

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1855.

No. IV.

Samuel Taylor

ARTICLE I.—*The Works of Thomas Reid, D. D.* Preface, Notes, and Supplementary Dissertations. By Sir William Hamilton, Bart. Edinburgh: 1846.

Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform. By Sir William Hamilton, Bart. Second Edition, enlarged. London: 1853.

THOUGH of Lord Bacon it was said, by his friend Dr. Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, "he writes philosophy like a Lord Chancellor," it must be admitted, Sir William Hamilton writes it like a philosopher. For he both thinks and writes, more like a pure intelligence, than any man in the history of speculation. In the first place, his diction is the most concise, the most accurate, the most direct, the most compact, and the most vigorous ever used by any writer on philosophy. Familiar with all systems of philosophy ever proposed, and their criticisms expository, supplementary and adverse, and a master of the languages, in which both the philosophies and the criticisms have been written; he has discovered how much of their errors can be ascribed to the deficiencies of language, both as an instrument and as a vehicle of philosophical thought; and he has, accordingly, formed a language for

ende Sprachforschung," because his engagements at Oxford render it impossible for him longer to assist in editing it, although he will still continue his contributions to its pages.

ART. IV.—*Church Architecture.*

IT is very manifest, notwithstanding the advance which has been made in church architecture within the last twenty years, that there is something still wanting—we have not yet attained to a proper church architecture. This is more strictly true of our own church, that is, of the Protestant church, than of any other. In the general revival of church life which has been going on within the last quarter of the century, and in the general revival of good taste which has, more or less, accompanied it, it has very naturally happened that those portions of Christendom whose religious sentiments seek their expression in ritualistic and symbolic forms, have found those forms at hand in the middle-age architecture. It is certainly a sign of better taste, if not of a better religious spirit, when we find ritualistic Christendom turning away from the tawdry worldliness of such architecture as that of St. Peter's and St. Paul's, and re-adopting the real and solemn forms of true cathedral art. Of course it were to be desired that they had attained to a form of faith which should have enabled them, for the time at least, to be independent of form; but that not being the case, it is assuredly better that their faith be crutched with a sombre Gothic pillar, than to be stilted upon so wretched an affectation as that of a pedestaled Greek column, falsely so called.

Protestant Christendom, however, finds no art to its hand. It has hitherto been above art. It has been doing battle for the truth; and in the meantime has gone into the Roman cathedral, into the oriental basilica, into the pseudo-Greek temple, into plain houses, and even into barns and caves to worship, scarcely stopping to see whether the tower, the dome, the plain ceiling, or the rafter were over its head. But now, as the strong man in the period of his vigour, finds it well to go

back to the poetry of his youth, even so has the Protestant church arrived at that point of progress, where she may stop to recover the beauty which she was constrained to pass by, in the warfare of her early progress. But this beauty, so far as it regards the arts of form, is yet to be created. It cannot be maintained that in this department there is as yet to be found a Protestant art. However glorious the work of the Reformation, as a moral and religious work, and as such, grand and heroic, beyond all earthly comparison—however sublime as a work of emancipation from the fearful thralldom of centuries and powers—however magnificent the conception of it under the view of its vast bulwarks of doctrine, its compact and towering masses of reason and logic, and however incomparably superior its products as witnessed in all that we mean by modern civilization—it must be frankly confessed that in the arts of form, and more especially in that of architecture, it has accomplished little or nothing, except as it has to some extent reanimated and adopted the forms of preceding periods. The only Protestant cathedral known to the world is that of St. Paul's, in London; a building composed of the Jesuitical elements of Italian art, and attempted to be made honest by the introduction of a pragmatistical English handsomeness, which has effectually exhausted it of all the ideality it ever possessed, which at its best estate was that of the fashion of this world, the low-lived fancifulness which is the single redeeming quality, in an artistic sense, of that great bauble of Italian art, ostentation and falsehood, St. Peter's of Rome. Surely the mind that could add the entablatures and pilasters of Renaissance style to the grand towers of Westminster Abbey, could not be expected to originate anything great and true, in dealing with the same elements on such a scale as that of St. Paul's. That these elements are skilfully arranged is not to be denied, and that St. Paul's is, in its way, an impressive building, will readily be admitted; but that these elements have been so mastered as to have formed a new creation, as to have added to the world of art an original idea, is plainly too remote even to be imagined. St. Paul's is but a smaller St. Peter's—and what, by the way, are such buildings as the Capitol at Washington, or the City Hall of New York, but smaller St. Paul's?

These latter buildings, indeed, are suitable to their purpose, and so might be St. Peter's or St. Paul's, if turned into a custom-house, or post-office, or hall of justice; but that as churches, as religious art, their architecture has but little that deserves the name, will appear, by imagining the City Hall turned into a church, or York Minster turned into a post-office.

It cannot be that the same style which is suitable for secular purposes and respectable as such, can be suitable or remain decorous when called into the service of religion. All architecture has its original in church architecture, and, in the absolute sense of the word, is probably confined to the same, because the highest architectural art, though ever resting in utility, yet cannot suffer a utility less noble than that of a religious consecration. It is a matter of fact that the originators of such architecture considered that the demands of the art, as such, could only be fulfilled in buildings devoted to religious uses. So thought and acted the architects of Egypt, so in like manner the architects of Greece, so also, it would seem, the architects of the middle ages. Egyptian architecture consists of an Egyptian temple. So, by all means, is a full Greek style to be found in that building only. The same thing is certainly, to a great extent, true of the Gothic. The remains of ancient architecture consist of temples, and it was not till genuine Gothic art was dying out that they applied the style to other than religious buildings. What would a middle-age architect have thought of a pointed window in a dwelling-house?

