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PREFACE.

In extant works on the philosophy of art landscape painting is passed over with very brief mention. It is the purpose of the following pages to supply what is lacking in this respect. In working out this purpose it has assumed three principal phases. The first phase is unfolded in the proof that the modern scientific view of nature, together with its necessary complement the scientific view of man, must first have been developed before true landscape art could exist. The second phase takes shape (a) in the tracing out of the elements, external and internal, which enter into works of art of this class; (b) in indicating the relation of landscape painting to the other forms of art, and (c) in defining and accounting for the types into which the products of this form of art naturally fall. Finally the third phase presents the realized unity of the first and second phases in a brief sketch of the actual historical development of landscape painting. And here the primary aim has been to show the central significance of the successive phases in the development of landscape painting.
through an interpretation of works of leading artists in the several schools.

If this purpose has been successfully wrought out the volume now presented to the reader can hardly fail to prove serviceable as an introduction to the study of the philosophy of art in general.

As to form: that has been made as little technical as possible. While in the first place the theme is philosophy, it is also in the second place philosophy as applied to, or rather as involved in the products of one species of art. There is, therefore, greater range here for the use of imagery than is the case in the treatment of the nature and functions of thought simply as such. I have, therefore, not hesitated to make use of imagery where that has not only suggested itself spontaneously but has also proved no less adequate than abstract terms to the expression of the thought it was desired to convey.

My obligations to Hegel in particular and to F. T. Vischer and other writers in general are acknowledged in the body of the book.

In another direction, however, I am under special obligation and make record of it here with sincere pleasure. It is to my Art Class, the members of which have for more than five years engaged with unflagging interest in the tracing out of the philosophy of art through its historical development, that I owe the constant stimulus to the studies of which this volume is a direct result.
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PHILOSOPHY OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING.

INTRODUCTION.

The art of the world has unfolded in a series of forms through which can be traced the progress of human development. Art is, indeed, one of the necessary forms or modes of human activity and is thus one of the essential phases of human history. It is the joyous mode of the spirit's utterance. Its successive stages express the gradual unfoldings of the faiths of the world. It is the outward bloom of the inward essence of man.

Thoughts are the substance which men embody in their deeds. True, and therefore vital, thoughts are not bounded by time and space. They belong to the infinity of the spirit and can never lose interest or value. But every thought, every mode of the spirit, has its appropriate form of expression. By far the greater number of these forms are also, in the actual life of men, such as address themselves to the imagination through
what have been significantly called the senses of “physical ideality,” namely: sight and hearing. These forms, then, are sensuous forms; and when special care is bestowed upon them, so as to render them as perfect as possible, we have an artistic effort. If, now, we join this to the further fact that the success of the effort—that is, the perfection of the form that has been wrought out in the effort—must always be judged of, on final appeal, with reference to the appropriateness and adequacy of the form considered as an expression of a given mode or phase of spirit, we shall be prepared in some measure to apprehend the meaning of the often-quoted definition of art as “the expression of spirit in sensuous form.” So also it will be evident that if the phase of spirit to be expressed is vague, the form of expression will inevitably also be vague; if simple and clear, the expression will be simple and clear likewise; if profound and complex, the expression must be correspondingly complex and powerful—otherwise it will not be an expression of the given mode of the spirit’s activity.

This phase of the subject can, of course, be referred to here only in the most cursory way, as affording the substantial basis of what we shall have to say of one special form of art. Thus much, however, should still be added: that it is precisely in the early stages of civilization that vagueness
of thought would naturally be expected, and there where it is actually found. It is there, too, that we see the vague, the vast, the abstract, the enigmatical appear as the chief characteristics of the products of artistic effort. The oriental world of antiquity presents this phase which found its culmination in Egypt.

Again, at a later stage, clearness is found to have been attained, but it was through seizing partial phases of the world-problem and representing each with great simplicity. Each phase is complete, but necessarily with a finite completeness. It is the idea of vast organizing power; or of the all-illumining potency of knowledge; or of conquering strength in war; or of the victorious sway of beauty. It is Zeus, or Apollo, or Mars, or Venus; each self-sufficing, but each also isolated and finite, and hence doomed.

A further step in advance brings out the Truth. The first phase was that of the vague and immeasurable; but nevertheless, in spite of its abstractness, it was still a phase of the Universal principle of the world. The second was clear and complete; but its fatal defect was that it not only involved, but was itself involved in, finiteness and isolation. It is the stage of particular existences, each of which is at the same time assumed to possess a separate independence apart from the rest. With the third stage, finally, it is discovered that particular existences can have no substantial reality
apart from the Universal principle; nor, on the contrary, can the Universal principle itself have any substantial reality apart from particular existences; for it is precisely these that constitute its modes of being. The world in its entirety is thus found to be the product of the activity of the one Universal Principle that creates all, cherishes all and illumines all. It is the divine Trinity of thought, love and will. Here isolation is impossible. It is the stage of spiritual individuality in the fullest sense of the term—namely, in the sense that the Individual attains, and can attain, to reality only in and by the Universal Principle and through the particular modes of the activity of that Principle.

Human life and human thought, then, become deeper and richer with the process of the ages; and Art, like other modes of the spirit's utterance, must advance from vagueness and feebleness to power and precision in its methods and appliances.

This progressive movement is clearly manifest in all the phases of art; and Landscape Painting will be found to be no exception to the general law.

In tracing out the essential characteristics of this form of art through its historical development we may consider it under the following General Divisions:

I. Course of development of the Idea of Landscape
Painting and of the Conditions necessary to its maturity.

II. Elements of Landscape Painting, its Relation to other Forms of Art, and the Types into which its Productions naturally fall.

III. Historical Development of the Fundamental Types of Landscape Painting.
PART I.

COURSE OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING AND OF THE CONDITIONS NECESSARY TO ITS MATURITY.

The course of development of the Idea of Landscape Painting presents three fundamental phases. The first is the Oriental and Purely Prosaic; the second belongs to the Classic world of Greece and is wholly Mythological; the third is the Modern and completely spiritualized Phase, in which the poetic treatment predominates and landscape painting assumes a deeply rational significance and enters upon its highest development.
CHAPTER I.

ORIENTAL PHASE.

RESPECTING this phase it will be sufficient to indicate, as briefly as possible, the essential characteristics of the representations of nature which were attempted by oriental peoples. Very few specimens, indeed, have come down to us of such work; and yet enough is known to enable us to form a fairly accurate estimate of the nature of what those peoples attempted, and of the value of what they accomplished in this direction.

As we would expect, the most ancient specimens come from Egypt. Two causes present themselves in explanation of this fact. The first is that the Egyptians were the earliest people of the world to arrive at a settled stage of civilization, involving a highly finished and monumental art. The second cause is the negative one that the climate of Egypt is so exceptionally dry, that disintegration of materials takes place there far less rapidly than in any other country. And yet, if we are to judge from the specimens of Egyptian landscape painting still extant we must conclude that the Egyptians were not impressed with the appearance of a landscape as a whole, but only with its individual
PHILOSOPHY OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING.

features taken separately.* Improbable as this may seem, it is distinctly confirmed by the fact that in their attempts to represent upon a surface a portion of the outer world there is no trace whatever of perspective. Water and land are alike represented by purely conventional drawings in the form of a rude map. Not only so, but while the Egyptian artist exhibited greater skill in representations of animal forms, than in those of the human form; on the other hand, in his representations of vegetable forms, he gave proof of far less skill. Indeed, we have only to refer to Dr. Samuel Birch's profusely illustrated edition (London, 1878.) of Wilkinson's "Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians"† for full proof that the landscape painting of the Egyptians was of a purely conventional and prosaic type, in perfect accordance with the well-known symbolic character of their art in general.

The feeling of the Assyrians for landscape appears to have been in the main very little if at all in advance of that of the Egyptians. Fewer remains of their art exist at the present day and we are left to judge of their painting from the frag-

* So the General in Oriental armies stationed his divisions one by one and then, instead directing the whole, rushed personally into the fight as a heroic example to his followers. Similarly among many barbarous tribes a herdsman who has never learned to count above ten, still knows the individual form of each animal in a herd numbering hundreds.

ments of their bas-reliefs that have been found. Among these a number of landscape representations appear in which there is but the faintest trace of any attempt to produce perspective effects. On the other hand vegetable forms are rendered with a decidedly nearer approach to nature than was the case with the Egyptians, though still quite conventionally.*

Still another Oriental people—the ancient Hindus—gave unmistakable evidence of a far greater depth and delicacy of sympathy with nature. This evidence appears in their literature and would lead us to suppose that they may have been much more successful in their attempts at portraying nature in paintings than were either the Egyptians or Assyrians. Evidence is not altogether wanting that they actually made such attempts, though with precisely what success cannot be judged with certainty. In a Sanskrit drama written not far from the beginning of the Christian Era, the hero, who is also a king, is represented as calling for a picture which he has sketched with his own hand. On examining it he remarks to an attendant: "Chaturika, the garden in the background of the picture is only half-painted. Go, fetch the brush that I may finish it." The picture is properly a portrait, and the king meditates upon the question as to what sort of background will be suitable.

Finally he declares:

"I wish to see the Malini pourtrayed,
Its tranquil course by banks of sand impeded:
Upon the brink a pair of swans: beyond,
The hills adjacent to Himalaya,
Studded with deer; and, near the spreading shade
Of some large tree, where mid the branches hang
The hermits vests of bark, a tender doe,
Rubbing its downy forehead on the horn
Of a black antelope, should be depicted."

