A PICTURESQUE AMERICAN SUBURB.

MUCH has been written of Lawrence Park in the twelve years of its existence, and of well-known people living there, and many views of the place have been published. Justly named a park, though not a formal one, its chief charm being its picturesque, it is within less than an hour’s ride from the center of New York, just beyond the northern boundary of that “greater” city; and transportation, from the town to the suburb, is so quickly made that the traveler is startled and pleased with the sudden contrasts of the two. The part is in its natural state, except for the houses that have sprung up and the roads that wind through its trees.

From the station of Bronxville a few steps lead into the park. There are no smart traps wheeling obtrusively at the depot, or vistas through tree-lined roads, or hedge-bordered lawns with varicolored floral designs and artificial fountains. All is simplicity here. To the left stands the Lawrence Arcade, with clock turret and many gables. Irregular and picturesque, the building, with its stone pillars and plaster walls, is in appearance very English. This spirit of rural England is met repeatedly in the details of the park, although the general effect is entirely lacking in the pastoral quality common to English villages. The Arcade contains the town’s shops, telephone station, livery, and local real estate office. The many angles of its sky line, from every point of view, produce a pleasing effect not attained by any other style of roof on a building so low and so irregular in plan. Many vertical lines, obtained by the repetition of stone piers, produce an effect of greater height and length than the building actually possesses. Altogether, it is an interesting little structure, and naturally first attracts the attention of the visitor and draws him in the direction opposite to that in which he should go to enter the park by the gate proper. It is
of no importance, however, which road is chosen, for either leads up the hill into the park, which is included, after all, within a very small compass.

At the gateway stands what is called the lodge, though it is the dwelling of one of the residents of the park—Professor F. Kavanagh. Good proportions, simplicity of line, absence of useless detail, and honesty of material, make this cottage worthy of approval in passing. Its boxlike shape, gable roof, twin dormers, square chimney, and porch, are so logically put together, so honestly used, that the result is happy and convincing.

The entrance to the park is marked only by two stone pedestals, one on either side of the road, of a design simple and appropriate.
Beyond are trees, trees everywhere, and hills—the park itself is but a hill—and over all hangs an air of peace, seclusion and tranquility.

Entering into every view of Lawrence Park are houses, or details of houses—picturesque bits seen half hidden by the trees or in silhouette against the sky. What could be more charming than the French-Norman round-tower of Major Robinson’s house, built on a steep incline, with its conical roof and encircling balcony? Sunlight, coming through the oaks, strikes its plastered walls and makes it stand out in bold relief. What could be more striking than the double composition of the great rear gables of the Smedley house? Their vertical lines, massive stone basements, and steep roofs, viewed in short perspective, and the rapid sloping of...
the ground, give them an exaggerated scale and sense of importance that is impressive. Splendid old trees add to the effect, and sunlight filtering through, mottles the plastered walls of the upper stories and brightens what would otherwise be a sombre picture.

What more picturesque than the Lombard residence, the Chateau? This house, perhaps the largest in the park, has a central location, and, though not of the highest type, or the most beautiful, is one of the principal buildings of the place. In style it is a mixture of Norman-French and that Renaissance style peculiar to England, called Elizabethan. Entirely different is the spirit of Gray Arches, the home of the Rev. R. Hayward, and once that of Kate Douglas Wiggin. Resting on the top of a mass of rock, its heavy stone arches rise naturally from, and seem to be part of, the rock beneath. It stands out against the sky, overlooking a road that leads out of the park, and from its porch the most extended view is to be had, as it is not buried in the trees. A gable roof, resting on the arches of the porch, with two large dormers, form the features of the front. Perched in the air, it is a breezy bit of picturesqueness, a happy inspiration of its architect. The list of charming views is almost endless; much time can be spent in wandering through the park enjoying them.
One fault that may be found from the standpoint of good arrangement is the proximity of some of the houses; they intrude upon one another. Large houses need extensive surroundings to make satisfactory pictures; small ones require less. Some views that would otherwise be perfect are somewhat marred by the accidental intrusion of inharmonious details. This is, of course, unavoidable under the conditions, and may be condoned on the ground that the houses form a colony. A rear view of the Ward Leonard house is beautiful from a central point of sight, but when seen at an angle, includes discordant details, and appears cramped. It is, when rightly viewed, one of the best pictures of the park.

The design, color, and bit of garden combined produce an Italian effect, intentional or not, but the cottage neighbor on the left and Elizabethan companion in the background are jarring elements.

Here, where the Leonard and Smedley houses stand, is to be found the nearest approach to formality in the park, due to the absence of trees on the well-trimmed lawn of the Lawrence place and the porte-cochère of the Smedley house. Then, too, the lawn of the Stedman place opposite, almost bare of foliage, and the stately Colonial front, add to this formal appearance of the spot. Turning a curve, one beholds a view through the trees that ends
in a thick grove beyond the "Chat-
eau." This stretch
has more resemble-
lance to a street
than any other,
having on either
side a row of houses
that possesses some
degree of regular-
ity. The roads are
all named, among
them being Valley
Road, Wellington
Circle, and Pres-
cott, Lookout, Sun-
set, Paradise, Park,
Chestnut and Tanglewylde Avenues. No attempt has been made
to map them out in a regular manner, but they are well made, and
those under way promise to be equally good when finished.

The park may indeed be termed a colony. The homes of artists
and men of letters, as well as architects, are here, among them
being Edmund Clarence Stedman, William T. Smedley, William
Henry Howe, W. S. Howard, Will Low, Tudor Jenks, and W. W.
Kent. The place has an atmosphere of good taste. It is impos-
sible not to appreciate the thoughtfulness and taste shown in locat-
ing and building the houses, and the ever-harmonizing effects of
Nature. There is no
ostentation or vul-
garity. The houses
belong where they
are placed, as if
they had grown
there and were con-
tent to remain, and
the general effect
is tranquil refine-
ment. Yet they are
not monotonous;
they have variety of
style, material
and color, but with-
out any competi-
tion of effect. This
may be due to the
fact that they are almost entirely the work of one architect or of
associated architects. The impression that the park is a colony
is given in some measure by the uniform kind of buildings, re-
strictions limiting them to dwellings, while stables, boarding-
houses, factories, as well as fences, are debarred from the park's
limits. It may also be said that there is a prevailing type of
dwelling, the English timber frame house, though the so-called free
Colonial, the Norman-French, and the shingle cottage styles are
represented. Of the first, the Elizabethan house of William T.
Smedley, the artist, is perhaps the best specimen, though its neigh-
bor and companion, that of the author, W. S. Howard, is a beau-
tiful structure.

The problems that confront architects here are free from the
restrictions of city-dwelling planning. The difficulty of providing
light and air to every part of a dwelling on a narrow, rectangular
plot is unknown. Given unlimited space and light, the architect
is required to satisfy the demands of his client as to size and ar-
rangement of the component parts of his dwelling, to provide
modern comforts, and to adapt, as nearly as is within his capa-
bilities, the chosen style to the location and its environments. Indi-
vidual preference in the choice of style has influenced to some ex-
tent the designs of the dwellings, but the characteristics of the place have, in turn, influenced the designs to such an extent that a homogeneous effect pervades the park. This effect of picturesqueness is most suitable, as the contour of the land is all “up hill and down dale,” the curves of the roads unexpected, everything devoid of symmetry. Doubtless the choice of site, material and design or style depended in every case upon the amount of money available; however, the best houses or the most expensive do not necessarily

occupy the choicest sites, though it is natural and logical that they should.