The law of which we are speaking has, in the case of the ancient orders, been fully tested by modern practice. Our attempts to revive Egyptian art have been little short of ridiculous, in nearly every instance. The modern world has not a single Greek style, fairly so called, that we are aware of, with the exception of a small copy of the Parthenon, said to have been built as a mausoleum by a late king of Prussia. As it respects Gothic architecture, the attempts thus far made in our own country most unequivocally go to show that this noble form of the art follows the same law as the ancient orders—its normal application is the church, its accomplished note is the cathedral. Imagine the builders of the Theseion, and of Co-

logne, brought to the view of our Doric cottages and Gothic villas! Perhaps the most remarkable of modern attempts at the secular application of the Gothic style, is to be found in the new houses of the English Parliament. The result is a notorious failure. How much more suitable would it be, even now, to turn that vast building into a church, or a college, and to send the Parliament into St. Paul's! It is not merely because we have been accustomed to see the pointed window in the church, or to associate the Grecian column with its temple, that we feel the inappropriateness of their application to secular uses—it is because also there is a veritable meaning of mystery in the pointed arch, and of beauty in the chiselled column, which all persons have recognized who have looked well upon a Grecian portico, or felt fully under a Gothic nave, and which at once assert their degradation when applied to less noble and sacred uses.

So, on the other hand, take this very amalgamation of the elements of Greek temple style with the Roman triumphal arch, at which, when professing to form a new religious art for Christian men, we instinctively revolt, and let it take its appropriate place in common life, as when giving form and dress to our country villas, when ornamenting our city fronts, when piled up into palatial halls, with their graceful balustrades, their noble cornices, and multiplied carvings and enrichments, and it does as instinctively win our admiration; it pleases the fancy, and we are ready to acknowledge that it has become a true and significant secular style, sufficiently various, flexible, worldly, and elegant for all ordinary civil purposes. It certainly has not thus become high art, but nevertheless it is art. It is descending into things of another kind, to compare religious architecture with civil. Let the palatial art of Italy be looked at in its place, and kept in its place, and it is among the finest products of modern times. It is not the Dante, or the Milton, or the Shakspeare, of the art, and hence its ostentatious offensiveness when aiming, with its small and disorderly elements, to imitate the tragic greatness of cathedral style; but it is the ablest architectural comedy that has ever been composed; it is the truest product of the fancy that has ever

been devised in brick and stone—it has all the gracefulness of the Moresco without its wildness—it is, in a word, the city or civil style for the world. Few finer sights can be imagined, than that of an avenue like Broadway, flanked throughout its length with the multitudinous art of Brunelleschi and Palladio, balcony and roof crowded with gay citizens, to watch the progress of some grand civic display. But the feeling thus excited is, after all, essentially a worldly one. It becomes mournful to think, that all this beauty and gaiety shall pass away. Venice was the queen of cities; but there are few more sadly desolate places than Venice, with her halls and palaces deserted. No such feeling, however, have we associated with the religious art of any people. The forsaken cathedrals of Protestant Europe, and the remaining temples of the time of Pericles, stand to this day, their own abiding witness, and their own sufficiency. They were not made after the fashion, and their fashion passeth not away. The people, the times, the uses, are essential to the life of secular art—whereas the grand Minster of York is still, as of old, when filled with Catholic worshippers, solemn, impressive, and beautiful as ever. When we contemplate the architecture of Pompeii, we think at once, and with sadness, of the people that lived and moved in the midst of it, while the independent beauty of the Parthenon enraptures our thoughts, and we only mourn over its own decay. Civil architecture needs the life of man to give it countenance; religious architecture, if it be truly such, bears its own life, and gives countenance to men—only another form of saying that religious art is intrinsically real; secular art is more or less conventional. A certain appearance of self-consciousness, and consequent play of activity, form a necessary element in a city or civil style, the least touch of which begins to be ruinous to the true spirit and dignity of church architecture. City style must go out to meet the citizen; religious art only waits for men to come to it. Civil art must be various, multiform, and little at rest; it defeats itself whenever it aims to be great and dignified—religious art is severe, simple, composed, and enduring, like the earth on which it stands, while men and things are passing away. The sense of final rest, of absolute immobility with which the perpetual minster has settled its foundations into the solid globe,

should never be imparted to our houses, private or public. If these have weight and strength to last their few generations it is enough—the church is the only structure in this world, that has right to be built for all time that is to come, and as such, it should be built—not merely our great churches, our cathedrals—but every town, every village even, of the land should have, at least, one building which should seem to be built for eternity, and that building should be the church, while every other building in the place should seem to be built for time.

It is plain then, upon the intrinsic reasons referred to, that the architecture of our churches should be different from that of the houses and buildings in which we live and traffic: in other words, that if we really have a church architecture, it will make itself and keep itself distinct in the idea of it, from the architecture of our dwellings and public buildings. But while this is not the case, and if the Protestant world should not be destined or commissioned ever to bring it to pass, it will still remain true by the common laws of mental association which yet adhere to us, that the places where we go to worship should be as different as may be in the proprieties of the case, from those in which we eat and sleep and laugh, and carry on the daily affairs of life and business. If the idea and sentiment of our church style do not hold forth and discourse the consecrated meaning of the building, then its purpose should be distinctly represented by means of regular appropriated parts, and formal arrangements in the building, or else by the addition of some one distinguishing element, as the spire. It has come to be not unfrequently the case that throughout our cities, and alas, too, in our country towns and villages, where in olden times they would as soon have thought of building a house without windows, as a church without a steeple—we must pass by Christian sanctuaries having nothing except their closed doors on the week day, to let us know whether they are churches, or halls of record, or hospitals, or what not. Surely if the men who are building splendid churchly houses are not unwilling to add a kitchen to let us know that they are places to dwell in, we who are building indistinguishable churches, ought at least to be equally willing to add something to inform the stranger that they are places to worship in.