There is further talk of tracing "a lotus-fibre necklace, soft and bright as an autumnal moonbeam." So also mention is made of a "vagabond bee" that has alighted on the face of the fair one in the picture "mistaking her mouth for a rose-bud;" and only after the "impudent insect" has shown utter indifference to the royal command to depart is it discovered to be only a painted bee which the royal hand itself has portrayed with such skill as to produce complete illusion! Wherein we seem to have the Hindu counterpart of the birds pecking at the grapes in the picture of Zeuxis; of the horse that paused opportunely with a neigh of recognition before the picture of Appelles, thus proving to the satisfaction of Alexander

that the Bucephalus of the artist was worthy of the real bearer of the world's conquerer; of the cardinal who knelt before the portrait (by Raphael) of Leo X, making due salutation and offering it pen and ink to sign certain bills, etc., etc! In our Sanskrit story, however, the Vidushaka, or court clown, appears to be perfectly conscious all the while of the true nature of the insect and has his own bit of fun out of it in a quiet "aside." So that we are warned, as it were, in the poem itself against taking too literally the poetic representation of the pictorial achievement. True, as we have already suggested, there is here indicated a more intimate acquaintance with and a finer feeling for nature than is shown in any of the remains, literary or other, of either Egypt or Assyria; a fact which is to be attributed partly to difference of race, partly to difference in natural surroundings. It cannot be without significance, finally, as indicating the esteem in which the art of painting in general was held among the Hindus, that a king should be represented as himself an artist.

If now we look for the precise characteristic of these early attempts at portraying nature we shall find that with the Egyptians it consisted solely in the prosaic value it possessed as a hieroglyphic sign to aid in the narration of an event; that with the Ayssrians the predominant characteristic is the same though here there is just visible the attempt to indicate the peculiarities distinguishing
a definite locality; and that with the Hindus, if we may trust the above-given quotation so far, the central characteristic of their representations of nature was a realistic portrayal on the principle of perspective and with a conscious intention to give to the scene as a whole an outward form appropriate to the mode of life of the personage represented therein. In other words it would seem that the ancient Hindus had attained to the power of giving a measurably poetic character to their representations of nature. This last, however, must be taken as conjectural rather than as clearly proven.
CHAPTER II.
MYTHOLOGICAL STAGE.

It is not till we turn our attention to the Greeks that we find unquestionable examples of landscape painting, which would certainly be recognized as such by the observer of the present day. True, even here we must depend upon the descriptions of ancient writers and a few imitations of the Roman period. But these suffice to assure us that the Greeks early attained to a consciousness of the requirements of perspective and to a fair degree of skill in perspective representation. "In the fifth century before our era, the Athenians who heard the tragedies of Aeschylus could admire upon the stage a fictitious architecture designed by Agatharcus. Two pupils of this artist-geometician, Democritus and Anaxogoras, published the theory of perspective, and later, Pamphylus publicly taught it at Sicyon."* Of Greek painters properly speaking it appears that Apollodorus of Athens was the first to construct the backgrounds of his pictures strictly as a unit based upon the principles of perspective. He it was also who brought to completeness the effects of light and

shadow and the blending or gradating of colors; who led the way in permitting the contours in the drawing of figures to vanish, and who did not merely draw outlines with his pencil and then color his pictures in monochrome but "actually painted."* And yet the glowing accounts that have been given of the achievements of these artists must be received with caution since the various phases of the development of Greek painting which we at the present day must look upon as rude and inadequate when judged of from the modern standard, constituted at that time a series of decided improvements which were calculated to produce a powerful impression.† Thus Zeuxis, in his turn, so far surpassed Apollodorus in the distribution of light and shade that he was afterward considered to have been the originator of this important feature of the artist's work.‡ It was not, indeed, until still later (in the second and first centuries B. C.) that landscape as such came to be made the subject of pictorial representation on the part of the Greeks; and even then this people never gave to their landscape art any higher form than that of simple surface decoration. It seems probable also that their perspective was only linear and that they never mastered the secret of filling the space of a picture with a visible and

* Woltmann's Geschichte der Malerei. I. 44.
† Ibid. p. 45.
‡ Ibid. p. 47.
yet transparent atmosphere.

Finally, of the works still preserved at Pompeii and elsewhere and which were executed in the Greek style, it is a significant fact that the finest landscapes have mythological accessories.* In other words nature was still looked upon from the mythological standpoint and could thus be represented only in the mythological spirit. This fact, indeed, taken in connection with the essentially plastic character of all Greek art, shows how impossible true landscape painting in the modern sense was to Greek artists, though their efforts in this direction were no less manifestly productive of a marked advance over anything accomplished in the same field by any other people of antiquity.

And yet there was this in common with all the peoples of the ancient world—whether Egyptians, or Assyrians, or Hindus, or Greeks—that with them nature was animate and altogether divine.† Men were earth-born and to this there was added among the Greeks, the conception of a divinity of the under-world that ate up the flesh of the dead who were buried in the earth. The two myths, taken together, seem to express a dim presentiment of the truth that man comes from the Divine

---

* Woltmann's Geschichte der Malerei. I. 132. See also Herculaneum et Pompei Recueil General des Peintures etc. Paris, 1875. A number of landscapes are reproduced in Engravings in Tome III.

† With the Greeks, the mere nature divinities are superseded, indeed, but not wholly put aside. They remain as real but subordinate powers.
and returns to the Divine. But all was conceived vaguely. The relation of the physical to the spiritual was understood only in the most superficial fashion. The existence of the outer physical phases of the world seemed better assured than that of the inner, spiritual nature of man. Evidently so long as this phase of thought continued there could be but little sympathy between man and external nature. There would be no lack of wonder and awe so long as the lightning was the thunderbolt of Zeus, or as the winds were mighty storm-gods, or as the earth-quake was but the result of the struggles of a chained Titan. It is, indeed, not to be denied that in the very creation of these nature-myths man was projecting his own conceptions of power, of caprice, and of rage into nature—but it is equally true that he did this unconsciously. To him these phases of spirit were already there in nature as the personal attributes of divine beings whose relation to man and whose concern for man could at best be but incidental. Such conceptions undoubtedly contained a germ of truth; but only after that germ had unfolded into completeness could nature be rightly understood and intelligently portrayed by man.

Thus, not only is it a fact that true landscape did not exist in the art of the antique world, but, as already intimated, from the very nature of the case it could not possibly have existed.
CHAPTER III.

MODERN AND COMPLETELY SPIRITUALIZED PHASE.

WE have seen that in the art of the Egyptians and the Assyrians landscape was represented only in a purely abstract and conventional manner; that the best efforts of the Greeks in this direction attained to results approaching more nearly to an accurate portrayal of nature; and yet that these in turn were pervaded and dominated by a mythological and anthropomorphemic character. It will be well to give a moment’s further consideration to the distinction here implied. To the Egyptians the Nile itself (the only stream of Egypt) was a god.* To the Greeks every stream was the dwelling-place of a divinity—even of multitudes of divine beings of higher or lower grade—but was not itself a god; just as the sea was the home of Neptune but was not itself divine. Thus the river-god of the Egyptians was formless and could only be represented by a symbol; while the divinities of the streams of Greece,

in the imagination of the people of that land, assumed the human form as the only form in which the spirit, even of a brook, might dwell. These statements, indeed, are simply illustrative of the essential character of the religions of these two peoples respectively; and we may expand them into the following, and equally true, general propositions: That the mode in which the Egyptians viewed nature led infallibly to the purely symbolic mode of representing it; while the way in which the Greeks conceived the outer world, led just as infallibly to its representation in anthropomorphc and plastic forms. Thus when the Egyptians attempted to give forms to their gods the result was generally a combination of forms (as, the combination of the head of an animal with the body of a man) in which was forshadowed the feeling that the Divine Powers involve all forms but can be confined to or represented in no one alone. This profound truth of the Egyptian religion, however, was, it should never be forgotten, seized by that people vaguely and abstractly; and its practical outgrowths were often monstrous in the extreme. Everything was seen in the Divine; but only so dimly that, for the greater part, everything might rather be said to have been seen as divine. The Universal Principle acquired too little vitality in the minds of the Egyptians to prevent it from perpetually falling asunder into an endless multiplicity of parts each
of which was vaguely conceived and at the same time looked upon as in some mysterious way divine. With the Greeks, on the contrary, every part of nature was, as we have said, a dwelling-place of some divinity, but was not itself divine; while each Greek divinity was conceived of under the form of man.

Thus the Egyptians, starting from vague conceptions of the all-controlling Powers of Nature as so many divinities, struggled to solve the problem of the world, but failed to reach the solution. The Greeks, on the other hand, were more fortunate in choosing man as the point of departure in their investigation of the world. To comprehend man in his ultimate Ideal is to master the central secret of the universe; and to study man as he is is the way to ascertain what he ought to be—in other words, that is the way to find out what his ultimate Ideal is. Hence the deep significance of the Greek motto: "Man, know thyself." The investigations both of the Greeks and of the Egyptians tended, indeed, toward the true solution, namely: That the world is to be explained only as the product of the activity of the Divine as one. A few rare minds among each of these peoples actually attained to this conception—the advantage of clearness and adequacy being with the philosophers of Greece. But the conception never became a vital element of the faith of either people. Hence the inadequacy of their views of nature,
and the consequent impossibility of their representing nature with any high degree of intelligence.

