries; the coloring of his imagery, although possessing great fullness, is rarely overcharged. His comic powers are not on a level with his serious; he is rather apt to aim at exciting ridicule by caricature, and his dialogue wants the sparkling wit of Shakespeare and Beaumont and Fletcher.

Among his tragedies the Duke of Milan is generally preferred, and among his tragi-comedies, the Picture, the Bondman, and a Very Woman. There are two others, however, which are more English that the rest, and to which the common voice has assigned a superiority. These are a New Way to Pay Old Debts, and the City Madam. In the former appears the character of Sir Giles Overreach, which, though darkly wicked, is not beyond the province of the higher comedy, and which gives to the play a striking originality and an impressive vigor. That is the only one of the plays of Massinger which still retains a place on the stage.

The great dramatist of all time is William Shakespeare. Greene, Peele and Marlow were his precursors. They had acheived for the drama a permanent place in the national literature. They had introduced a greater variety of character and action, with deep passion, and true poetry. They had familiarized the public ear to the use of blank verse, and thus had accomplished much in relieving the drama from the fetters of rhyme. This form of verse unites rhythmical harmony with the utmost freedom, grace, and flexibility. Thus had the genius of the drama made every reasonable preparation for the advent of her favorite son, "who was to extend her empire over limits not yet recognized, and invest it with a splendor which the world had never seen before." And yet it does not

appear that either in his own age or the next succeeding one, he was accounted a dramatist of such remarkable power. During the reign of Charles II his works were either not acted, or if they were, it was only after they had been very much disfigured. He was probably so far in advance that neither his own age nor the succeeding one could fully appreciate him. His shadow has only lengthened as the sun of each generation or century has slowly descended from its meridian.

The personal history of Shakespeare is very little known, and much controversy has been elicited in regard to the kind and extent of his learning. He must have been an attentive observer of nature; have had an accurate acquaintance with all the popular usages, opinions, and traditions which could be available in poetry; and while he was poor in dead learning, he possessed a fullness of living and applicable knowledge, and had the wonderful power of exhibiting a visible image of the living and moving of an age full of distinguished deeds. The period during which he flourished was the last half of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and the first half of that of James I. He has obviously reflected, and deeply so, on character and passion, on the human constitution, on all the things and relations of the world, and on the progress of events, and human destinies.

He has been called the master of the human heart; not only thoroughly comprehending the mainsprings of action, but also the nicer involuntary demonstrations of the mind, being able to express with certainty the meaning of their signs, and to draw conclusions from them, and to arrange his separate observations in a connected manner, according to the grounds of probability upon which they rested. He could transport himself so completely into every situation, even the most unusual, as to be enabled to act and speak in the name of every individual. He could endow the creatures of his imagination with such self-existent energy, as to enable them to act in each conjuncture, according to nature's general laws. Goethe

compared his characters to watches with crystalline plates and cases, which, while they point out the hours as correctly as other watches, enable us at the same time to perceive the inward springs, by means of which all this is accomplished. He did not occupy himself in analyzing, dissecting, or enumerating all the motives by which the man is determined to act, but in actually exhibiting the results of his observation and reflection. He everywhere observes the unity of feeling which is so necessary in a perfect dramatic performance. In Romeo and Juliet, for instance, "all is youth and spring; youth with its follies, its virtues, its precipitancies; spring with its odors, its flowers, and its transiency; it is one and the same feeling that commences, goes through, and ends the play." This unity of feeling and of action is like that proclaimed from a natural landscape, in which rocks, and heaths, and forests, and waterfalls, are all made conducive to one grand result, because each is modified by a single energy. This is made clear by the statement of Schlegel,[1] that he had in an essay gone through the whole of the scenes of Romeo and Juliet, in their order, and demonstrated the inward necessity of each, with reference to the whole, showing why such a particular circle of characters and relations, was placed around the two lovers; explaining the signification of the mirth here and there scattered, and justifying the use of the occasional heightening given to the poetic colors. From all which it appeared to him, that, with slight exception, nothing could be taken away, nothing added, nothing otherwise arranged, without mutilating and disfiguring the perfect work. And that he would be willing to undertake the same thing in all the pieces of Shakespeare produced in his maturer years.

The accomplished dramatist must possess the power of two kinds of characterization, the one of person, the other of passion. Both these were possessed in an eminent degree by Shakespeare. In reference to the former, his

[1] *Schlegel*, II, 181.

talent grasps the diversities of rank, sex, and age, including all the gradations between first and second infancy. Under his animating influence, the king and the beggar, the hero and the pickpocket, the sage, and the clown are made to speak and act each in his own tongue, and with equal truth. He brings upon the stage the ancient Roman, the modern Frenchman, the southern European, the cultivated man, and the barbarian, putting into the mouth of each what is appropriate to his own character. He stops not with realities, but enters the world of fancy, summons from the shades the ghost of the once king of Denmark, exhibits before us his witches amidst their unhallowed mysteries, and peoples the air with sportive fairies and sylphs. Even when he conjures up a monster like Caliban, he forces on us the conviction, that if such a creation could exist, he would speak and act precisely as he does.

But individual characterization is not his chief excellence. He so combines and contrasts his characters with each other that they bring each other out with great distinctness and power. He makes each of his principal characters a mirror in which the others are reflected, and in which we are enabled to discover what could not be immediately revealed to us. What in others lies very profound, in him appears on the surface. He has painted the facility of self-deception, the half self-conscious hypocrisy towards ourselves, with which even minds that are truly noble sometimes attempt to disguise the almost inevitable influence of selfish motives upon their own conduct.

His characterization of passion is equally admirable, including under this term every mental condition, every tone from the carelessness of indifference or familiar mirth to the wildest rage and despair. "He gives us the history of minds; he lays open to us, in a single word, a whole series of preceding conditions. His passions do not at first stand displayed to us in all their height, as is the case with so many tragic poets, who, as Lessing says, are thorough masters of the legal style of love. He paints, in a most inimitable manner, the gradual progress from the

first origin. He gives, as Lessing says, a living picture of all the most minute and secret artifices by which a feeling steals into our souls, of all the imperceptible advantages which it there gains, of all the stratagems by which every other passion is made subservient to it,[1] till it becomes the sole tyrant of our desires and our aversions. Of all poets, perhaps, he alone has portrayed the mental diseases, melancholy, delirium, lunacy, with such inexpressible, and, in every respect, definite truth, that the physician may enrich himself from them in the same manner as from real cases." He makes energetic and very powerful passions electrify the whole of the mental powers, and in highly favored natures, to express themselves in an ingenious and figurative manner.

He seems ever to have had in view the highest moral purposes. He has never clothed wild and blood-thirsty passions with a pleasing exterior. He has never varnished over crime and want of principle with a false show of greatness of soul. With him vice shows its own hideous deformity, and meets its own appropriate reward. The deep dyed villainy of Richard the Third, and Iago, instead of furnishing anything attractive, or that can excite admiration, thrills the soul with horrors at the terrible enormity of vice and sin, and utter abandonment logically and consistently carried out. "And this tragical Titan," says Schlegel,[2] "who storms the heavens and threatens to tear the world from off its hinges, who, more fruitful than Æschylus, makes our hair to stand on end, and congeals our blood with horror, possessed at the same time, the insinuating loveliness of the sweetest poetry; he plays with love like a child, and his songs are breathed out like melting sighs. He unites in his existence the utmost elevation and the utmost depth; and the most foreign, and even apparently irreconcileable properties subsist in him peaceably together. The world of spirits and nature have laid all their treasures at his feet; in strength a demi-god, in

[1] *Schlegel*, II, 136, [2]137. [3] *Idem*, 142, 143.

profundity of view a prophet in all-seeing wisdom a protecting spirit of a higher order, he lowers himself to mortals as if unconscious of his superiority, and is as open and unassuming as a child."

His comic talent is about equally wonderful with his tragic and pathetic. He invents comic situations and motives with the greatest ease and facility, and his comic characterization is equally true, various, and profound, with his serious. He has not only given a perfect delineation of many kinds of folly, but he has also exhibited mere stupidity in a most diverting and entertaining manner. It was an ancient custom for princes, and great men, to keep court fools, who could, when necessary, play the buffoon, and whose occasional witty remarks would agreeably diversify the insipidity and wearisomeness of ordinary life. This custom embraced the period at which Shakespeare lived and wrote; and hence the clown is made to appear in several comedies, but in only one of the tragedies, that of King Lear. He generally appears to exercise his wit in conversation with the principal persons, and is very seldom incorporated with the action. These clowns or fools have generally a great deal of humor, and also quite a superabundance of intellect.

Although Shakespeare must have been acquainted with the earlier English poets, yet he drew his language immediately from life, and he has blended the dialogical element with the highest poetical elevation. The poetical element of that day had a full feeling of its strength, and in its diction would occasionally run out into extravagance. Shakespeare's style yet remains the best model, both in the vigorous and sublime, and the pleasing and tender. His images and figures are original and appropriate, and have often a sweetness altogether peculiar. His verse is generally a rhymeless iambic, alternating sometimes with rhymes, but more frequently with prose. In the use of verse and prose he makes distinctions according to the ranks of the speakers, but still more according to their characters and disposition of mind. His tradesmen, peasants, soldiers, sailors, fools, and clowns, are all made to

speak in the tone of their actual life. His iambics are at times full of harmony and lofty sound; always varied and adapted to the subject, as distinguished at one time for ease and rapidity, as at another for moving along with ponderous energy. He is expressive in his irregularities of versification, "a broken off verse, or a sudden change of rhythmus, is in unison with the pause in the progress of the thought, or the entrance of another disposition of mind." All his transitions, where not intended to be otherwise, are easy. All changes of forms are introduced imperceptibly. "Each of his compositions is like a world of itself, which moves in its own sphere. They are works of art, finished in the most consummate style, in which the freedom and judicious choice of their author are revealed."

The plays of Shakespeare are properly divided into comedies, tragedies, and historical dramas. The subjects of the comedies are generally taken from novels and romances, others from legendary tales, and some from older plays. In his Roman subjects he followed Plutarch's Lives. His English historical plays are chiefly taken from Holinshed's Chronicles. From the latter he also derived the plot of Macbeth.

No attempt can be made to particularize the plays of Shakespeare. His Hamlet, Othello, Macbeth, and Merchant of Venice, are, perhaps, the best known, and, together with King Lear, the most widely esteemed. The character in which his comic invention has realized its acme, and which he has continued through three of his plays, is Sir John Falstaff. In his Hamlet and Macbeth he opens to our view the spirit world, and out of its hidden abysses produces his ghosts and witches.

In regard to theatres, or places of performance, the stages of the ancient mysteries, called pageant houses, consisted of large and high frame carriages, mounted on six wheels, and formed like dwellings containing two stories. In the lowest of these the performers dressed, and played upon the upper, which was either surmounted by arches, battlements, vanes, etc., or left open at the top. The stage was

strewed with rushes, and the lower room enclosed with cloths, which are supposed to have been painted with the subject, or emblems, of the performance. These theatres were drawn from one street to another in appointed order, as each piece was concluded, and thus the whole was in performance at the same time, which divided the crowd, and gave all an opportunity of seeing the entire series. The time of action was about six in the morning and nine separate pageants were exhibited in one day.

The Globe theatre of the time of Shakespeare, and of which he was manager, is thus described: "It was a massive structure destitute of architectural ornaments, and almost without windows in the outward walls.[1] The pit was open to the sky, and they acted by day-light. The scene had no other decoration than wrought tapestry, which hung at some distance from the walls, and left room for several entrances. In the back-ground there was a stage raised above the first, a sort of balcony, which served for various purposes, and was obliged to signify all manner of things according to circumstances. The players generally appeared in the dress of their time. The chief means of disguise were false hair and beards, and occasionally even masks. The female parts were played by boys so long as their voices allowed them. It was not customary to have music between the acts, but in the pieces themselves were introduced, on proper occasions, marches, dances, solo songs, etc. In the more early time it was usual to represent the action before it was spoken, in dumb show between each act, allegorically or even without any disguise. This was to give a definite direction to the expectation." Thus it will be seen that the theatre of Shakespeare was very meagre and plain in all its appointments, the want of attractions of an accessory nature, thus rendering it the more necessary to be all the more careful in regard to essentials.

The second period of the English drama, commencing with the reopening of the theatres on the downfall of the

[1] *Schlegel*, II, 275.

puritans, and continuing to the present time, can no more occupy the attention of the student of civilization than the subject of painting in Italy subsequent to the lives and labors of the great masters, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Titian and Correggio. The plays of Shakespeare are not only the highest examples of the English drama, but they may almost be said to constitute, in themselves alone, the beginning, fulfillment, and end of an art. There was nothing like them before; and whatever has been like them since, has owed its resemblance to imitation, not to related vitality.

In reviewing generally the history of the drama, as developed in modern Europe, two or three ideas cannot fail to present themselves. One is that the only real national dramas, those which flow from, and are developed by, the national spirit, and which, therefore, fitly represent the people with all their peculiarities of thought and feeling upon the stage, are the Spanish and English. The Italian and French are more bound down by the rules of Aristotle, and hence have had much less freedom in their development. Shakespeare constantly deviated from the dramatic unities of time, place and action, laid down by the ancients, and adopted by the French theatre. In his tragedies, he amply fulfills what Aristotle admits to be the end and object of all tragedy, viz: to excite admiration, terror, or sympathy. But in doing this, he does not follow the rules of Aristotle, but mixes comic with tragic scenes, thus blending together opposite qualities and characters in a manner which is accordant with the actual experience and vicissitudes of life. That he spoke out from the depth of English being is evident from the manner in which they have cherished his memory.

There is another marked difference between the French and English stage aside from the observance and disregard of the rules of Aristotle. This relates to the different manner of bringing tragical events before the audience. In the French mode of representation there is no killing

occurs upon the stage. A French audience is never shocked with violent death scenes. All these occur out of view, behind the scenes. They are brought to the knowledge of the audience through the narration of the actors. On the English stage everything is acted out in the presence of the audience. Fights and tragical deaths there occur in full view of all the spectators. The question may very well arise whether this has not had an adverse effect upon the progress of English civilization. In Rome it is beyond question that the horrid scenes of the amphitheatre, the contests of wild beasts, and the terrible fights of the gladiators,

> Butchered to make a Roman holyday,

Had their effect upon the Roman character and heart, rendering the one brutal and the other callous to every sentiment of humanity. It is true the stage representation must fall far short of the reality; and yet even that cannot be without its influence.

The history of the European drama discloses the fact that, among its different nations, the great dramatic writers were contemporary with each other. In Italy, we have Trissino and Ariosto, and Maffei and Metastasio; in Spain, Cervantes, Lope de Vega and Calderon; in England, Shakespeare, Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Massinger; in France, Corneille, Moliere, Racine and Voltaire; and in Germany, Lessing, Goethe and Schiller. Is there not much in the mutual influence which great minds exercise upon each other, and the mutual stimulus by which each pushes on the other to constantly renewed effort until the remotest limit of the capacity of each is reached?

Another fact we observe, and that is that, with the exception of Italy, each one of these nations has had but one period, which has marked the highest development of the drama. In Italy, there are three, viz: that of Trissino and Ariosto, of Maffei and Metastasio, and of Goldoni and Al-

fieri. The first fell within the first half of the sixteenth century, the second within the first half of the eighteenth, and the last within the last half of the same century. The highest development in Spain falls within the last half of the sixteenth, and first half of the seventeenth centuries; that of England within the same period; that of France covered a little more than the last half of the seventeenth century, and, with the exception of Voltaire, did not extend beyond that century; while in Germany it extended over the last half of the eighteenth century, and with the exception of Goethe was almost entirely limited to that century. Whether the drama has its appointed cycles to run in the history of its development, it is not, perhaps, possible, at the present stage of the world's history, to determine.

THE MILITARY ART.

The second of the mixed arts is the art military, which during the entire course of European history has received a constantly increasing development. War has been termed a "great drama, in which a thousand physical or moral causes operate more or less powerfully, and which cannot be reduced to mathematical calculations." Of the causes of war, and of its kinds, whether offensive or defensive; whether of convenience or of intervention; whether of invasion or of opinion; whether civil, religious, or political; whether national, or party, or sectional; we propose to say nothing. Nor have anything to do with the resources of nations, or their ability to carry on any species of warfare. Neither is it the science of war any further than it has become available, and has passed into realization under some of the forms of art, that we propose to speak. But while the causes of war have always existed, and have ever been substantially the same, the history of modern Europe has developed one, which although not en-

tirely new, yet has been vastly more influential in modern than in ancient times. This is the idea of the balance of power; which, although dimly foreshadowed in the history of the struggles of the Grecian republics, was nevertheless reserved to outline its more complete development in the war policy pursued by the states of modern Europe, and which has never been lost sight of either in the prosecution of that policy, or in the negotiations and terms of peace which have formed its agreeable interludes. This idea has lain at the foundation, and been one of the causes exerting a strong influence upon modern warfare.

Again, another feature which has been deeply inwrought into the policy of modern states is the creation, and keeping on foot, of large standing armies in times of peace. This, also, as a political institution, and a measure of policy, as well as in its more perfect organization, is a work of modern times. Rome, it is true, always had her armies in the field, but they were mainly, if not entirely, supported by the plunder derived from the enemy. But Rome, for centuries, had no time of peace. Hence the idea of standing armies in time of peace had, to her, no application. By means of these standing armies, war, in modern times, has become a trade, a calling, a profession, and hence its elements as a science, and its practice as an art, has been more thoroughly studied, and better understood. What we have to say on this subject will be included under the following heads:

I. Arms and weapons both of attack and defense.

II. Fortified places and means of attack and defense.

III. Armies, their composition, subsistence, and means of movement.

IV. Strategy, with its maxims and their illustrations.

V. Tactics, with its maxims and their illustrations.

VI. The art considered in its progress and different stages.

VII. Naval warfare.

Arms and Weapons both of Attack and Defense.

History fully verifies the fact that it is not so much numbers that have controlled the fortunes of the battle-field as superiority in arms and weapons, and superior skill, discipline, and dexterity in those who use them. The offensive weapons the earliest made use of were the bow and arrows, the battle-axe, and the sword. In England the use of the bow was once carried to a high degree of perfection. The Norman conquest introduced it as a military weapon. Under Edward III, the glory of the English long-bow was at its zenith. The success of the English on the fields of Cressy and Poictiers was chiefly ascribed to the English archers.[1] The same, also, won the battles of Homildon hill against the Scots in 1402, and that of Agincourt against the French in 1417. Its use was fostered by legislation. A royal ordinance of Edward IV, required every Englishman to have a bow of his own height made of yew, wych-hazel, ash or auburne, and arrows half the length of the bow.[2] The extreme range of an English bow was said to be about six hundred yards. The long-bow continued in use long after the invention of gunpowder, and the employment of artillery.

The cross-bow, or arbalest, is more modern than the long-bow, but has been known more than seven centuries.[3] It was probably introduced into France by the first Crusaders, and although less esteemed by the English than their long-bow was much employed by other nations. It was of various kinds, but the largest was the stirrup cross-bow, used for defending forts or walls. The bows were usually made of steel, though sometimes of wood or horn, and the missiles discharged from them were either bullets, stones, arrows, or short darts. Ordinarily, this species of bow would kill at about sixty yards.[4] The battle-axe was

[1] *Wilkinson*, 16. [2] *Idem*, 17. [3] *Idem*, 23. [4] *Iconographie*, III, 21.

bladed only on one side, and was wielded with both hands. When the handle was long, it had two edges and was called an halberd.[1]

The sword was various in form and dimensions.[2] It was often short and crooked in the manner of a scimitar. But sometimes very long swords were made use of, more especially by the Cimbri. They were also very keen, and frequently inscribed with mysterious characters. There were also other weapons, as javelins, slings, and clubs stuck round with points.

When we arrive at the age of chivalry, we find the lance the chief offensive weapon of the knight. Its staff was commonly formed from the ash tree,[3] having on it a sharpened iron head. The foe was transfixed by the lance. The weapons wielded by the knight in a close encounter, were the battle-axe, and the martel, or maule, which was a ponderous steel or iron hammer, dealing death by the weight of their fall, or the sharpness of their edge. The sword was also much relied on in the hand to hand fight.

The defensive armor of the earlier European nations, reached its culminating point in the knight of the age of chivalry. It is curious to note the extent to which human ingenuity has carried the power of protecting the body against the assaults of all weapons at that time in use. Here we have:

1. The shield; in shape oblong or triangular,[4] wide at the top for the protection of the body, and tapering to the bottom.

2. The body harness; having three general divisions: mail, plate and mixed mail, plate mail entirely. The first defenses consisted of rows of iron rings, sown on the dress, and when additional defense was required, a row of larger rings was laid over the first. When the improvement in the art of destruction had rendered the chain mail an inadequate protection,[5] small iron plates were

[1] *Mallet*, 166. [2] *Idem*, 165. [3] *History of Chivalry*, 1, 66. [4] *Idem*, 77. [5] *Mill's History of Chivalry*, 1, 79, 99.

added, which lapped over each other, and hence gave to this variety, the name of scale mail. All this variety was sown on an under garment of leather or cloth, or some other material, which was called a hauberk. The lower members were defended by chausses, which, when joined to the mailed frock, was called the haubergeon.

The addition of these plates of steel, thus creating a mixed harness, failed to render the body invulnerable. New plates continually were added,[1] the pectoral protecting the breast; the cuisses, the thighs; the brassarts, the arms; the ailettes, the shoulders; the gorget, the throat; and the gauntlet, the hand. The cuirass was the defense that protected both the breast and the back. This continued to gain ground until the knight became encumbered with nearly a double covering of mail and plate, when the plate being found a perfect defense, the mail was gradually thrown aside, and the warrior appeared clad entirely in steel plates. The head was at first protected by a mailed hood alone. Then followed the helmet, of varied shape, conical or cylindrical, having cheek-pieces of bars, placed horizontally or perpendicularly, as a defense for the face,[2] which latter, finally gave place to the aventaile, or iron mask, joined to the helmet, with apertures for the eyes and mouth. This was at first fixed and immovable, but subsequently, by means of pivots, the plates or grating before the face, called the vizor, could be raised or depressed. Plates were subsequently brought up from the chin, called the beaver, which rendered the casing complete. The only accessible part to the lance was the small holes in the vizor; and these were seldom exposed, as the knight, when he charged, was accustomed to bend his face almost to the saddle-bow. As the knight, however, generally fought on horseback, there was danger in the shock of his being unhorsed, and even then, there arose a difficulty in killing a human being cased in steel, until a thin

[1] *Mill's History of Chivalry*, 88. [2] *Idem*, 88, 89.

dagger was invented, called the dagger of mercy, which could be inserted between the plates.

The defensive armor was not confined to the knight. His war steed was also armed or barded, very much on the plan of the harness of the knight himself, and was defended by mail or plate according to the fashion of the age.

But at length the ingenuity of man discovered in the explosive force of gunpowder an agent that could give such velocity and power to a projectile as would render the most perfect steel casing a very slight defense.

The first application of a military character which was made of gunpowder was in the construction of cannon,[1] the earliest use of which was by Edward III, in his campaign against the Scots in 1327. They were used by the English in the battle of Cressy in 1346. Bolts and carrels were first shot from cannons, afterwards stones. The cannon employed by Mahomet II, in the siege of Constantinople in 1453, were formed of bars of iron,[2] hooped together lengthwise by iron rings, and were made use of to throw immense masses of stone, some of which weighed twelve hundred pounds. They were discharged only three or four times in a day. They were so reduced in size as to admit of being cast in iron and bronze; and to receive iron bullets in 1550. The length of some of them about this period was immense. One taken at the siege of Dieu in 1546, was twenty feet seven inches in length,[3] six feet three inches in diameter in the middle, and threw a ball of one hundred pounds weight.

The materials composing cannon have usually been metals; but wood, leather and rope have been occasionally employed. They were slow in being perfected. In France, the use and practice of artillery had not advanced beyond its infancy in the reign of Henry III, in 1574. Bombs were first used at sea by the French in the bombardment of Algiers in 1681. The largest cannon known in modern

[1] *Wilkinson*, 45. [2] *Idem*, 47. [3] *Idem*, 49.

times was the monster mortar recently cast at Liege, and used at the siege of Antwerp in 1832. It was only discharged fourteen times, and finally burst. Various improvements have been made in cannon recently, among which the most important may be stated that of converting the smooth into the rifled bore, thus giving the ball the same spiral direction as that given to the bullet by the rifle.

The hand-gun, or fire-arm, has had at least five different stages of progress independent of the change from the smooth bore to the rifle. The first was known as early as 1471. It had no lock whatever, but was fired like a cannon by applying a lighted match. In the second stage of improvement they were reduced in weight, and had a match lock, so that they could be discharged from the shoulder without rests. The third improvement bring us to the pyrites wheel lock, which was introduced about the reign of Henry VIII. The fourth was the flint lock, which recently has given way to the percussion lock now in use. The conversion of the smooth bore into the rifle is also a change of great importance in modern warfare. Great improvements have been made also in the ball, the most recent, the minie ball, being the most destructive. The rifling of cannon and fire-arms has had a prodigious effect in enabling them to carry, with great velocity, to great distances, and with a deadly aim. And these improvements have been recent. Half a century ago when General Moreau was struck by a cannon ball at two thousand yards distance, it was thought an extraordinary circumstance. But at the present day, cannon instead of carrying one mile will carry five. The rifle of the foot soldier will now carry as far as a field piece of old times, and with far greater accuracy.

The pistol derives its origin from Pistoja, a city of Etruria, where they were manufactured previous to 1544, in the reign of Francis I. The barrels were about one foot in length, and fired by the wheel lock. Their introduction into England was about the middle of the sixteenth century.

Another important change in modern times has been the substitution of the bayonet for the pike. The latter had a shaft from ten to fourteen feet in length, with a flat pointed steel head called a spear. This was in use until the beginning of the eighteenth century, the first charge of infantry with the fixed bayonet having been made at the battle of Spires in 1703. From that time until the wars of the French revolution the bayonet was little used. Since then the bayonet charge has been among the most important of modern movements in effecting sudden changes on the battle-field, in arresting a victorious movement, and sometimes in changing almost a defeat into a victory. Its instrumentality has been perhaps the most felt in its ability to withstand cavalry charges. Since its more perfect organization, the mounted cavalry have ceased to be so great a terror to the foot soldier. A compact body of infantry, with their fixed bayonets, present an ugly barrier for the cavalry to attempt to pass.

Fortified Places, and Means of Attack and Defense.

The object of fortification is to dispose the ground in such a manner as to enable a small number of troops to resist a larger army the longest possible period of time. It is of two kinds: field or temporary, and permanent. The former are resorted to, to strengthen positions temporarily occupied, or which constitute the base of the army's operations. These localities are not selected and fortified in advance of the campaign, as they must necessarily be determined by the position of the hostile forces. Their character and position must, therefore, shift with the varying fortunes of the war. The latter, on the contrary, consist of forts, fortresses, and walled towns or cities, the localities of which are selected after due deliberation, and with reference to the natural facilities they present for fortification, and their strategic importance in the defense of the country. Here the selection is usually made in time of

peace, and all the resources of art are exhausted in rendering the position impregnable.

Fortification in the middle ages varied very little from that of antiquity. It was the castles of the feudal barons that were protected by all that was then known of fortification, while the cities, in which the burgher class resided, remained open, or were protected only by a simple wall. Fortifications, during these ages, consisted usually of a ditch surrounding the whole place, of a closed circumscribing wall, and a place of retreat, in which the garrison could defend themselves even when the wall was in possession of the enemy. In all the walled cities there was a citadel for this purpose, and in the feudal castles a tower much stronger than the rest, and independent of the other parts of the fortification.[1] Thus the engineers of that period understood the problem of so arranging their works that they should mutually defend each other. Hence the interior works must command the exterior. The fortifications of the castle of the middle ages, aside from its walls, were to be found in its ditches, bridges, outworks, gates, towers, battlements, and turrets.