We are speaking now, it is true, of the church architecture that prevailed from the time of the dying out of the good old steeple-style through the prevalence of the Grecian spirit, until within the past ten years or so, since which time there has sprung up an almost universal tendency towards the revival of the mediæval forms. Whether wisely or not, remains to be seen. Whether the Romanesque, the Anglo-Norman, and even the pure perpendicular religious art be adequate to the sentiment and uses of a Protestant service, is at the outset a very doubtful question. There may be indeed no objection in itself considered, to taking certain elements of the perpendicular style, as for instance the pointed window with its mullions and tracery, for the purpose of ornamenting the enclosing walls of our churches. The Gothic window is a beautiful object of itself, just as the Grecian column is, and we see no reason why that window or that column may not as well lead off the ornamental character of the room, as any other existing form of carving or arrangement. It is not the mere repetition of Gothic windows that makes a Gothic style. It becomes a very different thing, however, when we are tempted to multiply the imitations, to add the clere-story with its side-aisles and clustered pillars, the transept-crossing and the groined ceiling. Such a building turns out to be Gothic indeed, and for a church turns out to be full of interfering elements that have lost their significancy to the Protestant Christian, dim mediators at the best, whose solid symbolism is but a stumbling-block to his religion—a place that is not completed without an altar, and that proves itself to be practically useless for the purposes of an articulate service.

So also as it respects the making use of a Grecian style of finish. Where a column or support is actually needed, there can be no objection to fluting the pillar, and capping it with an echinus or volute, and thus making it a Grecian pillar, and then letting that style of finish give character to whatever of architecture the building may have—even to the preposterous waste of pilasters and entablatures that are so persistently made to deface the wall behind the pulpit. But when we come to build a regular temple in autae, and to throw out a full columnar ordinance in front, then do we profess to be making

a Grecian building. Now, since it is essential to *church* architecture that it be consistent throughout, the moment we make that profession we ought, as honest Christian men, at once to stop up the windows behind the columns, and in strict honesty, those along the sides and rear also, open the roof to the skies, and then see if we are any better off here than amid the reverberations of Gothic groins, pillars, and pendentives. Not that we are bound to open the roofs of our churches to the weather because the ancient Grecks did theirs, but because it is intrinsically a violation of the idea of a Grecian building to make holes in its walls, and it is artistically injurious to a column in air to break up its back-ground with windows; and because a Christian church, if it cannot find its completeness in the best, must not consent to prank itself upon a portion, from whatever quarter taken. Still, with all the drawbacks of modern necessities, not to speak of the wholly gratuitous and most wanton violation of the cella wall by false windows, mock cornices, and flagrant string-courses—notwithstanding its forlorn elevation upon steps and basements, still is it hard to rob a Grecian portico of all its beauty, and it remains, even in the fragmentary state in which it is found in all modern examples, eminent among the things of grace and beauty that greet our eyes. Thankful shall we ever be for the sight of a Corinthian portico like that of Girard College, injured as it is by the frittered back-ground of the cella walls; of Doric ordinances like those of the Custom-houses of New York and Philadelphia, poorly off as they are with their stylobate of meagre steps; of an Ionic order like that of the Associate Church in Lafayette Place, crushed and vilified as it is by its steeple.

A portico, however, is but a single part of a Grecian order, and even if the porticoes are continued in a peristyle, it will remain for ever impossible to unite them with a modern building. Chaos and creation, fire and water, will as easily unite, as Greek columns with windowed walls. The Christian Church, therefore, is clearly shut off from a full Greek style. The interior of a Greek temple is not the place for a living Christian. If we shall ever get it entire—and if we do we shall get perhaps the most perfect work that the hands of man have fashioned—we must get it for the dead. Indeed the day may

not be far distant when we shall come to feel the propriety of confining our Egyptian and Doric architecture to our cemeteries. And, as it respects those spasmodic and partial attempts at the art of Greece, which appear in the porticoes of our churches, beautiful as they are in themselves, yet would they be far more becoming elsewhere—more beautiful perhaps as forming the entrance to a burial-ground, more beautiful in air, and more appropriate. Artistic propriety, as well as our moral sense, we repeat it, requires of church architecture that it be honest and consistent, neither of which qualities can co-exist with a windowed house and Grecian columns. Religious art is of that nature that it becomes plagiarism to adopt anything which it cannot assimilate. We would not actually destroy these church porches, for many of them are beautiful stoæ. Those which are in themselves correctly proportioned and well made, we could wish removed to more suitable places; while of very many of them, of all such for instance as the malformation which blots the front of the Church of the Epiphany in Philadelphia, and hundreds like it, it were to be wished they had been put into a spire, or sent on missions, or cast into the dock.

It does not by any means follow, that because our church style cannot appropriate Greek art, it must be entirely given up for modern uses. It is indeed our opinion, as we have hinted, that since a full Grecian order, in other words, a Greek peripteral temple, cannot be obtained in connection with the church the only remaining possibility of our securing such a boon must be in connection with that form of utility which is next sacred to that of the church, the uses, namely, of the tomb. But as to Grecian columns, they will remain beautiful as long as beauty lasts, and Greek porticoes and propylæa may be made as appropriate to civil and academic purposes as they were of old. It may, indeed, be not impossible that if the Doric temple could be *enlightened* (we intend the double meaning,) it might be the place for the Christian church. It may not be impossible that it is yet intended the Christian faith shall do with the architecture of this wonderful people something analogous to that which it has done for their language—that something of that which the language of Plato has acquired in the New Testament, the language of Phidias may acquire in Christian art.