We touch here upon the relation between that phase of Reason that has become internalized in human consciousness on the one hand, and the phase of it that is still externalized in the unconscious forms of nature on the other. Both these phases point to, and ultimately presuppose, the infinite and Divine Reason as their sole Substance; and thus both are but contrasted phases of the Universe—of the One-diverse, if we may so say,—of the substantial, concrete, vital Totality of the world, physical and spiritual. Now, while absolute Reason remains forever the same in the midst of its infinitely rich diversity; its phases, both in the outer world of nature and in the inner world of the human spirit, are constantly undergoing a process of development, of evolution. It thus happens that as human reason attains to greater fulness of realization on its own part it will be met by (that is, it will become conscious of) new and profounder revelations of the reason everywhere present in the outer world as well. There is, therefore, the profoundest significance in the statement of Hegel, that "To him who looks upon the world rationally the world in its turn, presents a rational aspect."*

* Philosophy of History. (Trans. Sibire). p. 11. So also Carlyle, in his own peculiar fashion: "Indeed, It is well said, in every object there is inexhaustible meaning; the eye sees in it what the eye brings means of seeing. To Newton and to Newton’s dog Diamond, what a different pair of Universes; while the painting on the optical retina of both was, most likely, the same!" French Revolution. Book I Chap. 2.
And we may add to this, with reference to our present topic and in connection with what has already been suggested, that he can worthily portray nature, and he alone, to whom the world presents a rational significance. But this cannot be until the enigma of the world has been solved. In short nature, and the world in general, can present a rational meaning only when viewed as the product of a total process, of which the very essence and vitality is infinite, absolute Spirit—a conception that can only arise with, and as a phase of, the complete development of the religion of Monotheism whose God eternally realizes himself in the world through His all-creating Power, His all-cherishing Love, and His all-illumining Reason. With the establishment of this view the gods of polytheism must necessarily vanish. But on the other hand they have not been wholly destroyed, or merged in an impersonal Brahman. The change is, indeed, not in the Divine as such, but in man’s mode of viewing the Divine. Having come to view the world rationally man finds himself confronted with a rational meaning in the world. He no longer looks upon the various parts of nature as being themselves divine; but every part of nature—whether a rustling leaf, or a rushing torrent, or a gathering mist, or a passing cloud-shadow—each proclaims the Divine and proclaims Him to be one and the same, whether He is thought of as the mighty Force that hurls the worlds through
space, or as the delicate Spirit who guides the atoms in the unfolding of the lily, or as He who gives impetus and direction in the blooming of that fadeless flower of Paradise which we name the human soul.

It is this far more adequate mode of viewing the world that gives such depth of spiritual significance to all the characteristic phases of modern art; and, we might add, to all the characteristic phases of modern civilization. But this adequacy of view was not reached at a bound. The roots of the modern world extend deep into the soil of the ancient. Our world—every finite phase of the total universe—is, and could only be, a process which consists in the steps or stages of a progressive development. Each succeeding stage presupposes all that has gone before; and only through them does it or can it attain to reality.

We shall now be able to account for, at the same time that we trace, the characteristic phases which modern landscape painting has assumed. So long as the conceptions which lie at the basis of the modern world were as yet only in the rudimentary stages of their unfolding and were therefore not yet completely formulated; but only undergoing formuation, we can easily see why there should be great care and much timidity respecting the application of art to those conceptions. For art is itself a mode of formulating conceptions, and were art to assume the leader-
ship in this, the artist would usurp the office of the theologian—as happened measurably in Greece, where religion came to be the worship of the Beautiful as such, instead of the beautiful worship of the True. On the other hand, with the development of Christianity, reverence for the newly maturing conceptions, joined to the fear of relaxation into paganism, kept art in the background. Its work was carefully prescribed among Roman Christians and well-nigh wholly proscribed among Greek Christians.* The limits allowed it were at best very narrow, and the rigidly fixed types well-nigh turned every work of Christian art, during the first centuries, into a mere symbol. The contrast which was already developed in earlier religions between the spiritual and the physical was now given the character of an irreconcilable hostility between these elements. The former alone was considered to possess any

* The great controversy of the eighth century respecting the relation of art to religion is deeply significant. The Greek Christians were descendants of a race of artists and lovers of art. But the art of the earlier Greeks was inseparably bound up with a polytheistic religion. Hence, to the Greek Christian, art was essentially “pagan” in character, and to make use of art in connection with his religion would be little short of a return to the old gods. The Roman Christians, on the contrary, were descendants of a non-artistic race and accordingly they could make free use of art to aid them in the apprehension of the truths of the new faith, without in any way endangering the purity of those truths or involving any risk of a return to the old religions. The Greek Chrisians, therefore were right in rejecting the use of images in connection with their worship and the Roman Chrisians equally right in adopting their use. To the former that use could not be other than a dangerous element, to the latter it could not fail to be altogether helpful.
worthiness, while the latter was looked upon as essentially evil and therefore a hindrance to the soul. In short we have here the final stroke in the complete degradation of the old nature-divinities. If they remain, it is only as goblins, sprites, powers of darkness—not as beautiful nymphs and dancing fauns as with the Greeks. It thus happened that for many centuries the sacred personage of the new religion were represented by the artists of the new epoch in fixed, conventional types, against a gold ground, and without any apparent relation to the physical world. Under such circumstances it could not be otherwise than that art as such should steadily decline. But by degrees the new conceptions became more fully developed. The new faith became widely extended until, from a small band of persecuted believers with timid views respecting the relation of art to their religion, there arose a powerful organization with fully developed and elaborately formulated doctrines, and with no fear of evil results, but with full confidence that unmixed benefit would follow from the free employment of art.

Not only so, but a radical change had meanwhile taken place in the outward as well as in the inner conditions of the people of Europe. We have but to recall the migrations, the mighty conflicts, the settlements, the blending of peoples; the growth of commerce, the increase and more general diffu-
sion of wealth; and, not least among these, the great intellectual awakening that followed the Crusades. In the midst of all this agitation the antagonism between spirit and nature that, in one or another form, had so long been unhesitatingly believed in, tended more and more to fade out of sight; and the awakened spirit of Europe began to express itself in the work of bold and original artists who, like Giotto, brought art back to life from the dead symbolism into which it had fallen during the darker portion of the Middle Ages, released the sacred figures from the conventional gold ground, and represented them as walking about the earth in the company of men and in the midst of smiling landscapes. It is true that the landscape thus introduced remained for a time quite rudimentary, little more earth being represented than was required as standing-ground for the personages portrayed. But this preliminary stage of the new tendency in art could not long continue. Once freed from the trammels of prescription and conventionality the artist could not but yield with enthusiasm to the charm of hollowing out vast depths for the eye upon what was but surface to the touch; and it was simply inevitable that a large share of attention should speedily come to be given to this new phase of the beautiful in art.

At the same time this new mode of viewing and representing nature necessarily involved the re-discovery of Perspective which had, it would seem,
been altogether lost during the transition period between the old and the new conceptions and methods in art. This too, however, was at first purely experimental and imitative and only by degrees came to be reduced (on the side of linear perspective) to a scientific basis. As for aerial perspective—that is clearly beyond the range of mathematical rules and must always depend quite as much upon the spiritual endowments of the artist as upon the simple, external realities of nature; for the artist can only represent nature as it appears to him. Hence the more subtle his comprehension of nature the more significant and true—and therefore the more beautiful—will be his representations of nature. This, indeed, becomes more and more manifest as we proceed with the investigation of the progress of Landscape Painting.

This progress was realized simultaneously in Italy and in the Netherlands. In the latter country Hubert Van Eyck (born in 1366, or later)* was "the founder of an entirely new mode of painting."† Besides his highly important discoveries resulting in the perfecting of the method of painting in oil "he boldly depicted actual life and placed his sacred incidents in the midst of verdant nature."‡ The greatest of his works—The Adoration of the

* Woltman (Geschichte der Malerei, II. 9) speaks of this date as "apparently too early".
† Luebke. History of Art. (Trans. F. E. Bunnett) II. 327.
‡ Ibid.
Lamb *—was begun in 1420 and only completed after his death (1426) by his brother John. The scene which gives name to the picture occupies the central panel and is represented in an extensive landscape of hill and plane. The perspective, if faulty, still gives great depth to the picture in spite of the fact that the horizon line is placed so high as to leave little room for sky and to give the effect of a continuous increase in the elevation of the ground from the front to the extreme background. The earth-masses and vegetable forms are, besides, depicted with such feeling and intelligence as to render them decidedly pleasing. So, again, John Van Eyck represented the Madonna "in a pleasing landscape;" while Rogier van der Weyden opens windows in his interior views thus giving us bright glimpses of sun-lit fields beyond; and still later Hans Memling, "one of the most gifted and attractive masters of his time," painted a number of scenes laid in rich landscapes. Of this early Northern school, however, Dirk Bouts (died 1475) was the one to give the greatest charm to landscape, not only by the greater delicacy of finish in the details of the foreground but also by the more careful observance of the effects of aerial perspective.† In short, from the exceptional

† Woltman's Geschichte der Malerei. II. 42, 57.
See also, on p. 41 of same Vol., the wood-cut reproduction of this artist's Abraham and Melchisedeck, the background of which is an extended landscape.
and meagre use of landscape backgrounds, their value as accessory to the principal purpose of the pictures of that time speedily occasioned their full elaboration and general employment.