In accordance with a law of harmony, buildings on a hilltop should be more aspiring than others; those on a hillside should be more irregular in plan, and should appear to be clinging to their positions; while those in a meadow should be more extended, and less aspiring. Carrying the analysis further, on the hilltop, where timber is small, soil scarce, and rock plentiful, it is but natural that rock should be used for building; on the hillside, that rock be used for foundations, and combined with timber for superstructures; while in the meadow, where rock is perhaps scarce, soil plentiful, and timber of full growth, that brick and timber should be combined. Yet a law of contrast demands equal consideration, and it
must necessarily be the eye of an artist that shall determine which law shall yield a determining influence, or to what extent their requirements shall be combined. "Oak Ridge," the home of William T. Smedley, the artist, though not the most pretentious in appearance, probably excites interest more than any other house in the park, and more firmly impresses itself on the mind. It is a beautiful structure, irregular and rambling, as it should be, but so well held together, withal, that it may be viewed and judged in its entirety. The long, low line of its main road is broken by a great gable, the most striking feature of the front, and by a smaller one to the north, which, through difference in size, detracts nothing from the greater. A feature is made of the porte-cochère, and, though hardly Elizabethan, it proves itself not incongruous. A circular stone terrace finishes the front on the north, and on the southern end the old and new studios form an irregular group. Mention has been made of the great gables in the rear, along the massive foundations of which an ivy has begun to steal its way. As to material, the foundations are of stone, extending in the rear, through the first story, and the superstructure is of the open beam and plaster kind. The color scheme is gray. The windows are of leaded glass, befitting the period. It is a house of charming interiors, showing the architect's appreciation of the value of wide staircases, windows and doors, and open
beam ceilings, and his knowledge of the importance of accenting fireplaces and mantels. The large studio occupies the entire southern end of the building, and extends through two stories, a small balcony marking the second story level of the main house. It is flooded with light from a large mullioned window in the east front, or from skylights in the roof. It is a spacious, airy and bright room admirably adapted to its purpose, and easels, half-finished sketches, tools of the artists’ profession, an old mahogany desk,

some massive chairs, and draperies make this an interesting interior.

The W. S. Howard house strikes one immediately as being a type and worthy of study. One is prompted to seek the purpose of the architects beyond that of meeting utilitarian requirements. The general effect, the impression, is pleasing, proportions and groupings good, the characteristics of the style well handled, the details unobtrusive. With beams stained dark brown, and plaster left its original color, a natural and harmonious effect is produced. The chief care here, beyond keeping within the limits of the style, is the wish to produce the effect of logical use of timbers, though but applied decoration, and good filling of wall-space. The entrance
porch might be classed as quaint. The house contains a beautiful
carved staircase.

The houses along the valley road are, perhaps, less interesting
than those on the hill. The meadow itself lacks variety, and the
dwellings, arranged in line along the road, resemble those of the
usual suburb. They seem much alike in plan and design, all being of
the plaster type, and hint what
may be done, even in small dwell-
ings, with stone, timber and stucco
in the many com-
p o i t i o n s of
porches, gables,
chimneys, oriel,
and other features
of a dwelling.

Viewing Lawrence Park as a picturesque suburb, as a collection
of attractive dwellings beautifully situated, one strolls about in quiet
enjoyment without distracting thoughts. Yet there is a social life
here that claims attention. The Casino, home of the Gramatan
Country Club, and a little church, a gray stone structure that is
attractive, are the centers of this social life. The Manor House,
with square stone walls, bears witness to the fact that, when only
a post road passed through the country, someone even then appre-
ciated the advantages or charm of this locality. A few years ago
a hotel was begun, but was burned before completion, and it is now
proposed to re-
place it with a
large fireproof
structure. The
wisdom of this,
from an artistic
point, may be ques-
tioned; not that
the hotel would
necessarily be in-
artistic, but is it
not an intrusion?

Charm is a fleeting quality; beauty may be marred. Peace, seclu-
sion and tranquility now characterize Lawrence Park, with free-
dom from those traits that make a suburb fashionable. To invade
it with a spirit of worldliness would be to rob it of its charm, to
over-modernize it would be to destroy its picturesqueness.

Theodore R. Tuttle.
ENTRANCE TO THE HOMESTEAD, ELSWORTHY ROAD.

Primrose Hill, London.
AN ENGLISH URBAN VILLAGE.

The advent of the speculative builder is generally regarded with disfavor by the residents of a district, more particularly when that district is a matured suburb and the builder acquires some highly prized open space that has chanced to remain. When it became known that the cricket fields near Primrose Hill, London, had been disposed of for building purposes by the ground landlords, the trustees of Eton College, the inhabitants of St. John's Wood and South Hampstead were full of regret and in some cases dismay. A large house with grounds in Avenue Road was acquired and demolished in order to form an approach to the building estate, thus strengthening the apprehensions of neighboring householders.

But Mr. William Willett, the purchaser of the land, promised to put up houses of a certain standard and value, and he soon proved better than his word. The three roads are of simple width, tree-planted and bordered with well trimmed privet hedges and strips of turf, while a small green has been formed, surrounded by posts and chains, and the back gardens of many of the houses open on to a common recreation ground in the center of the property.

The houses themselves, at present about forty-five in number, have been designed by the builder's own architectural staff, and are all different in plan and elevation, having only one feature in common, viz., that each stands detached. Most of the houses are built of red bricks, with red tiled roofs, white painted woodwork, overhanging eaves and barge-boarded gables. Purple bricks, rough-
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cast, half timbering and weather tiling are occasionally introduced. Several houses have green slate roofs and plaster enrichments upon the walls, "The Homestead" being, perhaps, the most attractive instance. One, the house with the green shutters, is of a formal Georgian type, with well proportioned windows and doorway, the latter of considerable refinement of detail. "Woodstock" is constructed with stone dressings, porch and quoins, and the lofty triple-transomed window of the hall recalls Elizabethan types.

The houses are well planned, well constructed and well drained, the interiors are commodious and homely. Spacious staircases, artistic fireplaces and modern fittings appeal to most of us, whilst the comparative lowness of the houses is one of their practical merits in the eyes of a prospective mistress of several servants. Lofty houses in London suburbs are not in request now the advantages of living in flats are so generally appreciated. These low houses command a rent of £300 to £400 per annum, or about as much as a six-storied mansion in South Kensington.

VIEW FROM THE COMMON GARDEN.

THE BASILICA OF ST. ANTONIO AT PADUA.

It is possibly one of the greatest drawbacks to the architectural profession in acquiring as well as practicing the art that we are in all things too imitative. Our desire is ever to "do the proper thing," which in nine cases out of ten is but to say that we shall be perfectly satisfied if we can only copy after other people: do what they have done, all that they have done and no more. In practice we have become accustomed to using certain forms for certain positions and there are few of us who would boldly attempt to adapt these forms to different uses or adopt new forms entirely. It is so with everything we touch, or do, or say. We wish to study classic architecture and we all flock to Rome and Athens. Do we ever think of visiting Dalmatia or Sicily? By all means let us visit the sites of the masterpieces, let us examine, sketch and measure them so as to make ourselves sure of the accepted archetypes; and then afterwards let us go a little further and see the same types as translated into material by other hands for other uses and to suit other soils; so we shall become acquainted with all the possibilities of the style. To study the Renaissance we travel—and rightly—to the place that gave it birth, to Italy; but there as before we find ourselves unconsciously iron bound in the grip of precedent. We begin our journey with the idea that the Renaissance produced three forms, Venetian, Roman and Florentine. We have read in all our books of these three cities teeming with examples, and if we have read and remembered more, it is that Anderson admired a palace or two at Bologna, that the architecture of Servia is described as "Streaky-bacon" and that Palladio lived at Vicenza and built a few things there. Those who have a taste for books have read of Pistoia, Genoa and other cities, but the majority of us have resolutely clung to the primary idea of Rome, Venice and Florence. So we pack up our sketch books and rules and hie us to Italy. We visit Milan, because we cannot very well help it and drive around the Duomo merely out of curiosity, for it is Gothic and we are in search of the neo-classic and do not dream that half the stones of that pile are full of the struggle of Renaissance-loving artists to produce Gothic forms, more instructive than the fully developed types could ever be. And from Milan we go to Venice direct, because every one does so and we know of nothing to see on the way. Similarly for Gothic we take our Moore or our Pickman and explore the examples they quote both in England and France. Our Romanesque we find cut and dried for us on the Rhine, at Cologne, Worms and Speyer.
But with all these copy book examples near, comparatively, to hand, there remains one style which we have to give up as beyond our reach; for it is only to be found in its complete form in its own home of Constantinople; and in our hurried visit to Europe there is little time to spare for a visit to the old city of Byzantium. True, we have St. Mark’s at Venice and the churches at Ravenna, but the dome being the great feature of the style and developed to its utmost limits only in the Santa Sofia, we grow to look at that one vast cupola which “appeared as though swinging from heaven by a chain” as being the example and nothing less will suffice. There is nothing else that will account for the apathy, with which examples of Byzantine architecture nearer at hand are passed by unstudied. It is true, of course, that we visit these buildings when we come across them, but we never pause to analyze the contrivances which have produced the results we see in the same way as we do with the other styles. It will be interesting to note by the way if Bentley’s great Westminster Cathedral in London, England, built in this style will have many followers and set the mode for a neo-byzantine craze.