It is manifest, however, that as yet Greek architecture has not been christianized—and for that very reason let our quotations from it continue to be applied and to be confined to secular uses. Civil architecture can not only afford to give way to a certain play of disorder, to a palpable freedom of strict unity, but it must do so or it loses its distinguishing quality. Remove the unnecessary windows from the front of Girard College, and place them behind the portico of the Philadelphia Mint, and both buildings will be improved. For the same reason turn our Grecian churches into banks, or public offices, and they will gain in beauty by the change, because they will gain in a kind of utility which is sufficiently common to receive without assimilating, and to exhibit without destroying the portions of the style applied. The pure Greek columns which adorn and render good practical service to the Bourse of Paris, the Custom-House of Liverpool, and which might have been made to do the same for the Exchange in New York, are really more beautiful in their places, because not so æsthetically incongruous, and because they are far more actually useful than as they stand in the most perfect church porticoes in the land. Philosophers and orators found shade and shelter in ancient stoæ, and scholars and merchants may put them to a like good service now—but as for our churches, they do not need a portico. It is not seemly for Christian people to dally about the church door, and it is not wise or salutary to tempt them with the shade and beauty of Grecian pillars. Such an ordinance at the church front forms a kind of beauty with which the building should not coalesce, if it could—a colonnade that leads to nothing, a resting-place that ought not to be rested in, and, at last, a row of supporting columns which ought not to have anything to support. What every church does need is a vestibule, and what every church vestibule should run into is a steeple or spire. Whatever may be the architecture of a church, or whether it have any architecture or not, we hold that it is not a church until it have a spire. Nothing yet devised can take its place, or answer its purpose. The cupola belongs to the court-house, and the dome belongs to the world. The bulbous dome belongs to Bram, the obelisk to Isis, the minaret to the false prophet—the truncated pyramidal tower,

and the tall tapering spire are the inalienable property of the Christian church. We hold that the steeple is as essential to constitute a church, as are the walls to make the building. Not because it has its type in the temple of Solomon, which, as far as the principle is concerned it has—not, that starting in mere use, it rises up into a free-will offering as it does, (the part above the belfry having not the least use in the world)—not that its aspiring lines have a tendency to direct the thoughts toward the heavens, as to all so disposed, they do—not for any other reason than the plain fact that a building with a spire means and is a church, and that a building without a spire does not have that meaning and is not that thing. This fact stares us in the face, and this is it at last which must, if nothing else does, effectually abolish Grecian columns from our church fronts. The impossibility of effecting an union between the horizontal style and windows may be thought by some to be imaginary, but the man who can look without a shudder upon a Grecian portico with a steeple on the top of it, may rest assured that he has no call to trouble himself with our subject. If a greater architectural folly can be acted than that of joining the spire with a Grecian style, it can only be that of joining the obelisk with it—a thing they are trying to do at Washington. We trust the nation will wash their hands of it. Only give us back again such churches as the Old Brick of New York, as St. Peter's of Philadelphia, and much as we love Greek columns, we should be willing never to see another, if they cannot be seen in more suitable position than as they are made to form the useless frontispiece of the Christian church.

It is our deliberate opinion, notwithstanding the general benefit of which the revival of the pure Grecian orders in our churches has been the occasion, it is our opinion that nothing was gained for the churches themselves which can at all compensate for the loss of the spire. A plain brick church, with a perfectly simple but tall steeple, such as was that of old Trinity, is altogether a more respectable, and infinitely more becoming, and a more truly educating object, than a marble or granite building, like the one referred to in Lafayette Place, having a row of columns in front, at a cost of more than enough to have thrown

up a spire which would have perpetually declared and inculcated the holy purpose of the building.

That the return to the perpendicular art of the middle ages which is now going on in our church architecture, is an advance upon that which it has immediately displaced, is not to be denied. All the world knows that St. Mark's in Philadelphia, and Trinity in New York, that Dr. Potts's, Dr. Phillips's, Dr. Alexander's, are churches—that they are Christian churches. But is it certain they are Protestant Christian churches? This is a question which we are by no means prepared to discuss. It, of course, involves the great question, whether the modern world, which is Protestant Christendom, is destined to give origin to a new kind of art. It is very certain that thus far, our steps are wholly tentative. In architecture, certainly, we have made nothing new. We are for the most part, as yet in the analytic period even in the use of the old elements. Critical knowledge is the highest quality of our practice. Very few of the Gothic structures of our country can be said to possess any distinct originality. They are chiefly compilations. Trinity spire is almost the only example we have, of Gothic composition, showing a high degree of architectural power. The architect of that masterly piece, has taken Gothic elements and created a living product. It possesses indeed a remarkable degree of ideality and power. But of most of our churches, thus far, it must be confessed that the draughtsman and builder appear more than the artist and poet.

Assuredly the works of preceding ages are the property of those that come after, and we have the same right to make fresh combinations out of the Egyptian, Greek, Roman, or Gothic elements of constructive art, if we can—the same right that we have to make use of the language of those who have gone before us. But this is exactly the point at which we fail. We have made nothing new, we do little else than to utter faint-like imitations. There is this fact which we have noticed, and noticed with pain, in passing along the streets of New York, that her architects in dealing with Renaissance elements as shown in mansions, stores, and rows of houses, seem to give evidence of far more creative power, variety, and freedom of imagination, than the tiresome sameness of the Gothic churches