The art of fortification has, in modern times, made very great advances. The discovery of gunpowder, and the employment of cannon in the attack of fortified places, led to a change in the manner of fortifying. The thin walls of the ancient works were no longer sufficient, and hence the necessity of erecting earthen ramparts behind them. The walls themselves were ultimately replaced with parapets of earth. The ancient towers were changed into bastions.[2]

Several distinguished engineers in Holland, Germany and France, during the first half of the seventeenth century, by their writings and the works they constructed, contributed the most largely to the improvements in fortifications. The most remarkable of these was Vauban, of the age of Louis XIV, who forms a connecting link between

[1] *Iconographie*, III, 144. [2] *Halleck*, 328.

the earlier systems of engineering, and the more perfect form which the art has since assumed.

The elements constituting a permanent fortification are:

1. The rampart, consisting of a mound of earth and enclosing the space fortified. This is the chief part of every fortification.

2. The parapet which surmounts the rampart, and is designed to protect the men and guns from the projectiles of the enemy. It varies in thickness with the kind of projectile the ground permits the enemy to use. If cannon can be used it must be from six to ten feet thick.

3. The scarp wall, which is designed to sustain the pressure of the earth of the rampart and parapet, and by the sharpness of its slope to present an insurmountable obstacle to an assault by storm.

4. The ditch, or fosse, wide and deep, surrounding the works, which serves the double purpose of furnishing earth for the construction of the rampart and parapet, and also for preventing the near approach of the enemy.

5. The counterscarp wall, which is the outer boundary of the ditch, which sustains the earth on its exterior, and in permanent fortification is revetted with masonry to render the ditch as steep as possible.

6. The covered way, which is the space between the counterscarp and the crest of the glacis, over which the garrison can pass without being seen by the enemy.

7. The glacis, a mound of earth, thrown up a few yards in front of the ditch to cover the scarp of the main work.

8. The enceinte is the body of the place, or the first belt of ramparts and parapets that enclose the place.

Then there are the outworks constructed between the enceinte and the glacis, the advanced works, constructed beyond the covered way and the glacis, but within range of the musketry of the main works, and detached works, or those constructed beyond the range of such musketry. The bastion is a work of two faces and two flanks, all the angles being salient, the demilune, composed of two faces forming a salient angle towards the country, and con-

structed to cover the curtain, or that part of the rampart lying between two bastions. The demilune serves to cover the main entrance to the work, and to place the adjacent bastions in strong reenterings. The tenaile is a low work constructed in the main ditch, upon the lines of defense, between the bastions, before the curtain, composed of two faces, and sometimes of two flanks and a small curtain. There are also places of arms, reentering places of arms, salient places of arms, redoubts placed within the demilune, and reentering places of arms; caponniers constructed to cover the passage of the ditch from the tenaile to the gorge of the demilune, and from the demilune to the covered way; posterns, or underground communications; sortie passages, or narrow openings made through the crest of the glacis. The traverses are small works erected on the covered way to intercept the fire of the besieger's batteries. The scarp and counterscarp galleries, arranged with loop holes, are sometimes constructed for the defense of the ditch. Embrasures are sometimes made in the scarp wall for the fire of artillery, while the whole is protected from shells by a bomb-proof covering overhead, termed a casemate.

Temporary fortification, belonging to field engineering, is resorted to for the purpose of strengthening positions designed to be occupied only for short periods, and are usually made of earth thrown up by the troops within a brief period of time. The principles upon which they are constructed are similar to those which preside over permanent fortifications, although much greater latitude is allowed in their application. These are generally termed intrenchments, and the object of their erection is to impede the march of the enemy, and to shelter the defensive troops. They may consist either of lines of works made to cover extended positions, or of detached works designed simply for the defense of the ground they occupy. As simple entrenchments we have the polygon, the redan, the lunette, the mitre, star-fort and bastion.

The redoubts are generally constructed square or polygonal, on account of their greater ease of construction in that form. The redan is a small work with two faces terminating in a salient angle, and is used to cover a camp, the front of a battle-field, advanced posts, avenues of a village, or other localities which it is desirable to protect. The lunette is a redan having flanks parallel to its capitals. The bastion fort is usually composed of four or five fronts, but it may be applied to a polygon of any number of sides.

All artificial obstacles, such as hedges, walls, houses, stone fences, etc., are availed of in the laying out of field-works. The abatis are tops and large limbs of trees arranged along the glacis of a work, the ends of the branches being lopped off and sharpened. Palisades are stakes eight or ten feet long, one end made sharp while the other is fastened in the ground. When placed in juxtaposition they are connected together by horizontal riband pieces. When the timbers are large and the work intended as a part of a primary defense, it is called a stockade. Mines are sometimes excavated, and charged with powder for the purpose of producing an explosion. In the earlier periods, they were only used to open breaches and demolish masses of masonry, but in later times they have been employed as important elements in the attack and defense of places.

Having learnt the essential parts of field and permanent fortifications, we will next briefly advert to the subject of attack and defense. The successful or unsuccessful prosecution of the arts here employed, tests the sufficiency or insufficiency of the fortifications. The attack and defense of the larger class of field-works are so similar to that of permanent fortifications that it is unnecessary here to make any distinction.

In the attack and defense of a regular, permanent fortification the skill of the engineer is more especially required. In the regular siege it is indispensable. The assault upon a fortified fortress, or city, requires a much greater proportion of force in the assaulting party. It should be

composed of troops divided into two portions, each equal in strength to three-fourths of the garrison attacked. One of these should be the attacking, the other the supporting party. It is usual for each column of the attacking party to assault the salient points of the works, and least defended portions. As each column moves on, points of security should be taken up, such as the reverse, or the exterior slope of the works, building, walls, as well as gorges and flanks. The assault, however, under circumstances the most favorable, is usually attended with an immense sacrifice of human life. This has rendered the siege the more generally resorted to, and the great facilities which the science and skill of modern times have afforded to its prompt, vigorous, and successful prosecution, have made the assault of much less frequent occurrence. At the siege of Ypres, the French general getting impatient, advised an assault before the breaches were ready. "You will gain a day by the assault," said Vauban to the king, Louis XIV, "but you will lose a thousand men." The regular works were continued, and the day following the place was taken with a very trifling loss.

The first operation of the besieging army is to invest the fortress, which is done by occupying positions on every side so as to cut off all communication with the adjacent country, and confine the garrison entirely to their own resources. All the positions thus taken are strengthened by field-works, and an unobstructed communication is kept up between them. When the investment is complete, parks of artillery are placed in secure localities, behind the slopes of hills, or in ravines, beyond the general range of the guns of the fortress, but with a ready access to the trenches and batteries of attack, for the use of which they are formed.

The besiegers have three objects in view: 1. By their artillery fire to dismount the guns and thus silence all the artillery fire of the place. 2. To construct a secure and covered road by which their forces may march to assault the defensive works, as soon as they are sufficiently impaired

to justify the attempt. 3. To breach or batter down the escarp revetments of the fortress in certain spots, causing the fall of the rampart and parapet supported by them, and thus exposing the interior of the place to the assaulting forces. The progress of a regular siege presents three distinct periods: 1. The operations preliminary to the opening of the trenches. 2. Those intervening between the opening of the trenches, and the establishment of the third parallel. 3. From the completion of the third parallel, to the reduction of the place.

The preliminary operations consist of the investment already mentioned, the securing and fortifying all the favorable positions; the establishment of posts and sentinels, called the daily cordon, at such a distance as to be beyond the reach of the guns of the fortress; and the nearer approach of the troops during the night, which constitutes the nightly cordon. Before any of the objects heretofore mentioned can be fully attained, it is necessary to resort to some means of protection against the fire and sorties from the garrison. With this view the trenches are opened, and the lines of countervallation and circumvallation are established. The first consists of works between the camp of the besieging army and the fortress. The last is exterior to the camp, and designed to protect the besieging army from being in its turn attacked or besieged.

In 1640, Prince Thomas of Savoy, and the Spaniards, held the city of Turin, while the citadel was defended by a French garrison. In May, the Count d'Harcourt set himself down before the place, but that was scarcely done before the Marquis de Lenages arrived with heavy forces to blockade him in his lines. Thus the citadel was besieged by the city, the latter by a French army, and that, in its turn, surrounded by a Spanish. In this position Prince Thomas corresponded with Lenages by means of shells in which letters were enclosed, and by the same means salt and medicine, in small quantities, were introduced into the city. Count d'Harcourt was obliged to protect him-

self by strong lines on both sides, and after four and a half months forced the city to capitulate.

The exterior, or lines of circumvallation, are now frequently dispensed with by employing a force called the army of observation sufficient to hold in check any succoring army.

The parallels are usually three in number, and are long lines of trench formed around the whole of the fronts attacked, the first being more and more distant as the range of fire-arms becomes increased. While formerly it was only between six and seven hundred yards, in the recent siege of Sebastopol it was twelve hundred. The first parallel is formed in the night by a body of men, some carrying intrenching tools, and others armed, and called guards of the trenches. These latter are in advance of the workmen, and lie down to keep themselves concealed from the fire of the fortress. They protect the workmen while the latter are digging a trench in the ground parallel to the fortifications to be attacked, and with the earth excavated from the trench raising a bank on the side next the enemy. This trench is afterwards widened and deepened, and the bank of earth raised till it forms a covered road, which constitutes the parallel, embracing all the fortifications to be attacked; so that along this road, guns, wagons, and men may move securely, and be sheltered from the fire of the garrison. They are arranged with banquettes for musketry, which are steps of earth within the trench so high as to enable the defenders, when standing upon them, to fire over the crest of the bank. From this parallel run boyaux, or small trenches in a zigzag direction along the capitals of the front of attack, and also to the magazines, which have no banquettes, and are intended exclusively for the circulation of the troops. The first parallel is constructed by what is called the simple sap, and on its completion the guards instead of advancing in front of the work, are placed in the trenches. So also the engineers select positions for the batteries to silence the defensive artillery. These batteries

are constructed a little in advance of this parallel, and in such positions that their guns enfilade, or sweep the whole length of the faces of the works attacked.

From the first parallel commence the approaches, which are trenches dug in the ground in the direction of the fortress. As these may be exposed to grape the flying sap is employed in their construction. The approaches are made not in a straight line directly towards the salients of the besieged fortress, because then they would be subject to an enfilading fire from one end to the other, but in a zigzag direction, alternately to the right and to the left, in such a manner that their prolongations fall clear of the fortress, and the possibility of being enfiladed is entirely removed. Any sorties from the garrison are met and repulsed by the guard of the trenches.

When these approaches have advanced about half way between the first parallel and the covered way of the fortress, a second parallel is established more especially to protect the guard of the trenches, and to prevent their being swept off by cavalry issuing from the covered way of the fortress.

From the second parallel approaches are again pushed forward much in the manner before stated, until they reach nearly the crest of the covered way. The besiegers being here greatly exposed to the fire of musketry the trenches are constructed by the full sap. This brings us to the third parallel, which is a trench of greater width than the two preceding, and in it batteries of heavy guns are constructed to silence the remaining artillery of the defense, and also to breach in certain selected spots the escarp revetment wall, thus destroying the formidable obstacle to assault presented by the high perpendicular sides of the ditches of the fortress. The second parallel is now appropriated to the reserve, while the first becomes the depot of materials. Demi-parallels are also frequently established between the second and third, to be occupied by detachments of guards.

During these advances of the besiegers, the defense have not been inactive. Their object has been to harass the

work men in the trenches, and retard the advance of the works of attack. With this view garrison pieces of long range and large howitzers have been brought forward on the salients, or projecting angles of the bastions and demilunes of attack, so as to fire in ricochet along the capitals on which the boyaux must be pushed. This ricochet fire is with a small charge, and at a low elevation, so that the ball may merely clear the parapet, and thence bound along a rampart. As soon as darkness has settled upon the earth, light and fire-balls were thrown out to light up the ground occupied by the besiegers, thus exposing them to the fire of the garrison, and to the attacks of the sortie parties. These parties are the most effective when the besiegers commence the second parallel, as the guards who are then in the first are not so immediately at hand to protect the workmen. These sorties are often frequently repeated, and tend very much to prolong the siege. Defensive mines are also sometimes resorted to, to prolong the defense, and they often force the besieger to make works that require much time in their preparation. This leads to the slow and tedious operations of subterranean warfare. A fourth trench is then required to be formed in front of the third parallel, into which shafts are sunk about six yards apart for establishing overcharged mines. As soon as the galleries of the besieged are destroyed by the explosion of these mines, the covered way may be attacked by storm. Other mines are established on the terre-plein, or level plain of the covered way to destroy the entrance to the galleries, and thus deprive the besieged of the use of their mines.

After the completion of the third parallel an assault is often made on the fortress. In the front of it stone mortar batteries are established, which, on a given signal, open their fire in concert with all the enfilading and mortar batteries. When this fire has produced its effect in clearing the outwork, a select body of troops sally forth and carry the covered way with the bayonet, sheltering themselves behind the traverses until the sappers throw up a trench some four or five yards from the crest of the glacis, high

enough to protect the troops from the fire of the besieged. It may afterwards be connected with the third parallel by boyaux.

The assault, on account of the loss of life with which it may be attended, is not always resorted to after the completion of the third parallel. Regular approaches may still continue to be made by pushing a double-sap or trench with parapets on each side forward from the third parallel to within thirty yards of the salient of the covered way; the trench is then extended some fifteen or twenty yards to the right or left, and the earth thrown up high enough to enable the besiegers to obtain a plunging fire into the covered way, and thus prevent the enemy from occupying it. This mound of earth is termed a trench cavalier. Boyaux are now pushed forward to the crowning of the covered way and the establishing of breach batteries. Descents are then constructed into the ditches, and when these batteries have made a breach into the walls of the bastions and outworks, the boyaux are pushed across the ditches and lodgments effected in the breaches. The demilune is first carried, next the demilune redoubt and bastion, and lastly, the interior retrenchment, and citadel. The retrenchment is an inner defensible line, either constructed in the original design, or executed on the spur of the occasion, to cut off a breach, or other weak point, so that the capture of the latter shall not involve that of the retrenched post. In some cases the breaches are carried by assault, but this again is always at the expense of human life.

As to the relative strength of the opposing forces, it has been estimated that if the fortress has been properly constructed, the garrison will be able to resist a besieging army which is six times as numerous as itself.

Armies, their Composition, Subsistence, and Means of Movement.

The army is the grand aggregate of a nation's military force. The military art organizes and combines its ele-

ments; divides it into different arms; assembles it upon the theatre of war; links it to a base by means of a line of operations; rests upon it fortresses or intrenched camps; marches it in combined columns or columns in masses; distributes it into army corps, divisions, brigades, and battalions; and on the day of battle assembles it between an advanced and rear-guard, and flanking parties.

The army is composed of four arms, viz: infantry, cavalry, artillery, and engineers. Each one of these is necessary, and no army can be complete without them all.

1. As to infantry or foot soldiers, most of the nations of Europe make a nominal division of infantry of the line, and light infantry, although they are usually armed and equipped alike, and receive the same organization and instruction. The infantry of the line acts in masses, and constitutes the principal fighting force; while the light infantry is more usually employed to protect the flanks of the army, to secure outposts, reconnoitre the ground, secure avenues of approach, and deceive the enemy. They usually begin the battle, and afterwards take their place in the line. The infantry was formerly armed with the pike, but in the reign of Louis XIV, through the influence of Vauban the pike was suppressed, and the musket and bayonet, substituted in its place.

Napoleon called infantry the arm of battles and the sinews of the army. It has also been called the soul as well as the sinew of armies. It is at home on every species of ground, level as well as broken, finishes operations begun by artillery; crowns heights which horses and pieces of artillery cannot reach; and often decides the fate of battles with the aid of cavalry, and sometimes alone. It costs little, occupies but little ground, is active, readily renewed, easily subsisted, and has always changed its tactics at the same time with its arms. The formation in lines has fitted it for action on all kinds of ground, and the invention of massing, condensation of ranks, and the formations by size, have given it a perfect ensemble. By the simplification of evolutions, the resort to guides, and turning upon pivots,

it has gained great rapidity in its march. Its susceptibility to rapid change of direction; its ready formation in order of battle, and alternate ployments and deployments, enable it to act skillfully in the affairs of plains and outposts. Its depth of formation has progressively diminished since the centre and wings have been armed alike. The introduction of the improved rifle musket has given it great power, and that, together with the bayonet, fits it alike for close or distant combat.

In all properly organized armies the infantry constitutes from three-fourths to four-fifths of the entire active force in the field, and about seven-tenths of the entire military establishment; and although it may well be regarded as the first instrument of victory, yet it finds a powerful support in the cavalry, artillery, and engineers, without which its operations would necessarily be comparatively very much limited.

2. Cavalry, armed soldiers on horseback, have always played a conspicuous part in armies. In some they have constituted the main, if not the only feature. Some nations have been horsemen. The savage Huns, who scourged Europe so severely under Attila, were such a nation. During the middle ages the knights fought on horseback. Under Pepin and Charlemagne, the two arms of infantry and cavalry were about equal, while under Charles the Bald armies were composed almost entirely of cavalry. The introduction of artillery at first diminished the employment of cavalry, but this arm was partially restored in modern warfare by Gustavus Adolphus, and finally perfected by Seidlitz under the great Frederick.

Cavalry have been divided into light and heavy, and a mixed class called dragoons. The heavy cavalry, divided into carbineers, cuirassiers, and sometimes lancers, acted in heavy masses, moved in united ranks, and made the decisive charges on the field of battle. Its perfect type may be found in the mailed chivalry of the middle ages. The light cavalry consisted of chasseurs, or troopers, hussars, and lancers, composed of smaller men and smaller horses

than those of the heavy. The dragoons were formerly a mixed body of horse and foot, but finally came to be a mixed kind of cavalry between the heavy and the light.

Since the use of rifles, and the more improved styles of fire-arms, the heavy cavalry have been less and less employed. When the heavy masses of cavalry could take a position in safety up to within four hundred yards of the infantry, they might hope, by increasing their trot to a gallop, and then to the highest possible speed, to be successful in their charge. But since the rifle can empty a saddle at the distance of a thousand yards, it would be quite a desperate undertaking for heavy cavalry, under ordinary circumstances to make a charge upon infantry. A well organized column of the latter, first by its fire, and second by its bayonet, would present a very effectual barrier. Hence in a fair fight between well armed, and well disposed infantry and cavalry, the former will now be successful. Thus in the battle of Auerstadt, in 1806, the assaults of the Prussian cavalry, led on by Blucher, in repeated and impetuous charges, made no impression upon the front of iron presented by the French infantry, formed into squares for the purpose of receiving them. The same superiority was evidenced at the battles of Krasnoe and Molwitz. But when the infantry on one side are already engaged with the infantry on the other, an unexpected charge of cavalry, made at the right time and in the right direction, is very likely to prove successful, and sometimes to decide the fate of the battle, as at Rosbach, Zrondorf, Wurtzburg, Marengo, Eylau, etc.

The principal merit of cavalry lies in its rapidity, its mobility, its promptness and audacity in action. Its principal object is to prepare or to finish the victory, to render it complete by taking prisoners or trophies, by pursuing the enemy, by rapidly carrying succor to a menaced point, by breaking the shaken infantry or by covering the retreat of the infantry and the artillery.[1] An army wanting in

[1] *Jomini*, 306.

cavalry rarely obtains great successes, and its retreats are always difficult.

Marshal Saxe termed the cavalry the "arme du moment for the reason that in almost all battles there are moments when a decisive charge of cavalry will secure the victory, but if not made at the instant it may be too late. Thus in the campaign of Napoleon in Egypt, Murat, Leclerc, and La Salle, cavalry generals, presented themselves to the Mamelukes in several lines. When the latter were upon the point of out-fronting the first line, the second came to its assistance on the right and left; the Mamelukes then stopped, and wheeled, to turn the wings of this new line. This was the moment seized for charging them, and they were always broken.[1]

It is the shock that constitutes the principal effect produced by this arm; and this effect will always be the greater in proportion to the velocity with which the charge is made, providing the troops can be kept in mass. The greater the speed with which the charge is made the more likely will the mass be broken, and the result be rendered ineffective. But although this arm is so effectual in producing a shock, yet it is unable of itself to resist a shock, and hence should never wait to receive the charge of another body of cavalry. Hence the injunctions of the Great Frederick to his cavalry officers always were never to receive a charge, but always to meet the attacking force half way. That this was the only mode to prevent a defeat.

Cavalry is always required to be sustained, and that immediately either by infantry or other bodies of horse. This arises from the fact that as soon as the charge is made, the whole strength of this arm is expended in it, and hence if immediately attacked, defeat becomes inevitable. At Waterloo, the attack by the French cavalry lacked the proper support, and disastrous consequences were the necessary result.

[1] *Halleck*, 268.

Cavalry is invaluable after a victory, for the purpose of pursuing a flying enemy. Where the rout is complete, large bodies of cavalry can almost effect the annihilation of the defeated army. Thus the Prussian army in 1806,[1] after the battle of Jena, and Napoleon's army in 1815, at Waterloo, were completely cut to pieces by the skillful use of cavalry.

In a well organized army, the cavalry arm should be from one-fourth to one-sixth of the infantry, according to the nature of the war, and also according to the nature of the country, a smaller number being required in mountainous than in level regions.

3. The third arm is the artillery, the material of which, as employed in modern warfare, is divided into two general classes. These are:

First. Siege artillery; composed of mortars, large howitzers, paixhan guns, or columbiads, and all cannon of a large calibre. All these, with the exception of the smaller mortars, are made of cast iron.

Second. Field artillery is composed of the smaller guns and howitzers. The projectiles thrown by artillery are: 1. Solid shot, made of cast iron formed in moulds of sand or iron. This is the only one which is effective against the stone walls of forts. Hot shot are used against shipping and wooden structures of every description. 2. Hollow shot and shells, called bombs, howitzers, grenades, etc. These are made of cast iron, and are usually spherical, the cavity in the interior being concentric with the exterior surface. A fuse so regulated, that the explosion shall take place at the desired moment, communicates fire to the combustible matter within the shell. 3. The strap shot, which consists of a round ball attached to a sabot of the same calibre, by two strips of tin passing over the shot at right angles, and fastened to a third, which is soldered around the sabot. While one end of the sabot is arranged for attaching it to the cartridge, the other is hollowed out to

[1] *Halleck*, 272.

receive the shot. 4. The case, or canister shot, is prepared by filling a tin canister with grape shot or musket balls, and attaching it to the cartridge by means of a sabot. This is quite effective against lines of infantry and cavalry at short ranges. 5. The grape shot consists of small balls arranged round an upright pin, which is attached to a plate of wood or iron. The balls are covered with canvas, and confined by a quilting of small twine. The use of this is for the same purpose as the canister. There are also light and fire, or incendiary balls and carcasses, employed to light up the works or approaches of the enemy, and also to set on fire the wooden structures with which they may come in contact.

As an arm of service, artillery is divided into: 1. Field artillery, which is intended for field service. 2. Siege artillery, which is employed for the attack and defense of places. The former when employed in the service of a campaign, is divided into: 1. Foot artillery. 2. Horse artillery. Artillery of any description was slow in coming into general use. Its great importance was seen by Gustavus Adolphus, who rendered it an effectual arm of service in the thirty years' war. So a great improvement was made by Conde, Turenne, and Prince Eugene of Savoy. Frederick the Great was the first to introduce horse artillery which, from the promptness and rapidity of its movements, was enabled to act with other troops without embarrassing them.

Artillery always acts by batteries and not by regiments. This term is used to mean a permanent organization of a certain number of cannon, with the men and other accessories required to serve them. A battery is ordinarily composed of six pieces, two of them being howitzers. In some services there are eight instead of six. Some are six, some twelve-pounders, the latter the more usually forming the reserve.

Artillery admits of three formations: 1. In column, in which it ordinarily moves by sections of two pieces, each piece being followed or preceded by its caisson. 2. In

battle, in which the pieces are drawn up in line, their caissons forming a second line, at the distance of a few paces. 3. In battery, in which the pieces are formed in the same way as for battle, except that the guns are directed towards the enemy and prepared for firing.

Artillery has generally been discussed under two heads: 1. As an arm of preparation. 2. As an arm of succor.

In the first it is often employed in the commencement of an action, signaling the approach of the hostile armies towards each other. The advancing army more especially employs it to feel its way through woods or other concealments, and to ascertain the positions of the enemy. This artillery warfare, engaged in, often while the armies are at considerable distances from each other, causes frequently much waste of powder and projectiles.

When within range this arm of service serves: "1st, to protect the deploying of the other troops;[1] 2d, to disorganize the enemy's masses, and to facilitate the action of infantry and cavalry, by weakening the intended points of attack; 3d, to force an enemy to evacuate a position by overthrowing obstacles with which he has covered himself; 4th, to keep up the action till the other troops can be prepared to strike the decisive blow."

As an arm of succor the artillery serves: "1st, to give impulsive force to the attacking columns; 2d, to assist in arresting or retarding the offensive movements of the enemy;[2] 3d, to protect the avenues of approach, and to defend obstacles that cover a position; 4th, to cover a retrogade movement."

The foot artillery, like infantry, is better calculated to defend, or to make a steady, slow advance, while the horse artillery, like cavalry, is the most effective in attack. The utility of every species of artillery is largely dependent upon the rapidity and accuracy of its fire. Those who direct it must not only possess science, patience, and skill, but also valor, coolness, and uninterrupted self-possession.

[1] *Halleck*, 290. [2] *Idem*, 292.

In such hands the batteries become truly powerful instruments of attack and defense. Their power of throwing shot and shell, and even canister and grape to great distances, secures to them under ordinary circumstances, an immunity from capture by any attack of infantry. Before they could reach the battery the men would be killed, wounded or dispersed.

Artillery is not alone useful in feeling the way for an advancing army. Where a retreat is rendered necessary, the horse artillery and cavalry may serve as a valuable protection in the rear. The retiring column may be well protected by placing in echelon the squadrons of horse, and the light batteries. The batteries may continue firing while the retreat is in progress. Thus, in the battle of Albuera, in 1811, the French artillery on the left wing held in check the right and centre of the Anglo-Spaniards till the army effected its retreat,[1] when the artillery retired in echelons, by batteries and fractions of batteries, under the protection of the cavalry. By echelon is meant an arrangement of battalions, so that each has a line of battle in advance, or in rear of its neighboring battalion.

Echelon.

The number of artillery in all well regulated army organizations,[2] should equal about two-thirds of the cavalry, and one-seventh of the infantry.

4. The fourth arm is the engineers, which received its greatest development under Louis XIV, and has ever since constituted an important part of the army organization. As compared with the artillery their numbers are about as two to three. They are divided into staffs, guards, or fort keepers, artificers and troops; their general duties are to plan, construct and repair all fortifications and defensive works, to prepare military materials, to direct and superin-

[1] *Halleck*, 293. [2] *Idem*, 295.

tend the attack and defense of military works, and to lay out and construct field defenses, redoubts, and intrenchments. Their place is in the vanguard of an advancing, and rear guard of a retreating army.

In the division of engineer troops are to be found the sappers and pioneers, the miners and the pontoniers. This division only obtains where the military art has advanced to a high degree of perfection. Its organization is the most perfect in France, where it owes its existence to Vauban in 1670. Previously, there, as now in this country, infantry troops were detailed as sappers, and instructed by engineers. The agency of the engineer department is essential in the movements of armies.

Next to the composition of armies follows their subsistence, and means of movement. These are both included under one term, viz: logisties, a word derived from the Latin logista, the administrator or intendant of the Roman armies.

The principle upon which armies have been subsisted have varied at different periods of time, with different circumstances, and somewhat with the different advances that have been made in civilization. The only possible modes of doing this are derived from two principles, and from their modifications by each other. The one of these is to support the army entirely at the expense of the country passed over, and the other to establish regular magazines to which the means of subsistence are transported, and from which the supplies are taken for distribution as circumstances may require.

The first has been the more generally resorted to. It was a maxim with Cæsar that war should be made to support war; and when armies have been traveling entirely through the enemy's country, and that country a rich one, that maxim has strongly prevailed almost ever since. The wars of Louis XIV, and Frederick II, were carried on mostly on their own frontiers, and hence led to the adoption of a system of regular depots and supplies. Several of the European wars, however, have been carried on upon

a different principle. In the famous thirty years' war, Wallenstein stipulated with the emperor Ferdinand to raise fifty thousand men, and to arm, equip, and feed them at his own expense. He raised them to an hundred thousand, and by levying heavy contributions upon the lower German provinces, was enabled to subsist his army, although in the same proportion as that prospered, the country through which it passed withered. Even at the period of the French revolution her armies made war without magazines, subsisting, sometimes on the inhabitants, and at others by forced requisitions levied on the country passed over, and at others still by pillaging and marauding expeditions.