As we have already intimated, this same tendency was no less marked in the South than in the North. Fra Angelico, born as early as 1387, breathed his ethereal soul into his charming little landscapes scarcely less than into the purely spiritual personages which he placed in them. The same yearning toward nature as something not wholly alien and hostile to humanity was exhibited even in the wonderful bas-reliefs of Ghiberti (b. 1381) and of Luca della Robbia (b. 1400). Indeed, this feeling is the premonition (already well-nigh transformed into clear comprehension) of the truth that all reality, whether spiritual or physical, centers in the One Great Cause and that Man and Nature are essentially akin; being but outgrowths on different planes of the same Divine Creative Energy. Sculptors of this epoch strove after the unattainable in sculpture precisely because moved by this irresistible, but as yet (to them) not clearly definable, tendency of the human spirit. The growing taste for the picturesque was by no means a mere fashion; on the contrary it possessed a profound significance, and the artists of that period were borne onward irresistibly to ever new and ever sublimer revelations by the new phase of inspiration that was steadily taking more and more
complete possession of them. A new heaven and a new earth were beginning to open before them and within them; and they but gave expression to the rich and beautiful conceptions involved in this change. It was thus that: "With the beginning of the fifteenth century, there appeared a new and independent development of Italian painting, which aimed more universally at a powerful conception of nature, at a more radical study of form, and at more complete perfection of coloring and of perspective."* Similarly, in the attempts of the artists of the fifteenth century to portray sacred story it often happens that "the incident itself is no longer the main matter, but it serves them, as it were, with a pretext for the lifelike conception and representation of reality. Hence they place sacred figures in rich landscape scenes, and delight in magnificent architectural backgrounds, introducing their own contemporaries, in the costumes of the day, as interested witnesses of the sacred events."† This tendency was wrought out to a high degree of perfection in Italy by Massaccio and his immediate followers; by Botticelli, a number of whose pictures are distinguished by beautiful landscapes;‡ by Benozzo Gozzoli, in whose representation of the Vintage Scene from the History of Noah "A number of lifelike figures

---

* Luebke History of Art. II. 93.
† Ibid. p. 159.
‡ Luebke. History of Art. II. p. 163.
stand in the background, the richness of which, both as regards landscape and architecture, is unrivaled even in this creative age, and surpasses all contemporaries in its joyous and cheerful expression;"* and by a multitude of other artists reaching to and including Perugino and Raphael and doubtless by far the greater number of their contemporaries. Raphael indeed, incomparably the finest poetic spirit of his time, gave to his landscapes the utmost charm and infused into some of them the richest accessory significance. Nowhere else in the world, not even by Fra Angelico, has exquisite delicacy and purity of spirit on the one hand and paradisiac charm of landscape on the other been blended so perfectly and harmoniously as in a number of the "Madonnas" of Raphael. No one could for a moment think of the nature which he represents with such elevated ideal beauty as being in the remotest way associated with evil.

Thus by degrees the landscape as an element of Italian painting came to embody so many beauties as to compete in a measure with the historical scene of which it was intended to serve merely as locality and physical support. Throughout the whole of what has come to be known as the period of the Renaissance there is observable a steadily increasing clearness and

* Luebke. History of Art, II, p. 165.—Carlo Lasinio’s engraving of the central part of the Vintage Scene is well reproduced in the Classics of Painting, plate III.
penetration in man's view of, and a consequent deepening of his sympathy with, nature; and in precisely corresponding degree do we see that landscape backgrounds were wrought out with greater elaboration and care until they began to acquire significance apart from the personages represented in them. Thus what had hitherto been only an accessory and symbolic phase of art was ready to assume rank as an independent form of art.

And yet it was only at a later period that the conditions necessary to this further step in the progress of landscape painting were actually fulfilled.

* The essentially symbolic character of all accessory landscape painting will be shown more fully later on.
CHAPTER IV.

OF THE CONDITIONS ESSENTIAL TO THE MATURITY
OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING.

WE have now traced the development of landscape painting from its earliest form where it was a mere hieroglyphic to that phase of its growth in which it began to be penetrated with a poetic spirit — with thought and sentiment harmoniously blended. At this point, as we have seen, there remained but a single further step for this form of art to take in order to arrive at complete independence. We have, therefore, to consider in the next place the question: What are the conditions necessary to the taking of this further step?

§ 1. Significance of the Contrast between the abstract Spiritual tendencies at Rome and the equally abstract Materialistic tendencies at Venice.

In the first place it cannot be wholly without significance that landscape painting attained to its first stage of independence at Venice, as religious-historical painting arrived at its ultimate perfection in Florence and Rome. In the fifteenth century, and also in the early part of the sixteenth,
Rome was the pivot of the spiritual, as Venice was of the commercial empire of Europe. Rome was the center of a spiritual power that had long aimed at nothing less than the complete spiritual supremacy of the world. It attempted to absorb all culture and to reduce all art to its own service. The greatest artists were inevitably drawn thither and the task was assigned them of rendering sensuously visible to all men the profoundest truths of a religion that was assumed to be the final religion of the world, and which must therefore penetrate all lands and be accepted by all the nations of the earth. Thus, at Rome, art was devoted to the portrayal of the Universal and Permanent as a distinctly Spiritual World.

On the other hand, Venice—the "Queen of the Adriatic"—was occupied also with the realization of vast projects. To control the trade of the East, to accumulate and enjoy vast wealth, to possess to the full the goodly things of this world—these were the aims toward the fulfilment of which the energies of Venice were bent. There was much that was Oriental in the culture and life of Venice, as at Florence and Rome all was decidedly of the Occident. Elegance, luxury, the external pomp and pride of life prevailed at Venice; while at Rome and Florence a severer taste went hand in hand with a profounder, more reflective, more spiritual mode of viewing the world and the life of man. It would be but natural to expect, there-
fore, that the art of Venice would be occupied with the splendors of color and with the gorgeous pageants of an opulent city. Even when sacred subjects were chosen by the artist the choice was, as has so often been remarked, rather determined by the opportunity which the subject might give for the covering of vast canvases with brilliantly colored representations of Venetian festivities, than by any deeply penetrating view of the spiritual significance involved in them. This tendency, indeed, as we have indicated on a former page, was characteristic of the art of this entire epoch and tended to become more and more decisively dominant. It was, however, a tendency which developed its extreme logical results nowhere else so completely as at Venice; and precisely for the reason that it was solely at Venice that the conditions most favorable to its complete development were in actual existence. But where such conditions did exist, where the attention and interest of men were monopolized by external and particular things, it is not surprising—it was, rather, altogether inevitable—that art should develop in the direction of the superficial and that the works of art thus produced should therefore prove to be destitute of any profound significance.

Nevertheless this very mode of life which turned the attention outward upon the visible and tangible phases of the world could not but lead ulti-
mately to a close study, and to a fairly intimate knowledge, of at least the more immediate phases of Nature. Even the most corrupt natures were unable wholly to resist the new tendency; at times they even flamed out in passionate enthusiasm at the splendors of the outer world. Thus it was that the soul of the otherwise despicable Aretino* involuntarily soared to the height of genuine poetic enthusiasm on leaning out from a Venitian window and beholding the glories of the Venitian sea and atmosphere and sky. How much more profoundly must the soul of a Titian have been wrought upon by such splendors; and how irresistible must have been his longing to catch the secret of the wondrous soul of nature and repeat its shifting, filmy radiance in productions that should henceforth prove the soul of Titian to be one in essence with this same mighty Soul of Nature! Titian is, indeed, credited with having been the first among Italians to treat landscape boldly as an independent form of art. Certain it is, at least, that while other artists of his time treated landscape altogether as an accessory and (however carefully they might finish the foreground) still gave to the whole a distinctly conventional type, Titian made a number of genuine,

* "Aretino stands out as a character, loathsome even to him who makes the weakest demands of a moral kind upon men. This was the opinion of him in Italy even in his own time." Herman Grimm's Life of Michael Angelo. (Trans. F. E. Bunnett), 7th Ed. Boston 1874. II. 329.
vigorous studies from nature and would possibly have at once given to landscape an unequivocal character as an independent form of art had there been sufficient encouragement for his doing so.*

This very fact that encouragement was wanting shows, nevertheless, that the popular mind had not yet arrived at an adequate mode of viewing nature—that, in fact, the times were not yet ripe for the complete unfolding of this new phase of art; and it may reasonably be questioned whether Titian himself was so far in advance of his time as to be able to seize upon and represent with perfect artistic freedom any very deeply significant phase of nature. For, it must be remembered, at the time of Titian that period had not fully reached its close during which a gas was believed to be a geist or ghost; and distilled “spirits” were so called because they were believed to involve and to be essentially related to, if they did not actually constitute, literal spirits or souls of the things of nature. Each force, each invisible and mysterious form of nature, had been, and in a measure was still, im-