can lay any claim to. Why is this? Is it so that the mere fact that he is making a design for a church should embarrass the artist's freedom? is it because Italian art is more flexible than the Gothic? The latter cannot be the case. There are no two cathedrals of Europe alike, there are scarcely two things alike in any one of them. Or may it not be that the architect does not as yet know exactly what he is about, when he comes to make a design for a church? May it not be that all our ideas on this matter are so ill-formed and indistinct, that we do not ourselves know precisely what we want for a church, except that it be a building to seat so many people, and have a pulpit in it? May it not be then, that while the particular elements of a Gothic finish are multiform as they are, the parts of a Gothic style are for that reason also many and various, and that the obvious explanation of the prevalent monotonous effect of our Gothic churches, is because they have not space and parts to make them otherwise? We can see no reason why the Episcopal Gothic churches so generally excel our own in their architectural effect, as they certainly do, except it be that they take up a greater number of the parts of the order. If it is necessary that our churches be built upon the plan of an unvarying parallelogram, then it will follow that if filled up with the same order of finish, whether Greek, Roman, or Gothic, they must be little else than repetitions of each other. The unsatisfying something complained of in our church buildings, be it sameness, tiresomeness, lack of character, or by whatever name called, we must attribute to the want of any adequate theory of a church building, on the part of the architect, and the consequent attempt to impress a character of beauty upon that which has not sufficient character to take up the impression. We demand a church, and he gives us a variously ornamented room and building, which might as well be called by some other name. The want of character, of ecclesiastical nationality, if we may use the phrases, which so generally marks our church style is, we repeat it, to be charged to the general want of a sufficient theory, or idea, of a Protestant Christian Church.

Now it is to be remembered that, the peculiar finish of the style being given, and it is contained in the pointed arch, then the great glory of the middle-age cathedral, is due originally to

so apparently simple a circumstance, as that of their seeking to represent the cross laid upon the ground. Hence the choir, nave, and transept-crossing, which so astonishingly make up the vastness of its art, well nigh overwhelming the beholder with the sense of infinitude in every direction. The side aisles give rise to the clere-story, with its sustaining piers and arches within, and its flying buttresses without. The clere-story comes to its finish in the groined roof, and its crossing starts up the great central tower, and lets down the grand pendentives which sustain it from beneath. The parts thus formed had each its appropriate and significant use, and thus grew up the cathedral, or which is the same thing, the Christian architecture, which reached its perfection in the middle ages. Now we may, it is true, get the reduced nave of a cathedral by itself, or the choir, or a transept wing; but a cathedral we cannot have without the whole of its parts; nor can we get an approximate Gothic church style, except as we make some considerable approximation towards the parts and arrangements of the cathedral. The churches we are building, however, and of whose want of character we complain, are in general not so much as a reduced nave or choir—they are commonly but a parallelogram of wall, ornamented with Gothic windows, ribs, brackets, and carvings. There can be no individuality, because there is no room for it; and then, when in order to attain this, we begin to add to the nave its side-aisles, with heavy clustered pillars and groined ceiling, we begin to find—whether the building be incongruous in sentiment or not—that as a matter of fact it is unfit for the use of a congregation, who seek to worship God in a language, and to be instructed by sermons, which they can hear and understand. Thus, as in the former case, whether our æsthetic speculations were correct or not, we arrived at an unquestionable point, where one of two things must give way—the Grecian portico, or the churchly steeple; so here, whatever may be thought of our speculations, as to the æsthetic incongruity or otherwise, between Gothic style and Protestant worship, we have come to an actual dilemma, where the choice is, in fact, between Gothic groins and pillars, or the Protestant sermon and service.

Whether, then, the spirit of Gothic art be reconcilable with

the spirit of Protestant Christianity or not—whether the sombre and indefinable mysteriousness of its deep channelled mouldings, its dark shadows, its imprisoning groins and arches, be consentaneous with the childlike confidingness and joyful freedom of the Reformed faith, or not—or whether the existence of the style, to say nothing of the sentiment of it, in the immense cathedral masses of the middle ages, be not of itself the witness of a concentration of ghostly power, that is, of a hierarchy, which furnishes its own evidence that it cannot be appropriated by the Protestant Christendom of the present age, without danger of compromising its religious trust and injuring its priestly freedom—whatever may be thought of these questions, we have the actual fact as the result of our experience, so far as trial has been fairly made, that a Gothic building, with its transept and side-aisles, its clustered pillars and groined ceiling, turns out to be a place not for worshippers who go to church to hear the gospel read or preached, and to join in the prayers of the congregation, but is, as it was intended to be, a place for a service to be exhibited before the people, and to be conducted for them, without more voluntariness on their part than that of their bodily presence and submission. The truth is, that when we come to think of the apparent meagerness of the most affluent of the Reformed liturgies, in comparison with the architecture that surrounds it, as of the English ritual in the choir of York Minster, we shall almost be constrained to conclude, without further argument, that it is not a part of the mission of the Protestant nations to seek to give any further expression to their faith, in the forms of religious art, than that of the perfunctory use of those forms, whatever they are, which happen to be most conveniently at hand. This much at least, in the present state of things, would appear to be certain, that whatever the style of our Protestant art may be, it cannot be Gothic. We cannot imagine ourselves entering *con amore* these mediæval temples to worship without having retreated from our present position. The Christian church of the Reformation has no service to which the visible glory and symbolism of Gothic art are other than a waste or a degradation. We may admire its forms as men, nay, for the time, as Christian men, but as Protestants we cannot religiously appropriate

them. In order to our cordially using it, and such is the only real use of art, the cathedral must become protestantized, or our faith must become gothicized. We may continue to use the elements of Gothic style as convenient and beautiful forms of church ornament, but the mechanical application of the forms of an elder style is a far different thing from the cordial appropriation of them. Indeed we very much question whether the Protestant faith is even yet sufficiently strong and intelligent to be with safety put to the temptation. We may imagine that our faith, in its higher spirituality, is above all visible symbolism except what we have in church and sacraments—we may fancy that we are capable of using indifferently all, any, or no art, and that we are far and for ever beyond the poetic period in these respects—but, notwithstanding all this, when we consider the native tendencies of our minds to form and idol, and the insidious sway which every religious symbolism has acquired over the hearts of its subjects, we cannot but tremble at the idea of the Protestant world generally making experiment of genuine cathedral art. With all its true beauty, and what stage of the true religion has ever been without it? a Gothic nave is a fearful place, and cathedral art has a power that would, in its own time and way, sooner or later, compel cathedral worshippers to a cathedral service. The only adequate cathedral service is the mass. The very idea is preposterous—turn any Protestant congregation into a Gothic cathedral, and where are they, and what have they for the place?