But to return to the indictment. To those who travel direct from Milan to Venice, thence to Florence and Rome and so back to the starting point, it will come as a startling novelty to be told that for every example in the “show” cities there are two equally good to be found in the provinces, yet this is no exaggeration of the truth: works at Brescia rivalling the Cheisa dei Miracoli at Venice, palaces at Piacenza by Vigsola and so on ‘till the score mounts up to thousands. But of all the unheeded towns of the north Padua probably is the one which best merits attention and among Padua’s buildings the chiefest is undoubtedly the Basilica di S. Antonio.

It was a good thing, on the whole, for Padua that St. Anthony—Il Santo, The Saint he is called there, as if there never was nor could be another Saint—happened to die there in 1231 and the Paduani rose to the opportunity, elected him their patron and vowed to erect a temple that should put all others to shame in his honor. History does not say who was the architect, but Vasari, with more courage than accuracy, tells us that it was designed by Nicola da Pisa. The Marchese Selvatico, the most accurate historian of the city, attributes the work to the Camacini, the “Cathedral-builders,” of whom Leader Scott wrote, and it is more likely that it was the work of the builders alone than the execution of any set design. It was begun in 1256 and practically completed in fifty years. It is exceedingly difficult to describe the building, for belonging to no style it yet partakes of all and in the result is one of the most remarkable and certainly one of the richest churches in treasure in the whole world. The plan is that of an ordinary Gothic cathedral in form, with nave,
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PLAN OF THE BASILICA OF S. ANTONIO AT PADUA.
aisles, transept, chancel and ambulatory, but what would have been slender pillars are massive shafts carrying the domes like those of St. Mark's, Venice. It is domical throughout, a form which makes for simplicity, as the bays are each perforce square, while at the transepts the aisles are simply widened out to form the square once again. Its place in the development of styles would approximate to that of the Angevin and Perigordian churches where the same influence was at work, viz., an Eastern influence following the trade route from Constantinople to Venice, thence via Padua across Italy to Marseilles and on to the south of France; an influence which brought with it sufficient Byzantine feeling to create a desire for domical coverings but west of Venice not strong enough to insist on the Greek cross in plan. At Padua we find in the central portion the complete Greek form of equal arms each with its own dome and one for the crossing; but in addition we have a lengthening of one dome to the westward and a similar one for the chancel with a half hoop of chapels thrown 'round it, the central one covered with yet another dome. Not that this was a gradual enlargement, for there is no evidence to show that the plan was ever intended to be less than we find it now and the result is one which, had it been in the South of France, might well be considered as a fresh variant of the many Romanesque attempts to roof a basilica with arched construction. It must be remembered that Venice, with its many domed St. Marks, lay but twenty-three miles to eastward, and Padua with her desire to eclipse all other churches would not have considered her object achieved unless her new church bore as many and as large domes as her neighbor. Moreover, St. Mark's was planned at a time when Byzantine influence was paramount in the Adriatic, while the "Santo" was not begun until 1256, when planning had fallen into the Latin form of cross; yet still it had to be domical, and so we have a kind of free-lance example, Gothic by force of the epoch while Byzantine in intention.

When we consider its external elevations we find ourselves face to face with fresh difficulties, for it lacks the marbles and surface enrichments we look for in the Eastern style and is innocent both of the traceries of Gothic and of the crude carvings of Romanesque. The little ornamentation on the western façade is Gothic, yet reminiscent in its arched gallery and corbelled cornice of Lombardic use, but who could affirm that the long and slender campanili which rise from either side of the chancel dome are anything but Byzantine minarets emanating direct from the Orient? Throughout the whole of the Veneto we find the bell-towers square in form and entirely detached from the building; here we find them incorporated in the edifice, multi-angular and crowned with extinguisher roofs which are own brothers to those of the Santa Sophia. The open-
ings of the many stories are gay with reticulated brickwork of every line and the belfry stage arcade is finished with pointed arches of horse-shoe form and with a contraflex curve, a variant which could belong to another style than that of the last. Above the roof all is plain sailing, for the shape of the domes is frankly that of Venice, saving for the omission of the bulbous cupolas which complete the latter example.

Coming to the exterior of the apse we are confronted with a work of later times, probably dating from the middle of the XV. century, to which period perhaps belong also the two minarets already referred to. In spite of the lateness of the date, the details are still Gothic, yet the arrangement of the whole is so subtle that in spite of one’s better judgment, one feels that the thing is Byzantine. The Byzantine is always there obtruding on the imagination while the eye sees but Gothic. Last of all in date externally comes the Cappella delle Reliquie, the Chapel of the Relics or more commonly called the Chapel of the Treasure. This is represented in the side view by the isolated dome to the eastward and was built in 1689 by Filippo Parodi, a Genoese architect.

If the outward appearance of the Santo is unimposing after the eye has become used to the singular arrangement of so many domes and the conical steeple which accentuates the crossing, it must be confessed that at first sight the interior is perhaps even less striking. Guide books tell us in the curt phraseology which they have made practically their own that “the interior is white-washed,” but when the present writer was last in Padua the white-wash was being carefully removed, revealing a perfect gallery of priceless frescoes, the undoubted work of Mantegna and others, and probably by now the whole of the walls and vaults glow once more with the bright colors which have so long been hid away. But this is not the only treasure of this wonderful treasure-house; it is indeed rather the least of them all, for the list is so long that one hesitates as to where to begin to recount the glories of this art museum. There is no space, and the repetition would be wearisome if one attempted it, to point out the worthy monuments of each chapel, and it must suffice if we confine our notice to the Chapel of St. Anthony and to the High Altar. The “Treasure” would require a whole article to itself.

In the north transept and jutting out into the line of the north aisle of the nave stands the Cappello del Santo—here we must reiterate that for Padua St. Anthony was and is the Saint—enclosed with a very beautiful arcade of Veronese marble. It was designed in 1500 by Andrea Riccio or Briosco and is certainly quite as rich and refined as any portion of the Chiesa dei Miracoli at Venice. Not only this, but the three walls of the chapel are par-
tioned out with plasters so as to form nine panels, each one containing a very large high-relief representing the miracles wrought by the Saint, and executed, some by Jacopo Sansovino, some by the Lombardi, but all of them of striking beauty and only lacking consideration as masterpieces, because there are so many here of equal merit that the eye becomes unable to appreciate their full value. It is a church where one must go every day for a fortnight fully to grasp the exquisiteness and delicacy of the whole. The examples illustrated are: the Saint restoring a dead girl to life, by Jacopo Sansovino, and the Saint causing a newly born child to speak in defense of its mother’s honor, by Antonio Lombardo. It is astonishing to note how almost purely Greek the latter is, the Hellenic profiles and drapery and the treatment of the hair reminding one irresistibly of the fragments from the Parthenon pediments in the British Museum. Yet the Renaissance is there, too, in the perspective of the background and the chubby children which are verily and indeed children of the Renaissance. It does not come within the pale of architecture proper to speak of the ornaments of the chapel, the sanctuary lamps of soiled gold, the candlesticks of both gold and silver and the massive silver coffin which contains the remains of the Saint, but one cannot refrain from calling attention
BAS-RELIEF OF NEW-BORN BAE SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF ITS MOTHER.
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Sculptor, Antonio Lombardo.
S. ANTONIO RESTORING A DEAD GIRL TO LIFE.

Sculptor, Jacopo Sansovino.
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BRONZE TABLET ON THE HIGH ALTAR.

S. Antonio restoring an amputated foot to a youth. Basilica of S. Antonio at Padua.
to the beautiful marble vases which sustain the large silver candlesticks on either side of the altar. They were sculptured in 1699 by Filippo Parodi and consist of gracefully grouped angels clinging to the pedestals.