* "For the first time in the annals of Italian painting we hear of a picture which claims to be nothing more than a landscape; and of this landscape Titian was the painter". And yet "we look through the numberless catalogues of the 17th century and find but one reference to a piece of the kind by the great Venitian." Nor are any to be found in European galleries. Doubtless Titian painted a number of such pictures, but if so these have been lost through the general indifference to such work. In any case, "numerous etchings and drawings show how fondly Titian would have given time to such subjects had he found a public to appreciate their value". Crowe and CavalcaSelle. Life of Titian. II. 219, et. seq.
agined more or less vaguely as an isolated being possessing the characteristics of personality. And among the characteristics thus attributed to the ill-understood forces of nature the predominant one was caprice, caprice not unmixed with malice. The mythological mode of viewing nature had not yet wholly ceased. We have, in truth, only to glance back at the varying modes in which the primitive Aryans interpreted nature to see what a circle human thought had passed through. With those early peoples the gods were the "bright ones," the sun, the dawn, etc.; and the common name applied to each of these was the appropriate one of deva meaning bright. "We can see, in fact, how in the minds of the poets of the Veda, deva, from meaning bright, came gradually to mean divine."* But, as the same author points out, to the followers of Zoroaster the same word (with the slightly changed form daeva) means evil spirit. Nor is this radical difference in the meaning attached to the same word, by two so nearly related peoples, without its deep historical significance; as the science of language has clearly shown. The unfavorable meaning is, in fact, a secondary one and "dates from the epoch in which the worship of Ormuzd replaced in Iran the ancient polytheism, the gods of which thereafter became demons; exactly as those of Germanic paganism

in presence of the Christianity of the Middle Ages, and as the Greek daimon, had taken the character of evil spirits.”† Zoroastrianism was a less rational and less successful, but a not less decided, struggle toward Monotheism than was Christianity. In the development of both religions—and this is what we wish to emphasize here—the existing conception of the forces of nature as a multitude of personal, divine powers could not at once be got rid of. Neither religion, in fact, possessed at the outset any rationally developed substitute for this interpretation. The existence of these personal, divine powers was not denied, but only interpreted in a new way. There could be but one true God. All other gods, therefore, were false gods. In other words this multitude of personified natural forces came to be looked upon as powers that were only superhuman in their capacity to do evil. They could not be destroyed, but could be “better understood;” and when better understood (according to the doctors of the new faith) they ceased to be worshiped and became objects of abhorrence. From being adored as divinities they came to be feared as demons, evil disposed dwarfs, giants, etc. Thus Christianity brought about the degradation of the anciently deified powers of nature; but it was only through a ferment of centuries that thought became suffi-

ciently clarified to apprehend (and comprehend) this religion as the Religion of Reason and thus to make possible the further progressive step of interpreting the powers of nature as wholly *impersonal*, and as belonging to the simplest modes of manifestation of the one, absolute, divine, creative Reason. In short man has always beheld his own image reflected in nature. The myth of Narcissus is the history of the human soul. The world is filled with the echoes of spirit, and man everywhere, in life and in death, struggles to catch the secret of the Divine Reason which meets him face to face wherever he turns his view and in which he cannot but see that his own reason is reflected. Thus it is that the adequacy of man’s view of nature has ever depended upon the adequacy with which he has comprehended himself. In proportion as he has come to be a more and more rational being and has thus come to look upon the world more rationally the world has in turn presented him with a more and more rational significance.

§ 2. **Blending of these extremes in the Unity of completed Spiritual Consciousness through the activity of the Teutonic Nations.**

Nowhere else, perhaps, has this transition out of the mythological into the rational mode of viewing the world been so powerfully, so magnificently portrayed as in the *Faust* of Goethe. Faust in his study, struggling to solve the mysteries of the
world and to gain the mastery over the Earth-spirit through the potency of cabalistic words, represents man in the midst of his struggle to rise above the conception of nature as a vast aggregate of isolated powers and to seize the actual unity of the whole in the Universal Spirit whose activity forms all and whose substance is the substance of all. But words, the significance of which is not distinctly known, are but empty sound. The utterance of a mysterious word may seem for a moment to compel the very soul of the universe to stand revealed before him who utters it; but next moment a penetrating glance reveals to the conjurer the supreme emptiness of what to the imagination had seemed so rich, so full of life and power. The sense of dilation as if with godlike might is suddenly replaced by that of a shrinking as if into utter nothingness, and Faust is ready to give up the struggle in despair. So long as man pursues the mythological method and grasps with his senses after an Earth-spirit he pursues a will-o'-the-wisp and falls, fainting, with empty hand and withered heart at last.

And yet it is not that the problem is insoluble, but that the method by which its solution has been attempted has been radically wrong! After the wrecklessness of crime and the consequent delirium of Walpurgis-night Faust reappears and takes up the problem by wholly new methods. The world-spirit which at first flitted before his vision
only in the weird, vacuous form which his own imagination conjured up, now begins to unfold itself to him in reality in human institutions; and the deepest, most truly practical problem of the world for each individual human being is found to have its solution in a life devoted to the attainment of a culture that shall be universal and which must thus sum up within itself the culture of the whole world, to attain which is possible only through actual participation in the process that constitutes the world's progress. Thus in his explorations man comes to use as his telescope the work of the whole human race. With this instrument he sweeps the heavens and finds God everywhere;* and discovers himself at last as the star that eternally reflects the purest light of the Divine.

It is this process that must have attained to something like completeness of results before nature could be comprehended in its true relations to the world as a whole. At Rome, however, the phase of the Universal was so far insisted upon that the particular failed to be recognized in its full significance. It was, assuredly, a far richer phase of the Universal than that to which the most enlightened peoples of the oriental world

* It was Lalande, one of the foremost French astronomers of last century who is said to have once exclaimed; "I have swept the whole heaven with my glass and have found no God." His maturity was reached in the midst of the intellectual and moral chaos which culminated in the French Revolution.
attained even in their loftiest conceptions; and yet even here it was still so far inadequately comprehended as to be regarded as an arbitrary authority that imposed its laws externally upon man, who must obey those laws on penalty of infinite punishment, even though he had no knowledge of their import. Here were the two extremes of externally imposed Authority on the one side and of unquestioning obedience required on the other; and between these extremes there was no adequate term of meditation. At Venice, again, these two extremes of Divine Authority on the one hand, and of human obedience on the other, were largely held in abeyance; and the broader freedom of daily life, and the more varied knowledge of the external phases of civilization remained as a mere disconnected multiplicity of particular facts and events instead of being seen in their true relations and thus serving as a connecting medium through which man should discover the vital unity of the world and thus comprehend and rationally realize his own true relation to the Divine. It was, in short, among the Teutonic nations that the Divine, as the true, vital Universal, attained, through the process of a freely unfolded civilization as the term of meditation, to its logical and necessary conclusion* in a rounded Humanity that

* For this particular world—a conclusion, nevertheless which must forever repeat itself in all worlds where the transition takes place from the merely natural to the perfected spiritual state of existence.

The "Universal" is the actual—the energizing Principle that constitutes
was able to conciously trace the total process of the world; and which thus, in its act of knowing, came to comprehend, and at the same time to constitute in itself a reflection of, the Divine Process of Creation. Here the independence of the Individual as Man first reached its true culmination. Politically it appeared under the form of a multiplicity of independent states—among which the free cities must by no means be forgotten. On the side of Religion it unfolded in the profoundly significant movement known as the Reformation. On the side of Art it made its appearance in the weird caprices of a Duerer (which, in spite of the seeming contradiction, always possess a rational basis); in the rich development of the Dutch genre and landscape painting of the seventeenth century, and in the sublime music of the last and early part of the present century, in which the whole universe seems to be focused into spaceless and yet infinite harmony in the depths of the human soul.

We have already pointed out the fact that, during the period of Titian's life and work, the process which we have just been tracing had not yet completely developed its results. Indeed the

the very substance and life of the world. For the world of humanity the Universal is the ideal nature of man that can only be unfolded into reality through the particular under the form of the specific deeds of man singly and in combination. Thus developed man becomes conscious of the Universal as not merely above and beyond him, but as also within him constituting his very essence and inmost being. Thus he unites the two extremes of the Universal and the Particular in his own completed Individuality and, in so doing, becomes truly the image of God.
sixteenth century was a period of well-nigh violent ferment. Greek culture fairly entered as an element into European civilization. The German Reformation, including the two sides of Religion and Philosophy, assumed distinct form, penetrating and revolutionizing society. During the same period also the physical world came to be studied with an ardor and intelligence never before applied to it. By degrees the full consequences of the discoveries of Columbus, of Copernicus, of Kepler and of Galileo were unfolded to the thoroughly awakened consciousness of Europe; so that nature ceased at length to be looked upon as a realm given over to the chaos of disconnected, personal, arbitrary, and generally malicious forces, and came to be thought of as but one phase of the grand Total of the universe which is knit together into an inseparable Whole by the subtle, all-pervading bond of infinite Reason. Thus the two realms of Nature and Spirit ceased to be looked upon as contrasted even to the point of irreconcilable antagonism, (as had been the case formerly) and were now believed to be but the two necessary modes of manifestation of the One Absolute Substance.

§ 3. Relation of this Movement to the Maturing of Landscape Painting.

With the seventeenth century this conception was sufficiently unfolded and clarified to admit of
being philosophically formulated on the one hand and, on the other, of being the guiding principle in the artistic representations of nature. It can scarcely have been a mere accident that the philosophical systems of Des Cartes and Spinoza should be developed contemporaneously with the sudden and fairly exhuberant unfolding of landscape painting in the seventeenth century. The philosophical systems on the one hand and the landscape painting on the other were but two modes of expressing the new conception of the perfect unity and harmony of the world, physical and spiritual—the one mode appealing directly to the Reason; the other, to the Imagination. The one begins with spirit, and finds that spirit necessarily includes nature. The other begins with nature and finds that nature leads on and upward to Spirit as the only possible solution of the problems of the world. Now for the first time in the history of the world had nature come to be properly understood; and now for the first time in the history of the world had landscape painting attained to actual completeness and independence as a form of art. Man had come at last to really view the world rationally and had accordingly found the world to be filled with a rational significance. To this significance he now began to give expression in all available forms and with that intense enthusiasm which accompanies every great discovery that the human spirit makes.
And yet, as we shall see, it was but the first firm step in this new direction that the artists of the seventeenth century proved themselves able to take.

We have now indicated the conditions upon which depended the complete development of landscape painting into independence as a form of art. Our next task will be to enumerate and characterize as briefly as possible the elements which enter into and constitute the substance of a work of art of this class; to point out the relations of Landscape Painting to other forms of art; and to show what are the fundamental types into which the products of the work of the landscape painter naturally fall.
PART II.

ELEMENTS OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING, ITS RELATION TO OTHER FORMS OF ART, AND THE TYPES INTO WHICH ITS PRODUCTIONS NATURALLY FALL.
CHAPTER I.