Having therefore, as we think, come clearly to the conclusion that neither the Grecian nor Gothic is a proper Protestant style, the question arises, what shall we substitute for them? What we have to offer on this point, of course presumes to be nothing more than some simple suggestions founded upon general principles. If so grand a product as the cathedral has grown up upon so simple a plan as the cross, we may hope it is not impossible for us to make a beginning which also shall grow to something great, suitable, and beautiful in the end. What then might be the result if we were to endeavour to ascertain more explicitly what we need in a church building? The thing needed certainly lies at the foundation of the archi-

tektural art. Nothing but confusion and equivocation, or at best, a mere fancifulness, can otherwise be the result. A man is always safer in seeking to make beautiful the thing he knows he wants, than in labouring to make something beautiful of which he is afterwards to devise the use. The greater part of the truly painful mistakes made in domestic style, within the past twenty years, would not exist as they do, to the disgrace of the land, and the distress of many families, had this simple canon been observed. Suppose then, we should begin by asking ourselves, what it is that the Christian congregation fairly needs. If this be no more than to answer the wants of a promiscuous company of people come together to hear a sermon, then any convenient room having a pulpit in it, will answer its purpose. If it be not proper to resolve the Christian congregation into its constituent elements and functions, and to allow that resolution of elements and functions to prompt the constructive theory of the building, then it is manifest that our church style ought to be, and must continue to be, the indefinable and uncharactered thing that it is. The lecture-room is the church's type, and the artist's ingenuity must find play on the walls. If, however, the Christian congregation, as such, be a multiplicity in unity, if it have its distinct elements and functions, then is it, in all probability, right and proper that these its constituent parts should be provided for, and to some degree represented in its architecture. Not necessarily symbolically represented, which might be in the end only an acting over again the story of middle-age art; but so represented as that there be at least a place for everything, and that everything be in its place.

The three attributes of worship, teaching and government, are the scriptural attributes of the Christian congregation. Why might it not be well for each of these to be provided for and represented in the building? As it is, the faculty of government is in our churches entirely lost sight of. The eldership has no place in the church except it be the session-room. The Dutch Reformed churches do a little better, inasmuch as they provide seats for their elders at the sides of the pulpit. We have heard even this objected to, as making invidious distinctions in the congregation. But surely if the Bible has in

fact made a difference of order in the church, we may not fear properly to bring out that difference in the building. If the idea of government be in the church, then it cannot be improper to have that idea actually represented, or in some way visibly held forth to the view of the congregation.

The prevailing idea in the minds of our young people, and many others, of a church session is, that it is a body whose business consists in carrying persons through a certain ordeal, in view of coming to the sacraments; indeed, it is by no means a far fetched explanation of the loose notions of church government, that is, of Presbyterianism, so prevalent among our people, which would attribute much of that vagueness to the fact, that our eldership is so democratically merged in the mass of the congregation. Episcopacy ever sees itself in its bishop, the Papacy in its pope, and the Presbyterian Church ought to give its people and its children the like advantage. The governing body of the church should be in sight of the congregation. Let the minister and his elders have a distinct part of the building; let the ground-plan of the building so alter its lines at the pulpit end, as that such a provision shall come to form an integral portion of the edifice—not a recess for a sofa, but a wing for the Presbytery. It is indeed to be regretted, that this word has been confined to its present application. The minister, with his elders, forms the governing body, the congregational Presbytery of the particular church, and—whatever we may say about mere names—the image of a Christian congregation, with its preaching and ruling elders in its sight, as the Christian Presbytery to whom we owe obedience, set over that congregation by the Lord, carries with it an impression of dignity and scriptural antiquity, which is not improved certainly by calling that body a session. However this may be, we have the thing, and if it is to make its proper impression it should be adequately provided for. In this way we should at least gain one additional part to the building, and every such addition will of course increase the variety, and give room for architectural skill. Should this Presbyterium, so to call it, do no more than give a new part to the building and be finished with plain walls and surrounding seats, it would have the good effect of abolishing the attempts at ornament which

so generally spoil the wall back of the pulpit in our churches; whether these consist in upholstery, in mock points of Greek temples, in plaster gothic windows or in frescoe imitations.