Before proceeding to describe the high altar a word of explanation is required. The basilica, rich in art treasure, is richest of all in the bronzes of Donatello and his pupils, but the many examples were previously scattered in different parts of the church and it was only when Padua celebrated the 7th centenary of its Saint* that it was decided, by a happy inspiration of the architect to the fabric, Commendatore Boito, to collect all these bronzes together and construct an altar which should be known as the "Altare Donatelliano." The interior view of the basilica shows the altar before the transformation, but the detail view shows it as reconstructed, and few people will be found to regret that this great work was carried out; the harmony of the whole is perfect and the whiteness of the marble borders only enhances the beauty of form and gradation of surface of the dull, yet gleaming metal.

The pieces collected for this work were:

In the riser of the retable three low-reliefs—(a) The Saviour seated on a monument surrounded by angels, (b) the story of the miser who was found to have a stone instead of a heart and (c) the miracle of the man whose foot was cut off and replaced.

The celebrated angel musicians, in the riser of the altar itself. These have probably been more illustrated than any other—save the statue of Gattemelata—of Donatello's works.

Statues of St. Louis of Toulouse and St. Prosdeimus (on the retable).

The life-size crucifix and five statues—(a) the Redeemer on the cross, (b) St. Francis, (c) the B. V. Mary and Child enthroned, (d) St. Daniel and (c) St. Guistina (all on or around the altar).

The low relief of gilt bronze representing the Descent from the Cross.

Four panels in low relief with the symbols of the Evangelists and three other panels—(a) the dead Christ between two angels, (b) miracles of the mule adorning the Sacrament and (c) the new-born babe speaking to assert its mother's innocence.

Those, then, who wish to study the work of Donatello need do no more than visit the Basilica of Padua, for there in this one altar we have an epitome of his craft from low relief to figure sculpture. It is said that documents have been found in the Ammistrazione del Santo which prove that the present reconstruction is but the carry-
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ing out of the original design, and this is indeed more than probable when it is considered how marvellously the whole combines into one harmony of line. Each portion is a masterpiece, especially the statue of St. Anthony with his emblems of lilies, to the right of the crucifix. The symbols of the Evangelists, again, are unsurpassed for refinement of treatment and grace of composition, while there is a subtle variety of surface without confusion which makes it impossible for the eye to weary of gazing. The least pleasing portions of the altar are the panels in the retable, which are described as the work of Donatello and his pupils. They lack the master's touch and do not display anything of the finish of the other works. Knowing as we do that all these tablets were modelled in wax on a plaster back, we seem to feel that the hand which wielded the irons had not gained the requisite strong-and-light touch, for while in the Evangelists there is all the appearance of repoussé work which is fit and proper for bronze castings, in these we see a little too obviously exactly how each stroke was made, and can see as it were the plastic wax yielding readily on each side of the knife. This is perfectly justifiable, of course, for a work which is to remain in wax, but when the wax is but a preparation for a somewhat intractable metal it is unfortunate that the finished bronze should bear upon itself the appearance of being still but a wax model. The elaboration of the perspective background is, however, remarkable, especially in the tablet representing the Saint restoring to a youth a foot which had been cut off.

One more work is here, which, though not by Donatello, but an adjunct of the altar, must be mentioned; the great bronze paschal candlestick by Briosco. Part of it is seen to the extreme left in the engraving of the altar. It stands over seventeen feet high and occupied the artist from 1507 to 1515. Like the cathedral candlelabrum in Milan Cathedral, it is covered with Pagan as well as Christian symbols and is a work of great beauty.

The church merits a visit from all who are interested in art and from all who love beauty. One enters the Giardino Treves and catches a glimpse of the pile from among the trees with its mirrored reflection in the clear waters of the Bacchiglione, or one can wander along the city walls and watch the successive domes and pinnacles as their relative positions change with the point of view: ever harmonious, always grouping sublimely and breathing a whisper of the East. And then to escape from the burning sun and the heat reflected from the cobbled streets and whitewashed houses, one enters the great Basilica del Santo to feast the eye on the works of man and to marvel at the greatness of the Power that created him and taught him to use his hands to such mighty purpose.

Robert W. Carden, A. R. I. B. A.
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The following four plates illustrate a proposed building for the New York "American" or "The Journal," as it is better known. The site for the building is quite irregular, the four fronts, those on Broadway, the Circle, 8th Ave. and 58th Street each being of a different length. In order to utilize the area circumscribed by these boundaries without the loss of a foot of space and without producing at the same time a building that should emphasize if not exaggerate the irregularities of the lot, was a problem that demanded unusually clever handling. It will be seen even from our illustrations that the architects succeeded with conspicuous success and produced a most notable skyscraper, five hundred and fifty-five feet high and of forty stories.
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SINCE the adoption of a distinctly Gothic design for the enlargement of West Point, it has become more permissible than it has been for twenty years or so to discuss the suitability of Gothic for other than strictly ecclesiastical uses. It is quite true, as I have had the honor of pointing out in these pages (Architectural Record, Vol. XIV., No. 6) that the choice of Gothic at West Point was practically compelled, short of a clean sweep of the existing buildings, with all their traditions, which would have been an operation of a more than architectural vandalism, so that the competition was by no means a "Battle of the Styles." If it had been, or if the expert advisers of the authorities had taken that view of it, we may be sure, from their own respective works, that a Gothic design would not have received their preference. They simply found themselves forced, by fidelity to the interests in which they were employed, to recommend a Gothic design for this particular purpose. But, none the less, the result was, as it could hardly help being, acclaimed on the one side, the side of the minority, "few and faint, but fearless still," as a victory in that battle, and deplored on the other, the side of the aggressive and triumphant majority, as a defeat in it. In fact, one of the disappointed competitors was overheard to remark, in the heat of his disappointment, that this result had put back architecture in the United States for half a century. To those who are by no means of that opinion, there is a special interest in the work of an architect who has continued to devote himself to Gothic in spite of the dictate of fashion, as followed and imposed by the great majority of his profession, that the Gothic revival is hopelessly dead.

That is a proposition which one finds great difficulty in accepting. While human nature remain what it is, the romantic element
in art, in all art, will sometimes break out. The preference for it seems, on the part of those who have it, to be temperamental and instinctive. *Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret.* The formal and periwig-pated Georgian art in England seemed to be, at the end of the eighteenth century, far more firmly established in all arts, literature particularly included, than the French academic architecture can to anybody seem to be established "here and now." And yet Walter Scott, preceded though he had been by Collins and Gray and Thomson, inaugurated a movement which not only characterized English literature throughout the nineteenth century, but swept over all Europe, and had its distinct effect upon the arts that deal with form. It became so firmly established as to enlist many men who were by instinct and temperament classics and not romantics at all, as, in architecture, the respectable Sir Gilbert Scott, whom nature destined for a correct composer in classic, but who found himself, possibly to his own astonishment, one of the leaders of the Gothic revival. That revival obtained, a third of a century ago, unquestioned control of the building of England, of which the United States were architecturally still a dependency, and of South Germany, and produced practitioners who really seemed to work in the mediaeval spirit as well as with mediaeval forms. In France, despite the vigorous protestantism of Viollet-le-Duc and his coadjutors, the official style, aided by the official inculcation, was too deeply rooted to be displaced, and the displacement was rendered the more hopeless by the fact that the protestants were so unsuccessful as designers. Indeed, the ineptitude of the modern Frenchman to the style of which his country was the birthplace, and of which it contains the chief monuments, the country being at the same time the home of one of the most artistic of modern peoples, is one of the strangest of the many strange anomalies in the history of modern architecture.