SUBJECT-MATTER OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING.

STRICTLY speaking neither philosophy nor art can concern itself with the accidental nor even with the merely vanishing phases of things. On the contrary both must deal with the true and permanent; and, for art, the true and permanent must always appear under the form of the beautiful. Indeed the beautiful itself is only a phase or mode of the true; and thus, as we have already said, art is but one of the modes of formulating the true.

The artist, then, is not merely to reproduce on canvas the perfect semblance of the forms he sees before him. On the contrary he is to look upon these forms simply as material out of which he is to construct, with the freedom of a true poet, the most perfect artistic expression possible to him of the conceptions and sentiments which the contemplation of these forms awakens in his soul. What they embody of the true that he will seize upon and, if need be, emphasize. What they present of the accidental (that is, the irrelevant) he will eliminate and reject. What is lacking in
them he will find means to supply. If this is true of the historical painter it is true in a still wider sense of the landscape painter. Man and nature are both embodiments (or modes) of Divine Reason but man is the culminating point above, while inorganic nature is the beginning point below. Man, even as a physical being, therefore, is immeasurably more adequate to the expression of the Divine Reason than is Nature. His form is immediately adapted to rational ends. He may, indeed even be looked upon as the actual epitome of nature itself since the elements of his physical structure are derived wholly from the inorganic world through the mediation of the organic. Thus far he is literally made of the dust of the earth. But he is far more than this merely topmost budding and finest rose-blush of nature, and is not altogether destined to return in a moment to the dust whence he, as a physical being, came. He is beyond this, and above all a spiritual being, self-centered, non-dissoluble, and capable of infinite progression. Hence in man nature is not merely epitomized; it is also completely transcended and at the same time wholly subordinated to spiritual uses. In nature as such, on the contrary, spirit is expressed only in the simplest, most abstract fashion. The forms and masses of inorganic nature are only here and there and, as it were, in a wholly incidental way, strongly suggestive of any distinct and tense phase of spirit. It is,
indeed, in the organic world—in vegetation—that a richer character is given to landscape and a higher phase of spirit expressed. Not less important are the aspects of sky and air with accompanying mists and cloud-masses. Above all does the character of a landscape depend upon the play of light-and-shade and shadow, and the magic of color. Light is the most ethereal, most subtle, most spiritual of all the elements. Only where light is obstructed is there shadow. Only where spirit is perverted is there evil. Thus light is the subtile, infinitely delicate connecting medium between the outer world and the human soul.

It thus becomes apparent that the subject-matter of landscape painting is two-fold. It exists partly in the outer world of nature, and partly in the inner world of the spirit. In other words the artist must, as it has been expressed, "not only paint what he sees before him, but also what he sees within himself." It will be well to consider these two aspects more at length and separately.

§ 1. What the Artist sees before him.—(Objective Elements).

Man has at last caught the true secret of perspective. He looks through his telescope, estimates the distances of the planets and sees them expand into their true and mighty proportions. Through the glass of history he glances down the
long vistas of the past and estimates the magnitude of the most distant of the stars that constitute the ever-unfolding galaxy of the human spirit in the aggregate. He rises in the car of science to a height from which he is able to include the whole world of nature in a single view. From this vantage-ground he beholds a vast nebula gradually condensing, assuming ever greater complexity, throwing off successively, equatorial rings that flow one by one into separate worlds and which in turn differentiate from themselves other spheres, until at length the solar system is complete in all its members. He turns his attention upon the earth and contemplates the play of Titan forces that clash, and rush, and roar in the forging of this mighty sphere. By degrees the primal tempest sclear away—but the Titan forces are not destroyed; they are only tamed, subdued. And science, in these latter times, has named them Gravitation, Heat, Electricity, etc. Indeed, it may properly be said that the whole of science constitutes the true perspective of the world in its entirety; for if on one side perspective is the power to represent things as they seem, on the other it is the power to see things as they are. To view the world in perspective (per-spicere) is to see it through and through—to comprehend it as a vital totality and not merely to apprehend it in a superficial fashion. Thus a fairly adequate scientific comprehension of nature was the indispensable prerequisite to anything
approaching a truly adequate sensuous apprehension thereof; and it was a logical necessity that perspective in the broader sense above referred to should precede the complete development of perspective in the more usual sense of the word; that is, as the art of representing a given view upon a plane surface in such wise as to present the same appearance that the view itself would offer to the eye from a particular standpoint. It is the province of reason to seize the world, or any part of it, in its totality. The senses but receive impressions of individual objects; and without reflection the senses would never be able even to complete these impressions. But it is only by slow degrees that human reason has been able to recognize the Divine Reason in the abstract unconscious forms in which it is embodied in nature. True, from the first, man has recognized reason in nature and looked upon it as divine; but he seized it only imperfectly and in isolated phases. Hence the polytheistic element that has entered more or less into all religions—the Christian not excepted. At length, however, the actual comprehension of the world as a totality of forces has been fairly arrived at; and one of the results has been the perfection and admirable simplification of perspective as regards both the right-seeing and also the adequate representation of nature. Since, therefore, science has prepared the way for the right-seeing and thus also for the ade-
quate representation of nature, let us trace out briefly the external or objective elements of landscape painting as science presents them to view. We may begin with

a. Earth-Masses. Those same Titan-forces to which we have already referred are all only so many modes either of attraction or of repulsion. But each of these, again, necessarily implies the other and is petpetually correlated with the other. Thetwo are, therefore, but reciprocal modes of the One Universal Force which, in its highest phase, is the Absolute, Divine Spirit—the infinitely self-conscious ALL. It is thus that attraction and repulsion are, in their physical aspects, but the lower modes of the Divine Reason. As such they work together irresistibly in the accomplishment of that part of the Divine Purpose which consists in the creation of a physical world. We have already glanced at the first phase of this process. Let us now indicate the succeeding steps. With the gradual change in the relation between attraction and repulsion—the latter diminishing steadily through radiation of heat into space, the former increasing in accordance with the law that the intensity of gravitative force between portions of matter becomes greater as the portions of matter approach each other more nearly— with this gradual change in the relation between these two complementary modes of force the volume of the earth has constantly diminished, so that after
the formation of a solid crust the continued shrinkage of the mass could not but result in the crushing together of this crust in vast folds or ridges which we recognize in the mountain-chains and other irregularities in the land-surface, whether above or below the sea. Nor have these forces ceased their activity.

To their never-ceasing interaction is due that strength of materials which enables these mountain-masses to stand aloft in their changeless might and majesty. Thus if the artist would see nature truly as it is he must behold in it this perpetual play and struggle of mightiest forces; and this he can never do with any hope of rightly portraying nature on canvas unless he studies with care the characters of the rocks that constitute the mountain-masses. Similarly he must familiarize himself with the characters of soils if he would hope to give intelligent portrayal to plains with banks and streams and other broken parts of surface. In short, the successful landscape painter must be, in his own way a thorough geologist.

But without further detail in this direction let us turn to the next phase of the subject.

b. Water. And in considering this we may find our point of departure on the mountains. The snow gathered on the mountain tops is gradually transformed into glaciers by the compression it undergoes in being dragged down by gravitational force through gorges toward the valleys
below. Reaching warmer levels the glaciers melt; and the water, released from its bondage, at first warbles like a bird, then writhes and hisses like a serpent, then roars and rages like a lion on its way down the mountain. In its growing impetuosity it is but obeying that same law of gravity in obedience to which the mountains themselves reached their sublime elevation. But these mountain-torrents reach the plain, seek the easiest descents and flow at length into the sea. Thus the forms of water—whether in the wild mountain stream, or in the more gently-flowing river of the plain, or in the arms or inlets of the sea, or in the heaving waves of the ocean itself—constitute a vital element of external nature and are found to be of utmost significance in landscape representation. These too, therefore, the artist must carefully study and intelligently make use of if he would rise above mere conventionality in his work.

But we have only traced the water in one direction. Arrived at the sea it is no less subject to gravitative force; but by the action of the opposite force of repulsion in the form of heat it is expanded into vapor and thus rendered specifically lighter than the atmosphere into the currents of which it is lifted and borne away over the earth to condense and fall in rain or in snow—perhaps upon the mountain-tops again, thence to descend once more to the sea. In this respect we might properly say that the ocean is quite as much the source as the terminus of the rivers.
Thus we have been led from the solid to the liquid state of matter—from the firm earth to flowing water—and already our attention has been drawn to matter in the state of vapor. At this point then we may turn to a brief consideration of the last named phase of the external elements of landscape painting.

c. The Atmosphere constitutes an element of nature not less essential to the completeness of landscape views than either of the two elements already mentioned. We have but just referred to the carrying of vapors by the currents of the air. Thus, to the ordinary blue tinge of the sky (due to the light-refracting power of the air) is added the perpetually changing appearances which are produced by the more or less of vapors and the incessantly varying states of the vapors suspended in the atmosphere—from the shimmering mists and gleaming, filmy cloud-patches of a sultry day to the black, mountainous masses of the tempestuous sky. But besides this the atmosphere is also completely subject to the play of the interrelated forces of attraction and repulsion (under the forms of heat and gravitation), and is thus kept in a perpetual state of agitation varying from the lightest breeze to the wildest hurricane. These atmospheric phenomena are among the most striking and deeply characterizing features of a landscape; and yet from their subtle, fleeting nature, they are among the most difficult to either
d. **Light.** But all these phenomena or "appearances" imply a medium of vision, and that medium is light. This element, indeed, constitutes (along with the other "radiant forces," heat and electricity,) the opposite extreme from the solid in the gradations of the states of "matter." Solids have fixed, definite boundaries. Liquids have definite but not fixed boundaries. The boundaries of gases (as the air) are neither fixed nor definite. With Light we reach the physically infinite. From innumerable centers it pervades space and leaves no corner utterly unilluminated and without hope. In "matter" we have merely an approximation toward an equilibrium of forces. In the solid, attraction predominates; it is precisely this that constitutes the solid. In the liquid attraction and repulsion are more nearly balanced. In the gas repulsion is in the ascendent; hence its extreme fluidity and the impossibility of assigning to it any definite natural boundary. With light, finally, the relation between the forces is so decidedly that of the preponderance of repulsion as to admit of no fixed points or "material particles." Hence in light we have, not a "state of matter," but only an infinitely subtle and agile mode of motion. It was, therefore, not without significance that light (along with heat and electricity) was once styled an "imponderable fluid." It is so far a "fluid" as to be simply and solely a flowing—a complex wave-movement or mode of
vibration. It is "imponderable" for the very reason that whatever is ponderable (that is, possessed of weight) is so precisely because of the predominance of attraction over repulsion; and in light, as has just been said, repulsion decidedly preponderates over attraction. But by this very property or characteristic light penetrates everywhere, illuminates all things, and, in illuminating all, unifies all.