As it respects the function of teaching little more can be said than that a sufficient prominence should be given to the pulpit, and that the audience-room should be constructed in reference to facility of sound, and the convenient position of the congregation. Most of our churches are sufficiently provided for in these respects. But would it not be well to seek to bring out more distinctly in our church style this idea of instruction, by means of a regular provision in front of the pulpit, to be appropriated to catechumens? This might be done, perhaps, by widening the middle aisle so as contain a row of benches. It were to be wished we could dispense with the use of galleries—but they appear to be a necessary evil, though not by any means in all cases. There are many of our churches containing an outlay in bad ornament which would have gone far towards making the building large enough on the ground plan to have obviated the necessity of a gallery. It requires less exertion of voice on the part of the speaker, to fill a very large room with free space, than it does to make himself heard in a much smaller one, where the space is obstructed with galleries and pillars. The New Testament leaves us in no doubt that preaching the gospel, in the proper sense of that term, is a principal part of the office of the Christian Church, and it is perfectly obvious, therefore, however desirable on the score of good looks certain architectural forms and arrangements may be, that if they render a room inconvenient for a congregation seeking to be instructed by sermons, they must give way. We wish not only to be able to hear the sermon, but also to see the preacher; and as no one would build a public lecture-room or concert-hall, and spoil its space with a multitude of pillars, so and much more should these obstructions, if possible, be kept away from our churches. Not merely however are these things of the nature of obstructions to sight and sound. They are artistic impertinences, unless sufficiently prominent to lead off the style, in which case, as we have seen, they become utterly ruinous to the building for a Protestant service. They interfere with solemnity of space in the same way that win-

dows corrupt the repose of the Grecian cella. There is a grand character, to the eye of all who have looked much at these things, in the unbroken expanse of a perfectly smooth wall, notwithstanding our architects seem so greatly to abhor it. So also an untroubled region of space, enclosed by the walls of a large building, has a character of its own—a character, which if the region enclosed be not sufficiently large to produce the effect of grandeur and solemnity, it may at least, that of stillness and quiet. No church with galleries can impart this feeling, so essential to the proper church feeling, to the same degree as one without them. The pillars and groins of interior Gothic art cease to be interferences in space, by being made so prominent as to take possession of the space and endow it. The air locked up by a Gothic arch, or imprisoned in its mouldings is, in its way, as much a part of the effect of the style, as is the solid material. But the Protestant Church is the church of freedom. It cannot imprison its spaces, it should not fill them up, and so fritter them away. It should cast out the pillars, and leave the space to speak its own language and do its own work. Let us rest assured it will do it well, if we will but consent to let it alone. We would undertake to make at least a still, solemn, and Sabbath-like room, of almost any of our churches, which are now a mere uncharactered Babel within, by removing galleries, pillars, pilasters, and petty mouldings, and placing ground, or stained glass in the window sashes.

We are naturally led to the third attribute of the Christian congregation, that of worship. Just how far the building itself should directly excite the feeling of worship, it is a very difficult thing to say. That the cathedral does this to a wonderful degree, no one can deny. Whether it is good and safe to worship habitually in such a building, is a very different question. The feeling of worship is also excited by the great subterranean cavern, by the wild forest, by the storm, and by the cataract. Is this the best condition of the feeling however? or rather, is not its normal state that which we experience when abroad in free nature, in the wide fields, under the complacent vault of heaven, at the rising or setting of the sun? Of the two we should say, the one is that of bondage, the other that of

freedom. Perhaps then we should aim that our church interior should produce an impression, not gloomy and hierarchical, but a true Sunday impression, the elements of which are sacred rest, freedom, and joy; the correlatives in style would be quiet, extent and simplicity, in a word the power and tranquillity of ærial expanse as opposed to a brooding symbolism of forms. In the one the worshipper will certainly have more to do on his own part, but he is not exposed to the danger of the factitious, not impossibly the idolatrous, feeling engendered by the other. If the feeling excited by the contemplation of nature at rest, as contradistinguished from that excited by the view of nature in action, forms a fair illustration of the Protestant form of religion, as compared with the Roman Catholic, then Protestant style ought to be one of broad, definite limits, with nothing of an embryonic, and nothing of a mysterious cast within it, or about it. The atmosphere of our churches, while it should be as spacious and as free from all stricture as possible, should be perfectly genial, and so pervaded throughout by a law well-known, that the feeling of fearfulness, of irksomeness, and of incomprehensibility should find no place. Keeping in mind this distinction, let us remember that there is one feeling which should always be excited when we enter a church, and that is the feeling of reverence; and the one great principle we would lay down with regard to the interior of our churches in this respect, is, that anything that will properly tend to promote this feeling may be introduced, and that everything which would tend to lessen or destroy it, should be avoided. We must be able to feel, as we enter the building, that we come there to worship God.

The question of proportion in building is very much one of a transcendental nature. There is a certain relation of the dimensions of length, height, and breadth to each other, which when exactly attained, as in a room for instance, produces a feeling of complaisant satisfaction. Now if these dimensions are so increased as to enclose a considerable space, then in addition to the feeling of good proportion, will be the impression of size, and that to a degree far greater than is due to the actual capacity of the space enclosed. This effect of good proportion in exaggerating size, is observable even in an ordinary

room. A well proportioned room of small dimensions will have the effect of a much larger one, whose proportions are bad. In the absence then of any positive architecture, we must endeavour to secure the impression of solemnity, and at the same time of sacredness, by means of the actual size of the interior, enhanced by good proportions. When we enter a church, let us find in every direction, above, before and around us, a free and untrammelled scope for the eye and the mind, with nothing irksome, and nothing to overawe, but something broad, lofty, capacious and still; something which, in virtue of its mere size, shall impart the sense of greatness, and of its good proportions, shall convey the feeling of composure and rest.