In the practical operation of this principle there is much to be considered in the ability of the country in reference to its productiveness, to support an invading army. While Italy, Suabia, and the basins of the Rhine and the Danube could in this manner furnish supplies for an invading army of one hundred thousand men, some of the provinces of Poland, and especially the bleak regions of Russia, could do but little towards satisfying the demands of such an army.

Not unfrequently questions of policy are mingled up with the resort to one of these principles. Thus in the war with the Spanish peninsula Napoleon had to choose between regular operations, with provisions either carried in the train of his army, or purchased and paid for of the inhabitants which would require drafts of three or four millions of francs upon the French treasury, or to subsist his army by irregular warfare, and with forced requisitions, thus creating a perpetual hostility between himself and the people of Spain whom it was his policy to conciliate. He finally decided upon the adoption of a middle course of supporting out of the country his active masses, and of employing the regular system of magazines for his reserves who are designed for the occupation and pacification of the conquered provinces.

The principle that would seem to commend itself for general adoption would be that regular magazines should be formed, so far as is practicable for the subsistence of the army, and that the levying of requisitions should be limited to cases where the nature of the war, and the rapidity of marches render a resort to them absolutely necessary; and also that with a view to safety, depots should be formed in places strengthened by nature or art, defended by troops or garrisons and situated in positions least liable to attack. "All depots of provisions and other supplies are called magazines, which are divided into principal, secondary, and provisional. The first are usually found on the base of operations; the second on the line of operations; and the last in the immediate vicinity of the troops, and contain supplies for a few days only."[1] All the great depots are placed on navigable rivers which communicate with the line of operations,[2] so as to afford easy and rapid means of transportation as the army advances on this line.

The efficiency of armies lies largely in their capacity of prompt and rapid movement. Marches are of two kinds: 1. Route marches. 2. Marches within reach of the enemy.

The first are within the empire of strategy, the last within that of tactics. But so far as concerns the means of executing either, there is an intimate connection with logistics. The rule in moving an army on a line of operations is to move it in as many columns as the facility of subsistence, celerity of movement, nature of the roads, etc., will permit. Small columns are more readily subsisted, and can move with greater rapidity than large ones. But when an army reaches within striking distance of the enemy the most important thing is concentration of the forces, which must be kept in mass, or at least within supporting distances of each other.

The advance of an army on the route march is always attended with no inconsiderable difficulties. Besides the clearing away of obstructions, there occurs usually in long marches

[1] *Halleck*, 90. [2] *Idem*, 93.

the necessity of crossing streams and rivers, and of castrametation or the bivouac. The first must frequently be accomplished in the absence of bridges, which either have never been constructed, or have been torn away by the enemy. These are supplied by that division in the engineer department termed pontoniers. Upon these it devolves to make the pontoon bridges, which are composed of vulcanized india rubber, and when on hand are constructed with great rapidity, so as to afford a safe passage for the army. The sufficiency of these pontoons for the purpose has been amply tested by experience, but the difficulty has been in the having a sufficient number at the right place in the right time. The failure to do this has not unfrequently saved or lost armies. These have occurred the most frequently in the wars of Napoleon. In his passage of the Po, he writes: "If I had had a good pontoon equipage, the fate of the enemy's army had been sealed; but the necessity of passing the river by successive embarkations saved it." In the winter of 1813–14 he writes to his minister of war; "If I had had pontoons, I should have already annihilated the army of Schwartzenberg, and closed the war; I should have taken from him eight or ten thousand wagons, and his entire army in detail; but for want of the proper means I could not pass the Seine." And again on the 2d of March he wrote: "If I had had a bridge equipage this morning, Blucher's army had been lost." And yet with all these drawbacks, the facility with which Napoleon crossed rivers, and made forced marches, has had no parallel in history. In 1809 his army crossed the Inn, the Salza, the Traun, and reached Vienna with such wonderful rapidity that the Austrians could not prepare for its defense. And then he crowned all by a passage of the Danube, which considering the depth and width of the river, the positions of the enemy, and his preparations to oppose a passage, has been pronounced one of the most hazardous and difficult of all the operations of the war.

Castrametation is the art of laying out and disposing to advantage the several parts of the camp of an army. The importance to be attached to the exercise of this art varies with the length of time the encampment is to continue. Where it is to continue for some time, and more especially if the presence of the enemy is expected, the art of fixing a camp is much the same as taking up a line of battle on the same position. It should be in such a position as to be neither commanded, out-fronted, nor surrounded; but if possible, to command and out-front the enemy's position.[1] There may be several modes of arranging an encampment in the same position, requiring great experience and genius in making the right selection.

The choice of position is governed by several considerations, such as the nature of the ground, whether moist or dry, its proximity to good roads, canals, or navigable streams, to woods and to water; its being beyond long cannon range; and if bordering on a river or stream, there must be space enough between them to form in order of battle. The cantonment for winter quarters requires still greater care in the selection.

The bivouac is a simple kind of camp, consisting merely of lines of fires and huts for the officers and soldiers. It is only a temporary encampment.

To ensure safety the camp must be carefully guarded. This is done by the camp guard, and also by detachments of infantry and cavalry, denominated piquets, which are thrown out in front and on the flanks, and which in connection with the guard preserve order and discipline around the camp, prevent desertions, intercept reconnoitering parties, and give immediate notice of the approach of the enemy. Beyond these the grand guards are posted, occupying as outposts the surrounding villages, farm-houses, or small field-works, from which they can conveniently watch the movements of the enemy, and detach patrols and sentries to furnish timely notice of danger.

[1] *Halleck*, 111.

Another matter of great importance connected with army movements relates to the necessity of ascertaining, by some means, the strength and purposes of the enemy. There are commonly reckoned four different modes by which this may be sought to be accomplished. The first is by a system of espionage well organized and liberally paid; the second by reconnaissances made by skillful officers and light troops; the third consists in the information obtained from prisoners of war, and the fourth is that of establishing with one's self the hypothesis which may be the most probable from two or more different bases.[1] Some include a fifth mode, that of signals to indicate the presence of the enemy. Of these the fourth mode requires some explanation. It can only be based upon the most profound knowledge of military operations. It has been observed that an army being able to operate only upon the centre or upon one of the extremities of its front of operations, there are scarcely ever more than three or four possible chances to foresee.[2] It will, therefore, only remain for a mind the most thoroughly penetrated with military truths to estimate in advance the most probable chances. Jomini gives the following as an illustration:

When in 1806 the war with Prussia was not yet decided upon by the French emperor, in a memoir made by him upon the probabilities of the war, he established the three following hypotheses:

"First: the Prussians will await Napoleon behind the Elbe, and will make defensive war to the Oder, in order to await the concurrence of Russia and Austria. Second: in the contrary case, they will advance upon the Saale, resting their left upon the frontier of Bohemia, and defending the outlets from the mountains of Franconia. Third: or else, expecting the French by the grand route of Mayence, they will advance imprudently to Erfurt. * * * * Those three hypotheses being laid down, if it were asked the course which best suited Napoleon to

[1] *Jomini*, 275, 276. [2] *Idem*, 277.

adopt, was it not easy to conclude that the weight of the French army, being already assembled in Bavaria, it was necessary to throw it upon the left of the Prussians by Gera and Hoff, for whatever hypothesis they should adopt, there was the Gordian knot of the whole campaign. Did they advance upon Erfurt? By falling upon Gera, they were cut off from their line of retreat, and thrown back upon the lower Elbe, to the North sea. Did they rest upon the Saale? By attacking their left by Hoff and Gera, they were partially overwhelmed, and could yet be anticipated by Leipsic at Berlin. If they remained finally behind the Elbe, it was always in the direction of Gera and Hoff, that it was necessary to seek them. Hence what importance was it to know the details of their movements, since the interest was always the same? Thus well convinced of these truths, I did not hesitate to announce a month before the war, that it would be what Napoleon would undertake, and that if the Prussians passed the Saale, it would be at Jena, and at Naumburg that they would fight."

In regard to what may be obtained by the aid of signals, there are several kinds of them, the most important of which is the modern telegraph. It was to this that Napoleon owed his success at Ratisbon, in 1809. He was yet at Paris when the Austrian army passed the Inn, at Braunau,[1] for invading Bavaria, and piercing his cantonments. Informed in twenty-four hours of what passed at two hundred and fifty leagues from him, he threw himself instantly into his carriage, and eight days afterwards was the conqueror in two battles under the walls of Ratisbon; when, without the telegraph, the campaign would have been lost. This refers to the signal telegraph, and not to the more recent transmission of intelligence by means of the electric fluid. The ascent of balloons has also been resorted to, for the purpose of obtaining a knowledge of the position and number of the enemy.

[1] *Jomini*, 280, 281.

In proportion as the army advances and becomes further removed from its base,[1] there arises the necessity of organizing the line of operations and staple lines, which should serve as a bond between the army and this base. The marches of an army are often preceded by a general advanced guard, or what is more frequent in the modern system, the main body and each of the wings have their particular advanced guard.

On the certainty and precision of army movements are of vital importance to secure the success of a campaign. No man ever understood so perfectly the principles upon which these movements reposed, or the art of effecting them so perfectly as Napoleon Bonaparte. He best knew how to collect together, with an admirable precision, upon the decisive point of the zone of operations, his columns which had departed from the most divergent points. One of the most remarkable instances of this is found in the almost miraculous assembling of the French army in the plains of Gera in 1806. He had first to make choice of the decisive point, and then to calculate the army movements that would reach it. For this purpose he was found "leaning over and sometimes lying down upon his map,[2] where the positions of his army corps and the presumed positions of the enemy were marked with pins of different colors, he ordered his movements with an assurance of which it would be difficult to form a just idea. Moving his compass with vivacity upon this map, he judged in the twinkling of an eye of the number of marches necessary to each of his corps for arriving at the point where he wished to have it at a given day, then placing his pins in those new positions, and combining the rapidity of the march which it would be necessary to assign to each of the columns with the possible epoch of their departure, he dictated those instructions which of themselves alone would be a title to glory."

[1] *Jomini*, 268, 269. [2] *Idem*, 271.

The results of all this were: "that Ney, coming from the borders of Lake Constance, Lannes from Upper Suabia, Soult and Davoust from Bavaria, and the Palatinate, Bernadotte and Angereau from Franconia, and the imperial guard arriving from Paris, were found in line upon three parallel routes debouching at the same time between Saalfeld, Gera and Plauen, when no person in the army, nor in Germany, conceived anything of those movements in appearance so complicated."

Strategy, its Maxims and Illustrations.

We have already seen how armies are constituted, subsisted, and moved from one point to another. We now come to inquire of the purpose of movement, the plan of a campaign, and this brings us within the empire of strategy, which is defined to be the art of conducting armies upon the most important point of the theatre of war, or of a zone of operations.[1] It covers the principle or motive of movement of all armies when not in immediate conflict with each other. It has nothing to do with the dispositions with a view to a battle, or to the movements, changes, or operations of the battle-field. It is content simply with leading armies upon the decisive points of the zone of operations, prepares the chances of battle, and influences in advance its results. It includes in its operations, and may have to do in the prosecution of its designs, with the whole theatre of war, which embraces not only the domain of the belligerent powers, but also that of their respective allies. This is contradistinguished from the theatre of operations, which is limited to the grounds upon which the attack or defense may have to be conducted.

The first thing that strategy sets about doing is to select a base of operations. By this must be understood that secure line of frontier or fortresses occupied by troops, from

[1] *Jomini*, 326.

which forward movements are made, supplies furnished, and upon which troops may retreat, if necessary. An army either of invasion or defense may have successive bases of operations. Thus in a war between France and Germany, a French army may have three bases, viz: the Rhine, the Moselle, and the Seine, each one of which may form a successive line of advance or retreat. The most favorable base is a large and rapid river which is commanded by fortresses situated on its banks. As the lines of operations are taken from the base, it is important to select and establish the one in reference to the other. It has been insisted upon by some that a base should be parallel with that of the adversary, but there is high authority for selecting bases perpendicular to those of the enemy,[1] and more especially those which are oblique, presenting two faces nearly perpendicular, the one to the other, and forming a reentrant angle, by means of which a double base might be insured at need, which would control two sides of the strategic field, thus procuring two lines of retreat distant from each other, and facilitating every change of the line of operations which any unexpected turn of the chances of war might render necessary. The two faces need not be occupied in force. The one may have a few fortified points, with a small corps of observation, while the great mass of forces may be carried on the other face. In the campaign of 1806, Napoleon had the double base of the Main and the Rhine, forming almost a reentrant angle, but while he left a small force upon the Rhine he massed his forces upon the Main,[2] and gaining the extremity of the perpendicular face, and thus anticipated the Prussians at Gera and at Naumburg, on their line of retreat. The great leading principle always is for the general "to seek his base upon the points where he can be sustained by all his means of war, and find, at the same time, a certain refuge."[3]

[1] *Jomini*, 89, 90. [2] *Idem*, 94. [3] *Idem*, 95.

Along with the establishment of the base of operations must be also the strategical points and lines, the decisive points, and objectives of operations. These latter are correlatives with the former, and each should be selected with reference to the other. While every point of the theatre of war should have a military importance, some are called strategic from the fact of their situation, their importance on the field of operations. These are geographical. Others derive their importance from their relations with the position of the hostile forces, and with enterprises that may be formed against them. These are strategic points of manœuvre. Again there are others that are of immense and incessant importance.[1] These are the decisive strategic points. These latter must be capable of exercising a prodigious influence either upon the whole campaign, or upon a single enterprise. They may be either:

1. Geographical or permanent, deriving their importance from the configuration of the theatre of war.[2] They are those which control the junction of several valleys, and the centre of the great communications which intersect a country. So also in mountainous countries, they are those controlling the defiles, which present the only practicable issues for an army.

2. Political, as the capital of the enemy, and not only on account of its being the capital, but also because in virtue of its being such, it is the central point towards which all the routes of a country converge. The strategic points of manœuvre are upon that one of the extremities of the enemy from whence he could be the more easily separated from his base and from his secoudary armies, without exposing one's self to running the same risk. In case the hostile army is extended over a long line, the decisive point will be the centre, as by penetrating there and dividing the forces, each division may be overcome in detail.

In regard to the objective point that is determined by the object of the campaign. In a war of invasion the pos-

[1] *Jomini*, 96. [2] *Idem*, 98.

session of the capital is generally the objective point. Next to the capital will rank any front of operations which might serve as first base to the enemy,[1] and where are to be found important places commanding the territory around them, as if France were to invade Italy in a war against Austria, its first objective might be to attain the line of the Ticino and of the Po, the second Mantua and the line of the Adige, and the third the Noric Alps.

If a nation is acting on the defensive, the objective point would be that which it would seek to cover. This would generally be first the capital or the first front and the first base of operations.

Not unfrequently the first objective point for an invading army is to seek an engagement with that of the enemy. The same may also occur to a nation acting on the defensive. This first seeking the army of the enemy was the policy of Napoleon. After making himself thoroughly acquainted with the position and forces of the enemy, his habit was "to burst with the rapidity of lightning[2] upon the centre of the enemy's army, if it be divided, or upon that one of the two extremities which should conduct the most directly upon its communications, to out-flank it, to cut it off, to break it up, to pursue it to the utmost, forcing it in divergent directions; finally, quitting it only after having annihilated or dispersed it." This he carried out quite successfully in all his early compaigns. But he at last found himself mistaken in attempting to apply these principles to the conducting of the Russian campaign.

Next to strategical points and lines, and decisive and objective points come up for consideration zones and lines of operations. By the first is understood a certain fraction of the general theatre of war, which should be passed over by an army with a determinate aim. Thus in the campaign of 1796, Italy was to the French armies,[3] the zone of operations of the right; Bavaria, that of the army of the centre; and Franconia, of the army of the left.

[1] *Jomini*, 100. [2] *Idem*, 101. [3] *Idem*, 111.

While zones of operations are used to designate a great fraction of the general theatre of war, it is left to lines of operations to designate the part of that grand fraction which an army will embrace in its enterprises, whether it follow several routes, or but one. The term, lines of communications, is used to designate the different practicable routes which should be found in the extent of the zone of operations. Thus in 1813, in the great coalition against Napoleon, and when three allied armies were to invade Saxony, another Bavaria, and another Italy, Saxony formed then the zone of operations of the principal mass. The objective point was Leipsic, and the zone had three lines of operations conducting to it, viz: the first was that of the army of Bohemia, leading from the mountains of Erzgebirge by Dresden and Chemnitz;[1] the second, that of the army of Silesia, going from Breslau by Dresden or by Wittemberg and thus upon Leipsic; while the third was that of the Prince of Sweden's army, departing from Berlin to go by Dessau to the same objective point.

There are also lines of defense, which may be strategical or tactical. The first are permanent, as fortified frontier lines, while the latter are temporary, referring merely to the transient position where an army is found. The first the more generally occurs when such lines present a mixture of natural and artificial obstacles, such as chains of mountains, great rivers and fortresses, forming between each other a well connected system. Thus between Piedmont and France is the barrier of the Alps, and between France and Spain that of the Pyrenees. So also the Rhine, the Oder and the Elbe may be considered as permanent lines of defense by reason of the important places which cover them.

As to the temporary or eventual lines of defense they may be found in every considerable river, every mountain chain, and every great defile which presents a few temporary intrenchments, as they serve to suspend, for some

[1] *Jomini*, 113.

days the march of an enemy, and often compel him to deviate from his direct route to seek a less difficult passage.

By pursuing out lines of operation from their base will ultimately be reached the front of operations,[1] by which is meant the extent of a line which an army occupies in advance of its base, and in the sphere of which it acts momentarily, whether in an enemy's country, or its own.

Fronts of operations and lines of defense often mean the same thing, and in both it is equally important to have sure communications with the different points of the line of operations. So also in each it is equally advantageous to have upon the flanks, the same as upon the front, great natural or artificial obstacles which may serve as points of support. These are sometimes called pivots of operations, being partial bases for a given time. As in the campaign of 1796, Verona was the pivot of operations for all the enterprises which Napoleon undertook around Mantua during eight entire months.

Where the front of operations is identical with the line of defense, it is obvious that the least extended it is,[2] the more easily will an army cover it, if thrown back upon the defensive. But a too great front of operations would leave some parts less strongly defended, and hence give to the enemy spaces vast enough for escaping the results of a well combined strategic manœuvre; as the operations of Marengo, Ulm and Jena could not have had such results upon a theatre as extended as that of the war with Russia in 1812.

The direction given to a front of operations is by no means a matter of indifference. In general, it should be parallel to the primitive base, but there are circumstances in which it should be perpendicular to the general base and parallel to the principal line of operations. In such case this direction might form a kind of new temporary base, as in the operations of Napoleon adopted in his march upon Eylau, making of the Vistula a kind of temporary

[1] *Jomini*, 105. [2] *Idem*, 107.

base, while his pivots of operations were at Warsaw and at Thorn.

Armies are sometimes required to have double fronts of operations arising the more generally from the configuration of certain theatres of war, as would occur in Turkey and in Spain, to armies wishing to cross the Balkan or the Ebro,[1] the first for facing the valley of the Danube, and the last for showing front to forces coming from Saragossa or from Leon.

There are also strategical as well as tactical positions of armies. Such are those taken for a given time with the view of embracing a larger front of operations than is necessary for combat. Instances: all positions taken behind a river, or on a line of defense of which the divisions should be at a certain distance asunder. The conditions essential to every such position are, that it be more concentrated than the hostile forces to which it should be opposed, and that the communications between all parts of the army be such as to enable them to unite notwithstanding any opposition of the enemy; and with that view all central or interior positions are preferable to exterior ones.

Thus it will result that "the front of operations is the space embraced by the enterprises of an army, on the side where the enemy is found; that the line of defense is the part of that front where the bulk of the forces should be united when reduced to the defensive;[2] and finally, that strategic positions designate the provisory distribution of the forces of an army, whether upon the line of defense, or upon the front of operations."

Very much in strategy is made to depend upon the lines of operations of an army. We have several lines of operations as:

1. The general line of operations, meaning that which the bulk of the army will follow, and on which are its

[1] *Jomini*, 138. [2] *Idem*, 111.

depots and magazines. Its line of retreat, if necessary, will be the same.

2. There may be simple or double lines of operations, according as one army is acting in the same direction from a frontier, or two armies independent of each other, are forming upon the same frontier.

3. Interior lines of operations are those which an army would form to oppose several hostile masses, but the direction to the different corps should be such as to draw them towards each other, so as to have their movements connected before the enemy could oppose to them a greater mass.

4. Exterior lines are the opposite, being those which an army will form at the same time upon the two extremities of one or several hostile lines.

5. Concentric lines of operations are lines departing from distant points to arrive on the same point, in front or in rear of their base.

6. Divergent lines express those which a single mass will take, departing from a given point, and dividing in order to move upon several divergent points.

7. Deep lines are those which, departing from their base, pass over a great extent of ground to arrive at their end.

8. Secondary lines designate the relations between two armies, when they act upon the same development of frontiers.

9. Accidental lines occur where unforeseen events change the primitive plan of the campaign, and give a new direction to the operations.

Almost everything depends upon the choice and direction given to lines of operations. That direction must be governed by the geographical situation of the theatre of operations, and by the position of the hostile forces upon that strategic field.[1] As a general rule, however, it could only be given upon the centre, or upon one of the extremi-

[1] *Jomini*, 125.

ties. It would only be possible to act upon the front and extremities at the same time, where there are greatly superior forces. The manœuvre line is best directed upon the centre of the enemy, provided his forces are divided upon a too extended front; otherwise the direction should be given upon one of the extremities, and from thence upon the rear of the hostile line of defense or front of operations.

Except in cases of great coalitions, or when immense forces are at command, it is reckoned unwise to form two independent armies upon the same frontier. With equal forces, a simple line of operations on the same frontier will be much preferable to a double. The latter, however, may become necessary, on account either of the configuration of the theatre of war, or because the enemy may have formed one himself. In case of such necessity, the interior or central line will be preferable to the exterior one, because the army having the former will be able to bring each of its fractions into cooperation in a plan combined between them, and thus get the start of the enemy in assembling together the mass of its forces. By means of such combination and skillful movement, the disunited forces of the enemy may possibly be separately attacked and dispersed.

It is a maxim having high authority, that the line of operation should not be abandoned; but circumstances may render a change in its direction necessary. Hence accidental lines of operations. These are seldom resorted to, except to extricate an army from an embarrassing situation. It is one of the most skillful manœuvres in war to know how successfully to make this change; and when so done, it may deceive the enemy, who becomes ignorant where to look for its rear, or upon what weak points it is assailable. This was done by Frederick II, and was several times projected by Napoleon. As the general configuration of the bases greatly influences the direction to be given to the lines of operations, the great art of directing these properly is so to combine their relations

with the bases and with the movements of the army, as to be able to seize upon the communications of the enemy, without being liable to lose our own.

It has been recommended "to act offensively upon the most important point with the major part of your forces,[1] remaining at secondary points on the defensive, in strong positions, or behind a river, until the decisive blow being struck, and the operation terminated by the total defeat of an essential part of the hostile army, you find yourself at liberty to direct your efforts upon one of the other menaced points." Eccentric operations are recommended when a mass is to depart from a given centre, and to act in a divergent direction to divide and separately to defeat two hostile fractions which form two exterior lines, as was done by Frederick II, in the campaign of 1767,[2] and which resulted in the splendid battles of Rosbach and Leuthen. But concentric operations are much preferable, either when they tend to concentrate a divided army, on a point where it would be sure to arrive before the enemy; or when they tend to make act, towards a common end, two armies which could not be anticipated and overthrown separately, by any more concentrated enemy.

Strategic lines are all the communications which lead by the most direct or the most advantageous way from one important point to another,[3] as also from the front of operations of the army to all the objective points which it may be desirable to attain. Those lines must be concentric when the object is to prepare for a decisive shock, and after a victory eccentric. In making choice of those which are momentary it is important to avoid wholly uncovering the line of operations, and exposing it to the enemy. This may be done where a desirable object justifies the risk run. As in the line followed by Blucher from Gembloux by Wavre upon Mont St. Jean,[4] which was a strategic line of manœuvre, and a central or interior one, leaving uncovered

[1] *Jomini*, 136. [2] *Idem*, 140. [3] *Idem*, 143. [4] *Idem*, 145.

his natural line of operations in order to seek safety in the important junction of the two combined armies.

When an enemy's country is offensively penetrated, there should be formed eventual bases, which can be used as temporary bases without being as strong or as sure as those of the frontiers of the invading army.[1] These are often a line of river with tetes de ponts, or field intrenchments covering a bridge, with one or two large cities secure from a coup de main, for covering the grand depots of the army, and to serve for the union of the troops of reserve.

Tactics, with its Maxims and Illustrations.

Strategy brings armies into the neighborhood of each other, and there leaves them. The lines of operations of the two armies are then suspended to await the arbitrament of battle. This brings them within the empire of tactics, which teaches the employment of forces in battle, or more definitely, the drawing an army up in order of battle, and all the movements of the two armies during the continuance of the engagement. It has been divided into two parts: 1st. Grand tactics, or the tactics of battle. 2d, Elementary tactics, or tactics of instruction. It is with the former only that we have now to do. By grand tactics is to be understood the art of well combining and well conducting battles.[2] The great guiding principle which presides over the combinations of tactics is the same as that of strategy, viz: the carrying the weight of our forces upon a part only of the hostile army, and upon the point which promises the greatest results.

There are three kinds of battles: 1. Defensive, or those in which an army while in an advantageous position awaits the enemy. 2. Offensive, where the army attacks the enemy in his chosen position. 3. Unexpected, where battles are delivered by the two parties on the march.

[1] *Jomini*, 147. [2] *Idem*, 201.

Circumstances may concur to enable an army to choose its own position. An invading army may be under the necessity of defeating and dispersing an opposing army in order to make any further progress in the invasion. Such army is the head of the opposition. It must, therefore, be sought out, and either defeated or rendered victorious. To give up such a contest would be equivalent to giving up the invasion. This allows the army of the invaded country, within certain limitations, to select its own position in which to receive battle. The limitations are found principally in the strategic necessities, which no army can with safety disregard. The position selected is the one which is most in harmony with the object proposed in taking it, and which offers the greatest possible advantages to the kind of troops which constitutes the principal strength of the army. Thus Wellington, whose whole strength consisted in his weight of fire, chose well the position of Waterloo, all the avenues of which he could sweep with his tremendous fire.

The following are the maxims that are here laid down for observation: "1st. To have outlets more easy for falling upon the enemy when the moment is judged favorable, than the latter would have for approaching the line of battle. 2d. To assure the artillery all its defensive effect. 3d. To have a ground advantageous for concealing the movements that might be made,[1] from one wing to the other, with a view of directing masses upon the point judged suitable. 4th. To be able on the contrary, to discover easily the movements of the enemy. 5th. To have an easy retreat. 6th. To have the flanks well supported, in order to render an attack upon the extremities impossible, and to reduce the enemy to an attack upon the centre, or at least upon the front."

Crotchets in the rear will sometimes remedy a defect of support for the flanks, but they are dangerous as they constrain the movements, and the enemy, by planting a battery

[1] *Jomini*, 204.

upon the angle of the two lines might cause in them very destructive ravages.[1] The same object might be accomplished by a double reserve placed in deep order behind the wing which it is desirable to secure from insult.