All the same, the Gothic revival, in the sense of an attempt to extend the style of the Middle Ages to all modern requirements, was a failure, and we have to own that it deserved to fail. It failed because "the letter killeth," and because the archaeological and ecclesiological traditions which in England had so much to do with bringing it about, prevailed, with the majority of its practitioners, to the end. Those who attained to a perception of the principle, as separable from the forms of mediaeval building, perceived and proclaimed that that principle was capable of meeting the exigencies of new constructions and new principles as, in the thirteenth century, it had met the exigencies of a vaulted construction in masonry. To this there was no logical answer possible except a demand that the new forms should be produced, and the new
forms were not forthcoming. The revival declined to a mere preference for Gothic over classic forms, which were equally and only equally irrelevant to modern requirements, with the addition, to be sure of the far wider range and variety of the Gothic repertory, but with correlative drawbacks, of which one of the chief was the apparent impossibility of employing independent and fully developed sculpture in association with those architectural forms. One may maintain that the impossibility was only apparent; that the Gothic sculptors modeled as well as they knew how, even though their work, like that of the Egyptian sculptors, was conditioned by the architecture and took on architectural lines and an architectural character; that they would have made better figure sculpture if they had known the figure better, and that they would have found some way of combining this more perfect sculpture with the architecture. But, obviously, the only satisfactory way of making this demonstration would have been by way of an object lesson, in which the more developed sculpture should equally take its place in as part of the architectural effect. A partial solution of this problem has lately been offered, here in New York, in the new porch of St. Bartholomew’s, where a sculptor of modern acquire- ments and of distinct individuality had to fit his work to an archaeological reproduction of Romanesque architecture. The result is full of encouragement, in this particular view. It is not to be supposed that the sculptor deliberately laid aside any part of his technical equipment, or modeled less well than he knew how. And yet the architectural appropriateness of his work is not less striking than its merit as sculpture. It is indeed a Gothic revival in spirit, and puts to shame the work of those “Gothic sculptors” who have been insisting by their works that only stiff manikins and “stained glass attitudes,” “both angular and flat,” were really consonant with the traditions of Gothic architecture.

While, from the Gothic point of view, the evolution of structure constitutes the history of architecture, and the exposition of the construction, in any particular building, constitutes the architecture of that building, it would be impracticable and unjust to hold the Gothic revivalist to too strictly a logical account for all his details. What, for example, is the “function” of a crocket, or, as it most frequently occurs in modern work, of a gargoyle? It has, I believe, been attempted to be shown that the crocket was a facility for the mediaeval steeple-jack, though the modern steeple-jack, so far as I have observed his operations, when he has a spire to scale, is wisely wary of trusting himself to it. But, practically, it is evident that these two members, to which many more might be added, have no more “meaning” than the ailerons or cartouches of the Renaissance. They make the outline bristle. The designer
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introduces them because he likes the bristling effect which they produce, an effect which unquestionably belongs to the style of his choice. What we really have a right to require of him is only that when he has occasion to deal with a new structural device, he shall deal with it frankly to the best of his ability, and not dodge it or mask it under an application of irrelevant architectural forms denoting some other construction. When he descends to this, it is obvious that he has no ethical advantage, as the English Gothic revivalists, headed by Ruskin, put it, no logical advantage, as the French revivalists, headed by Viollet-le-Duc, characteristically preferred to put it over the common architectural practitioner who simply follows the fashion, and does not aspire to lead it. The whole question then resolves itself into one of taste, concerning which, proverbially, "non disputandum." This difference, by the way, between the French and English revivalists, is at once queer and illuminating. The attentive reader of the "Seven Lamps," on the one hand, and of the "Entretiens," on the other, cannot have failed to observe that whereas the English prophet condemns the things he does not like as eternally unrighteous, the French professor confines himself to pointing out that they are unreasonable. "Base," says Ruskin; "absurd," says Viollet-le-Duc. It is all very well for Emerson to say that Ruskin regenerated art, "as an appeal to moral order always must." But if the French revivalist had confined himself to precept, and refrained from the examples of actual design, which only showed his own lack of artistic tact, he would have had the greater effect upon the actual practitioners of architecture, who, if they are intelligent and honest men, feel less the necessity of being "converted" than that of being enlightened.

All the same, there have been some fine and inspiring careers run under the influence of and inspiration of the Gothic revival, by men who did not seem to themselves prophets, nor even professors, but who were simply practising a great art the best they could according to their lights, and taking the best care they could that their light should not be darkness. Not to speak of either the living or the dead, it is perhaps permissible to mention an architect who is, so to say, neither, being both; that is to say, surviving, but having definitely relinquished the practice of his art. I mean Mr. William Appleton Potter, whom, but for his own modest reluctance, I should long ago have delighted to celebrate in these pages. For something like thirty years Mr. Potter has been "doing Gothic" chiefly for the purposes to which the appropriateness of Gothic is commonly recognized, such as churches and educational institutions, doing it in such a way as "to keep himself out of the common controversies of the street and of the forum." Besides the actual
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merit of such works as Saint Agnes' Church and the Union Theological Seminary and the Princeton Library and the rest, Mr. Potter's career seems to me afford a much needed proof that in the hurly burly of contemporary architectural competition, an architect who is sufficiently so minded can pursue a really artistic professional practice, taking no more work than he can actually and personally perform, and keeping himself "hors concours."

But the citation of such an instance, and the thought of the other instances of the living which it is not permissible to cite, equally go to show that Gothic has lost its vogue, and that its present practitioners, men of middle age or more, are almost necessarily "praisers of past time." The singularity of Mr. Barney's case is that the tyranny of temperament has so far prevailed with him over the oppression of his professional training as to make him a Gothic architect, born out of due time, as it seems, since his professional training was that of the Columbia school and of an architect's office, by no means of Gothic tendencies, and his practice is not much more than a decade old.

About the first of Mr. Barney's works in the order of time, and quite the first to attract the attention of the present reviewer, was a residence-studio for Mr. Olin L. Warner, the lamented sculptor, which must have been erected by or soon after 1890 in Central Park West, near One Hundred and Fourth Street, and which sufficiently testified that the architect, or his client, was out of joint with the architectural tendencies of the time, which were divided, in domestic architecture, between the expiring throes of the Richardsonian Romanesque and the beginnings of the reproductions of the French official style, as acquired, if not inculcated, at the Beaux Arts. The modest street front of twenty or twenty-five feet, as one saw it from the avenue, or, still better, caught glimpses of it from the eminence opposite in the park, was a stranger in the neighborhood, though even less so than now, when the development of the Central Park West has been determined in the direction of apartment houses, and one was inclined to give it welcome as such, and also for better reasons. It was a well composed little front, with the masses in the right places, and with a resulting effect of solidity and walliness in spite of the modest dimensions, well bonded by the lintel-courses of the two stories, and, with the duplication in the lower, above the transom of the window and under the balcony, of the triple openings that lighted the hallway, and with the ornament, discreet in scale, sparing in quantity and refined in design, of a really decorative result. It was only the upper story, the studio, that designated the style as Venetian, being elsewhere, if one had to classify it, rather that of the French Renaissance, whereas the traceried arcade unquestionably had its origin
in the Adriatic. But it was also this crowning feature which unmistakably designated the house as also a studio, and would have designated it as a sculptor's studio if the ample skylight had been furnished with some visible means of swinging and lowering the heavy pieces of modeling to which the interior was devoted. Draw-
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ings were in fact made for that purpose, but one sees that the great crane which would have been needed would have been very difficult, as least, to reconcile with the Venetian arcade, and it was very possibly the designer's insistence upon this undoubtedly pretty and effective feature that prevented him from fully characterizing his
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work. For the crane implied a gable, and the feature thus formed belongs to "the Venice of the North," meaning, this time, Amsterdam and not Stockholm, rather than to that of the South, and indicates the Dutch Renaissance as the style of the wall of which it
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is the crowning feature. All the same the little front was not only full of promise but unusually creditable as a performance.