As it respects the limiting finish to the interior dimension upward, it is one of the most difficult of architectural problems. The dome and the groined ceiling are the only successful solutions of modern times, the one of which is too secular, the other too churchly for our use. We are scarcely able to imagine what was the effect of the Grecian hypæthral; but it showed, whatever it was, they felt the difficulty which we feel in ceiling the space above. The ordinary flat ceiling of our churches is nearly as bad as can be; a flat ceiling ornamented with panels, or heavy ribs, or frescoes, is worse; the semi-circular, or elliptical, smooth groin is still more crushing. Perhaps there should be no actual finish in that direction. Since our climate will not permit us to open the roof to the skies, it may be, that to show the actual construction of sloping roofs, rafters, and cross-ties, may be the best arrangement that can be made. Certainly more so, even if left in the rough, than to waste the immense space included in the triangle of the roof, by closing it over with a solid flat ceiling. It is a fixed principle, where the object is to secure anything like a grand effect, that the eye should not be brought to a sudden close from above. Even the groined ceiling of the Gothic is oppression, except in cases where it has great height, and the relief of the central tower. The interior dome, which is the one merit of Roman art, has its good effect only as it is relieved by side-ports and the central lantern. It may be because we are so accustomed in nature to a limiting horizon around us, and to none above, that the mind finds it irksome to consent to a palpable zenith in a building; and hence that the

indistinctness which by means of the upward distance, of complication of beams and rafters, and variety of light and shades, may be brought about without an actual ceiling, will form the very best ceiling of itself.

Besides the impression of size produced by the general dimensions of a well-proportioned interior—and here the most common mistake made in our churches is that of want of height—the addition of the spacious room behind the pulpit, and an equally bold addition at the opposite end for the choir, would vastly tend to increase the total impression. The Presbyterium and the choir should be far more spacious than any of the incipient attempts we have seen—they should be carried up to the full height of the inner walls, and arched over. The choir would form the interior of the spire above the vestibule. Thus are we led to the exterior of the building, concerning which we have at present but a single word to say. It is to repeat what has already been affirmed, that it is, as it appears to us, for the present at least, impossible to erect a building which can in any really distinguishing sense, be called a church, except as such building shall have its steeple. A church building to be such, ought to be a building not capable of being turned, without manifest desecration and absurdity into anything else. The steeple, so far as we can at present see, is the one and only architectural element which will effectually stigmatize any church edifice which has been diverted from its proper religious to a secular use.

We are well aware, that in saying what we have on our subject, we have not escaped the common temptation of the critic. It is certainly much easier to find fault than to show a better way. That our church architecture is very deficient, we are not at liberty to doubt; that we can do much towards the remedy we are not so vain as to imagine. Nevertheless the point we are urging seems to us to have the force of something real. Many, very many of our churches have nothing about them, or within them, except the pews and the pulpit, in the least significant of a sacred purpose. Many of them are so overlaid with trivial ornaments, the walls so broken up with panels, cornices, and pilasters, and the space so crowded with pillars and huge brackets, that the first feeling upon entering

them is one of positive distress and confusion. Now, we think that the sense of the powers of the world to come, with which we strive to go to the house of God on the Sabbath, should not be cast back by the worldly architecture of the building. We think that a church can be made to be at once sacredly significant, and that this will be effected by making it actually suitable. And, although it is our opinion that the ground-plan of no one of our churches is adequate to its purpose, yet we think that the removal of superfluous architecture from the most of them, would leave an interior which would at least have the advantage of not injuring the composed and reverential state of mind in which the worshipper may be as he enters the church door; that the mass of space enclosed will, if well-proportioned, and not needlessly obstructed, of itself go far towards producing this good effect; that, as a general principle of interior style, nothing should be introduced which would hurt the proportions, enfeeble the power, or injure the tranquillity of this mass of pure consecrated air. Abundance of ornament, common-place ornament, smallness of mouldings, gaiety of carving or colour, all articles for mere beauty's sake, (falsely so called,) in a word, whatever goes by the name of rich, gorgeous, elegant, should be put out of our churches, and confined to civil style. If there is a place about our churches to which this description of style may be applied, it can only be the spire as it rises above the building, at which point we may say, "Give all thou canst." Let this, as it rises towards heaven, rise with a richness of beauty as lavish, gorgeous, and superb as the imagination of the architect can well devise, and the hearts of the people can furnish. Where elaborateness of outlay and finish may properly find place within, let it be fit, and confined to particular places and things. A thousand dollars spent on a really superb and beautiful baptismal font or communion-table, will do more towards true effect upon the eye and feelings of the congregation, than ten times the amount distributed among carved cornices, gallery bulwarks, and pulpit fronts. Good taste will make the pulpit itself as unpretending as possible, its adjuncts—the place of the pulpit, prominent and decisive. And as to the particular cast of the interior finish, it should be churchly—it should be something,

like the entire order, made and kept sacred to its use and purpose. We should not find in our churches the same forms and lines that we are accustomed to in our houses, and other secular buildings. The mere entering a room which is suitably different, in its general appearance, in the objects which meet the eye, in the decorousness of its details, in the tone of its light and colour, from that to which we have been accustomed during the week, will assist the mind to a proper state of feeling. Let then the dimensions of our churches be as large, generous, even gratuitous, as may be, especially in loftiness, in which respect they may be distinguished from all other buildings—let there be distinct portions of additional spaces having their assignable place and purpose, let the light be subdued, not made gloomy, but by all means let the interior view be shut off from objects without, let the eye rest on large masses of wall, on bold, broad surfaces of moulding, in a word let breadth and freedom, nobleness, simplicity, and unity form the reigning spirit within, and we are convinced that the general complaint of want of force and character in our prevailing church architecture would be to some extent diminished.

Henry Brugsch

ART. V.—*Demotic Grammar, containing the general principles of the popular language and writing of the ancient Egyptians.* By Henry Brugsch, of the Royal University of Berlin: 1855. 4to. pp. 202. With a general table of the Demotic signs, and ten plates containing fac similes.

[*Grammaire Démotique, contenant les principes généraux de la langue et de l'écriture populaires des anciens Egyptiens, par Henri Brugsch, etc.*]

THE different kinds of writing found upon the Egyptian monuments appear to differ not only in their methods of representing the same sounds, but in the language or dialect to the expression of which they were respectively applied. The sacred writing contains the oldest dialect which gradually became a dead language, preserved only in the religious