It is undoubtedly true that the army taking the initiative, and commencing the attack, will, under ordinary circumstances, reap the double benefit; first, of the moral advantage of being the assailant; and second of directing his masses,[2] and of striking just where he deemed it most effectual, while the army waiting in position is everywhere anticipated, and often taken by surprise, being always forced to subject his movements to those of his adversary. But as a compensating benefit, he also marches upon the enemy, has against him all the disadvantages resulting from obstacles of the ground which he has to overcome, in order to approach the line of his adversary. These may be inequalities in the ground, little ravines, forests, hedges, farm-houses and villages. Besides, there are batteries to transport, and a distance to travel under exposure to fire of musketry and artillery. And this last since the vast improvements made in fire-arms, and the great distances achieved by the rifle, is a matter of great consideration. Notwithstanding all this the general who limits his ideas in the selecting of his position simply to the defensive will stand a great chance of being beaten. He should have in view the taking of the offensive whenever the fortunes of the battle would permit, and if after thus realizing all the benefits of the defensive, and after having thinned the ranks of his enemy by his shot and shell, he can suddenly assume the offensive, and thus in turn realize all the benefits resulting from the attack, he will be very likely to remain master of the field. In transferring his army from the defensive to the offensive he should apply the same general principles that would have presided over his order of battle, if he had commenced by being the aggressor.

[1] *Jomini*, 205. [2] *Idem*, 206.

In the offensive battles it may be difficult to begin with any settled plan on account of ignorance of the exact position of the enemy. It is recommended, however, to be impressed with the idea that there is in each battle one decisive point which procures the victory better than others, and that every faculty must be fully alive to reach the apprehension of that point.[1] This may be sought for in the configuration of the ground, in the combination of the localities with the strategic end that any army proposes to itself, or in the position of the respective forces. The primary object in an offensive battle is to dislodge and break the enemy, and that may be accomplished either by overthrowing his line upon some point of his front, or by outflanking it, in order to take it in flank or in reverse, or in making the two means concur at the same time, that is to attack in front at the same time that an acting wing should double and turn the line.

The first thing the commander of an attacking army is called upon to do, is, after having obtained all the information possible of the position of the enemy, to choose and arrange his order of battle. There are twelve kinds of orders of battle. These are:

1. The simple parallel order which is the simplest, evidences the least ingenuity, and is the worst, there being no skill in causing the two parties to fight with equal chances, battalion against battalion. Skill can have little to do with such a contest.

2. The parallel order with the defensive or offensive crotchet. This is taken most ordinarily in a defensive position, but may be the result of an offensive combination. In such case it will be found in advance of the line, whilst in the defensive it is in the rear. At Waterloo, Wellington formed the parallel order with the retired crotchet on the right flank.

3. The parallel order reenforced on one or both wings.

[1] *Jomini*, 208.

4. The parallel order reenforced upon the centre, the object of both being the same, viz: to pierce the enemy's line. This evinces a higher tactical knowledge than either one of the preceding, but it is attended with this difficulty, that with an equality in the forces that part of the line which must be weakened in order to reenforce the other, may be compromised if placed in battle parallelly to the enemy.

5. The simple oblique order, which best suits an inferior army attacking a superior one, as it offers the advantage of carrying the mass of the forces upon a single point of the enemy's line. This has been, under some circumstances, a favorite mode of attack. It was employed by Epaminondas at the battles of Leuctra and Mantinea. It was rendered forever memorable by being employed by Frederick the Great at the battle of Leuthen.

6 & 7. The order perpendicular upon one or both wings. This projecting of the whole army upon a single wing, or half upon each, or the whole upon the centre, although a theoretical form to indicate the practical direction, can never be long maintained after the commencement of a battle. It soon subsides into, and takes the direction of oblique lines. So the carrying a single division of the assailing army perpendicularly upon the enemy's flank, whilst the remainder approaches the other extremity to disquiet it, finally results in attaining an oblique disposition. An attack at the same time upon both wings can only be made when the attacking force is vastly superior. At Eylau, Napoleon made a perpendicular attack upon one wing at the same time that he sought to pierce the enemy's centre.

8. The concave order. This is seldom taken in advance except against an enemy who should himself be formed in a convex order; the reason being that the enemy, instead of throwing himself upon the centre, and thus allowing himself to be enclosed by the two wings, would only have to fall upon the wings which would of themselves present their extremities, and would be thus in the same situation

as if they were found assailed upon a flank. This formation is not so much a semicircle as a broken line reentrant towards the centre, such as the English formed on the fields of Agincourt and Cressy, and the Austrians at Essling. After the attack, and while the enemy is pressing upon and pushing the centre, this form may very advantageously be assumed in order to envelop him by the wings. At the battle of Essling, however, Napoleon attacked the Austrian centre, but he had the Danube at his back, and was circumscribed in his liberty of manœuvering.

9. The convex order salient at the centre. This is the reverse of the last mentioned, and may be formed when its object is to arrest an enemy who forms a concave line,[1] or when fighting defensively backed against a river, or immediately after the passage of a river, in order to rest on it and cover the bridges. In such case there are three points exposed to attack, viz: the salient, and the two extremities; and if the enemy direct his attack upon the first or either one of the others, it might result in disaster and defeat. A false attack in order to hold the centre, while the grand effort is made upon a single extremity, is accounted the most favorable mode against such a convex line. The French took this order at the battle of Fleurus in 1794, but the Prince of Coburg instead of limiting his attacks upon the salient centre, or a single extremity, divided his efforts upon five or six divergent rays, and especially upon the two wings at the same time.

10. The order by echelon upon one or both wings. This varies little in principle from the perpendicular order.

11. The order by echelon upon the centre. This might be successfully employed against an army whose line was broken and too much extended, because if it could be thus cut in two, leaving the two wings to be overcome separately, it would probably be destroyed.

[1] *Jomini*, 212.

12. The combined order of attack upon the centre and one wing at the same time. This may, perhaps, be said to be the most rational of all the orders of battle. It divides the attention of the enemy, and leaves him in great uncertainty in what manner to dispose of his forces to meet both. It gave Napoleon the victory at Wagram and at Ligny, and was attempted by him at Borodino. It was also employed by him at Bautzen, and would have been entirely successful but for a single incident.

These orders, exhibited through geometrical figures, proclaim rather the ideal than the real actual modes of disposing forces for battles. All that is claimed for them is that they approximate so near to the actual fact, as to render them fair representations of tactical dispositions made upon the battle-field. The greatest difficulty is experienced in such a simultaneous movement of different parts as will bring about the execution of the capital manœuvre which, according to the primitive plan, should result in the desired success. In order to its successful accomplishment two points may be assumed as true: first, that the more simple a decisive manœuvre shall be, the more certain will be its success; and second, that the seasonableness of sudden dispositions, taken during the combat, is of more probable success than the effect of manœuvres combined in advance.

But laying aside geometrical figures as indicating orders of battle, certain great facts must be everywhere true, as that the object of the offensive order of battle is to dislodge the enemy from his position by every rational means, that the manœuvres proper for this purpose may be to overwhelm a wing only, or else the centre and a wing at the same time. So also the wing may be outflanked and turned. That to attack the centre and two wings at the same time would be unsafe without very superior forces. That the oblique order is only a disposition tending to unite the half at least of one's forces in order to overwhelm a wing, keeping the other fraction out of the reach of the enemy, either by echelons, or by the inclined direction of

the line. That the various formations, convex, concave, perpendicular, etc., all present the same combination of attacks parallel or reenforced, upon a portion only of the hostile line. That the employment of material force upon the front, seconded by a turning manœuvre, both at the same time, will be more likely to succeed than to employ them separately. And that to break the hostile line and compel a retreat there should be first employed a superior artillery fire, then a well directed and timely cavalry charge, succeeded by masses of infantry preceded by skirmishes and flanked by a few squadrons. Skirmishers only can march and fire at the same time. This cannot be expected of regular masses of infantry.

The tactical movements upon the battle-field are always delicate, difficult, and dangerous. More especially so is every such movement which is sufficiently extended to give the enemy time to beat separately half of the army whilst it is being performed. The general rule laid down is to hold the weight of the forces in hand in order to cause them to act at the opportune moment, but without falling into the contrary excess of too much accumulating them.

The composition of the troops composing the line, and the posting them in the order of battle are matters of primary importance. In these respects a great change has taken place since the outbreak of the French revolution. Previously all the infantry, formed by regiments and brigades were united into a single battle corps, subdivided into first and second lines, each having their right and left wings. The cavalry was placed on the two wings, and the artillery distributed upon the front of each line.

This unity in the old formation was utterly broken by the system of divisions introduced by the French revolution, which gave fractions capable of moving on their own account upon all kinds of ground. They were composed ordinarily of infantry, artillery and cavalry, which manœuvered and fought separately. The danger of this was that the mass of the enemy's army might attack and defeat each separately. Bonaparte sought to remedy this as far as possi-

ble by the mobility and rapidity of his manœuvres, and thus by uniting the bulk of his divisions upon the point where the decisive blow was to be directed. He ultimately organized permanent army corps under marshals, each forming a little army by itself. The heavy cavalry was united into a strong reserve, and finally into corps of three divisions to give more unity to its increasing masses. The grand army of the emperor, which served as the model for all other European armies, was ultimately composed of four fractions, viz: two wings, a centre, and a reserve, the composition varying according to the strength of the army. To maintain it, however, a certain number of divisions must be secured out of the line to furnish the necessary detachments. Those divisions, while detached, could form a second body of reserve, to reenforce either one of the fractions which circumstances rendered necessary.

The disposition of the three arms, the infantry, cavalry, and artillery, in the order of battle, is a matter of great importance. The general principle is that each should be so disposed as to aid and support each other in the best and most effective manner. How far this may be subject to rules and to what extent it is necessarily dependent upon localities and the contingencies of the hour, may be matters in which all may fail to harmonize.

In regard to infantry there are reckoned five modes of formation for combat. They may be employed either: 1. As skirmishers. 2. In deployed lines, either continuous or checker-wise. 3. In lines of battalions ployed upon the centre of each battalion. 4. In deep masses. 5. In small squares.[1] These together form either: 1. The shallow order, or the one deployed into three ranks. 2. The half deep order, formed of a line of battalions in columns of attack upon the centre, or of squares by battalions. 3. The mixed order, where the regiments should be in part deployed, and partly in columns. 4. The deep order, composed of heavy columns of battalions, deployed the one

[1] *Jomini*, 295.

behind the other. Of these, the one last mentioned is deemed the most objectionable, as such masses are exposed to the ravages of artillery, and are possessed of less mobility and impulsion without adding any strength. This is alleged as one of the causes of the small success of the French at Waterloo. The formation in squares is good in plains and against an enemy superior in cavalry, that by regiment being considered best for the defensive, and that by battalion for the offensive. The long squares have often been preferred as presenting a greater front.

The first mentioned, or shallow order, is objectionable as it can only move slowly, because if it attempts rapid movements it often breaks, and could be early penetrated by troops of a deeper order. The mixed order has sometimes been employed with success.[1] It was used by Napoleon at Tagliamento, and by the Russians at Eylau. It is generally admitted that for the offensive it is necessary to employ a mode which should unite mobility, solidity and impulsion, and for the defensive, solidity united to the greatest possible fire.

The general conclusion seems to be:

"1. That the very shallow as well as the very deep formation is objectionable under ordinary circumstances, and can seldom be employed with safety.

"2. That the attack by battalions in columns by division is the best for carrying a position,[2] diminishing the column in depth as much as possible with a view to increasing its own fire and diminishing its exposure to that of its enemy.

"3. That the mixed formation of the first line deployed and the second in columns of battalion by division is the best for defense.

"4. That either of the last two may be employed in the offensive or defensive, according to the nature of the ground, the character of the general, and the character and position of the troops. Squares are always good against cavalry."

[1] *Halleck*, 122. [2] *Idem*, 125.

With the exception of columns of too great a depth, the mode of formation is ranked of less importance in achieving a victory than the well combined employment of the different arms. In such employment it is important for an army, whether it assails or acts on the defensive, to avail itself of every means of protection within its power. Thus villages which are upon the front are generally the scenes of bloody encounters,[1] each army seeking to carry them, both as evidence of progress upon the field, and as affording some means of protection. So also is it useful to occupy clumps of trees or copses, as a means of protection and support. They serve to shelter the troops, conceal their movements, protect those of the cavalry, and hinder that of the enemy from acting in their proximity.

The efficiency of cavalry as an arm of service in battle depends something upon the habits of the nation in using horses, and also in the abundance and quality of horses. Its principal merit lies in its mobility, its impetuosity, and the rapidity of its movements. An army wanting in cavalry rarely obtains great victories, or follows them up successfully, or effects a retreat without considerable loss. Its great use, however, does not consist in defending a position, but in carrying succor to a menaced point, in breaking a shaken line of infantry, in pursuing the enemy, and rendering the victory complete by taking prisoners and trophies, and in covering the retreats of the infantry and the artillery.

The mode and moment in the use of cavalry are of vast importance. To urge them on to the attack of a line in good order is never recommended unless sustained by infantry and artillery. The French at Waterloo and Frederick II at Kunersdorf suffered from a violation of this rule. It may be found advantageous for them to charge upon a line of infantry already engaged with adverse infantry, as in Marengo, Eylau, etc. So a charge upon infantry may be successful when the latter are deprived of

[1] *Jomini*, 304.

the use of their arms by a beating rain or snow, or when the line has already been shaken by the fire of artillery, as by the Prussian cavalry at Hohenfriedberg, in 1745. Although the cavalry charges against unbroken squares of good infantry will generally fail, yet they may succeed in carrying batteries, if well sustained and supported by infantry. But the support must be immediate, as the cavalry charge is but an instantaneous effect, and cavalry, if unsupported, are driven back disunited. So also general charges may be made against the enemy's cavalry. While infantry are engaged with, in front, cavalry charges of each upon the other may be made in flank or in reverse. If repulsed it is easy for this arm to rally and return again to the charge. So its fleetness may enable it to charge in the rear of the enemy without much hazard of being cut off.

As concerns the defensive, if an adversary is shaken and disunited by its first successes, a charge of cavalry may reestablish affairs, and totally disperse the enemy, as the English at Waterloo. So also charges may be made either for favoring an attack, or profiting from a false movement of the enemy, or to finish his defeat in a retrograde movement.

There are four modes in which cavalry may charge, viz: 1. In columns at a distance. 2. In lines on a trot. 3. In lines on a gallop. 4. At a helter skelter. In regard to weapons, the charge in line may be done by the lance, in the melee by the sabre, and while the first rank may be armed with the former to break, the second may be armed with the latter to finish by partial struggles. The pistol and the carbine are only for occasional use. The fast trot is the best gait for charging in line, as that admits of steadiness, order and compactness, which the gallop does not. The latter may be useful in charges against artillery, where celerity of movement is more important than order. Where it is possible, a cavalry charge should be spurred upon the enemy's flank at the moment his line is assailed in front. The same orders as to shallow, half deep, mixed,

and deep order prevail in cavalry as in infantry with some modifications.

In combats of cavalry against cavalry two maxims may be stated: one, that the first line after making its charge should be led back; as even if successful, the enemy, by opposing fresh squadrons, will ultimately force it to rally behind the second line.[1] The other, that the victory will remain to him who shall have the last squadrons in reserve, and who shall know how to launch them at the proper moment upon the flanks of the hostile line, already engaged with his. The helter-skelter, or irregular charge, may be a powerful auxiliary in the daily rencounters of cavalry, and a useful accessory in decisive shocks, but in other respects is but little depended on.

Artillery, as an arm of service, is employed both offensively and defensively. In the former, it is employed to crush a hostile line, shake it, and thus better enable the troops that attack, to break it. In the latter, it doubles the strength of a position, both by the moral effect it produces upon the enemy at a distance, and by its local defense when within grape-shot range. The fire should be directed on that part of the enemy's line which it is designed to pierce, with the view, not alone of weakening this point, but also to aid the attack of the cavalry and infantry upon the same point. In the defense, the usual mode of distribution is throughout the whole line,[2] on ground favorable for its fire. But although thus extended, batteries should know how to direct their attention upon the point where the enemy would find more advantages and facilities to penetrate. The character of the ground, whether level or uneven of surface, would affect the use of artillery. Level ground, or declivities slightly inclined in front, is the most favorable to direct or ricochet firing. Concentric fire is the most effective when employed against the enemy's columns of attack. This was illustrated by the position of the English artillery on the field of Water-

[1] *Jomini*, 312. [2] *Halleck*, 128.

loo. It is not, however, possible to subject the position of artillery to any fixed rule. In the battle at Wagram, Napoleon threw in a battery of a hundred pieces, in the gap occasioned in his line by the departure of the corps of Massena, and thus was enabled to hold in check all the efforts of the Austrian centre, and yet it would be dangerous to elevate such an employment of artillery into a maxim.

The use of artillery is by no means limited to replying to the batteries of the enemy. Its object is also to batter the troops of the enemy. If the latter advance in deployed lines, the batteries should cross their fires in order to take those lines obliquely. If they advance in columns, they can be battered in front, that is in their depth, also obliquely, and in flank and in reverse. The moral effect is the greatest in the two last modes of charge. The movement of Ney in the battle of Bautzen was arrested, and he was obliged to change his direction in consequence of the opening of a battery upon the flank of his columns.

Batteries should be constantly sustained by infantry or cavalry. When by the former, the protection is best afforded by forming in squares, and when the infantry is in the rear of the pieces, the squares are elongated in proportion to the extent of the front of the battery.

"To place," says Jomini, "the different arms according to the ground,[1] according to the object which is proposed, and that which may be supposed of the enemy, to combine their simultaneous action according to the characteristic qualities of each, this is all that the art can advise."

It is asserted that strategy is more dependent upon fixed principles, more clearly reducible to rule than tactics; that in the latter more is really dependent on genius, than on the observance of any fixed rules. The difference between the mere tactician, and the man of genius is well exhibited by Victor Hugo where, in his Cozette, he characterizes Wellington and Napoleon as they stand before us on the field of Waterloo. "Never," he says, "has God, who takes

[1] *Jomini*, 324.

pleasure in antithesis, made a more striking contrast and a more extraordinary meeting. On one side (that of Wellington), precision, foresight, geometry, prudence, retreat assured, reserves economized, obstinate composure,[1] imperturbable method, strategy to profit by the ground, tactics to balance battalions, carnage drawn to the line, war directed watch in hand, nothing left voluntarily to chance, ancient classic courage, absolute correctness; on the other, intuition, inspiration, a military marvel, a superhuman instinct, a flashing glance, a mysterious something which gazes like the eagle and strikes like the thunderbolt, prodigious art in disdainful impetuosity, all the mysteries of a deep soul, intimacy with destiny; river, plain, forest, hill commanded, and in some sort forced to obey, the despot going even so far as to tyrannize over the battle-field; faith in a star joined to strategic science, increasing it, but disturbing it. Wellington was the Barreme of war, Napoleon was its Michael Angelo, and this time genius was vanquished by calculation."

This is perhaps defining a little too rigidly, and presenting an outline of two representative characters, more strongly than the exact truth will warrant. Neither should the mere tactician triumph over the genius. Nor in fact could it be said to be so. It was the arrival of Blucher, and the non-arrival of Grouchy that decided the fate of Waterloo. It is genius working by tactical rules and principles that makes the great captain.

Different Stages of Progress in the Art.

During the middle ages there was little art in warfare. Previously to those ages there was none worthy of notice, The middle ages present us with the armed knight, the Crusade, the reign of chivalry. Two general facts here present themselves:

[1] *Corette*, 32, 33.

1. The casing in steel armor, which, when carried to its highest perfection, did afford very good protection against the arms then in use. But while it protected, it at the same time, disabled. The immunity from wounds was purchased at the expense of a deprivation, to a large extent, of the power of inflicting them. The more effectually the limbs were encased the less perfectly could they obey their owner's will in the effective use of offensive weapons. The mania for armor continued on the increase until it finally reached its height during the Crusades and remained undiminished during the rest of the middle ages, and did not cease at once even on the introduction of fire-arms. Even then, it was only gradually and reluctantly discontinued.

2. The contests, although a number might be engaged in them, were really individual contests. It was man to man, and not army to army, that fought. It was this all-pervading idea that resulted in rendering the individual armor so perfect as to be invulnerable, and that placed the knight on a horse, also armed for the battle. Tactics had, therefore, little to do, and strategy still less, with the battles of that period. Armies, instead of being regarded as organized bodies, as having in them a living principle pervading the mass, and as capable of intelligent movements in the way of attack and defense on the battle-field, were rather looked upon as an aggregation of individuals, who were only to play their separate parts when the masses to which they belonged joined in battle.

The introduction of infantry in the place of cavalry first led to the idea of an organized force, of merging the individual in the organized body. This was done by the Swiss about the end of the fourteenth century,[1] who first attempted the formation of regular infantry armed with pikes, and resembling the phalanx in its organization. This example was gradually followed by other nations.

[1] *Graham*, 100.

It was not until the middle of the fifteenth century, in the reign of Charles VII of France, that any well considered attempt seems to have been made towards the restoration of the military art. The elements of a regular system begin to appear. Authority and discipline are introduced, and infantry armed with the pike present on the field regular, concerted action.[1]

The first great name that appears on the foreground of history to gather together the hitherto floating elements of a higher military art, that had previously been cropping out from the teachings of Prince Maurice of Nassau and the Marquis Spinola, was that of Gustavus Adolphus, the king of Sweden. The hero of the thirty years' war was also one of the founders of the system of modern warfare. His first point was the introduction of a strict and severe discipline. Every regiment was ordered to form round its chaplain for morning and evening prayers. Impiety, theft, gambling, and dueling were expelled from his army. The sobriety he enforced, and the perfect discipline he introduced, gave him a perfect command over his army. By these means he aimed at reducing his army to one piece of machinery in the day of battle. And he so far succeeded that the existence of a tactical element of an invariable form and dimensions is more apparent in the Swedish army of that time than in preceding organizations.

He introduced a larger proportion of fire-arms into his army, and armed his infantry with muskets of a lighter description, doing away with the encumbrance of the rest. He relieved his pikemen of the cuirass, leaving them only a headpiece. He was the first to clothe his men in uniform.

The more extended use of fire-arms required a larger and more uniform supply of ammunition than had formerly been required. This again rendered necessary the choice and preservation of bases and lines of operation. These were more thoroughly comprehended by him than by any

[1] *Graham*, 104.

preceding modern general. He reduced the unwieldy squadrons of cavalry, and by breaking up the heavy masses, increased the mobility of his troops, and diminished the destructive effects of the enemy's fire. Still he allowed the unity of force in his infantry to remain, retaining his brigade of two thousand and sixteen men, which was too large to be suitable for evolutions. He ranged the different arms according to their intention, and thus established facility in manœuvering as well as their mutual capacity to aid each other. He never seems to have comprehended any other than the parallel order of battle; his order consisting, according to circumstances, in a formation of two or three lines ranged parallel to each other, or in echelons upon the wings, the cavalry behind the infantry or upon its wings. The infantry was ranged in six ranks. The cavalry fought in four, and was proportionably very numerous. He had a large artillery force for that period consisting of two hundred pieces, and his batteries were massed and masked. His favorite military maxim was that the grand science of war consisted in seizing incidents, or keeping always in a state of preparation, though the particular stroke may be unforeseen."

The innovation made by Gustavus into the unbroken unity of an army was afterwards followed up by others. The French general Rohan proposed to organize the infantry in regiments of fourteen hundred and forty men, to be composed of six hundred pikemen, six hundred musketeers, and two hundred and forty men protected by a large shield and armed with a sword.

The bayonet appeared for the first time in the Netherlands in 1647, and gradually superseded the use of the pike. It was at first very unhandy and difficult to use, as it was necessary to take it from the musket before firing. This, however, was remedied under Charles XII, and in the Prussian army in 1732 the front rank was armed with a bayonet during the fire. In 1740, at the battle of Molnitz, the three ranks were thus provided.

From the death of Gustavus Adolphus to the era of Frederick II, king of Prussia, better known as the Great Frederick, no very marked advance was made in the millitary art, so far as strategy or tactics in the fighting of battles were concerned. In the arts of attack and defense of cities and fortified places great advances have been made. This includes the period which marks the greatest development of those arts. It was the period of Vauban, the great French engineer. The establishment of infantry as the strong arm of battle, of the bayonet in the place of the pike, and of the play of artillery upon all that opposed it whether of unprotected lines or defenses, walls or ramparts naturally led to the consideration of what defenses would be the most available, and what kinds of attack and defense would be the most probably successful.

There was no very regular system of attack previous to the siege of Maestricht in 1673. Then it was that Vauban developed the system of parallels, which has prevailed down to the present time. The Turks, about six years previously, had multiplied their trenches and places of arms at the siege of Candia, on account of the great caution which they were obliged to observe in their advances towards the place. Improving upon this hint, Vauban developed his system of parallels. At the siege of Valenciennes in 1677, he first brought his system of attack to perfection, resting the ends of his parallels on two inundations, by which he prevented sorties and counter approaches. He first tried the ricochet fire as a means of destroying places at Philipsburg in 1688. This consists in firing with a small charge, and from a low elevation, so that the projectile shall merely clear a parapet, and thence bound along a rampart, destroying gun carriages and whatever it may find in its course.

He also introduced great improvements into the art of defense, modifying the system of Pagan, which was no longer suited to the range of the arms in use, and laying the foundation of the existing bastion system. He first conceived the tenaille, a low work constructed in the main

ditch, upon the lines of defense, between the bastions; also the tower bastions. He enlarged the demilunes, and improved the covered way.

He endeavored so to construct that all the parts of the fortification should give mutual support to each other; that the interior cannot be seen from adjoining heights; that the prolongations of the faces should fall in marshes, or places covered with shallow water so as to protect the rampart from the ricochet fire; and that, if possible, the control of water should be preserved or obtained to serve the purpose of inundation before the glacis, or, if desirable, to fill the ditches. So also he aimed at the higher art of so selecting the sites of his fortresses along a frontier, as to have reference to strategy and the movements of armies both on the offensive and defensive.

While the art of fortification was thus in the course of development, the possession of fortresses ruled the operations of war,[1] and kept in fetters all the military talents of the generals. Battles were fought not so much with the view of defeating and dispersing opposing armies, as to raise a blockade or siege; or to prevent the enemy from throwing supplies or reenforcements into the beleaguered city. It is true there are exceptions, and Turenne and Conde seem to have been the first to act upon the principle that there are objects to be obtained by battles wholly unconnected with the capture or preservation of fortresses; that if armies are everywhere overthrown and dispersed, the fortresses will make but a feeble resistance.

The century succeeding the death of Gustavus Adolphus witnessed a great number of wars and battles. The remainder of the thirty years' war, and the long and violent war of the Spanish succession afforded many splendid opportunities for developing some of the higher principles of strategy and tactics. The great names of Turenne, Conde, Montecuculli, Marshal Luxemburg, Prince Eugene, the Duke of Marlborough, and Marshal Saxe, stand forth

[1] *Graham*, 108.

as the most prominent of that period. The battle-fields of Rocroy, Nordlingen, Entzheim, Turckheim, Fleurus, Neerwinde, Blenheim, Ramilies, Oudenarde, and Malplaquet, are so many theatres upon which these great men had an opportunity of displaying their military skill and art. And yet it cannot, perhaps, be said that any new principle in strategy or tactics has been reached, settled, and fully applied during all that period. Armies continued to be drawn up in two lines, sometimes with, occasionally without a reserve; infantry in the centre, cavalry on the wings; the usual distances between the lines three hundred yards; the artillery placed in front of the infantry; and the intervals between the battalions and squadrons ranged in line varying apparently according to the orders of the general in command.[1] The column was always formed in front of the line by making the subdivisions turn to the right or left.[2] So the line was reformed by inverting this process. The division of a battalion into sections, companies, and grand divisions, was not practiced. The front of a column of infantry varied from eighteen to twenty-four files. The subdivision distance was generally preserved in column, and the march always made with open ranks.

The column must consist of troops of one arm only; the artillery was flanked on one side by the first line, and on the other by the second, the lines being formed of a greater or less number of columns according to circumstances. Troops sometimes marched in four columns, two of cavalry and two of infantry. A difficulty came to be experienced as armies increased in size. In the time of Turenne and Conde all fought, or could fight, and each arm occupied the ground suited to it, contributing its share in the contest. Subsequently armies increased greatly in size without any corresponding advance being made in tactical science. Consequently the power of movement was deficient and imperfect.

[1] *Graham*, 170. [2] *Idem*, 172.