It is pretty evidently not what its author would do or recommend at present. Of course neither they nor their client could
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have foreseen, fifteen years ago, what line the development of Central Park West would take, nor how lonely the little house would come to look. In a quarter of which the development is determined, and the building well under way, the obligations of comity ought to be recognized as superior to those of the architect’s own preferences, and his efforts may well be limited to doing, in a general way, what his neighbors are doing, with as much more refinement than they as he may be able to command. This obligation our firm has recognized and discharged in two more recent house fronts, one in East Forty-ninth street, on the site of the old buildings of Columbia, and one on East Seventy-ninth. The former is distinctly and avowedly a design in French Renaissance, the latter more difficult to classify, being, indeed, an “example,” if of anything, of “Old New York,” albeit, with its swell front and its basement, with two entrances at the street level, an illustration of the newest of new New York in its lay-out. Unlike the first essay we have been considering each is an example of comity, of a desire rather to be neighborly by conformity than to attract attention by difference. Each is, at any rate a negotiable and well behaved New York street front of the early twentieth century, and one’s choice between them will be apt to depend upon temperamental preferences, since one is as carefully and successfully designed; for its own purpose and in its own way, as the other. The arrangement which admits of carrying the swell to the ground with a central entrance is architecturally more eligible than that which compels the construction of the doorway on one side where it cannot without a visible awkwardness be united either with the swell above it or with the swell along side of it. And certainly one has to condole with the designer upon the practical exigencies which have prevented him, in his street front in the style of the chateaux, from crowning the edifice with a single central feature in the style of so many we remember, and has compelled him to crown it instead with two equal dormers, each of two stories, which rather contradict than carry out the arrangement and the promise of the substructure, even though this less eligible disposition is also by no means without precedent.

Apparently a much better architectural opportunity than that which is offered by the front of twenty-five feet or less which is by far the most frequent problem in the domestic architecture of New York is that of the family hotel which commonly shows at least two fronts, and occupies three or four city lots. Our firm has had such an opportunity in the Hotel Navarre, at the corner of Seventh avenue and Thirtieth street. But this, although something like 100 feet on each front, and only nine stories high, and thus by no means a skyscraper as skyscrapers are coming to go, yet, being a steel
frame building, involves all the artistic problems of the skyscraper. Being, as to its visible frontages, a building of masonry, and being practically required to be for the most part enveloped in masonry, it is yet forbidden to the architect to make the effect of depth and massiveness which the use of masonry compels and invites the architect to exhibit and accentuate. The apparent wall is a mere veneer in which effective depth is out of the question, and which yet seems to forbid the exhibition of the actual and articulated structure behind it so as to gain a new and alternative source of

expression and effect. It is the architectural problem of our time and country what is to be done with this construction. The partial successes in its solution are thus far successes of compromise in which the architects have forborne to break with the traditions of masonry, in which they are unable to rid themselves of the effort to make the bottom look massive and appear to furnish the support which it no longer in fact furnishes to the superstructure, and do their best, with what depth of screen wall is left to them, to imitate the effect of the massiveness which has been withdrawn. The scheme of composition which aims at a base of two or more
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stories, a middle wall absolutely plain and unbroken except by the necessary openings, and a crowning feature as ornate and elegant as he can make it, is the scheme which has imposed itself upon all but a very few radicals. It is that which has in this case adopted, and in which it will be agreed that there has been won one of the successes of compromise which are all at which the generality of architects aim. Except for the extension upward of the main entrance, by a trellis of ornament extending over several stories, an arrangement of which I believe the first appearance was in the American Surety Building of the late Bruce Price, a work on so many accounts noteworthy in the development of the skyscraper; the four middle stories of the Hotel Navarre are of the utmost plainness, while the ornament is concentrated at the bottom and the top in as much richness as the architect was permitted to give it. The two stories of visible roof, with bristling dormers relieved
against it, may very likely have been suggested by the similar feature in the very successful building of the Washington Life, of which, in fact, the roof constitutes the success, and may almost be said to comprise the architecture. Adorned to the utmost, at any rate, the basement and the roof of the Hotel Navarre are, and to a distinctly successful result, to which the advantage taken by the architect of the plasticity of the terra cotta which is the substance of his screen wall very largely contributes. A degree of ornateness which would be extravagant in a palace in hewn stone is, in a building of much less than palatial pretensions, in terra cotta, a merely proper tribute to the facility of the material. A plain terra cotta building is almost an accusation against its architect's knowledge of his material, or else against his willingness to take trouble, an elaborate terra cotta building a vindication of both. In fact, the weakness, or the danger, of the material, its liability to distortion in baking, is brought out by any attempt to treat it with massive simplicity and dissembled by elaboration of superficial ornament, provided this be so designed as not to enable the eye to judge too readily the deviations from rectilinearity. Elaborate detail costs no more to bake than plain. Considering that all the work is moulded, and that the larger and simpler the parts, the greater the liability to visible distortion and consequent rejection, it may be said, up to a certain or rather an uncertain point, to cost no more to mould. So, in the basement of the Navarre, it is not the delicate and profuse detail so much as the blocks in which a character of massiveness almost to be called in comparison Cyclopean has been attempted, that one considering the probable proportion of rejections between the two will be apt to charge with extravagance; although, of course, he must recognize the desirableness of the plain blocks as foils to the intricacy of the superficial ornamentation alongside. There is no building in New York from which it is more evident than from the Hotel Navarre, whether in fact or in the photograph, that it is a building in terra cotta and not an imitation of or a substitute for a building in masonry, and that the architect knows and employs his material. And this, quite apart from the merits of the detail otherwise, though these seem to me equally high. Naturally and quite properly, detail of this kind in an historical style, is not "original" in the sense that it has occurred for the first time to the modern designer. But, whatever models he may have for it, he does not find it quite as he requires it, and the process of adaptation and readjustment to which he subjects it amount to redesigning. In this the success of this detail is eminent, and in nothing more than the comparative scale of the ornament at the base which is close to the eye, and at the summit where it is equally effective and telling and practically pro-
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fuse at a distance of seven stories. There are few features in our recent street architecture so effective as this crown of the Navarre, the comparatively rich parapet, with the texture given to it by the overlay of trellis, above the severely simple attic and the still richer bristling tiara of dormers above, and few so successful compositions as the whole building, having regard to the limitations under which its designer worker. There is no pretence of "purity" in the archaeological sense, in the detail. Indeed, from that point of view, there is even a contradiction between the distinctly Italian character of the detail of the base and the distinctly French character of the detail of the crown. But this frank eclecticism is more than justified by the result, of which the freshness and spirit are not gained at any real sacrifice of its "scholarly" quality.

In such a work as this, the romantic impulse and preference of the designer are as marked as indeed they are in the French Renaissance, so-called, which, if we were obliged to classify the building we should have to denote as its "style," and in which the Gothic basis is so much more essential than the superadded classicism. In another work, which aims at a much more formal classicism, the same spirit betrays itself, almost, as it seems, in spite of the designer. This is the extremely interesting Hart Memorial Library at Troy, of which the exterior is evidently but gratifyingly the result and expression of a scheme imposed by the special requirements of the case, and to be discerned in a study of the ground plans. Of course the spectator would prefer, and of course the architect would have preferred a broader pier as the terminal of the lower wall. It seems questionable whether he could not have allowed himself this luxury by uniting the two openings that light each of the corner rooms, and thus avoiding the narrowing of these ter-
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minal piers to less than the width of those that flank the entrance at the center. But the fact that his second floor was to be skylighted gave him a chance for an arrangement of that story as effective as it is unusual, a very broad expanse of perfectly plain wall flanking a fenestral feature, on the longer front a loggia of five openings, on the shorter a triple window. In each case the feature is admirably foretold in the substructure, and upon each the ornament of its respective front is very wisely concentrated. The arrangement gives opportunity for the relegation to the inconspicuous rear of the "stacks" of which no architect has thus far managed to make the exterior presentable, and leaves the visible building to be treated monumentally. This arrangement, including and requiring a flat roof, almost compels the style, and even indicates the material, the white marble in which the architect was fortunate enough to be able to execute it. The central feature will recall to many observers the similar feature in the Century Club of New York, although the general aspect of the exterior much more resembles, in its effective simplicity, that of the Savings Bank in Fourth avenue, with which this has nothing of detail in common. The temptation to "let himself go" in the ornate central feature the architect has kept within bounds, and the richness of it is attended by a restraint that makes it all the more effective. The detail here and elsewhere, as in the cornice and the balustrades of the central roofs, is thoroughly well studied, in scale as well as in other points of the design, and the work, without question, is interesting and successful.