This last statement, however, implies more than mere physical "light" alone is capable of. It penetrates everywhere as a mode of vibration, impinging upon all bodies, and is reflected from their surfaces. But thus far it is—and thus far it must ever remain—merely a mode of vibration. It is only when these vibrations reach the spirit along the delicate bridge of the nerves of the eye that light, from being a mere mode of external, vibratory force, suddenly bursts forth in the splendors of illumination and thus enables the spirit to find the unity that already exists in the material world. Light, then, in the sense usually attached to the term (namely, that of illumination) is quite as much a spiritual as a physical element or fact; and we may now repeat with emphasis what has already been said: that Light is the most subtle, most ethereal, most spiritual of all the elements. To which we may now add: It constitutes one of the most significant and admirable links of connection between the material and the spiritual worlds.
Finally, we have in this place merely to mention that characteristic of light by which it breaks up into the infinite variety and splendor of Color, to which more extended reference will be made further on.

e. Vegetable Forms. We have traced out, by merest indication, the varying inter-relation between the two opposing and yet reciprocal * modes of physical force through their various ponderable products and have reached that splendid unponderable product, Light, which would seem at first view to be the immediate transition from the material to the spiritual. And yet physical light reaches spirit only by a movement from without. It is only a "tremulous bridge" † connecting spirit and matter. It does not tend to become spirit; it only serves to awaken spirit.

The real transition out of the unconscious into the conscious is by another way. Life is more subtle than light. Even the simplest forms of vegetable life sum up and necessarily presuppose all the physical elements, all the phases of the pon-

* The reader will of course remember that reciprocal quantities are those which, being multiplied together, produce unity. Their very opposition is their unity. No single force could exist save in opposition to—and hence in vital connection with—another force. The unity of the two is thus in reality a self-opposed unity. Self-opposition is the highest term of force.

† The pagan Norsemen believed the dying hero passed from the visible to the invisible world—from the battle-field to Valhalla—over the rainbow which he named Bifroest, Tremulous Bridge; "die ruhig stehende und doch leise zitternde Bruecke." Luening. Die Edda. p. 67.
derable and of the imponderable which we have hitherto considered. Earth, water, air, light, as well as heat and chemical energy, are all essential to the growth of the plant, in which we have the first phase of movement from within—in other words, the first phases of life. These inner potencies receive the light and transform it into chemical energy * whereby the elements essential to the growth of the plant are absorbed and assimilated and the life of the plant is unfolded in added power and new organs with more vigorous and varied surface that now becomes capable not only of absorbing the sunbeam and utilizing it as chemical energy but also of shivering it mechanically into the myriad splendors of color which we are accustomed to consider as belonging immediately to the vegetable kingdom.—So, too, through the eye the soul receives the impact of luminous waves and dissolves the impressions thus obtained into spiritual nutriment whence in turn is derived added spiritual might.—Along the track of life; from the plant to the animal, from the animal to man: such is the true way out of the unconscious into the conscious; out of nature into spirituality.

If, therefore, light is the universal, unifying element of a landscape, vegetable forms give to it the more specialized characteristics of a rich indi-

* Strictly speaking light is a chemical energy; but it is manifested as such only where it impinges upon elements which are there ready to combine into new products or to separate into simpler states.
viduality that bring it distinctly within the range of our best understood sentiments. In a certain sense it might be said that Light is the divine element, while vegetable forms constitute the element most nearly allied to the human in a landscape. Similarly light may be said to form one of the chief phases of sublimity, while vegetable forms constitute the greater part of the elements of beauty in such views.

But this enumeration of the elements which the painter of landscapes sees before him in nature need not extend further. It will suffice for our present purpose to have indicated their essential unity, and, at the same time, to have also shown, at least by implication, how vitally important to the landscape painter a thorough familiarity with and thoughtful interpretation of the central facts of natural science in its several departments must be.

We have intentionally omitted animals, architecture and human beings from our enumeration of the external elements of landscape painting, for the reason that these are, and can be, nothing more than accessories in such views and cannot even be given conspicuous place in them without serious risk of dividing the interest of the picture and thus vitiating its character as a work of art. We shall therefore now turn to the obverse side of the subject-matter pertaining to the form of art which we are considering.
§ 2. What the Artist sees within Himself (Subjective Elements).

It is evident, from the enumeration of elements already made, that the artist in this field possesses a sufficiently wide range of materials. But to represent all these on canvas, to convert mere surface into the semblance of fathomless sky above and of infinite vistas of solid earth fading away into the deepening haze of shimmering atmosphere below—this is the true miracle of landscape painting! It is one of the finest triumphs of the poetic spirit. It is a genuine creation and is possible only to spirit arrived at its full maturity. But true landscape painting does not pause in its creative work with the mere production of a semblance of a given view in external nature. Its triumph is not simply to produce something like illusion by the literal fidelity with which it reproduces such views. On the contrary its triumph is, if we may so say, that it creates a semblance of nature that is more real than nature itself. For reality is truth; and it should never be forgotten that while nature is a product of Spirit in that simplest and most abstract phase which is described under the name "natural forces", and can thus be an expression of spirit, or of the Truth, only in a general and abstract way; a true work of art, on the contrary, is a product of spirit arrived at the infinitely higher stage of self-consciousness—that
is, at the stage of reason as reason is unfolded in man. Such work of art is a product of reason directed to the specific realization of some definite phase of truth. We repeat, therefore, that, as an expression of spirit, the representation which the true artist makes of a landscape is more real, embodies a richer truth, than does the portion of nature of which he has made a study and which has served him as nucleus and point of departure for his creation.

But such achievements are not for every one who assumes the name of "artist." We have already seen how nature presents a richer meaning to the spirit of man in proportion as man approaches nature with a more richly endowed spirit. We may be sure, therefore, that only the artist who already possesses within his own soul a rich subject-matter for his art can hope to find any worthy material for his art in nature. It is at the point we have now reached that this question should be considered: What are these elements of art which the artist finds within himself? To this it may be answered that, first of all, and as the prerequisite of all really productive effort, the artist, in order to be truly an artist, must possess character—genuine honesty-with-self—which not only brings with it honor in dealing with others, but also absolute sincerity in his art, from the lightest to the most deeply penetrating of its phases. He must possess integrity in the fullest
sense of the term—namely that of integrality of soul; a perfectly self-centered, consistent oneness of spirit which is the very essence of his immortality whether as a man or as an artist. Indeed this quality is the central one of all true humanity, the basis of all true spiritual existence. But in addition to this it is requisite that the artist should possess a profound, infinitely delicate, and at the same time thoroughly rational imagination. He must be able both to unerringly seize the True in all its aspects of sublimity and beauty, and also to recognize and reject the accidental, the irrelevant, the capricious, the ugly.

If now we glance through this brief enumeration of spiritual qualities essential to the artist we will see that all the qualities necessarily pertaining to the spirit are included. "Character" is but the fully developed rational will. The actual, rational imagination is the intellect occupied in seizing phases of the Truth under appropriate pictorial forms; while a "delicate" imagination implies that elevated sentiments so mingle with the imagination as to cause the instinctive rejection of all that is coarse and incongruous and to lead to the equally instinctive and unerring acceptance and appropriation of all that is refined, harmonious, beautiful. In other words: (1) The intellect is found to be active, first as imagination, in perceiving and creating images; secondly, as understanding, in selecting materials; and thirdly, as reason, in
ordering and unifying the whole. (2) The Sensibility is present as a refining and animating element throughout the whole. (3) The Will appears as the self-active energy of the total spirit directed to the perfect realization of what would otherwise remain merely abstract, vague, shadowy, unrealized images. Indeed no single one of these phases of spirit is possible as a reality except in combination with all the rest. Either may be developed beyond the others so as to impress its own characteristic upon all the acts of the spirit. But to speak of one of the phases (for example, the intellect) as if it were a spiritual force acting independently would be to make use of terms utterly destitute of meaning. Similarly, to speak of a "profound, infinitely delicate, and thoroughly rational imagination" not only implies that all the powers of the spirit are present but also that these powers have been brought into substantial concreteness or reality through an extended process of individual culture. The uncultivated individual is the mere vague image or shadow of what he may and ought to become. He is, so to speak, a merely abstract, substanceless conception of a man; a scarcely breathed word of which the richly cultivated spirit is the substantial deed.