Notwithstanding all this, however, we perceive the rudiments of progress made during this period. It may not have been in pursuance of any systematic reasoning, or of any soundness of conclusion, but a result rather of feeling after the means and modes of developing military power in a manner hitherto unknown. Thus it is that almost every art sends out its tentacula, in order to ascertain its surroundings, before it can venture to take any decided step in its onward progress. By substituting the bayonet for the pike the inconvenience of different descriptions of infantry was abolished, and the foundation laid of many improvements increasing the effect of its fire.

The parallel order of battle was not in all cases adhered to. Instances are not wanting of the oblique order being resorted to. So the term column is made use of in reference to the formation adopted by the allies to carry the intrenchments of Malplaquet, it being pretty evident at that time that such a formation would be eventually required. But the method then adopted can only be considered introductory to the column, being a formation of several regiments in line, one behind another. This deviation from the deployed order, was consequent on the increase in the strength of the armies employed, and the uniformity which had been introduced in the armament of infantry.

Both the campaigns of Montecuculli and Turenne, as also those of Eugene and Marlborough, who proceeded on the plan of taking fortresses on their flanks before advancing, furnished evidence that they understood the system of operating on a base, and on lines of operations.

The use and application of cavalry seems to have been but little known. The manœuvres prevalent,[1] or generally adopted, cannot be considered as a system of tactics based on any fixed principles.

In approaching the middle of the eighteenth century we reach a new era in the history of the military art. It is that of Frederick II, king of Prussia, generally known as

[1] *Graham*, 169.

the Great Frederick. The kingdom of Prussia was not half a century old, but its situation was compact, its resources had been excellently husbanded, and it assumed from the commencement a decidedly military character. Frederick was its absolute master, and circumstances favored the development of his extraordinary military genius.

He found war as an art very little improved by the experience of the century that preceded him. Infantry, it is true, had advanced to become by far the most important arm, and the musket with its bayonet the most important weapon. The cavalry was heavy and incapable of rapid movement, and its weapons being pistols and carbines, it had almost shrunk into the mere furniture of parades. The order of battle being essentially limited to the parallel, had degenerated into the merest formalism. There was a great want of life, celerity, genius, power, and energy on the battle-field.

Frederick's first attention was given to the arms of his troops, and the perfecting of their discipline. He perfected the musket which he found in general use. He fixed the depth of infantry at three ranks, and thus originated the deploying those long thin lines which later took with the art of moving them the denomination of tactics of lines. The invention, by Prince Dessau, of the iron ramrod gave an activity to the fire of infantry not previously known. Instances of bayonet charges also occur in his campaigns.

He was the captain for field fights, and not for sieges. His system of carrying on war differed essentially from the cautious, timid system of his contemporaries. He is even said to have been opposed to entrenchments; but although he did not make them a primary object, yet he did not disregard them.

He made important changes in his cavalry. He discovered that the slow trotting pace, and the charge by the firing of pistols and carbines, could never produce the desired effect upon the enemy. He changed the trot into a gallop, and ordered his troopers to advance at the most rapid rate amid the fire of the enemy's squadrons, and

laying aside their pistols and carbines, to attack at once with the sword. What his cavalry, therefore, studied, and attained great proficiency in, was the use of the sword, and the preservation of close order, and the alignment at the gallop. They finally reached such perfection, that they could go through all their manœuvres in perfect order at full gallop. A body of ten thousand horsemen could make a charge, halt in perfect order after it was made, ready to renew the charge on a fresh line of the enemy. And this was possible with no other than the Prussian cavalry.

It was, however, obvious to Frederick, that by depriving his cavalry of fire-arms, and by employing them in large masses in their rapid advance upon the enemy, he exposed them more than ever to the deadly effects of artillery and infantry. To afford a remedy here, he organized artillery to be specially attached to cavalry, and thus originated the horse artillery.

The military genius of Frederick found its highest point of culmination on the battle-field. It was there that he showed himself infinitely superior to all his adversaries. But for that he could not have carried on a seven years' war with three-fourths of all Europe, and in the end have raised Prussia to a first class power. His armies were always greatly inferior in number to those of his enemies, but his discipline was perfect, and he was the most thorough master of expedients. Thus at the battle of Prague, while Marshal Schwerin was engaging and capturing the Austrian batteries on his left flank, and the Prussian cavalry was, at the same time, defeating the Austrian, he brought forward his reserve, and by a sudden dash, succeeded in penetrating the Austrian centre, thus dividing the Austrian army into two disconnected parts, and rendering certain its defeat.

That, however, for which Frederick is more especially celebrated, is the introduction upon system, of the oblique order of battle. In this respect the battle of Leuthen is claimed to form an epoch in the history of military science, as the theory of the oblique order received here an intelli-

gent practical application. This order had been used by Turenne, but the manœuvres by which it was effected were executed slowly in presence of the enemy, thus giving them time to establish a parallel line, and to reinforce at the same point. The order had never been applied in a similar manner as employed by Frederick. He formed his line of battle at an angle with the enemy's line. This constituted the oblique order, which after its thorough introduction constituted for a long time in Germany the basis on which the plan of most of the battles was formed. For the purpose, however, of using the order with success, the enemy must be deceived as to the intention to attempt it, otherwise he may frustrate its execution by reinforcing the menaced flank. Caution and dispatch are therefore necessary[1] in the preparation and execution of such a manœuvre.

Frederick's system was designed more for the offensive than the defensive, and although it is generally admitted that he was the first to comprehend clearly and distinctly the true principles on which war should be conducted, yet it is denied that he was master of the strategical art. Although he sometimes brought the greatest mass to the decisive point, yet he never knew how to embrace his line of operations so as to bring all the favorable chances on his side. To reach this point, as well as many others in tactics, we are obliged to make a further advance which brings us by the side of Napoleon.

The system of tactics developed by the French revolution is in some respects peculiar. Before the occurrence of this event the formation of infantry was by regiments and brigades,[2] the whole united in a single body and drawn up in two lines. The artillery was distributed along the entire line, and the cavalry placed on the two flanks; so that in moving by wings they formed four columns, two of cavalry and two of infantry, while in moving by a flank they formed only two very long columns.

[1] *Graham*, 139. [2] *Halleck*, 130.

The French revolution quickened the latent energies of every Frenchman, and threw into the French armies a moral element to which those of the rest of Europe were strangers. The people of France had inaugurated a new order of things, and every Frenchman felt himself pledged to sustain it. The new order and the old could not coexist on the same continent without a conflict. That conflict must take place between France and Europe combined. Under ordinary circumstances the odds would be fearful, and yet France threw down the gauntlet to Europe with a will that manifested the determination to maintain the issue. While the heads of the higher orders were daily sleeping by scores in Paris, the spirit of a new born freedom was running riot in the veins of every Frenchman. This followed from declaring equality among men.

Two results followed from this. One by throwing open the avenues to distinction to merit alone, led to the army promotions of those only who were possessed of military genius. The other threw into the ranks of the army men burning for distinction, and animated by the full determination of supporting France and French principles, policy, and interests against the combined armies of Europe.

This latter result greatly influences the new system of tactics introduced into the revolutionary armies. This system consists in a great measure of so recasting the plan of organizing armies, as to allow individual effort to be conspicuous in all their marches, manœuvres, and battles. Where every peasant's son could aspire to the baton of a field marshal, it was necessary that each should have the opportunity of signalizing himself in action. The heavy tactics of long thin lines were, to a large extent, abandoned. In the place of it the army was broken up into smaller masses, thus rendering each more manageable, and enabling individual effort to be more conspicuous. While this gave greater freedom and facility to the movement of all the parts, it gave also the ability, where it was

necessary to break strength by strength, to reunite the whole in masses, and thus hurl their united and concentrated force upon the enemy. Out of this has grown two systems, viz: the system of skirmishes and the system of masses. With these two, the one to be first employed to feel the position and the force of the enemy, the other to be hurled against the lines of the opposing army in front, flank, or rear, or altogether, the system of modern warfare has acquired a great advance since the era of Frederick.

The latent powers and energies that were thus slumbering in the revolutionary armies of France, only required the touch of some great genius to give them activity and direction. In virtue of that law that adapts things to each other in producing the events of this world's history, that genius was not long in making its appearance. Several distinguished themselves during the earlier period in the wars growing out of the French revolution, especially Moreau, but all were ultimately eclipsed, and lost in the more brilliant display of military talents developed by Napoleon Bonaparte. Little doubt can now remain but that in strategy and grand tactics he must be allowed to stand at the head of the world's great captains.

His first object was to perfect the recasting of the French armies, to get them into a more manageable shape. Accordingly the system of grand divisions, composed of the four arms combined, was introduced. Each division could move separately and independently of the other. He united two or more of these divisions into a corps d'armée, which formed a wing, the centre, or reserve of his grand army. He had besides large reserves of cavalry and artillery, which were employed as distinct and separate arms. This system of reserves was carried so far that if the forces were to act by grand divisions only, each had its separate reserve.

The citizen soldier of the French revolution supplied by valor what he lacked in discipline. The first object, therefore, was to introduce into the army a most thorough system of discipline. This enabled him to move the

masses at his pleasure. All that was, however, merely an instrument or agent. A most powerful one to be sure, but wanting still one thing further to render it effectual; and that was a perfect control over the minds of the soldiers. This he succeeded in obtaining. His sharing with them their hardships and dangers, his brief stirring speeches, his masterly movements, and unbroken succession of victories, rendered him the idol of the army, and "like an organ player, who, with the light pressure of his fingers, knows how to call forth the tide of sounds, and blend them in majestic harmony, so Napoleon knew how to bring into wondrous harmony all the movements of his army."

Strategy, as a military art or science, had received but small development until the time of Napoleon. There had never been until that time such vast armies massed together, wars of such prolonged duration, and campaigns and battles requiring such extensive combinations. Europe from the sunny regions of Calabria and Andalusia, to the frozen clime of Moscow, was to witness a succession of battles, sieges, and campaigns, such as the world's previous history could furnish no parallel. As the great Frederick furnished to Europe the tactics of war, so Napoleon may be said to be the maturer of strategy. He also placed tactics on a broader and surer foundation. Had not the able generals whose arms were lifted to defend against his attacks the ancient standards of Europe, learnt from him lessons in these high arts he would probably have died an emperor instead of an exile. No one know better than he how to secure a good base, from which to draw supplies and reenforcements, and how to establish new ones successively as an army advances or changes its line of operations. No one better knew how to project from the base his lines of operations, and to change them as circumstances required; having in view the safety of his own army, and the cutting off the retreat of his enemy from his own base of operations, and thus compelling his destruction, dispersion,

or surrender. He dispensed with the old practice of fortifying camps, and carrying along tents, rejecting every clog upon rapid movement, and adopting everything that would impart mobility to his army.[1]

His genius was peculiarly adapted to offensive war. He always looked for the shortest way to the battle-field whether it was by single or double lines of operation. He knew when and how to pass from concentration to deconcentration, or the reverse, and that with the greatest rapidity, at the very moment, and at the very point where the metamorphosis was desirable. "The great art," he says, "consists in knowing how to separate in order to subsist, and how to concentrate to fight." The lesson he taught was that the fate of battles, not the fall of fortresses, decided the fortunes of war. After the battle of Marengo he dictated to the Austrian general the surrender of a dozen fortresses.[2] Another lesson he taught was the immense importance of a body of reserve. The old guard was the glory of the army. On the field of Marengo he called it "a pillar of granite." It finally disappeared on the field of Waterloo. The reserve forms according to rule, from one-third to one-fifth of the army engaged, and consists of each one of the three arms, infantry, artillery, and cavalry. It is the last argument of battle, the dernier resort, and everything depends upon its being called into action precisely at the right moment. When this occurs, must depend upon the intuitive perception, insight and tact of the commanding general. Napoleon had the most felicitous tact in this respect, and yet there are not wanting highly respectable military authorities who assert that if he had summoned up his reserve at Waterloo a few minutes sooner, he might have gained the day and saved the empire.[3]

Napoleon's first campaign, that of Italy, in 1796, established on an inmovable foundation his reputation for

[1] *Szabad*, 108. [2] *Idem*, 129. [3] *Idem*, 221.

strategy and tactics. With an army of forty thousand men, hardened by the passage of the Alps, he suddenly fell down upon Italy, and by a rapid and masterly succession of movements and battles, defeated and destroyed three Austrian armies successively sent against him, thus temporarily relieving that peninsula from the Austrian sway. The ideas entertained of him by his enemies, may be gathered from the reply made by an old Hungarian officer who was taken prisoner, and being inquired of how affairs were going on, could not deny that they were not in a very prosperous condition, but added:[1] "It is impossible to comprehend anything, now we have to deal with a young general who is sometimes before us, sometimes behind, and then suddenly on our flanks; we do not know how to place ourselves; such a manner of making war is intolerable, and violates all rule." And Napoleon may be said to have made rule subservient to his great genius, although generally he was a great observer of the principles of war. And yet there were some singular violations. In reference to single and double lines of operation, he demonstrates the preference of the former, from the fact that flanks are the weak points of every army, and should be exposed as little as possible. This exposure always increases with the multiplication of lines of operation. Thus a single line will only expose two weak points; a double line, four; and a triple line, six, etc. And yet in Italy, in 1796, we see him taking two lines of operation on both sides of the Lake de Garda.[2] So the victory of Marengo was preceded by a march on both banks of the Po. In all the dispositions of his armies he always had an eye to their possible and practicable concentration; for, although operating on an extensive theatre, the separate corps followed interior and converging directions. He held as a maxim: "that an army ought always to keep all its columns connected,[3] so that the enemy cannot intro-

[1] *Graham*, 209. [2] *Szabad*, 192, 193. [3] *Graham*, 217.

duce himself between them; and, if circumstances require a deviation from this rule, those corps which are detached, should be independent in their movements, and have orders to unite at some fixed point, towards which they march without hesitation, and without waiting for fresh orders."

He could exercise the art, always difficult, of directing the masses on the decisive points; and, when necessary, of supplying the want of numbers by rapidity of movement. His orders were always clear and precise, and his divisions, although separated when the enemy was at a distance, were always concentrated at the moment of his approach. Although he always managed to be a move in advance of his enemy, yet he always penetrated the intentions of the enemy before acting. His army, disencumbered of all unnecessary material, far surpassed all those of his own, and perhaps of still more modern times in its facility and rapidity of movement. In his operations in Switzerland he revealed the relation between tactics and topography in a new light, and changed the old maxims as to the defense of states. It demonstrated that an enemy could no longer be stopped by lines of fortresses, when the Alps and the Rhine could be turned and crossed at twenty different points.

Napoleon so constructed and arranged his armies as fully to realize all that each arm could deliver on the battle-field. His cavalry was employed to make a dash on the enemy's infantry: to combat his cavalry; to make charges in flank and to attack the opposing artillery. The cavalry was a projectile carried on by its own velocity; its charges under Murat were tremendous. It swept the ground like a hurricane. The world perhaps has never witnessed charges on so large a scale. It may be doubtful whether it ever will again. The great perfection in fire-arms, in the minie and enfield rifle, rendering it possible to empty saddles at such great distances, will render cavalry charges less frequent in the future, unless made under peculiarly favorable circumstances as to protection.

Napoleon was the first to introduce the mode of resisting cavalry charges by arranging his infantry into squares. This was first tried in his Egyptian campaign, and the trial was made against the famous Mameluke cavalry, whose horses, and horsemanship, and natural valor, were probably unsurpassed. At the battle of the Pyramids the French infantry were formed in squares flanking each other. The cavalry and artillery had a position inside the squares, thus presenting to the enemy angular walls six ranks deep. The Mamelukes rushed on to the attack, passed between the squares, and dashed on to the bristling walls of bayonets with terrible force and intrepidity. But it was only to find man and horse mingled together in interminable confusion.

Napoleon's order of battle depended much upon circumstances; the lay of the land, the position of the enemy, the arrangement of natural defenses, the facilities for advancing and retreating. The policy of his attack and defense was so various as to render it impossible to bring it within any fixed rule. He often made feints upon particular parts of the enemy's line, so as to draw their forces in that direction, when all of a sudden, he would dart upon some other part of the weakened line, penetrate it, follow up by flank attacks, and thus succeed in disorganizing and dispersing the enemy. His main object very frequently was to decide upon what constituted the key of the enemy's position, and to avail himself of the first fair opportuuity to make a dash upon that, seize and hold it, and from it effect the dispersion of the army. Thus at the celebrated battle of Austerlitz the heights of Pratzen constituted the key of the enemy's position. While Napoleon was engaging both wings, and the enemy's centre was drawn upon to support them, he suddenly dispatched Marshal Soult, supported by Bernadotte, to climb up and take the plateau of Pratzen. This being effected, Napoleon changed front with two of the divisions, and moved on to take the ene-

my's left wing in the rear. The result was the complete overthrow of the enemy.

Napoleon directed in person, as general-in-chief, fifteen campaigns. His battles were innumerable, and he was only four times defeated. "He fell," says one, "from the pinnacle of grandeur because he forgot that there are limits to both the moral and physical powers of man, and that the greater the masses put in motion the more is genius trammelled by the imprescriptible laws of nature, and the less can it control events."[1]

The arts of strategy and grand tactics have made no advance since the age of Napoleon, but the construction of fire-arms as instruments of war has been greatly improved. While the minie rifle, and other improved fire-arms have been coming into use, and supplanting the smooth-bore of former times, the question has been asked will these improved weapons have any influence on tactics? Will whole armies be disposed in skirmishing order? Or will it still be necessary to keep up lines deployed, either of battalions in column or in line? Will battles become mere duels with the musket? To this question, Jomini expresses the opinion, that notwithstanding these great improvements, two armies wishing to engage in battle cannot thus fire at each other from a distance throughout the day;[2] but that one or other must advance and make the attack; and that, therefore, ultimate success will depend, as heretofore, on the most skillful manœuvering, according to the great tactical principle of bringing the preponderating mass on the decisive point at the decisive moment. The subsequent experiences in the Italian campaign, and in the great American rebellion, seem to sustain this opinion of Jomini.

[1] *Graham*, 232. [2] *Idem*, 253, 254.

Naval Warfare.

Naval warfare, with the exception of the battle of Navarino, has attracted very little attention in Europe during the last half century. Even during the war era of Napoleon the terrible contests in which nations were engaged, were principally on land, a few of them, however, being upon water. The reason of this is probably to be found in the fact that for the last half century the supremacy of the British navy has remained undisputed. In order, however, to acquire that supremacy the ocean had, at times, been the scene of terrible conflicts.

From the time when the Roman and the Carthaginian battled for the supremacy of the sea to that which was signalized by the use of gunpowder and the invention of cannon, naval warfare underwent but little variation. These were first used by the Venetians against the Genoese in 1370. One of the earliest naval contests that occurs after their introduction was the great battle of Lepanto fought between the Venetian, papal and Spanish fleets on one side and the Turkish on the other, in September, 1571. The Christian fleet consisted of two hundred and fifty ships, manned by fifty thousand men, while the Turkish was still larger. This was a terrible battle; the ships grappled with each other; the enemies fought hand to hand, sword to cimiter. Pikes, javelins and arrows, cannons, match-locks, and arquebusses, aided the fury of the combatants. At length the Turkish galley slaves rose upon their masters, and in the end the Turks were badly beaten, and their navy almost annihilated.

The Christian fleet was commanded by Don John of Austria, a natural son of Charles V, which gave occasion for the pope to exclaim, when the news reached Rome: "There was a man sent of God whose name was John."

After this period an improvement took place in the form and adaptation of ships of war, which at the same

time progressively increased in force and size, until before the close of the sixteenth century, Spanish and Portuguese ships sometimes carried eighty or ninety guns. A vast motive, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, stimulated the maritime powers of Europe to give the greatest possible efficiency to their navies, and that was the planting and sustaining of colonies in distant countries with a view principally to the enlargement of their commerce. This transportation of men, manners, and Euro pean civilization, into the remote regions of Asia and America, and the successful establishment of them there required large naval facilities. The nations that went into these the most extensively were the Spanish and Portuguese, the Dutch, Danish, French, and English. These distant colonies, during the early periods of their existence, possessed little or no internal means of defense, and hence afforded an easy prey to the invader. They looked for their protection to the navy of the mother country, and hence those maritime nations having colonies felt the necessity of possessing large naval resources. The sovereignty of the seas, therefore, became a matter of most desirable attainment, because it would carry with it the power of wresting from its enemy all its colonial dependencies. Hence we have the key to the severe and terrible ocean conflicts between the Spanish, Dutch, French, and English navies, until the supremacy of the latter became established. The most severe and protracted of these conflicts have been between the Dutch and the English and the French and the English, that between the two latter extending itself into some of the first years of the present century.

It is not proposed to go into the history or peculiarities of naval warfare. The record of battles will show that the contests have been principally between the Dutch and the English and the French and the English for the dominion of the seas. The battle which was the most instrumental in deciding the question as between the two latter was that

off Trafalgar, which was fought on the 21st October, 1805. The French and Spanish fleets together amounted to thirty-three sail of the line, while that of the English numbered twenty-seven. The former were superior in ships, guns and men, but the crews of the latter made up their inferiority in number by their discipline, the service they had seen, and by their commander, Lord Nelson. The former formed their line of battle on the larboard tack, the wind being at south-west. The ships were drawn up in a double line in close order, the intervals in the first line being filled by the ships of the second with room to fire between. This combined the advantage of a dense, unassailable column, with a sufficient interval to obviate the danger of contact among the ships. Nelson bore down also in a double line, himself leading the left of fourteen ships in the Victory, and Collingwood in the Royal Sovereign, the right line of thirteen ships. The object was to break the line of the enemy in two points, separating and overpowering them in sections inferior to his own. From the mast-head of the Victory floated the signal, "England expects every man to do his duty." The action was a close and decisive one, and ended in the complete triumph of the English fleet, twenty of the allied vessels having surrendered. But the victory in one sense was dearly purchased. Lord Nelson was among the slain. Since that battle the superiority of the English navy may be said to have remained undisputed.

The peculiarities of naval warfare relate more particularly to the vessels and the instruments, arms and methods of using them. The vessels were of small size all through the middle ages. And they were not enlarged until the spirit of more adventurous commerce, and new discoveries, longer voyages, and additional demands created the necessity of employing larger and better rigged vessels. The origin of the English navy goes no further back than the reign of Henry VII. The modern frigate was not generally adopted in the English navy until about the middle

of the seventeenth century. Towards the latter part of the eighteenth century the carronade was invented, which was a very short gun with a large calibre, much resembling a howitzer, but designed to throw solid shot, with small charges, at short ranges. This produced fearful effects upon the timber at close quarters. This, during the war of the French revolution, gave such power to the British broadsides, that it helped to decide many an action when fought at close quarters.

It was about the year 1820, that the celebrated paixhan gun was invented by the French general, Paixhans. This was a gun of large calibre, and having at the breech a narrow chamber for the insertion of the powder, and began to fire hollow shot, at low elevations. Thus the shell, or projectile, that would burst after hitting, and which could have given to it a horizontal range, became generally introduced into all navies, and has ever since maintained its position there.

Next, and very soon afterwards, came the first attempt to substitute steam power in the place of the sail in the propulsion of ships of war. This would render the ship vastly more manageable, and hence bring naval engagements more directly within the control of those who embark in them. But the difficulty was that the engine and paddle wheels together usurped the place whence the broadsides should be discharged, and besides they were directly exposed to the enemy's shot, and a single lucky hit would entirely disable them. In addition to all this, the engines, paddles and coal were too weighty for a vessel which must carry heavy ordnance. The idea, therefore, of using steam as a means of propelling ships of war was abandoned.

At length came the invention of the screw propeller, which was destined to revolutionize naval warfare. By means of it all war vessels could be transformed into steam vessels. It was first made use of by the French in 1849. The Napoleon was constructed into the first screw

line of battle ship, and in so doing the ship was allowed to retain all the lines and rigging of a sailing vessel, and to be moved either by steam alone, or by sails alone or by both combined. The result has been that almost all ships now made are screw steamers, and that many of the old strong built ships of the line have been newly fitted with a screw and engines, so that almost all the European navies have become transformed into steam fleets.

There are two more improvements that have crowned the ingenuity of modern times. The first of these is the mortar boat, or steam gun boat, which was of English construction, and was designed to be used in the attack on Cronstadt. It is a vessel armed with one or two heavy long range guns, or a heavy mortar, which can be used in a bombardment, from a long distance, of fortified naval arsenals. Thus these mortar boats by hovering about the coasts, and by running up rivers, can batter down towns and fortified places, while they are themselves so small, and at such a distance, as to be in little danger from any of the enemy's projectiles. They are destined to play an important part in all future warfare which offers facilties for their use.

The other improvement is the substitution of iron clads for wooden vessels. The aim here is to invest all the assailable parts of the vessel with plates of iron so thick as to be impermeable to the heaviest and most forcible projectile that can be hurled against them. This can be done more effectually by constructing the vessel itself with a view to this iron rig. In such construction, the most assailable parts are made in a circular, or a slanting form so that the projectiles may glance off from the point at which they strike. In this way it has been sought to protect all the parts above the water line so perfectly that the crews can manage their guns, and keep up their fire upon the enemy without being themselves exposed to any serious hazard of loss. This is an experiment in naval warfare which, if successful, must change its entire character. A whole fleet

of wooden vessels would stand a poor chance of success against a single iron clad, especially if in the form of a ram. There are two difficulties in the way of the perfect success of this experiment. The first is found in the fact that it is possible to increase the force of projectiles and to arm them with greater power than has ever yet been done. This involves the necessity of thicker and heavier iron plating to insure protection against them, and this latter in its turn endangers the safety of the iron clad upon the watery element. The recent sinking and loss of the iron boat Monitor in the American waters justifies the apprehensions entertained on this point. It will also be obvious that as a counterpoise to the increasing the force and power of projectiles, a heavier ordnance will be required, and thus in addition to the weight of the iron plating, will be the superadded weight of the heavy ordnance and stores necessary to insure any prospect of success against other similarly armed vessels. The contest now going on in the United States is testing the feasibility of this experiment. It may result in determining its success so far as relates to the carrying on of war upon the same continent. Whether it will prove a perfect success here, and if it should do so, whether it shall prove successful on a larger scale, and whether fleets of iron clads are to be seen ploughing the ocean, encountering each other and striving for the mastery over its wide domain; or crossing it, and pouring their destructive broadsides into the cities of another continent than that to which they belong, may well rank among the unsolved problems of the future.

INDEX

Abatis, the, 527.

Accompanied madrigals, date of, 279.

Adam's Ruins of Spalatro, influences English architecture, 75.

Admiralty the, in Russia, described, 68.

Akenside, Mark, dates, poems and style of, 406.

Alaric captures Rome, 88.

Albani, characteristics, 200.

Alexander's Feast, by Dryden, 394.

Alfieri, dramatic genius of, 469; reform effected by, 470.

Alhambra, the, elegance and magnitude of, 32, 33.

Almogaver, Juan Boscan, influence and poetry of, 337.

Alunno, Nicolo, characteristics of, 165.

Ambrosian chant, 270.

Anasto da Sienna, 94.

Andrea Pisano, carried art to Florence, 94; founded the Tuscan school, 94.

Andrea Orgagna, dates of, 153; genius of, 153; great works of, 153.

Angelico, Fra, of Fiesole, dates of, 154; style of, 154; great works of, 154; rank and position of in the history of art, 153, 154.

Anne, Queen, literary character of the reign of, 396.

Antonello da Messina, 162.

Approaches, 531.

Apse, the double, unfortunate effect of in German churches, 30; in Byzantine architecture, 15; made a part of the church in Germany, 24.

Arabian or Saracenic architecture, 31; its richness its chief recommendation, 31; has the pointed Gothic arch, 32; light and airy, 32; character of been in its deades, 32; gothic features seen in, 32; perfect specimen of in the Alhambra, 32; relic of seen in the tower of the Giraldo at Seville, 33; served as models of imitation, 33; seen in Sicily, 33; prevalent in Palermo even during the Norman rule, 33; not Gothic, but a distinct style, 33, 34.