One of the best criteria of the talent and the training of a modern architect we may take to be his proved capacity for producing a work which, though of no historical style, yet has style. The heir of all the ages is necessarily, one would say, an eclectic. He must, if he be in earnest, find dispositions and devices suitable to his purpose beyond the limits of the historical style which he may have proposed to himself. When he attempts to introduce these, however, he finds it as difficult to retain "style" or to regain it, as he finds it easy by staying within the prescribed limits in which not only the formal elements, but the permissible combinations and permutations were exhausted generations before he was born. But so long as he confines himself to working in styles he is composing in a dead language and in effect acknowledging that architecture is a dead art. How to find new expressions for new notions—in this case for new materials and new modes of construction—and still to keep the effect of purity and unity, this is the problem to be solved before architecture becomes again a living art. It is a problem which presents itself to the worker in free architecture alone, since it is shirked by the worker in styles on the one hand, who excludes the novelties, and by the engineer, on the other, who
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introduces them freely but without any care what the result looks like or what kind of figure he may be cutting as an artist. It is for the reason that mediaeval architecture furnishes so much more help than classic, which furnishes none at all towards the solution of this problem, that it is rationally advocated as the starting point of future work. One sees with satisfaction from time to time in contemporary work examples of the kind of success I mean—of a work which has transcended the trammels of “the styles” and still retains “style.” One of these one is inclined to acclaim in Mr. Barney’s treatment of the problem presented by the Thomas Orphan School for Indian Children at Iroquois, N. Y.

A generation ago an undertaking of this kind, executed wherever in the United States or by whosoever, would have issued in one huge single block of an “institution” as grandiose as the architect could make it. The change to the separate housing of each of the chief requirements of the institution was made not upon architectural but upon sanitary grounds, in the introduction of the pavilion system in hospitals, and from that extended to eleemosynary “plants” in general. The architects ought to be very much obliged to the doctors, both for instigating a system under which a more detailed and specific architectural expression was possible, and for inducing the founders of institutions to establish them where there was ample enough and verge enough to accommodate their several requirements with dignity as well as with convenience, which means that, where that is possible, they should be suburban or even rural rather than urban. These conditions are all fulfilled in the Thomas Orphan School. The pavilions are arranged in a great quadrant, connected by covered ways continuing along the fronts of the buildings a school at each end, then two dormitories for girls in one side and two for boys on the other, and at the center the common meeting place, the refectory, with the administration building in front of it. Where, as in this case, there is no inequality of surface which suggests a different arrangement, this is an obvious and rational disposition, having certain advantages over the arrangement in “quads” which is the alternative, and offering opportunities quite equal to that for effective architectural treatment. These opportunities have here been admirably employed. The “style,” if we had to classify it, would have to be classified as Colonial, and, with the material used, gives the result a certain resemblance in effect to the effective group of the New York University on Morris Heights. But, in the present case, the forms proceed so naturally from the material and the construction has to give the result a very welcome home-bred and vernacular air as if the designer had never heard of such a thing as a style of architecture, but was putting together the material at his command in
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the most workmanlike, which was also the most artistic manner. Of course this remark does not apply to such features as the porches with their orders, nor to such decorative features as the center of the Refectory, with its triple-stone framed arcade, over the continuous open arcade of the basement and under the triplet of dormers on the roof, nor yet to the more elaborate central decorations of the Dormitory, with its mullioned and transomed single window above the order, flanked by nched fig-

GRACE CHAPEL.

ures and surmounted by the coach, with the triple gabled dormer above. One recognizes the historical origin of these things. But he recognizes also that the designer "has taken his own where he found it," without troubling himself about academic but only about architectural congruity, and so these things do not detract from the impression as of an inspired bricklayers attaining style by working out a style for himself. This is a rare and signal success.

Of all the kinds of building that come in the way of a modern architect of a romantic turn of mind, one would say that a country house would be the most alluring, given the right client. For the
architect of this temper will avoid fitting the special requirements of each case to a predetermined box, and will insist upon the architectural expression of them, in which event the work is a continual challenge to his ingenuity. To say that this is the genre in which American architects, as a rule, make their chief successes, is to say that they are not deficient in ingenuity when they give it a fair chance. Evidently it has had full scope in the very pretty country
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house at Cedarhurst, of which, in this free mode of design, the architectural success may to a considerable extent be taken to attest the practical success, seeing that the practical needs have so clearly everywhere been made the basis of the architecture. In spite of the extent and costliness of the house, it is kept distinctly short of the "palatial" point, and offers a gratifying contrast to those "cottages," especially at Newport, which are merely shelters for a summer sojourn, tents pitched on the beach, so to say, but
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of which the architectural pretensions yet so far transcend both their purpose and the extent of the grounds that enclose them, of which each ought to be a park, and is only a "building lot." Architecturally, the chief success of this work under consideration, on the entrance front, is the success with which the extent of the frontage is expressed and even emphasized in the first story by the simple expanse of brickwork, while, above it is diversified and animated by features which seem to grow quite naturally out of the

 requirements of the case. It is difficult to see how any architect can regard a rectangular and symmetrical block as more eligible than such an irregular and yet balanced and unified arrangement, at least for the purposes of a country house. The central feature here is especially successful, the low-arched balcony below, and the little loggia above, so effectively framed between the little rich gable of brickwork on the one side, and the foot of the main half timbered gable on the other, and so effectively hooded by the penthouse slope of the main roof. The well studied Gothic detail gives a
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particular piquancy to the feature. And yet one cannot help seeing that the piquancy and picturesqueness have come from the faithful following out of the actual requirements, and that the open arch, open at least in summer and apparently glazable in winter, is only a highly successful treatment of the "storm door" which so many designers find intractable, and which they finally attach to the house from which it is evidently detachable, in such wise as to deprecate all architectural criticism from it, and to waive architecture in its construction altogether.

But, after all, church building is the one branch of building that comes nearest to being abandoned by architects of all schools to the architects who take their inspiration from the building of the Middle Ages, of which the other building was so insignificant in comparison, or has by its slighter character so nearly disappeared that, in common speech, church architecture and Gothic architecture come very near to being synonymous. The most zealous propagandist of the most recent Parisian fashion, while he may occasionally fall in with a client facile enough to allow him to compose a place of worship in that extremely mundane and even "mordain" manner of building will commonly allow that, for churches, Gothic at least "tolerari potest." The choice is not wholly architectural, may be so on the part of the client in a small and even imperceptible degree. It was the ecclesiastical tradition that gave
HOLY TRINITY CHURCH—NORTH AISLE, LOOKING EAST.
East 88th Street, New York City.
Barney & Chapman, Architects.
HOLY TRINITY CHURCH—VIEW OF THE INTERIOR.

East 88th Street, New York City.

Barney & Chapman, Architects.
rise to the Gothic revival, particularly the "Anglican" tradition, for the tradition of what is called the "orthodox" church in New England, the tradition of the "meeting house" remounts only to Sir Christopher Wren, and with the Pilgrim Fathers and their immediate successors became a distinctly anti-Gothic tradition. It remains true that the Protestant Episcopal Church has been in this country the chief promoter of Gothic architecture and was the chief source of the Gothic revival. The first learned and grammatical essay in this country in Gothic, on a scale which made it impossible to ignore, was Trinity Church in New York, which, although it is approaching the sixtieth year of its completion, it would be rather rash to say has since been surpassed in the essential qualities that go to make an architectural success.

Not only can an architect addict himself to Gothic for churches without incurring the reproach of any part of his own profession.
But so great is the range and variety of the examples included under the general designation that he can produce churches which come under it and which have little other specific resemblance, while, also within the limits of historical Gothic, he can manage to express his own artistic individuality, if he happen to have any. This remark is illustrated by Mr. Barney's two churches in Richmond, Va., Holy Trinity and All Saints, both which would be pretty readily identified as his by any observer familiar with his church work in New York, although they have little in common beyond the treatment of the tower of which their architect is so fond, the treatment of it, that is to say, as a solid and simple shaft itself of great plainness, but crowned not with a spire but with a mere belfry stage which becomes a diadem or tiara, as rich as he is permitted to make it. The ruggedness and simplicity which are the prevailing characteristics of Holy Trinity are, all the same, in marked contrast to the delicacy and richness which characterize All Saints. It would be hard to say which is the more effective in its own way and for its own purpose, for which in each case it is
carefully and successfully studied. The unusual breadth of the gable of All Saists would denote that it was an "auditorium church" in which the greatest width attainable was practically desirable. Otherwise, one would say that the more usual arrangement, in which the tower is carried to the ground as a separate structure and the foot of the gable confined to the space inside of it was more eligible than that adopted, which, to be sure, has the architectural advantage of visibly and effectively framing the projecting chapel which is so effective a feature and so thoroughly carried out in detail.