Arch, the, definition of, 10; known in Egypt and Greece, but did not enter into their architecture, 11; foreshadowed in the early Pelasgian monuments, 11; style architecture growing from, 11; employed first in Italy, 13; predominant in Roman architecture, 13; destined to supplant the entablature, 19; the round position of in architecture, 27; has its appropriate ornamentation, 27; in harmony with its massive pier, 27; characteristic of the Romanesque, 28; contrasted with the Gothic arch, 28; pointed, originated by Mahometan nations, 35; introduced into the Gothic, 35; the four centered in the later Gothic architecture, 45; Gothic, peculiar character of, 48.

Architecture, schools of, see schools.

Architecture, 6; influenced by material most readily accessible, 6 influenced by the face of the country, 7; influenced by the form of government and the habits of the people, 7; influenced by the state of the country, 7; influenced by climate, 8; influenced by national development, 8; reflects the degree of civilization, 8; different from the work of the engineer, 9; styles of whence derived, 10; horizontal style, 11; vertical style of, 11; in Egypt, 11; in Greece, 11, 12; among the ancient Druids, 12; orders of, in Greece, 12; perfected in the age of Pericles, 12; Grecian, 12; Romans, 13; among the ancient Etruscans, 13; of Modern Europe, where seen, 14; great divisions of 14; Byzantine, 14–18; early Romanesque, or Basilican style of, 21; ecclesiastical, circular form of, in Italy, 21; new style of Romanesque, 22; Lombard style, 22; German Romanesque, 23, 24; Norman, 25; Saxon, 25; Saracenic, 31; Gothic, 34–52; style of, during the period of the renaissance, 52–59; Florentine school of, 54; Roman school of, 52–57; Venetian school of, 57; modern, 59–82; French, 60–64; German, modern, 64–67; in Russia, 68; modern in Spain, 69; polychrome, 76; reflections upon, 79; modern in Great Britain, 70–82.

Aretino, comedies of, 467.

Ariosto, Ludovico, dates, character and form of, 349; comedies, 466.

Armies, standing, in time of peace, a modern policy, 517; their composition, 534; subsistence of, 542; how subsisted under Cæsar, 542; how under Louis XIV, 542; how under Frederick II, 542; how under Napoleon, 543; general principle of, 544; marches of, 544.

Armies, continued —

Armor, defensive, of the earlier European nations, 519.

Arms and weapons, 518.

Army movements, certainty and precision of, necessary, 549.

Arne, Dr., musical ability of, 292.

Art, definition of, 1; subject upon which it operates, 2; motive for, 3; limit, 3; dependent upon religion and government, 89; aim of, 40; pagan cycle of, the most favorable to the development of, 140; pagan, culminated when, 140; pagan, when overthrown, 141; Christian, when commenced, 141; three great eras of modern, 141; early Christian, 142; Byzantine, 143; revival of in Italy, 145; lyric, prominent traits of, 151; supplied the want of books, 152; sources of its models, 156; under what political conditions most triumphant, 167; law of its development, 208; in England, 240.

Artillery, use of in early times, 521; general classes of, 538; siege, 538; field, 538; pieces and projectiles used by, 538; division of, 539; action of, 539; formations of, 539; as an arm of preparation, 540; as an arm of succor, 540; in case of retreat, 541; relative number of, 541; how placed and used in battle, 512.

Arts, classification of, 4; objective, 4; subjective, 4; mixed, 5, 7;

Arts, continued —
most flourishing under a free government, 90; revived by the Crusades, 90; stimulated by the Italian republics and free cities, 90; the fine, in Germany, 119; the, kindred in character, 344.
Assembly, national, of France, great orator of, 431.
Attack upon fortifications, mode of, 527.
Attila scourges Italy, 89.
Augustino da Sienna, 94.

Bach, 287.
Bacon, English sculptor, 125.
Balance of power in Europe, influence of, 517.
Banks, dates and power of modeling of, 125.
Baptistery, form of in Italy, 21.
Barbarian invasion, dates and influence of, 88, 89.
Bards, Celtic, occasions requiring the songs of, 308; study and office of, 309; aim of, 310; culmination of, 311; of Germany, 320; culmination of, 320.
Barry, James, dates, style and works of, 244.
Basilican style of architecture, character and defect of, 21.
Basilica, form and description of, 19, 20; adapted to Christian worship, 20; moral aspect of its change into a church, 21.
Bastion, the, 525.
Battle, line and order of, primary importance of, 567; order of, formed by Frederick the Great, 583.
Battle-axe, the, 518.
Battles, kinds of, 560; offensive, difficulty of arranging a plan in, 563; orders of, 563.
Bayonet, the, substituted for the pike, 523; the, first used, 577.
Beaumont, Francis, dates of, 498; dramatic genius of, 502; literary partnership of, with Fletcher, 502.
Beethoven, Ludwig Von, dates, birthplace and early genius of, 302; mode of composition of, 303; peculiar beauties of, 303; death of, 303.
Befreing Shalle, in Bavaria, 67.
Bell tower, 23.
Bellini, Giovanni, dates of, 163; longevity of, 163; character of the paintings of, 163, 174.
Berlin, museum of, described, 66, 67.
Bernini, dates, aim, and works of, 106.
Besieged, the, operations of, 531.
Besiegers, the, operations of, 528.
Bivouac, the, 545.
Body-harness, the, 519.
Boiardo, Count, 349.
Boileau, dates and satire of, 375.
Bologna school of music, 284.
Bombs, when first used, 521.
Bouchardon, merit of, 116.
Bourdaloue, pulpit eloquence of, 492.
Bow, the, use of in England, 518; introduced by the Norman conquest, 518.
Brabant school of painting, 216.
Bramante, founder of the Roman school of architecture, 55, 56.
British eloquence, 439.
Bronze gates of the Baptistery at Florence, beauty of, 95.
Brougham, Lord, eloquence of compared with that of Canning, 453.
Brunelleschi, Philip, dates of, 53; introduced the renaissance style of architecture into Italy, 53; the dome of Florence cathedral his greatest work, 53.

Burke, Edmund, dates of, 445; eloquence of, 446.
Burlington, Earl of, influence of upon English architecture, 75.
Burns, Robert, dates, education, character and poems of, 411.
Butler, Samuel, dates of, 387; great work of, 395; character and genius of, 395.
Byron, Lord, dates, forms and characteristics of, 421.
Byzantine architecture, 14, 18; invented in Constantinople, 14; where found, 14, 15; periods of, 15; pure forms of, 15; main feature of, 15; general appearance of, 16; most perfect sample of, 17; greatest grandeur of, 17; period of decline, 17; extinction of, 17; influence of upon Western Europe, 18; art, 143; copied by the Italian masters, 143; head of Christ, 144; peculiarities of, 144; mission of, 144.

Cæsar, eloquence of, 426.
Cagliari, Paolo, 188; see Paul Veronese, 196.
Calderon, dates and dramatic genius of, 477.
Camoens, author of Lusiad, dates, life, etc., 340.
Camp, principles of the construction of, 546; guarding of, 546.
Campanile or bell tower, introduced by, 23; characteristic of Christian worship, 23; description of, 23; changed and improved by the German nations, 23.
Campbell, Thomas, dates, forms and style of, 419.
Campo Santo of Pisa, 152.
Canning, George, eloquence of compared with that of Lord Brougham, 453.
Cannon, the, employed by Mahomet II at the siege of Constantinople, 521; metals composing, 521; largest known, 521; first use of, 521.
Canova, Antoni, birthplace, dates and ancestry of, 107; early studies of, 107; in Venice, 107; early works of, 108; goes to Rome, 108; aim of, 108; number of compositions of, 109; three classes of his works, 109; great statues of, 109, 110; tombs chiseled by, 110, 111; genius of, 111; models after the antique, 112; merits of, 112; style of, 113.
Canterbury Tales, 383.
Caravaggio, dates of, 201; aim and characteristics of, 202; works of, 202; scholars of, 202.
Carlo, Maderno, works upon St. Peter, 56.
Carracci, Agostino, 199; Annibale, merits of, 199; Ludovico, dates of, 199; schools of painting founded by, 199.
Castrametation, principles of, 546.
Catacombs of Rome, art in, 142.
Catharine de Medici, commences the Tuileries, 61.
Catharine II of Russia, 68, 69.
Cathedral at Cologne, 77; of St. Denis, 77; of St. Peter, 78; at Cologne, 48; of Florence, dome of, 53; of St. Mark, 18, 47; of Milan, 47; of Seville, 47; of Toledo, 47; of Burgos, 47; at Salamanca, 69.
Cavalry, early use of, 535; in the middle ages, 535; under Gustavus Adolphus, 535; under Frederick the Great, 535; division

Cavalry, continued—
of, 535; heavy, 535; light, 535; dragoons, 536; at the battle of Auerstadt, 536; principal merit of, 535; under Napoleon, 537; shock produced by, 537; must be sustained by infantry, 537; invaluable after a victory, 538; relative number of, 538; how formed for and used in battle, 570; how used by Frederick the Great, 582.
Celtic remains, architectural character of, 12; music, 273; poetry, 308; bards, 398; culmination of, 311.
Celts, bards and instrumental music among, 272,
Cervantes, dates and dramatic works of, 473.
Chamber music, 278.
Chambers, Sir Wm., 75.
Chantrey, Sir Francis, genius and works of, 126.
Charlemagne, obtains singers from Italy, 272.
Charles I, 71; a lover of art, 240.
Charles V, 226.
Charles V of Spain, aim of, 338.
Charles VIII, influence of his wars upon Italian architecture, 60.
Chaucer, Geoffrey, dates, works and genius of, 382.
Chausse d'Antin, polychromy of, 77.
Chiaroscuro, derivation and use of, 134; effect of, how accomplished, 135; by whom discovered, 135, 188; importance of, in painting, 188; studied in Venice, 188; developed by Correggio, 188.
Chivalry, influence of upon Provençal poetry, 325; influences poetry in Italy, 349.
Christ, head of, as represented in the Catacombs, 144; Byzantine head of, 144.
Christian art in architecture, 14; worship demands a suitable architecture, 19; temples, earliest not derived from the Basilica found in Ireland, 24; description of, 24; art, spiritual in its tone, 89; subjects of, 89; first attempts and subjects of, 142, 143.
Christianity, primitive, hostile to art, 89.
Christopher Wren, 71.
Church of St. Eustace at Paris, 60; of St. Michael at Dijon, 61; of St. Peters at Caen, 61; St. Sophia, 17; of St. Vitalis, 18; form of in Saxon architecture, 25; form of in Norman architecture, 26; of St. Peter's at Rome, dimensions, expense, character of, 56, 57; of St. Mark, when begun, 57; of the Invalids, 61; of St. Genevieve or the Pantheon, in Paris, 62; of Santa Maria del Fiore, 62; of St. Peter, 62; of St. Paul, 62; of the Madeleine, in Paris, 62; of Santa Engracia at Saragossa, 69; of St. Paul in London, 71, 72; of St. Stephen, 72; of St. Magnus, 72; of St. Michael, 72; of the Madeleine, 77; music, species of, 278; in France, 290.
Churches, greatest modern in Europe, 62; forms of in Byzantine architecture, 16.
Cid, poem of the, date, hero, and character of, 333.
Cimabue, representative of the earliest stages of coloring, 138; the father of Italian art, style of, 147; chief merit of, 147.
Circular form of ecclesiastical architecture in Italy, 21.
Circumvallation, lines of, 530.

Civilization, degree of, reflected by architecture, 8.
Claude Lorraine, dates of, 234; style of, 235.
Clerestory, the, in the Gothic, 45.
Climate, influence of, upon architecture, 8.
Clouet, Francois, dates and style of, 234.
Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, dates, friends and early aim of, 415; works and genius, of, 415.
Collins, William, dates, works and genius of, 404.
Cologne, cathedral of, the most perfect specimen of Gothic architecture, 48; school of painting of, how characterized, 205; polychrome architecture in, 77.
Color, effect of, dependent upon, 138.
Coloring in painting, 136; gradations, 137; earliest stages and representative of, 138; perfect stages and representative of, 138; in early Spanish schools, 225.
Comedies, earliest English, 496.
Comedy, in France, 486; Italian, origin of, 466.
Commerce, influence of upon naval warfare, 594.
Communications, lines of, 554.
Composition of armies, 534.
Compromise effected in architecture in France, 60; seen in the church of St. Eustace, 60; St. Michael, 61; St. Peter at Caen, 61.
Condé, statue of, 116.
Convention, national, of France, great orators of, 434.
Corneille, Pierre, dates and dramatic genius of, 479.
Correggio, develops chiaroscuro, 188; compared with Raphael, 189; dates and birthplace of, 189; by whom influenced, 189; excellence of, 189; principal works of, 190.
Counterscarp wall, the, 525.
Cousin, Jean, the founder of the French school of painting, 234.
Covered way, the, 525.
Cowper, William, dates, character and forms of, 408.
Crabbe, George, duties, poems and merit of, 410.
Cranach, Lucas, dates of, 213; characteristics of, 213.
Creation, the, oratorio of, 298.
Critical school of poetry in England, 393.
Cross-bow, the, or arbalest, introduced into France, 518; construction and use of, 518.
Crusades, influence of upon sculpture in England, 123; influence of upon the arts, 90.
Curran, John Philpot, dates, appearance and eloquence of, 457.

Dædalus and Icarus of Canova, 108.
Dagger of mercy, the, 520.
Dannecker, German sculptor, works of, 118.
Dante, dates and life of, 343; subjects of the poem of, 344; conception of hell, 344; conception of purgatory, 345; conception of paradise, 345; measure of the poem of, 346; peculiar genius of, 346.
D'Antin, Chausse, polychromy of, 77.
Danton, appearance, character and eloquence of, 436.
Da Pisa, Giovanni, 94.
Darwin, Dr. Erasmus, dates and poems of, 409.
Da Sienna, Anasto, 94.
Da Sienna, Augustino, 94.

David, Jean, of France, studies and great statues of, 116; dates and style of, 238.
De Brosse, erects Luxemburg palace, 61.
Defense, lines of, 554.
Deliverance Hall, on Mt. Michael, description of, 67.
De l'Orme, architect of the Tuileries, 61.
Demosthenes, apostrophe of, 426.
Design, necessary to painting, 135; elements of, 135.
Development period of music, 273.
Dioclesian, palace of, at Spalatio, peculiar architecture of, 19.
Ditch, or fosse, the, 525.
Divine comedy of Dante, 344.
Dome, the crowning ornament in Byzantine architecture, 15; how sustained, 15; how constructed, in Rome, 15.
Domenichino, excellencies of, 100; works of, 200.
Donatello, dates and works of, 96, 97.
Dow, Gerard, dates and style of, 223.
Drama, the, an outgrowth of social life in large cities, 460; styles of, 461: classic, 461; romantic, 461; in Italy, 465; in Spain, began to flourish, 472; character of, 472; in Spain, period of its success, 473; contributors to, 473; in France, culmination and great lights of, 479; in England, 495; great masters of, 498; what schools of really national, 514; concluding remarks upon, 514; great periods of, in European countries, 515.
Dramatic art, the, 460; a mixed art, 460; exhibitions, earliest, 462; in Italy, greatest contributors to, 467; the period of its prosperity, 477; the, in France, gradual character of, 482.
Dramatic music, arose from, 279; early specimens of, 279; symphony, 281; in France, 290.
Dramatists, contemporary, 575.
Druidical bards, 272.
Dryden, John, education and early productions of, 392; founded a critical school of poetry, 394; duties of, 394; lyric poetry of, 394.
Duccio, of the school of Sienna, 151.
Duchess Marie of Orleans, statues made by, 117.
Dunciad, by Pope, 399.
Durer, Albert, characteristics of, 209; principles upon which he proceeded, 209; marks a transition period in German art, 210; most celebrated works of, 211; dates of, 207.

Early Gothic, the, character and beauty of, 40, 41; the varieties of windows in, 42, 43; Christian music, 270.
Eclectic school of painting, 198.
Edda, the, of Saemund and Snorre Sturleson, 316; compared with the songs of Ossian, 319.
Egypt, architecture of, 11.
Eleanor, Queen, monuments of, 123.
Elizabethan age of poetry, characteristics and poets of, 384, 386.
Eloquence, 424; fields for the display of, 425; ancient compared with modern, 425; of the bar, 427; of the pulpit, 428; of the senate and popular assembly, 431; in England and France, 431; in France, 431–438; after the revolution, 438; in the Bri-

Eloquence, continued —
tish parliament, 439; great condition of its development, 459.
Embrasures, 526.
Enceinte, the, 525.
Enemy, the movements of, how ascertained in advance, 547.
Engineers, the, greatest development of, 541; numbers of, 541; division and duties of, 541.
England, polychromy in, 77; sculpture in, 122; Italian origin of, 123; indebted to America for her most celebrated historical painter, 245; music in, 291; great composer in, 291; poetry and poets of, in the eighteenth century, 396; poetry and poets of, 381–424.
English architecture, begins to be modeled after the Grecian style, 75; cause of, 75; modeled strictly after the Italian, 75; in the present century, 76; school of painting, 240; language, composition of, 382; Augustan age of, 396; sermons, 429, 430; drama, the, 495; early character of, 495; the, periods of, 496; during the reign of Elizabeth, 496, 497; most brilliant period of, 497; copies the antique, 497; great masters of, 498; founders of, 498; contrasted with the French, 514; navy, origin of, 595.
Entablature, the, definition of, 10; style of architecture growing from, 11; principle of, seen in the Celtic remains, 12; perfected in Greece, 12.
Entrenchments, forms of, 526.
Epistle from Eloise to Abelard, by Pope, 397.
Equestrian statues in France, 116.
Eras of modern art, 141.
Erskine, Thomas, eloquence of, 456.
Escurial, palace of the, dimensions and architecture of, 69.
Essay on Man, by Pope, 399
Etruria, art revived in, 146.
European schools of music, 283.

Fables of Dryden, 394.
Façade, form of, 16.
Faëry Queen, the, of Spenser, 385.
Farnese palace at Rome, by whom designed and how built, 55.
Faust, by Goethe, character of, 370.
Ferdinand and Isabella, tomb of, 92.
Flamboyant style of Gothic architecture, 46.
Flaxman, John, the greatest English sculptor, 125; genius and great statues of, 126.
Fletcher, John, dates of, 498; dramatic genius of, 502.
Florence, dome of the cathedral of, 53; bronze gates of the Baptistery at, 95; school of painting in, 147; character of the art of, 151.
Florentine school of architecture, dates of, 54; seen more in palaces than in churches, 54; character of, 54.
Foliation, an important element in Gothic decoration, 42.
Fontenelle, dates and poetry of, 376.
Foreshortening, art of, first ventured upon, 150.
Form and color in painting, 138.
Formative period of music, 270.
Fortifications, object of, 523; kinds of, 523; in the middle ages, 524; improvements of in modern times, 524; permanent, elements of, 525; terms of permanent defined, 525; temporary, 526; mode of attacking, 527.

Fortified places and means of attack and defense, 523.
Four Seasons, the, oratorio of, 298.
Fox, Charles James, dates of, 449; eloquence of, 449.
Fra Angelico, 154.
France, Italian architecture introduced into, 60; polychromy in, 77; poetry in, 373; sculpture introduced in, 114.
Francia, Francesca, excellencies of, 165.
Francis I, tomb of, 92; patron of the arts, 60; influence of his wars in introducing Italian architecture into France, 60; imported into France Italian architects, 60; brings sculpture into France, 114; the first French monarch who loved painting, 233; poetry and poets in the reign of, 373.
Franco, gives rules to rhythm, 273.
Frederick the Great, military genius of, 581, 582; statue of, 119; system of war of, 584.
Free institutions, how overthrown, 203.
French modern architecture, 60–64; Palatine architecture celebrated, 62; revolution, influence of upon sculpture, 116; school of painting, 232; art, great period of, 234; painters of the present century, 239; music, 289; school of music, 288–291; sermons, 429; revolution, orators of, 431; eloquence, 431–438; drama, the, 479; culmination and great lights of, 479; comedy, 486; revolution, moral element and results of, 585; effect upon military tactics, 585.
Fresco painting, 129.
Fugitive pieces of chamber music, variety of, 279.
Fuseli, Henry, dates, style and works of, 252.

Gafforio, Fanchino, Practica Musica of, 274.
Gainsborough, Thomas, dates and characteristics of, 250.
Gamut, the, constructed, 273.
Gay, John, dates, works and genius of, 401.
Genseric burns Rome, 89; persecutes the Catholic Christians, 89.
Gentle Shepherd, the, by Allan Ramsay, 402.
Geometrical variety of windows in the early Gothic, 43, 44; how distinguished from the lancet style, 44.
German nations, improve the bell-tower and apse, 23, 24; Romanesque architecture, 23, 24, 30; modern architecture, 64, 69; artists, culture and merits of, 119; schools of painting, 203; schools of music, 286, 288; early origin of, 286; superiority of, in instrumental music, 286, 287; great composers in, 287; bards, 320; poetry, great lights of, 363; poetry, modern, 372; race, locality, nationalities and languages of, 355; drama, the, 488; origin, character and great names in, 488.
Germany, existing old houses in, style of, 64; sought its models of architecture in Greece, not in Italy, 65; national monument of, described, 66; polychromy in, 77; sculpture in, 117; sculptors of, 118; its peculiarities as related to art, 208; poetry in, 355.

Ghiberti, Lorenzo, executes the bronze doors of the baptistery at Florence, 95, 97.
Ghirlandajo, aim of, 160; characteristics of, 160; celebrated productions of, where found, 161.
Gibbons, Grinling, English sculptor, 124.
Giorgiani, pupil of Bellini, 164.
Giotteschi, 150.
Giottian epoch, distinguished for, 150.
Giotto, humble origin of, 147, 148; wonderful genius of, 148; the intimate friend of Dante, 148; naturalistic in his tendencies, 148; dramatic character in the paintings of, 149; heads of, 149; cities containing the works of, 149; crucifixions of, 149; the type of a coming epoch, 150; imitators of, 150; epoch of, how marked, 150.
Giovanni da Pisa, 94.
Girardon, French sculptor, style of, 115.
Girondists, destruction of, 435.
Glacis, the, 525.
Globe theatre of Shakespeare, construction and management of, 513.
Gluck, 281.
Goethe, John Wolfgang Von, dates, works and genius of, 366; Faust of, 370; dramatic genius of, 490.
Goldoni, dramatic genius of, 468.
Goldsmith, Oliver, dates, character and works of, 407.
Gothic arch, peculiar character of, 48.
Gothic architecture contrasted with the Romanesque, 27, 28, 29; arch, development of, 28; architecture, 34, 52; the heritage of the Teutonic race, 34; where it prevailed, 34; principle upon which it is based, 34; carries out the vertical principle, 35; characteristics of, 35; adopted the pointed arch from the Mahometans, 35; system of decoration of, 35; clustered pillar essential to the ideal perfection of, 36; mouldings in, 36; does not consist wholly of vertical lines, 37; high roofs, spires, pinnacles and flying buttresses of, 37; style of vaulting in, 37; speculations as to its origin, 38; is it Saracenic? 38; may have been brought into Europe by the Crusades, 38; resemblance of to a forest, 39; supremacy of not accomplished without a struggle, 40; subdivisions of, 40; character and beauty of the early, 40, 41; character and beauty of the later or continuous, 41; form of the tower in, 43; spire in, 43; arcade in, 44; pillar in, 44; triforium, 44; four centered arch in the continuous Gothic, 56; clerestory in the later or continuous, 45; fan tracery vaulting in, 46; flamboyant style of, 46; where most found flourishing, 45; never native or fully adopted in Italy, 46; nearest resemblance to it in Italy found in the cathedral of Milan, 47; Italian, 47; in Spain, introduced, 47; borrows from the Saracenic, 47; specimens of, 47; in England, France and Germany, adapted to Christian worship, 47; most perfect specimen of, 48; contrasted with the Greek or classical, 49, 54; the favorite style in northern countries, 59; did not

Gothic architecture, continued — easily yield to the renaissance, 59, 60; power of in France, 61; declines in Germany.
Gothic poetry, 315.
Gougon, Jean, the first eminent sculptor in France, 115; dates, studies and school of, 115.
Government, influence upon architecture, 7; form of, influences the arts, 89; best form for the arts, 90.
Grattan, Henry, dates, appearance, and eloquence of, 457.
Graun, 287.
Gray, Thomas, dates, works, and genius of, 405.
Great Britain, modern architecture, in, 70, 82.
Grecian architecture, 11, 12; art, materialistic and sensual, 89; subjects of, 89; not wholly destroyed, 93; revived in Italy, 93.
Greece, perfects the entablature in architecture, 12; developed sculpture to its highest degree, 88; wonderful works of, 88; despoiled by Rome, 88.
Greek churches, union of, contending principles of architecture in, 17; preserves the cross form, 17.
Greek, or classical architecture contrasted with the Gothic, 49, 54.
Gregorian chant, 270; first introduced into England, 271; in Germany, 271; corrupted in France, 271.
Guido, a Benedictine, constructs the gamut, 273.
Guido Reni, two styles of, 200; works of, 200.
Guild singers in Germany, 356; most notable of, 357.
Gunpowder, first applied in warfare, 521; in naval warfare, 593.
Gustavus Adolphus, systematizes the art of war, 376; efforts of, 576; tactics of, 576.
Gutenburg's monument in Strasburg, 116.

Handel, George Frederic, dates and birthplace, and early life of, 292; settled in London, 293; great oratorios of, 293; later life of, 293; organ performance of, 293; effects of the music of, 294; perfections of the musical art in, 294; choruses of, 295; influence of upon England, 295.
Hand-gun, or fire-arm, the stages of progress of, 522.
Hapsburg, house of, unfavorable to poetry, 356.
Harmony, nature of, 263; of the dominant, invented, 277.
Haydn, 287; Francis Joseph, dates, birthplace and early life of, 296; excellence of, 296; manner of composition of, 296; highest production of, 297; comic pieces of, 297; in England, 297; slowness in composing of, 298; the Creation of, 298; the Four Seasons of, 298; peculiar excellence of, 299.
Heathen temples not adapted for Christian worship, 19.
Helmet, the, 520.
Henriade, the, of Voltaire, 379.
Henry III, architectural sculpture in England during the reign of, 123.
Henry VII, tomb of, 92; chapel of, 124.
Henry VIII, destruction of works of art during his reign, 124; influence of, upon art, 240.
Hercules and Lycius by Canova, 109.

Herder, John Gottfried, dates, works, and genius of, 362.
Hermitage in Russia, 69.
Herrera, loftiest of the Spanish poets, 339.
Heywood, John, dramatic genius of, 495.
Historical painting in Germany, period of, 221; in England, 243, 247.
Hogarth, as a historical painter, 243; style of, 241.
Hohenstauffen, emperors of the house of, encouraged the Minnisingers, 330.
Holbein, Hans, the younger, birthplace and dates of, 211; excellencies of, 211; aim of, 212; characteristics of, 212.
Holland school of painting, 218.
Holy Families of Raphael, 183.
Horizontal style of architecture, 11.
Horse artillery, used by Frederick the Great, 583.
Hudibras of Butler, character of, 395.
Hugo, Victor, genius of, 380; great poem of, 380.
Humboldt, bust of, 116.
Hurtado, Don Diego de Mendoza, character and classical poetry of, 337.

Iceland, discovery of, and colonization by, 315; destiny of, in reference to poetry, 316; poetry of, 316.
Idealism in German poetry, 359.
Iliad, translation of by Pope, 398.
Infantry, position and duties of, 534; relative number of, 535; arms of, 534; how formed for and used in battle, 568; first introduced, 595; how used by Frederick the Great, 582.
Influences that modify architecture, 6, 8.
Inigo Jones, date of, 71; planned the palace at Whitehall, 71.
Instrumental music, 281.
Intervals in melody, 277.
Ireland, style of early Romanesque found in, 24; ancient buildings found in, 25; round towers of, 25; the favored land of eloquence, 458.
Iron clad vessels used in naval warfare, 597.
Italian Gothic architecture, 47; architecture, best days of, 47; introduced into France, 60; how introduced into Germany, 65; when introduced into England, 70.
Italian, mode of singing, 268; singers introduced into Europe, 271; schools of music, character of, 283, 286; superiority of execution in, 285; decline of, 285; language derivation of, 342; poetry, great styles and exponents of, 351; drama, the, 465; tragedy, origin of, 465; comedy, origin of, 466.
Italian republics, the, influence of upon the arts, 90; and free cities, influence of upon art, 90, 93, 98; lose power, 105.
Italian schools of painting, 145; of painting, in what direction and by whom developed, 191.
Italy, not the home or seat of Gothic architecture, 46; schools of architecture in during the period of the renaissance, 54.

James I, 71.
Jerusalem Delivered of Tasso, celebrity, dates, subjects and character of, 351, 355.

Joanes Vincent, dates and style of, 226.
Jones, Inigo, date of, 71; planned the palace at Whitehall, 71.
Jonson, Ben, dates of, 498; appearances, character and dramatic genius of, 499, 502.
Julius II, the patron of Raphael, 179; sells indulgences to meet the expenses of St. Peters, 57; statue of, 102.

Kent, English architect, 75.
Keyser, the first German composer, 286.
Kleuse, Leo Von, great architect, 65; celebrated building of, 65.
Klopstock, Frederick Gottlieb, dates and poetry of, 358; Messiah of, 359.
Knight, arms of, 519.
Knight, Death and the Devil by Albert Durer, 211.

La Fontaine, dates and fables of, 375.
Lance, the, 519.
Lancet, style of window in the early Gothic, 42, 43; presents great beauty and loveliness, 42.
Language of France in the seventeenth century, 376; pronunciation of, influences music, 268; perfection of, attributable to poetry and eloquence, 381.
Last Judgment, the, by Michael Angelo, 175.
Last Supper, the, by Leonardo da Vinci, 171.
Later or continuous Gothic, character and beauty of, 41, 45.
Lawrence, Sir Thomas, dates and style of, 256.
Lay of the Nibelungen, 321.
Lebrun, Charles, dates of, 234; style of, 237.
Legend of the Ages, by Victor Hugo, character of, 380.
Leo X, 57.
Leon, Luis Ponce de, life and poetry of, 339.
Leonardo da Vinci, discourses chiaroscuro, 135; dates of, 166; genius of, 168; diverse talents of, 169; aim of, 169; studied character, 169, 170; portrait of Mona Lisa, 171; Last Supper by, 171; Struggle for the Standard by, 172; compared with Giotto, 172.
Lepanto, naval battle of, 593.
Lessing, dates, dramas and dramatic genius of, 488.
Lesueur, Eustache, dates of, 234; style of, 237.
Lippi, Filippo, the Carmelite, the first notoriously profligate artist, 158; painted from nature, 158.
Lombard style of architecture, by whom and when introduced, 22; character of, 22, 23; style of architecture, description of a church so built, 23; campanile or bell tower, characteristic of, 23.
Lombards, the, influence of upon architecture, 22; style introduced by them, 22, 23.
Lombardy school of music, 284.
London, great fire in, 71.
Lorenzo the Magnificent, patron of art, 99.
Lorraine, Claude, dates of, 234; style of, 235; statue of, 101.
Louis Philippe, completes the architectural monuments of Napoleon I, 64.
Louis XII, wars of, influence Italian architecture, 60.

Louis XIV, 61, 115; art in the reign of, 234; musical taste of, 289.
Louis XV, reign of, characterized by improved taste in architecture in France, 62.
Louis XVIII, 63.
Ludwig I, king of Bavaria, patron of the arts, 65; most celebrated structures erected during the reign of, 65, 66, 67.
Lully, introduced Italian music into France, 289.
Lusiad of Camoens, character, subjects and object of, 340.
Luxembourg palace, by whom built, 61; architect and architecture of, 61; modeled after, 61.
Lyric comedy, 281.
Lyrical poetry in Spain, 335.

Macdowell, study of, 127.
Machiavelli, comedies of, 467.
McPherson's translation of the songs of Ossian, 311.
Madeleine, church of, in Paris, 62; design of, 63; architecture of, 63; polychromy of, 77.
Maderno, Carlo, works upon St. Peter's, 56.
Madonnas of Raphael, 183.
Madrid school of painting, 227.
Madrigals, date of, 279.
Maestricht, siege of, 578.
Maffei, dates and tragedy of, 467.
Malherbe, age and poetry of, 374.
Mansard constructs the church of the Invalids and the Palace of Versailles, 61.
Mansions of the nobles in Germany, style of after the decline of the Gothic architecture, 64.
Mantegna, Andrea, style of, 161.
Marble Palace in Russia, by whom built, 68.
Marcello, 281.
Marches of armies, kinds and difficulties of, 544.
Marie of Orleans, duchess of, statues made by, 117.
Marlowe, Christopher, dramas and genius of, 498.
Marot, Clement, excellence of, 374.
Martel, or maule, the, 519.
Martini, Simone, style of, 152; great frescoes of, 152.
Martyrdom of St. Peter the Dominican, by Titian, 195.
Mary de Medici builds the Luxembourg palace, 61.
Masaccio, dates of, 157; aim of in painting, 157; style of, 157; most celebrated works of, 158.
Masolino, 157.
Massillon, pulpit eloquence of, 429.
Massinger, Philip, dates of, 498; dramatic genius and dramas of, 505.
Mazarin, imported Italian opera into France, 190.
Medici, house of, patrons of art, 98, 99.
Melancholy, by Albert Durer, 211.
Melody, nature of, 263.
Meneling, Hans, characteristics of, 207.
Messiah, the, of Klopstock, 359.
Metastasio, dramatic genius of, 467.
Michael Angelo, character of, his architecture, 56; some of his works, 56; dates of, 99; brought forward by Lorenzo de Medici, 99; a great student of anatomy, 99; a leading genius in all the arts, 99; place and mission of in modern art, 100; manner of working, 100; style of his productions, 101; his statue of Lorenzo de Medici, 101; his Moses, 102; his Julius II, 102; charac-

Michael Angelo, continued—
ter of his subjects, 102; differed from other sculptors in, 103; style and manner of, 102, 103; most natural works of, 104; copied by every other artist, 104; influence of, 104; art declines after him, 105; as a painter, 173; paintings of, 173, 176.
Milan, cathedral of, nearest resemblance to the Gothic style in Italy, 57.
Military art, 515; its objects, 533.
Milton, John, dates and education of, 387; periods of the literary life of, 388; works of, 388; great poem of, 389.
Mines, 527.
Minnesingers, the, country and period of, 330; character of, 331; ceased, 332; period and decline of, 356.
Mino, of the school of Sienna, 151.
Mirabeau, appearance, character and eloquence of, 431.
Miracle plays, or mysteries, origin and character of, 462; most celebrated, 462.
Miracles and moralities, the, in England, 495.
Modern architecture, 59, 82; in Great Britain, 70, 82.
Moliere, dates and comedies of, 486.
Mona Lisa, by Leonardo da Vinci, 171.
Monasteries in England, influence of their suppression on architecture, 70.
Montemayor, George de, pastoral poetry of, 338.
Monteverd, invented the harmony of the dominant, 277.
Monument, national, of Germany, described, 66.
Moore, Thomas, dates, poems and genius of, 412.
Moralities, the, origin and character of, 473.
Moses, statue of, by Michael Angelo, 102.
Mouldings in the Gothic architecture, 36.
Mozart, 287; dates, birthplace, and early genius of, 299; celebrated works of, 301; health of, 300; a child in everything but music, 300; excellence of, 301; object of music according to, 301; last work of, 302; circumstances of the death of, 302.
Munich, art loving, 65; sculpture and picture gallery in, 65; polychromy in, 77.
Murillo, Bartolomede, dates and early life of, 229; style of, 229, 230; coloring of, 230; great works of, 231.
Museum in Berlin described, 66.
Music, schools of, see schools; nature of the art of, 261; effect of, 262; conditions necessary to, 262; sources of, 264; curious materials from which it has been drawn, 265; instrumentalities of, 265; ethnological in its character, 268; influenced by the pronunciations of different languages, 268; peculiar style of, in each country, 268; periods of, 270; early Christian, 270; at the close of the fifteenth century, 275; four principal styles of, 278; in France, under Francis I, 288; under Henry IV, 288; under Louis XIII, 288; under Louis XIV, 289.
Musical instruments, 266; earliest, 267; notation, earliest forms of, 267; progress of, 267; literature of Germany, 288.
Musket, the, first style and improvements in, 522.

Naharro, Torres, the inventor of Spanish comedy, 472.
Napoleon I, architectural works of, in Paris, 63; his understanding of the movements of an army, 549; seen in the campaign of 1806, 549; and Wellington compared, 573; first object of, 586; military genius of, 586; first campaign of, 588; infantry under, 590; cavalry under, 590; order of battle of, 591.
Napoleon's war with Prussia in 1806, 547.
Naturalistic school of painting, 201; chief representative of, 201.
Naval warfare, 593, 598; principal nations by whom waged, 594; peculiarities of, 595; in the middle ages, 595; improvements in, 595, 598; arms used in, 596; steam introduced in, 596; iron clad vessels introduced in, 597; future problem of, 598.
Neapolitan school of music, 284.
Nibelungen Lied, subjects, character, imagery, etc., of, 321, 324.
Nicolo, Pisano, dates and merit of, 93; principal works of, 94; school and followers of, 94; influence of, upon early art, 151.
Night Thoughts, by Young, 405.
Nollekens, English sculptor, 125.
Norman architecture, 25; form of pier in, 25; points toward the Gothic, 26; a Romanesque development, 26; type of church in, 26.
Normans, influence of, upon Romanesque architecture, 26; Romanesque, 30; distinct from the German, 30; offers a point of unity, 30; the most perfect and fully developed of the Romanesque style, 30; forms the point of union between the waning civilization of Rome and the rising power of the Teutonic races, 31; conquest, influence of upon the language of England, 382.
Oberon of Wieland, 361.
Oblique, order of battle, 583.
O'Connell, Daniel, eloquence of, 458.
Odin, religion of, overthrown in Scandinavia, 616.
Odoacer puts an end to the western empire, 89.
Oil painting, 129.
Old Flemish school of painting, characteristics of, 206, 207.
Opera, the origin of, 279; improvement in, 280; first brought out in France, 290.
Operations, base of, how selected, 550; lines of, 553; in the campaign of, 1796, 553; base of, in the campaign of, 1806, 551; lines of, in the campaign of 1813, 554; pivots of, 555; in the campaign of, 1796, 555; direction of 555; lines of enumerated, 556.
Opie, style of, 243.
Opitz, Martin, dates and poetry of, 357.
Orator, qualities of the, 424.
Oratorio, the, when, and by whom invented, 278.
Oratorios of Handel, 293; of Haydn, 298.
Orators of parliament in the 18th century, 445.
Orgagna, Andrea, dates of, 153; genius of, 153; great works of, 153.

Organ, the, introduced into France, 272.
Original constructive forms, 10.
Orlando Furioso, the, of Ariosto, object and character of, 349, 550.
Orpheus and Eurydice of Canova, 108.
Ossian, dates and poetry of, 311; compared with Homer, 312; works of, 312; subjects treated of by, 312; great merits of, 313; imagery of, 314; translation of, 311.

Paduan school of art, 161; by whom originated, 171; character of, 161; chief representative of, 161.
Pagan cycle of art, 140.
Painter, the, province of, 83, 88.
Painters, the great, in the 16th century, 166.
Painting, schools of, see schools; kinds of in European art, 128; in tempera, 128; in fresco, 129; in oil, 129; processes employed in, 130; invention in, 130; dramatic, 131; historic, 131; test of a, 132; subjects of, 132; elements of, 132; art of commences with design, 135; coloring in, 136; glaze feature of, 137; deception as a feature in, 137; two great cycles of, 139; revived first in Etruria, 146; earliest schools of, 147; Italian, history of dates from, 147; supplied the want of books, 152; in the 14th century, sources and objects of, 156; in the 15th century, characteristics and representations of, 156, 157; Italian, in the 16th century, 166; great artists of, 166; character of the period, 167; Italian, when most perfect, 168; in Germany, first cycle of, 203, 214; imitates the Italian, 213; genre, period of its origin, and character of, 221; distinguished exponents of in Germany, 222; Spanish school of, 225; in France, how influenced, 232, 233.
Palaces of the Medici, the Pitti, and the Strozzi in Florence, appearance of, 54.
Palermo, Saracenic character of its architecture, 33.
Palestina, musician, dates and works of, 284.
Palisades, 527.
Palladio, the greatest architect of the Venetian school, 58; style of, 58.
Pantheon, the, in Paris, architecture of, 62.
Paolo Uccello, 157.
Paradise Lost, of Milton, review of, 389, 592.
Parallels, the, 530.
Parapet, the, 525.
Paris, great churches in, 62–64.
Parliament, British eloquence in, 439.
Parnell, Thomas, dates, works and genius of, 401.
Parthenon at Athens, 63.
Paul III, 175.
Paul IV, 175.
Paul Veronese, dates of, 196; characteristics of, 196, 197; most celebrated work of, 197.
Pelasgian monuments show the entablature, 11.
Penni, Gianfrancesco, a pupil of Raphael, 187.
Permanent fortifications, elements of, 525.
Perseus of Canova, 109.

Perspective, principles of, first taught, 150.
Perugino, Pietro, dates of, 165; school of at Perugia, 165; characteristics of, 165; great frescoes of, 165; teacher of Raphael, 166.
Petrarch, dates and character of the poetry of, 346; glory and immortality of, 347; principal subject of, 347; merit of, 348.
Philip II of Spain, 226; builds the Escurial, 69.
Philip III, 226.
Philip IV, 226.
Pier, the, influence of, in the development of the round arched style, 18.
Pietro, della Francisca, taught perspective, 150.
Pigal, French sculptor, merit of, 116.
Pike, the use of, 523.
Pillar, the, borrowed from the Grecian style, 18; the clustered, essential to the perfection of Gothic architecture, 36; the character of, in Gothic architecture, 44.
Pisa, Campo Santo of, relation of, to art in the fourteenth century, 152; politics of the citizens of, 151.
Pisan school of art, 147.
Pisano, Andrea, carried art to Florence, 94; founded the Tuscan school, 94.
Pisano, Nicolo and Andrea, 93, 94.
Pisano Nicolo, dates and merit of, 93; principal works of, 94; schools and followers of, 94; influence of, upon early art, 151.
Pistol, the, origin and early style of, 522; first introduced into England, 522.
Pitt, the elder, Earl of Chatham, dates, appearance and eloquence of, 441.
Pitt, William, the younger, dates of, 445; education and appearance of, 451; eloquence of, 452.
Poem of the Cid, 333.
Poems of the Provençals, 325.
Poetic art in Portugal, summed up, in, 340.
Poetry, schools of, see schools, 304–308; definition of, 304; affinity with painting, 304; differs from the painter's art, 305; mission of, 306; inquiry concerning the development of, in modern Europe, 307; of the Celtæ, 308, 315; of the Goth or Teuton, 315, 324; of the troubadours, 324; of the trouveres, 329; of the Minnesingers, 330; schools of, 322; Provençal, 324, 332; change of in Spain, how accounted for, 338, 339; Italy as influenced by chivalry, 349; elder, of Italy, classes of, 348; in Germany, great period and names of, 358; French, age of, 374; change in the character of, 374; romantic, first germs of, 382; of the Elizabethan and the Stuart periods, how divided 387; in England change of, after Milton, 392; critical school of, 393.
Poets and poetry of England in the 18th century, 296.
Polychrome architecture, no warrant for, 76; sought to be restored, 76; seen in Cologne cathedral, St. Denis cathedral, and Sainte Chapelle, 77; found in France and Germany, 77; churches seen in, 77; introduced into England, 77; natural as seen in St. Peters, 78; nature of, 78.
Pontoon bridges, necessity and construction of, 545; Napoleon's opinion of, 545.

Pope, Alexander, dates and genius of, 397; precocity of, 397; great works of, 398; satire of, 399; merits of, 399.
Porta, 284.
Portrait painting in Germany, period of, 221.
Portraits by Raphael, 184.
Portugal, great poem of, 340; monarchy in, 380.
Position, choice of, how determined, 546.
Poussin, Nicholas, dates and style of, 234.
Pre-Raphaelite school of painting, character and aim of, 258.
Price, Sir Uvedale, 74.
Provençal school of poetry, 324–332; influence of chivalry upon, 325; no real power in, 326; in Spain, 327; in the north of France, 328; brought into notice in England, 328, 329.
Prussia, under Frederick the Great, 582.
Puget, French sculptor, school and works of, 115.
Pugilists, the, by Canova, 109.
Pulci, Luigi, 348.
Pulpit oratory, 429; orators, most celebrated of France, 429; in England, 430.
Purcell, Henry, musical ability of, 291.
Puritanism in England opposed to music, 291.

Racine, Jeane, dates, works and dramatic genius of, 480.
Raeburn, Sir Henry, dates of, 253; style of, 255.
Rampart, the, 525.
Ramsay, Allan, dates and style of, 254; dates and poetry of, 401.
Rape of the Lock, the, by Pope, review of, 398.
Rauch, German sculptor, works of, 118.
Reaction of the mind in its historical development, 257; in art, 258.
Realism in German poetry, 360.
Redoubts, construction of, 527.
Regnier, age and satire of, 375.
Reliefs, the first species of sculpture, 82; kinds of, 82.
Relievi in bronze, the sculptures of the fourteenth century, 94.
Religion, influence of, upon the arts, 89.
Rembrandt, Paul, dates, and early advantages of, 218; characteristics and aims of, 219; contrasted with Rubens, 219; coloring of, 220; excelled in, 220; works of, 220, 221; as a portrait painter, 221.
Renaissance, the, or attempt to return to the classic architecture of Greece and Rome, consequent upon the revival of letters, 52, 59; where originated, 52; transition between it and the Gothic, 53; distinguishing feature of, 53; introduced into Italy by Philip Brunelleschi, 53; not adapted to sacred edifices, 54; three schools of in Italy, 54; grew out of, 59; effectual in Italy, 59; opposed in northern countries, 59; when introduced into England, 70.
Reni, Guido, two styles of, 200; works of, 200.
Revett's Antiquities of Ionia, influence of, upon English architecture, 75.
Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 78; dates, theory, and excellence of, 241, 242; great portraits by, 243; as a historical painter, 244.

Rhythm, nature of in music, 264; modern, introduced, 278; divisions and nature of, 278.
Ribera, Jose, see Spagnoletto, 231.
Ricochèt fire, first tried, 578.
Robert, Leopold, aim of, 260.
Robespierre, character and eloquence of, 437.
Rogers, Samuel, dates, long life and poems of, 411.
Roman architecture, 13; defects of, 13.
Roman school of architecture, date and character of, 55; great names in, 55; specimens of, 55; school of painting, greatest exponent of, 187; art, influence of in Central Europe, 204; school of music, 270, 284.
Romanesque architecture, 18, 34; early character of, 21; new style of, approaches the Gothic, 22; by whom and when introduced, 22; character of, 22, 29; German, 23, 24; early, interesting style of found in Ireland, 24; appearance of, 24; resemble the Pelasgic remains in Greece, 24, 25; special mission of, 27; different from the Gothic, 28; the development of the round arched construction, 28; solid appearance and character of, 29; a distinct form of Christian architecture, 29; inception of, 29; progress of, 30; origin of, 34.
Romano, Guilio, pupil of Raphael, 187.
Rome despoils Greece of her statues, 88; is despoiled by the barbarian hordes, 88.
Romney, style of, 243.
Rousard, Pierre, age and poetry of, 374.
Round towers of Ireland, 25.
Rubens, Peter Paul, dates of, 216; studied in Italy, 216; characteristics of, 216; landscapes of, 217; most celebrated paintings of, 217.
Runciman, Alexander, dates, style and works of, 254.
Rusconi, Camilla, followed out the teachings of Brunini, 106.
Russian architecture, 68; improvements in, 68; no original style, 68.

Sachs, Hans, dramatic works of, 488; dates and songs of, 357.
Saemund, Edda of, 316, 317.
Saint Chapelle, an example of polychromy, 77.
St. Denis, cathedral of, polychrome architecture of, 77.
St. Eustace, church of, architecture, 60.
St. Genevieve, church of, in Paris, 62.
St. Mark, cathedral of, anomalous appearance of, 18; oriental character of, 47.
St. Michael at Dijon, church of, architecture of, 61.
St. Paul, church of, in London, 62; dimensions and architecture of, 71, 72.
St Peter, at Caen, church of, architecture of, 61.
St. Peter's church at Rome, 62; inception of, 56; actual commencement of, 56; by whom begun, 56; original design of, 56; plan changed by Michael Angelo, 56; plan changed again by Carlo Maderno, 56; completed, 56; number of years it consumed, 56, 57; number of popes reigning during its pro

St. Peter's church, continued — gress, 57; great expense of, and manner of meeting it, 57; dimensions of, 57; character of, 57; natural polychromy of, 78.
St. Peter's church, natural polychromy of, 78.
St. Petersburg, architecture of, 68.
St. Sophia, church of, by whom built, 17; dimensions and architecture of, 17.
St. Vitalis, church of in Ravenna, architecture of, 18.
Sallust, palace of destroyed, 89.
Salvator Rosa, characteristics of, 202.
Sangallos, the, 55.
San Micheli, the founder of the Venetian school of architecture, 58; character of his works, 58.
Santa Maria del Fiore, church of, in Florence, 62.
Sanzio, Raphael, dates of, 176; epochs in the artistic life of, 177; in Umbria, 177; in Florence, 177; remarkable quality of mind of, 178; studies nature, 178; in Rome, 179; frescoes of, in the Vatican, 179; cartoons of, 181; works of for princes, 182; striking characteristics of, 182, 183; Madonnas and Holy Families of, 183; celebrated portraits of, 184; the transfiguration by, 184; as a sculptor and architect, 185; great merit of, as a painter, 185; pupils of, 186, 187; compared with Correggio, 189.
Sanzio, Raphael Giovanni, style of, 165.
Saracenic architecture, see Arabian, 31.
Satires of Dryden, 394.
Saurin, pulpit eloquence of, 429.
Saxon architecture, employed wood, 25; character of, 25; tower in, 25; Saxon, continued — relic of, 25; form of pier in, 25; arch in, 26.
Scald, the, of Scandinavia, as related to the Celtic bard, 316.
Scale, the, of music, took its present form, 273.
Scarlatti, 284; improves the opera, 280.
Scarp wall, the, 525.
Schadow, German sculptor, works of, 118.
Schiller, Frederick, dates, early life, and works of, 363, 364; poetic genius of, 364; characters of, 365; heroes of, 365; dramatic genius and dramas of, 490, 492.
Schinkel, architect, 66, 67.
School of Philosophy, by Raphael, 180.
Schools of architecture, in Italy, 54; in Florence, 54; in Rome, 55; in Venice, 57.
Schools of music, Roman, 270, 284; European, 283; Italian, 283; Bologna, 284; Venetian, 284; Lombardy, 284; Neapolitan, 284; German, 286; French, 288; English, 291.
Schools of painting in Florence, Padua and Venice, characteristic of, 162; Byzantine, 143; Italian, 145; Tuscan, 146; Pisan, 147; Sienna, 147, 151; Florentine, 147; of Giotto, 150; Paduan, 161; Venetian, 162, 192; Umbrian, 164; at Perugia, 165; of Leonardo da Vinci, 166; of Michael Angelo, 173; of Raphael, 176; Roman, 187; of Correggio, 189; of Titian, 192; eclectic, 198; naturalistic, 201; German, 203; Cologne, 205; old Flemish, 206; in the Netherlands and Holland, 215; Brabant, 216; Holland, 218;

Schools of painting, continued — Spanish, 225; Valentia, 226; Madrid, 227; Seville, 229; French, 232; English, 240.

Schools of poetry in Spain and Portugal, 332, 342; in Italy, 342, 355; Celtic, 308; Gothic, 315; Scandinavian, 316; German, 320; Provençal, 324; troubadour, 324; trouvere, 329; Minnesinger, 330; Spanish and Portuguese, 332; Italian, 342; Germany, 355; Silesian, 357; French, 373; English, 381; English critical, 393.

Schools of sculpture, of Nicolo Pisano, 94; Tuscan, 94; of Michael Angelo, 103; of Canova, 107, 113; of Puget, 115; of Thorwaldsen, 120; of France, 114; of Germany, 117; of England, 122.

Schools of the Netherlands and Holland, 215.

Schwanthaler, works of, 119.

Scotland, painting in, 254; poetry in, 401; sculpture in, 124.

Scott, Walter, dates, poems and genius of, 417.

Sculptor, the, province of, 83, 88.

Sculpture, school of, see schools, 82; idea of first suggested, 82; first species of, 82; and painting, agreement of, and difference between, 83–88; a higher art than architecture, 88; reached its highest development in Greece, 88; in ancient Rome, 88; suffered by the inroads of the barbarian hordes, 88; opposed by the early Christians, 89; first received in Germany and Italy, 90; the handmaid of architecture then, 91; of an ecclesiastical character, 91; renewal of, traced in sepulchral monuments, 91, 92; in Italy, 93; infancy of, 96; cultivation of, extended throughout Italy, 96; character of, in the 15th century, 96; progress of, in the 16th century, 98; in the 17th century, 105; cycles of, 106; character of the cycle of, ending with Michael Angelo, 106; first cycle of, 112; second cycle of, 112; third cycle of, 113; home of, after the downfall of Greece, 114; introduction and career of, in England, 122; introduced into France, 114; influence of the French revolution upon, 116; in Germany, 117; among the Saxons, 122; influence of the Crusades upon, 123; in Scotland, 124; influence of upon painting in the 15th century, 158, 159; of the 14th century character of, 94.

Senate, the, eloquence of, 431.

Sepulchral chapel, form of in Italy, 21; monuments, the first works of sculpture in Germany and Italy, 91; excellence of, 91, 92; of the first Crusaders, 91.

Serlio, 60.

Seville school of painting, 229.

Shakespeare, William, period of, 507; personal history of, 507; the master of the heart, 507; his power of characterizing persons, 508; characterization of passion by, 509; had in view the highest moral purposes, 510; comic talent of, 511; language of, 511; plays of, how divided, 512; best plays of, 512; age and forms of, 386; precursors of, 498.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe, dates, character and works, 420.

Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, eloquence of, 453.
Shield, the, 519.
Sicily, architecture of, 83.
Siege, the, mode, of, 528; objects to be kept in view, 528; periods in the progress of, 529; operations preliminary to, 529; the operations of the besiegers, 528; operations of the besieged, 531; assault in, 532; numbers necessary to, 533.
Sienna school of art, 147; school of, 151; character of, 151; fathers of, 151; great painters and works of, 151, 155.
Signals, importance of, 548.
Signorelli, Luca, style of, 159; celebrated works of, 159.
Silesian school of poetry, 357.
Singing guilds in Germany, 356; Italian mode of, 268; English mode of, 268.
Sistine chapel, frescoes of, 165; chapel frescoes in by Michael Angelo, 174.
Snorre Thurleson, prose Edda, 316.
Soldiers Bathing in the Arno, painting by Michael Angelo, 173.
Songs, popular, in Germany, kinds of, 356.
Souflot, 62.
Southey, Robert, dates and poems of, 416.
Spagnoletto, dates and characteristics of, 231; style of, 202.
Spanish modern architecture, 69; school of painting, 225; peninsula, character of art in, 225; school of painting, culminating point of, 226; schools of painting, number of, 226; peninsula, races, language, and literature of, 332; ballads, 335; lyrical poetry, 335; poetry, epochs of, 336; great change of, with the reign of Charles V, 336; drama, 472; the, since the 17th century, 479.
Spenser, Edmund, great poems and genius of, 385.
Squarcione, Francesca, 161.
Statues and works of Michael Angelo, 101, 102, 104.
Steam introduced in naval warfare, 596.
Steen, John, dates, characteristics and works of, 223.
Steeples, a noble feature of the continuous or later Gothic, 45.
Stefano dal Ponte, 150.
Strategic lines, 559; points, 552.
Strategy, objects and sphere of, 550; its maxims and illustrations, 550; definition of, 550.
Stringed instruments in music, 266.
Stuart's Antiquities of Athens, influence of upon English architecture, 75.
Suabian dynasty, poetry during the of, 356.
Subjective art, meaning of, 361.
Substance of armies, 542.
Swift, Jonathan, dates and genius of, 400.
Sword, the early, 519.
Symbols in the early Christian art, 142, 143; early Christian prohibited, 143.