But, after all, the advantages of Gothic, even for ecclesiastical purposes, are less evident when the question is of a single church building than when it is of a parochial "plant," a group in which the flexibility of the style permits the architect to dispose all the members of his composition to the best practical advantage, and to enhance the inherent effect of such a disposition by the most directly expressive treatment. Mr. Barney has had in New York
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two opportunities of this enviable kind, albeit they are removed by their situations from the usual observation of persons interested in architecture, but may be more useful on that very account. One is Grace Chapel, including a hospital, a parish house and a clergy house in far eastern Fourteenth Street, and the other the Church of the Holy Trinity, including a rectory, or rather a "vicarage," and a parish house, "St. Christopher's House," in far eastern Eighty-eighth. Architecture is not "civics," but one may be allowed in an architectural review to express the wish that instead of two there might be twenty such centres of civilization on the East Side of New York, as there are many more than two in the East End of London, of which several, notably those designed by James Brooks, are as noteworthy architecturally as the two designed by Mr. Barney in New York. One hesitates to say that either of these most interesting works is architecturally superior to the other, considering the respective conditions and limitations. The later and richer, the Church of the Holy Trinity, however, has the adventitious advantages of a far more liberal allotment of ground for its purposes and of a far more liberal appropriation, with, naturally, a corresponding increase of effectiveness. As both these have been reviewed by the present reviewer in the present periodical, and in some detail, he may refer the reader who cares for more information about them than the illustrations afford to No. 6 of Vol. XIII. of the Architectural Record. But he may be permitted to repeat the judgment he there gave that the works in question "show such a strong and subtle artistic sense as is manifested in few indeed of the buildings of Manhattan Island." And the success of them seems to denote the applicability of the style in which they are composed to other than ecclesiastical uses, to all uses, indeed, where a group of buildings has to accommodate itself to a varying terrain, and the Procrustean method of design is manifestly inapplicable. It would have been extremely interesting to see, for example, what Mr. Barney would have done with that project for the enlargement of West Point which, to be sure, we all admit is in excellent hands as it is, but which seemed to call for precisely those qualities which he had exhibited in the design of these two parochial plants in New York.

A third, and a much more startling solution of the problem, presented by the parochial plant is now nearing completion in New York. It is startling because it is the first attempt to apply to such a plant the modern facilities of the elevator and the skeleton construction. Some ten years ago, indeed, an attempt was made in the parochial plant of St. Mary the Virgin to apply the steel frame to ecclesiastical uses, in what became known as a "Chicago church." But in that case the modernity consisted merely in employing the
modern appliance to the support of a system of apparent vaulting, and neither in general nor in detail can that work be acclaimed as a success. The present case that of the Broadway Tabernacle, driven a mile up-town because its old quarters were submerged by business, and become both too noisy and too costly to be available for its further occupation. The novelty, in the new quarters, is not in the church but in the appendages. It is a frank attempt to take advantage of the new construction, not in the sacred edifice itself, but in its “temporalities,” and to make up, in the accommodation of these, by altitude for the area that is lacking. Stated in words this programme is doubtless horrifying enough to the architect of tradition. But stated in terms of architecture, as it is in the plans and drawings herewith shown, is there really anything repellent about it? Nay, is it not distinctly more attractive, in some respects, than the traditional treatment would be in such a city as New York has grown to be. Poor old Trinity, a generation ago a landmark visible and conspicuous from the Orange hills, now shrunken by the greedy skyscrapers crowding in to get a gleam of light and a breath of air from the open spaces of its churchyard, how can one fail to resent the indignity which has been put upon it? And the case is typical. Not only can a church no longer afford, in a crowded American city to take the area necessary for the carrying out of a parochial plant in the old way, and spreading its apparatus of evangelization over the space it needs, but if it could do so, its edifices would be overshadowed and belittled by the altitudinous Mammon. The remedy is obvious. Let the church also go into the competition of aspiration. Let her, as Burke has it, “exalt her mitred front” and pile up her provision for spiritual needs, tier above tier.

In any case, this responsibility is not the architect’s. It were a very “cynical asperity” to hold him responsible for his problems. He is rightly responsible only for his solutions. Given the necessity of accommodating the requirements of a metropolitan church on a strip of land much too small to accommodate them after the old ecclesiastical fashion, and how has our architect handled it? It seems to me that he has handled it so well that it would not occur to anybody to be shocked by the result who was not resolved to be shocked beforehand; on the contrary, that the uncommitted spectator must be impressed not only with the beauty, but with the appropriateness and “churchliness” of the result. The difficulty of the problem of superposing the various provinces of parochial work, instead of grouping them on the same level, was much enhanced by, or at least it was much complicated with, the necessity of adjusting the structure to an unusually irregular plot, showing not only the irregularities resulting from the anomalousness of
Broadway in our street system, but also a special irregularity resulting from the fact that the North line of the lot is parallel or "normal" to no other. These irregularities are the despair of the architect of academic conventions, who ought to hail the street system of Manhattan as a great labor saver. They are the opportunities of the practitioner of free architecture, upon whom it is laid to overrule them into sources of architectural interest and beauty. In the present case, the irregularity of the North line is made available for the lighting of the North side, and its protection against whatever darkening skyscraper may come to be reared against that line, while the complication of irregularities has enabled the architect to adjoin to the church the little chantry at the North end of the front for which various practical uses suggest themselves, but which is quite its own excuse for being, in an architectural sense, by the variety and picturesqueness which it adds to the pile.

The general scheme is that of a decorous and well-behaved, though individual and interesting, Gothic church, having picturesqueness and interest added to it by the skilful advantage taken of the irregularity of the plot on which it stands, is completed, including transepts, but excluding the choir. The place of this latter is taken by a large tower, spreading at the base into transepts of its own, behind those of the church, and rising like a huge cimborio to the height of ten stories, frankly shown as such, and frankly devoted to the secular uses of the church. Although it has most evidently been evolved from the exigencies of the special case, this disposition gives the scheme a general resemblance to Trinity Church in Boston, especially since the West front of that church, the architectural West front, has been added. The one is carried out in the vigorous and massive Southern Romanesque which its author imported, and strove so hard, and at one time as it seemed with so much prospect of success, to domesticate: the other in an advanced and elaborate Gothic, advanced in some places to the verge of the French Renaissance. There are diversities of operations, but the same spirit. The Tabernacle may be described, roughly, as a Trinity minus the apse, but plus an additional transept. It is the cimborio that gives the resemblance. And if the elevator had been developed to its present usefulness thirty years ago, when Richardson planned Trinity, is it conceivable that he would not have seized the opportunity to give still greater predominance to his central feature? Even as it is, he has divided his belfry stage into two stories without any justification in the interior arrangement, and simply upon architectural grounds.

Doubtless the double transept is the questionable point in the Tabernacle, the double transept with the addition that the de-
signer has treated the transept which denotes the temporalities more ornately than that which denotes the spiritualities, that his uncomely parts may have more abundant comeliness. Pretty clearly there is a defect of expression here. But how admirably the cimborio "crowns the edifice" How well studied its relation to the smaller Western towns, which from the proper point of view, count as its pinnacles. How successful is the choice and combination of material, the pale buff of the brickwork with the pale gray of the terra cotta. How full of life and spirit is the modelling of this latter, really recalling the old work in comparison with the lifelessness of so much of most modern Gothic. In all these ways it seems to me to show the progress we have a right to look for, to be the best thing its author has yet done.

And there is no doubt at all that it is a pioneer which is destined to have followers. The practical advantages of the arrangement are such that it will impose itself upon even those architects whom the novelty of it now most horrifies. "Soyez de votre siecle" is the legend that is writ large in this tower. As a matter of careful and skilful composition, and as a matter of scholarly and spirited detail, it promises to be one of the most effective of its author's works. With this compound of tradition and revolution we may fitly close this survey of the work of an architect whose performance is already very considerable, but of whose work a main interest remains in the promise the performance gives that he has not yet done his best work nor said his last word.

*Montgomery Schuyler.*