Tactical movements upon the battle field, difficulty and danger of, 567.
Tactics, its maxims and illustrations, 560; sphere of, 560; division of, 560; maxims of, 561.
Tasso, Torquato, dates, study and life of, 351.

Taylor, Sir Robert, extends the bank of England, 75.
Temporary fortifications, object and style of, 526.
Tenniers, David, dates and style of, 222.
Terburg, Gerard, dates and style of, 223.
Teutonic spirit, the, originated the Gothic architecture, 34; art, how characterized, 204; mind, nature of, 204; poetry, 315.
Teutons, divisions of the race of, 315.
Theatres, early, construction of, 512; Globe, 513; the first erected in England, 498.
Theological era of art, 141, 142.
Theseus, by Canova, 109.
Thirty years' war, great captains of, 579; the effect of, upon literature, 357.
Thompson, James, dates, principal poems and genius of, 403.
Thorwaldsen, dates of, 120; career of, 120, great works of, 120; style of, 120, 121; merits and defects of, 121; relievos of, 121.
Tieck, German sculptor, works of, 118; Ludwig, dates and poetry of, 363.
Tintoretto, dates of, 196; aim and merits of, 196.
Titian, perfected coloring, 138; theory of color of, 138; dates of, 192; compared with Correggio, 192; compared with Raphael, 192; periods in the style of, 192; great merit of, 193; as a portrait painter, 194; principles in his coloring, 195; death of, 195; works of, 195; pupil of Bellini, 164.
Tomb of Francis I, 92; of Ferdinand and Isabella, 92; of Henry VII, 92.
Tone, nature of, 262.
Tower, the, in the Gothic architecture, 44.
Trafalgar, battle of, 504.
Tragedy, Italian, father of, 465.
Transfiguration, the, by Raphael, 184.
Traverses, the, 526.
Triforium, the, 24; in the Gothic architecture, 44.
Trissino, the father of Italian tragedy, dates, works, and characteristics of, 465.
Troubadours, songs of, 275; country of, 324; the, influence of during the middle ages, 324; the, in Spain, 327; in the north of France, 328; in Sicily, 328; in England, 329; sameness in the songs of, 226.
Trouveres, the, language used by, 329; character of, 329; songs of, 329.
Tuileries, the, site of, 61; by whom begun, 61; architect of, 61; architecture of, 61.
Turin, siege of, 529.
Turner, style of his works, 251.
Tuscan school at Florence, founder of, 147.
Tuscan school of art, 94.
Tuscany, painting and great men in, 146.

Uccello, Paolo, 157.
Umbrian school of painting, 164.

Valenciennes, siege of, 578.
Valentia school of painting, 226.
Valhalla, the, or national monument of Germany, description of, 66.
Values in music, system of simplified, 276.

Van Eyck, Hubert and John, 206; John, 130.
Van Ostade, Adrian, dates and characteristic of, 222.
Vanbrugh, Sir John, architect in England, 73; built mansions, not churches, 73; massive style of, 73; epitaph of, 73; Sir Joshua Reynolds's opinion of, 73; Sir Uvedale Price's opinion of, 74; merits of, 74.
Vandyke, Anthony, dates of, 217; style of, 217; as a portrait painter, 218.
Vatican, the, frescoes in, by Raphael, 179.
Vauban, improved fortifications, 524.
Vauban, military genius of, 578.
Vaulting, fan tracery, 46; in the Gothic architecture, 37.
Vauxhall songs, 292.
Vega, Garcilasso de la, influence and poetry of, 337.
Vega, Lope de, dates and dramatic genius of, 474.
Velasquez de Silva, dates and manner of study of, 227; works in Madrid, 227; goes to Italy, 227; characteristics of, 228; as a portrait painter, 228; as a landscape painter, 229; works of, 229.
Venetian school of architecture, 57. 59; commenced, 58; chief members of, 58; characteristics of, 58; school of painting, especial mission of, 162.; school of painting, coloring and character of, 162, 163; head of, 163; mission of, 191; great representation of, 192; school of music, 284.
Vergniaud, eloquence of, 434; last speech of, 435.
Veronese, Paul, dates of, 196; characteristics of, 196, 197; most celebrated work of, 197.
Versailles, palace of, 61.
Vertical principle, the basis of the Gothic architecture, 35.
Vertical style of architecture, 11.
Viadan, invented fundamental bass, 277.
Vibrating plates and bars as musical instruments, 266.
Vignola, 55, 60.
Vincent, Joanes, dates and style of, 226.
Voice, the, in music, 265.
Voiture, influence of, upon French taste, 375.
Voltaire, dates, literary activity, and poetry of, 377; compared with Horace, 378; satire of, 378; as an epic poet, 379; Henriade of, 379; philosophic poetry of, 380; reforms in the drama effected by, 434; dates, dramatic works and genius of, 481.
Von Gartner, architect, 67.
Vouet, Simon, dates and style of, 234.

War, art of, in the middle ages 574; different stages in the art of, 574; art of, began to assume a system, 576; first great promoter of, 576; between Gustavus Adolphus, and Frederick the Great, 578; during the French revolution, 585; upon the water, 593.
Wars, the, in Italy, introduced a taste for Italian architecture in France, 60.
Wellington and Napoleon compared, 573.
Wells, cathedral of, sculpture in, 128.
West, Benjamin, dates and early life of, 245; period of, 245; great paintings of, 245; characteristics of, 246.

Westminster Abbey, chapel of Henry VII attached to, statues in, 124.
Whitehall, royal palace of, architectural beauties and defects of, 71.
Wieland, Christopher Martin, dates, character and poetry of, 360.
Wilkie, Sir David, style and works of, 255.
Willaerst, 284.
Wilson, Richard, dates, and style of, 247.
Wind instruments, 267.
Windows in Gothic architecture, 42; styles of, in the early Gothic, 42, 43.
Winter Palace, the, in Russia, 68.
Wood's ruins of Palmyra and Balbec influences English architecture, 75.
Wordsworth, William, dates, poems and genius of, 414.
Wren, Christopher, 71; Sir Christopher, date of, 71; mission of, 71; crowning work of, 71; number of churches designed by, 72; adapted the Italian style of architecture to the Protestant worship, 72; architectural design of, 72; epitaph of, 72.
Young, Edward, dates, character and poetry of, 404.
Ypres, siege of, 528.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

Aken, Isaac W.	Albany.	Bull, M. V. B.,	Albany.
Albany Female Academy,	"	Bush, Walter R.,	"
Allen, W. F.,	"	Carpenter, Edward A.,	"
Allis, J. M.,	"	Cassidy, Wm.,	"
Anable, Samuel,	"	Cavert, M. P.,	"
Anderson, Wm.,	"	Chamberlain, Frank,	"
Angus, Charles,	"	Clark, E. C., Jr.,	"
Annesley, Lawson,	"	Cole, Addison D.,	"
Anthony, C. H.,	"	Cole, Fred. W.,	"
Argesinger, E. E.,	"	Cooper, S. C.,	"
Armsby, James H., 5 copies,	"	Corning, C. H.,	"
Armsby, Mrs. J. H.,	"	Corning, Erastus,	"
Arnold, B. W.	"	Corning, Erastus, Jr.,	"
Austin, J. J.,	"	Cox, James W.,	"
Bacon, Samuel, N.,	"	Craig, J. E.,	"
Bailey, John M.,	"	Crannell, W. W.,	"
Barnes, Lucian,	"	Crombie, J. H.,	"
Belknap, E.,	"	Cushman, R. S.,	"
Bender, E. H.,	"	Darling, Henry,	"
Bender, Matthew,	"	Davis, R. C.,	"
Benedict, E. G.,	"	Dawson, George,	"
Benedict, Henry M.,	"	De La Mater, S. T.,	"
Bensen, A. V.,	"	Delavan, J. S.,	"
Birch, G. A.,	"	De Witt, W. H.,	"
Bishop, F.,	"	Deyermand, Wm.,	"
Blanchard, Mrs. J. W.,	"	Ditson, G. L.,	"
Bloomingdale, W. H.,	"	Douglass, John,	"
Bogg, Wm.,	"	Downing, George,	"
Bond, L. V.	"	Dunham, John W., 2 copies,	"
Boone, H. H.,	"	Durant, A. B.,	"
Boyd, David I.,	"	Durant, E. A.,	"
Bridge, Charles,	"	Durant, E. P.,	"
Bridgeman, C. D. W.,	"	Edwards, Isaac, 2 copies,	"
Briggs, J. M.,	"	Edwards, James,	"
Briggs, Smith,	"	Fassett, Wm. N.,	"
Brown, Andrew E.,	"	Fearey, Thomas H.,	"
Brumaghim, A. M.,	"	Fearey, W. H.,	"

Fensham, John,	Albany.	Kelley, J. B.,	Albany.
Fenton, Reuben E.,	"	Ketchum, Daniel,	"
Fondey, Townsend,	"	Keyes, Addison A.,	"
Foster, S. L.,	"	Keyes, Emerson W.,	"
Freeman, S. H.,	"	King, Rufus H.,	"
Frothingham, Worthington,	"	Kip, Leonard,	"
Gifford, J. P. S.,	"	Kneeland, S. F.,	"
Goold, James,	"	Knowles, C. R.,	"
Gould, William,	"	Lane, John,	"
Gratwick, Wm. H.,	"	Lansing A. Douw,	"
Gray, S. R.,	"	Lansing, Chas. B.,	"
Greene, Walter N.,	"	Lansing, Henry,	"
Greene, Wm. H.,	"	Lansing, J. Townsend,	"
Griswold, S. B.,	"	Larrabee, E. J.,	"
Groesbeeck, Stephen,	"	Lawson, Isaac,	"
Gross, James H.,	"	Learned, B. P.,	"
Hall, James,	"	Learned, Wm. L.,	"
Hamilton, R. M.,	"	McClure, Archibald,	"
Hand, Samuel,	"	McClure, John C.,	"
Harris, Hamilton,	"	McElroy, James,	"
Harris, Ira, 2 copies,	"	McMurdy, R. S.,	"
Haskell, W. H.,	"	MacNamara, John,	"
Haskins, H. R.,	"	McNaughton, James,	"
Hastings, F. H.,	"	Macomber, M. W.,	"
Hawley, Gideon,	"	March, Alden,	"
Hawley, Henry Q.,	"	Martin, Bradley,	"
Heiltz, E. D.,	"	Marvin, Selden E.,	"
Hendrick, James,	"	Meads, Orlando,	"
Herbst, John,	"	Mink, Wm. G.,	"
Homes, Henry A.,	"	Mitchell, Jno. L.,	"
Hotchkiss, M. K.,	"	Mix, James,	"
Hughson, J. C.,	"	Moak, N. C.,	"
Humphrey, T. F.,	"	Monteath, P.,	"
Hun, Thomas,	"	Mosher, Jacob S.,	"
Hyatt, Chester,	"	Munsell, Joel, 10 copies,	"
Irwin, Wm. P.,	"	Nichols, Charles C.,	"
Jackson, Geo. P.,	"	Nott, John C.,	"
Jenkins, C. M.,	"	Olcott, Dudley,	"
Jermain, Jas. B.,	"	Olcott, Thomas,	"
Johnson, Benj. W.,	"	Olcott, Thomas W., 5 copies,	"
Jones, E. D.,	"	Orr, David,	"
Jones, George O.,	"	Paddock, W. S.,	"
Judson, A. C.,	"	Page, John E.,	"
Judson, E. L.,	"	Paine, H. M.,	"
Karslake, Samuel,	"	Palmer, A. P.,	"

Palmer, E. D.,	Albany.	State Library,	Albany.
Palmer, L. W.,	"	Steele, George B.,	"
Park, S. Curtis,	"	Stevenson, Robert,	"
Parker, Amasa J.,	"	Stickney, Leander,	"
Parker, Wm. W.,	"	Stickney, M. N.,	"
Parsons, J. D.,	"	Stimson, E. S.,	"
Patten, Mrs. Samuel,	"	Stonehouse, Col. J. B.,	"
Patton, John R.,	"	Strain, Robert,	"
Pease & Prentice,	"	Sumner, Alanson,	"
Peck, Jessie T.,	"	Sumner, J. A.,	"
Peckham, R. W., Jr.,	"	Sweet, Wm. H. D.,	"
Pollard, C. W.,	"	Ten Eyck, James,	"
Pratt, D. J.,	"	Thatcher, Ralph W.,	"
Pratt, James Hyde,	"	Thomas, Wm. G.,	"
Pratt, L. M.,	"	Thomson, Lemon,	"
Prentice, E. P., 2 copies,	"	Townsend, Franklin,	"
Pruyn, John V. L.,	"	Treadwell, George C.,	"
Pruyn, Robt. H.,	"	Treadwell, John G.,	"
Radcliffe, Henry G.,	"	Tremper, Cantine,	"
Radcliffe, Robert D.,	"	Tucker, Luther,	"
Ramsey, J. H.,	"	Twitchell, A. W.,	"
Ramsey, Wilfred,	"	Van Allen, Adam,	"
Ransom, Albion,	"	Van Allen, Garret A.,	"
Ransom, S. H.,	"	Van Alstyne, T. J.,	"
Rathbone, John F.,	"	Van Antwerp, J. H.,	"
Rathbone, Lewis,	"	Van Antwerp, Wm. M.,	"
Read, J. Meredith, Jr.,	"	Van Benthuysen, Charles,	"
Reynolds, John H.,	"	Vanderpool, S. O.,	"
Rice, W. A.,	"	Van Santford, H. S.,	"
Rogers, John P.,	"	Van Santvoord, Mrs. Alfred,	"
Rogers, Nelson,	"	Viele, Maurice E.,	"
Rosendale, S. W.,	"	Vosburgh, Isaac W.,	"
Ross, H. P. & E. A.,	"	Wade, Edward,	"
Roy, James,	"	Ward, John,	"
Russell, Alfred,	"	Warren, Clement,	"
Russell, Joseph W.,	"	Wasson, Mrs. James D.,	"
Safford, Edwin,	"	Waterman, Jeremiah,	"
Sage, Dean, 2 copies,	"	Waterman, R. H.,	"
Scoville, Oliver,	"	Weeks, C. W.,	"
Sheppard, A. K.,	"	Weidman, Daniel,	"
Sheppard, Chas. T.,	"	White, Douglass S.,	"
Sheppard, George W.,	"	White, Wm. J.,	"
Sheppard, Wm. H.,	"	Wickes, H. N., 2 copies,	"
Smith, Henry,	"	Williams, C. P., 2 copies,	"
Smith, Louis B.,	"	Wilson, Edward,	"

Wilson, James A., 2d, Albany.
Winne, Miss C. M., "
Wolford, George, "
Wood, B. R., "
Woodward, John, Jr., "
Wooster, B. W., "
Young Men's Association, "
Young, W. A., "
Ackert, A. T, New York.
Allen, Thomas S., Madison, Wis.
Alling, Fred. D., Rochester
Anderson, F P., Nevada city, Mo.
Andrews, John O., Danville, Ill
Appleton, D. & Co., 6 copies, N Y.
Armstrong, R. J., Lock Haven, Pa
Arnold, E. C., Milwaukie.
Atwood, Samuel, A. C., Adel, Iowa
Barger, Thomas J., Philadelphia.
Bland, George, Roxborough, Pa.
Borden, Edward P., Philadelphia.
Brobson, William, "
Butler, Charles, New York.
Bissinger, Philip, " "
Bush, Stephen, Waterford
Barnett, Wm. E., Bridgeport, Conn.
Becker, S. A., Cohoes.
Bennett, Henry, Toledo, Ohio
Bennett, C. W., Chicago, Ill.
Barrett, James, Woodstock, Vt.
Batcheller, Geo. S., Saratoga Springs.
Bigelow, H., Galva, Henry Co., Ill.
Butler Horace P., Memphis, Tenn.
Ball, Farlin Q., Madison, Wis.
Bryant, Geo. E., " "
Boltwood, Thos. K., Amherst, Mass.
Brevoort, J. Carson, Brooklyn.
Barnard, Samuel W., New York.
Brownell, S. B., 2 copies, " "
Brownell, J., 2 copies, " "
Botta, Mrs. A. C. L., " "
Bouton, J. W., " "
Ballard, H. C., Chicago, Ill.
Brown, Stephen F., " "
Burt, Horace E., Detroit, Mich.
Backus, Charles K., " "
Brayton, Isaac, New York.
Bowman, J. B., Lexington, Ky.
Black, J. S., York, Penn.
Brown, Charles E., Buffalo.
Browne, J. W., Corning.
Bissell, L. Parsons, Clinton.
Bigelow, L. J., Watertown.
Baker, Geo. E., Washington, D. C.
Birge, Charles, Whitewater, Wis.
Berry, Gurdon S., Titusville, Penn.
Bull, J W., Tipton, Cedar Co, Iowa.
Benedict, M., Denver, Colorado.
Beloit College Library, Beloit, Wis.
Browne, G. A., Nebraska City, Neb.
Barton, P. H., Danville, Ill.
Baldwin, C. V., " "
Beckwith, H W., " "
Brunaghim, J. W., San Francisco.
Billings, F., 2 copies, Woodstock, Vt.
Cary, Wm B., New York.
Clark, George, " "
Custis, Geo. W N., Camden, N. J.
Cruikshank, Jas., 2 copies, Brooklyn.
Carnahan, R. H., Danville, Ill.
Coon, D. R., East Liberty, Pa.
Cornell, Ezra, Ithaca.
Cook, Edward E., Davenport, Iowa.
Capron, H., 2 copies, Uxbridge, Mass.
Cumming, S. J., Camden, Alabama.
Coulon, Charles, St. Louis, Mo.
Coonley, John C., Louisville, Ky.
Carpenter, S. H., Madison, Wis.
Craig, A. J., " "
Campbell, W. W., Cherry Valley.
Caswell, Obed, Marshalltown, Iowa.
Carr, Ezra S., San Francisco, Cal.
Colton, David D., " " "
Chaney, Henry, Detroit, Mich.
Congress Library, 2 cop., Washington.
Caldwell, S. S., Omaha, Nebraska.
Curtis, J. S., Green Bay, Wis.
Cawker, E. H., Milwaukie, Wis.
Carpenter, Hon. M. H. " "
Clarke, Robt. A., 2 copies, Cincinnati.
Chadbourne, P. A., Milwaukie, Wis.

Coleman, James, London, Eng.
Clarke, C. W., Chelsea, Vt.
Cloyd, J. C., New York.
Dorrance, G. M., Bristol, Pa.
Dill, Charles G., Middletown,
Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Davis, O. L., Danville, Ill.
Dimmitt, Rev. J. P., " "
Drury, J. Wilson, Davenport, Iowa.
Danforth, I. N., Chicago, Ill.
Durborrow, J. R., Bedford, Pa.
Dawson, Bros., Montreal.
Draper, Lyman C., Madison, Wis.
Delavan, Edward C., Schenectady.
Eckels, James S., Princeton, Ill.
Eberly, Jacob, Lancaster, Pa.
Elder, J. G., Lewiston, Me.
Elmendorf, Eugene, New York.
Farnsworth, H. E., " "
Forney, Wien, Harrisburgh, Pa.
Ford, J. C., Madison, Wis.
Fairchild, Lucius, " "
Flower, J. M., " "
Fuller, M. E., " "
Fenton, John B. J., Newburgh.
Fisher, Robert J., York, Penn.
Fisher, Samuel W., Utica.
Flagg, John H., Bennington, Vt.
Felton, J. B., San Francisco, Cal.
Field, George W., Portsmouth, O.
Ferguson, J. A., Hanover, N. J.
Felt & Dillingham, Minneapolis, Min.
Gristock, C. F., Philadelphia.
Goodell, Jas. M., Corunna, Mich.
Glidden, H. A., Albion.
Gilbert, George, Carthage.
Gilmore, R. H., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Griggs & Co., 6 copies Chicago, Ill.
Hitchcock, B. D., New York.
Hastings, George S., " "
Hill, J. J., " "
Holcomb, J. W., " "
Hinman, Arthur P., " "
Hovey, J. A., Ballston Spa.
Hoyt, J. N., Madison, Wis.
Hill, James L., " "
Hyatt, T. Hart, Jr., San Francisco.
Harrison, Ralph C., " "
Hoyle, Charles, St. Louis, Mo.
Hilton, Manetho, " " "
Hammond, P. D., Lafayette, Ind.
Hawes, M. D., Danville, Ill.
Hannah, George, Brooklyn.
Haskell, Harriet N., Godfrey, Ill.
Hipple, T. C., Lock Haven, Pa.
Hunt, Ward, Utica,
Hungerford, S. D., Adams.
Huntington, Henry F., Rochester.
Hollister, M. H., "
Hale & Barrows, Nebraska City.
Hill, R. C., Albany, Oregon.
Hastings, S. D., Jr., Green Bay, Wis.
Hancock, John, Oshkosh, Wis.
Jenkins, H. D., Joliet, Ill.
Jarboe, John R., San Francisco, Cal.
Jones, G. Wheeler, Danville, Ill.
Jones, Marvin M., Utica.
Kirkpatrick, Edwin, Philadelphia.
Kelley, Wm., 2 copies, Rhinebeck.
Kip, William B., "
Kimball, M. G., Madison, Wis.
Keyes, E. W., " "
Ketchum, Edgar, New York.
Ketchum, Alexander P., " "
Kapp, Friedrich, " "
Kshinka, R. G. F., Dushore, Penn.
Keating, John M., Memphis, Tenn.
Kidder, I. N., Boonesboro, Iowa.
Kumber, John A., Danville, Ill.
Kinley, Isaac H., Brunswick, Mo.
Kelley, Frank R., Racine, Wis.
Library Company, Philadelphia.
Lodge, W. E., Jr., New York.
Lawrence, L. L., Burlington, Vt.
Longenecker, J. H., Bedford, Pa.
Lewis, Tayler, Schenectady.
Landt, S. V., Tipton, Iowa.
Long Island Hist. Soc., Brooklyn.

Ludlow, James M., New York.
Lippincott, J. B. & Co., 6 cop., Phila.
Latta, B. Frank, Clinton, Wis.
Martin, James S., Philadelphia.
Mercantile Library Co., "
Metz, Charles D. Lockport.
Molyneaux, Charles, "
Mack, C. Stacey, "
Minnesota Hist. Soc., St. Paul.
Mac Allister, James, Milwaukie, Wis.
Miller, B. K., "
Miller, B. F., New York.
Morrison, John A., St. Louis, Mo.
McLean, Chas. D., Brockport.
Mann, Mrs. H., Cambridge, Mass.
Morse, N. B., Jr., Brooklyn.
Madison, University, Hamilton.
Mechling, John, Denver, Colorado.
Marchand, Norval, Leavenworth Ks.
McNeal, Robert L., Davenport, Ia.
Mercantile Library, New York.
Norris, Isaac, Jr., Philadelphia.
Nidell, George A., St. Louis, Mo.
Norton, J. H., Plainville.
Norris, Wm. H., Jr., Green Bay.
Newland, John, Saratoga Springs.
O'Brien, John, Philadelphia.
Ockershausen, George I., New York.
Ohio State Libary, Columbus, O.
Peterson, Jacob E., Philadelphia.
Proudfit, Andrew, Madison, Wis.
Pinney, S. U., " "
Peak, M. D., Green Bay, "
Peckham, Geo. W., Jr., Milwaukie.
Platto, J. V. N., "
Porter, Geo. A. Syracuse.
Pierce, V. A., Danville, Ill.
Payton, Isaac N., " "
Place, J. A., Oswego.
Price, R. W., Pittsburg, Pa.
Public Library, Boston, Mass.
Prior, I. R., New York.
Paddock, L. H., Nebraska city.
Paris, Daniel E., Troy.
Palmer, A. W., Amenia.
Perry, John L., Saratoga.
Pickard. J. C., Madison, Wis.
Parks, T. W., North Bennington, Vt.
Parker, A. X., Potsdam.
Pond, Ashley, Detroit, Mich.
Preston, Geo. C., Jacksonville, Fla.
Reid, Joseph H., New York.
Randall, C. D., Coldwater, Mich.
Rice, John Jay, New York.
Root, Elihu, " "
Rubler, Horace, Madison, Wis.
Rollins, J. A., Belvidere, Ill.
Ryan, F. B., 2 copies, Rochester.
Rice, Victor M., Buffalo.
Russell, E. F., Albany, Oregon.
Robinson, Levi, Iowa, City.
Russell, John A., 2 cop., New York.
Rossiter, S. B., Elizabethport, N. J.
Sell, Edw. H. M., 2 cop., New York.
Simon, J. K., 2 copies, Philadelphia.
Sanford, Robert, Poughkeepsie.
Stevens, A. J., Columbus, Nebraska.
Sowles, Edward A., St. Albans, Vt.
Sylvester, R. H., Memphis, Tenn.
Seymour, Horatio, Utica.
Seeley, J. P., Chicago, Ill.
Sibley, S. P., Nebraska City, Neb.
Sheldon, A. C., Louisiana, Mo.
Steiger, E., 2 copies, New York.
Sage, Henry W., 2 cop., New York.
Stillwell, Edward F., " "
Stillman, James W., Westerly, R. I.
Strahan, John H., New York.
Sabin, J. & Sons, " "
Smith, George B., Madison, Wis.
Spooner, John C., " "
Smith, Wm. E., " "
Spenser, R. C., Milwaukie, "
Salomon, Ed., " "
Sawin, T. Parsons, " "
Sulcer, A. A., Danville, Ill.
Short, J. C., " "
Steely, J. W., Albany, Ore.
Stone, E. B., "
Stevens, H. R., Newburgh.

St. John, Daniel B., Newburgh.
Sheldon, Henry G., Toledo, Ohio.
Selden, Henry R., Rochester.
Trotter, Charles W., Philadelphia.
Tredway, W. W., Madison, Wis.
Thompson, W. S., Marshfield, Mo.
Townsend, Wood F., Danville, Ill.
Terry, E. S., " "
Terry, Stephen, Hartford, Conn.
Tompkins, H. B., Newport, R. I.
Tompkins, Henry, New York.
Teel, Wm. H., South Canaan, Conn.
Tuttle, S. J., Lewis, Cass Co., Iowa.
Taylor, H. H., Yonkers.
Tibbals, N. & Co., New York.
Thayer, Frank, New York.
Toedteberg, Augustus, Brooklyn.
Terry, John H., St. Louis, Mo.
Tuthill, Wm. H., Tipton, Iowa,
Union College, Schenectady.
Ullman, Frederick, Chicago.
University Library, Madison, Wis.
Vilas, Wm. P., Madison, Wis.
Vilas, Levi M., Eau Claire, Wis.
Vickery, N., Adams.
Viele, Columbus J., Wolcott.
Van Ness, Edward, New York.
Vincent, W. B., Providence, R. I.
Van Huysen, John, New York.
Van Nostrand, D., " "
Wycoff, E. S., Philadelphia.
Wallace, Wm., A., Clearfield, Pa.
Whitney, Asa, Philadelphia.
Williams, Edward H., Altoona, Pa.
Whitaker, J. Vernon, Philadelphia.
Williams, J. W., Newburgh.
Wisconsin State Hist. Soc., Madison.
Whitchurch, Samuel, New York.
Whitcomb, C. B., Purdy's Station.
Wilson, H. A., Saratoga Springs.
White, Andrew D., 2 copies, Ithaca.
Wilson, Peter, Buffalo.
Williams College, W'mstown, Mass.
Winslow, J. C., Danville, Ill.
Williams, J., Middletown, Conn.
Whitney, J. J., Albany, Oregon.
Williams, C. L., Madison, Wis.
Worthington, D., "
Watkinson Library, Hartford, Conn.
Wilson, S. M., San Francisco, Cal.
Wright, S. A., Nevada City, Mo.
Wood, Charles H., Onargo, Ill.
Whitman, H. B., Providence, R. I.
Whitney, H. O., New York.
Wiley, J. & Son, 2 copies, " "
Waters, Jas. S., Baltimore, Md.
Western News Co., Chicago, Ill.
Wolcott, J. H., Corning.
Young, Thomas, Huntington, L. I.
Younglove, S. G., Crescent.
Y. M. Association, Milwaukie, Wis.
Young Men's Library, Detroit, Mich.