It is evident, therefore, that the fruit of the labors of the artist (as well as of the man of any calling whatsoever) will be rich and valuable precisely in proportion to the maturity to which he
as an individual has attained. Genius has been significantly defined as "infinite capacity for work." In no other field has this proved more literally true than in the field of art; as witness every artist whose work has been greatly prized by the world; and notably, in the department of landscape painting, Claude Lorraine and Turner. There is a world of meaning in the often-repeated anecdote respecting the greatest of the Flemish painters. An English courtier, so it is said, finding Rubens painting, exclaimed in surprise: "So! the ambassador sometimes amuses himself with being an artist"! "No," said Rubens—and we can imagine the covert, courtly sarcasm in his tone,—"the artist sometimes amuses himself with being an ambassador"! Diplomacy, state-craft, upon the issues of which depended highly important interests of great kingdoms—however great ability that might require, however much perplexity it might involve—was yet to be regarded as mere play and pass-time as compared with the intense and profoundly serious labor which the spirit is called upon to perform in the production of a work of art. The labor need not be painful; nay, must not be painful if its product is to be of any real worth; but serious, sincere, it must be; and genuine art could never become a mere amusement, whether to ambassadors or to kings. On the other hand, the "genius" who has no need of work in order to develop or realize himself is nothing else than a
flippant, pretentious idler possessing no value either to himself or to the world.

The true landscape painter, then, does, indeed, go to nature for the subject-matter of his work, but he also finds his subject-matter within his own richly endowed and highly cultivated spirit. Sketches from nature are indispensable; but before these can be taken there is requisite, on the one side, a certain course of "manual training" (which after all is but a training of the soul to intelligently use the hand) and, on the other side, a training of the spiritual eye to rightly see by means of the natural eye what is before it. This accomplished, however, the sketch is not to be taken at random. Nature seldom presents us with the ugly— the positively repulsive; but it also seldom presents us with the strikingly beautiful; and only at still rarer intervals does it present us with what in the pictorial sense can be called the truly sublime. The realm which forms the subject-matter for what are so persistently styled the "positive sciences" is the realm of inertia—of indifference. And yet it is precisely in this realm that the artist must find some true, abiding, really positive phase of spirit if he would produce from the materials it presents to him a genuine work of art. Hence the difficulties of selection which necessitate the frequent and extended journeys of the artist. Nor do the difficulties of selection cease with his arrival in a region presenting "striking" views. A scene
which proves attractive to one will prove indifferent to another, whatever may be its intrinsic worth as a theme for art. Indeed the same view will present altogether different appearances to—that is, will awaken wholly different states of mind in—the same person at different times. "One sees what one brings with him the eyes to see"; and the focus of vision changes, so to speak, according to the varying modes of the soul. Thus the mood which the artist may chance to be in will either find itself mirrored in the view before him, or, on the contrary, it may render him for the time wholly insensible to the beauties it may suggest to him at other times and when he is in other moods. But whatever his mood may be, when the artist finds himself confronted with a view in nature of which the predominant character strongly reflects the state of his own mind, he finds that he has by no means merely the task of copying the scene in detail. A slight change here or there will heighten the total effect—render the view more adequate as an expression of the phase of spirit it is found to reflect or represent. Minor details here and there are seen to be indifferent, or even positively discordant with and therefore detrimental to the total effect. Such details are not allowed to appear in the sketch. So, on the other hand, it may also be found that the scene as a whole will be more adequate as an expression of the predominant conception or sentiment if this or that detail—a
tree, a distant mountain, a sweep of clouds, or even simple accessories, such as animals, architecture, or human beings engaged in ordinary occupations—were added; and accordingly the artist who is truly free, who possesses complete control at once over his subject and over his technical means of representation, will introduce without hesitation whatever element he finds needful to give artistic completeness to his work. This freedom of the artist extends to every feature and element of his work. Besides those already mentioned atmospheric illumination and its influence upon relative distinctness of near and of distant objects must also be modified to conform to and heighten the predominant conception. This, together with the management of light and shade and color may be justly regarded as constituting the supreme test of the artist's subtlety of intellect and delicacy of sentiment; so much so that this frequently constitutes the very soul and substance of the picture.

Thus, in a landscape painted by a truly gifted artist, while there may be a striking similarity between the picture and the particular view in nature which has afforded the external material therefor it will nevertheless be found on further examination that the very likeness in the total effect has been produced by a greater or less modification of every particular element of the scene. As M. Charles Blanc has finely said: "The spectacles of nature want the essential character-
istic of art—unity. Nature not only varies every moment of the day, but in her infinite complexity, her sublime disorder, she contains and manifests to us that which corresponds to the most contradictory emotions. Capable of exciting these emotions in man, she is powerless to express them. He alone can render them clear, visible, by choosing the scattered features lost in the bosom of the real, and eliminating from them what is foreign to or contradictory of his thought".* We may have looked a hundred times upon the scene which the artist has chosen to represent and may have felt a vague pleasure in the view—or may never have been specially impressed by it. The artist has brought with him a different and, for this purpose, better spirit to which nature has revealed a meaning that remained concealed from us up to the moment that the artist’s interpretation made all plain to us. Or again, perhaps the artist’s vision has been so penetrating and has so transfigured the scene that we can only admire his work and wonder that so charming a creation should follow upon what appears to us so commonplace a suggestion.

Such artist’s are in a double sense idealists; first by their selection of such views as possess decided character, or, in other words, such as suggest some noble conception or sentiment, and secondly, by introducing into the representation

* Grammar of Painting and Engraving. p. 213.
such modifications as heighten the effect of the whole and make of it an adequate artistic expression of the conception or sentiment which was only vaguely suggested by the selected view of nature itself. Nature at best speaks an obscure, vague language; but her utterances, though vague are always noble and for the most part beautiful. The true artist studies this language with all his energies, seizes the deep significance which it vaguely shadows forth, interprets and develops that significance, and writes it out at length with his pencil in the luminous language of form and color.

Even the most uncompromising advocate of "fidelity to nature"—the self-styled "naturalistic" painter—will select one rather than another view as being more picturesque, and, in portraying it, he will find it absolutely impossible to represent everything which he sees before him; so that here too he selects—if no otherwise, at least negatively by rejection of what seems least essential to his purpose. * But his "purpose" is an idea, in realizing which through inevitable modifications of the selected view in order to make it conform more perfectly to his idea, he turns out to be an idealist in spite of himself! True, there is an exceedingly wide range of power among artists to idealize a

* "However sincerely we may try to paint all we see, this cannot, as often aforesaid, be ever done: all that is possible is a certain selection and more or less willful assertion of one fact in preference to another." Ruskin. Modern Painters. IV. 20.
given scene. Each one paints the view before him as he sees it. He who brings to the task a highly refined and intensely poetic spirit will discern in a given view infinite subtleties of beauty that are absolutely hidden from the coarse or stolid soul. Thus each presents and cannot escape presenting, in his picture a mirror of his own spiritual development. His efforts to portray nature are embodiments of his interpretations of nature. Each picture he paints is but the drapery which he wraps about his conception, his idea, of the phase of nature which he has chosen to represent; and through this drapery the idea, if it is possessed of any vigor, will be everywhere visible, just as the form of an antique Venus Urania is manifest in all its splendor beneath the marble folds which envelop and are at the same time one with it.

In addition to this, however, there now and then appears an artist possessing the power, not merely to idealize a given view, but to actually organize or create new and wholly ideal scenes out of a multiplicity of varied studies from nature. Such are, in the highest sense, creative artists; but always upon condition that the ideal scenes thus constructed are truly organic in their growth and spring from the germ of a profound, all-absorbing sentiment in the soul of the artist himself. The impulse must be from within; and he who attempts to produce a great and highly ideal composition without such motive will only succeed in
bringing together a multitude of heterogeneous elements without being able to fuse them into a vital unity. The product of his efforts will at best be but conventional in its character and can, in the strictest sense, scarcely be classed as a work of art at all. Indeed there cannot be the least doubt that the attempt to construct a work of art of this type is a bold, not to say hazardous one—one which cannot possibly succeed save at the hands of a truly poetic genius. Ruskin assuredly said nothing but truth when he declared that: “All great art must be inventive; that is to say, its subject must be produced by the imagination. If so, then the great landscape art cannot be a mere copy of any given scene”. * This, however, is far from saying that great landscape art may not be an idealized copy of a given scene, and Ruskin would, and does equally emphasize the absolute necessity of the most careful, serious, painstaking study of the forms of nature as the sole means of obtaining the materials essential to any valid work of the imagination in this realm of art.—The relation between these more or less plastic materials on the one hand and the creative imagination on the other in art-work generally has been finely expressed by Vischer, who, however, considers it not to be within the province of landscape painting strictly speaking to freely compose

* Modern Painters. IV. 16.
a picture out of "separate, individual motives borrowed from nature". He says: "The vigilant spirit keeps in view the outer object along with the inner image in order to compare the latter with the former. Thus there is present with the complete inner [image] an outer objectivity measuring the image with the fact. We keep nature in the background but dare not lose sight of it. It is a sort of revenge which natural beauty still takes on the victorious phantasy (in which it must sink in order to rise again in it) that the phantasy should still be compelled to form images objectively like nature itself. It is simply a continuance of this necessity [which causes] that the phantasy properly speaking must still submit to the test [which determines] whether or not it has done its work in a merely capricious fashion and brought forth its ideal forms out of the chaos of unbridled fancy, whereto the touchstone of the actual object is applied in its full vigor*. 

On the other hand, he who has least capacity for idealizing what he sees before him may give pleasure by the marvelous technical skill with which he perfects his representations. But in such case we are pleased with the work not because the objects appearing therein are so natural, but because they are so naturally represented.†

---

† See Hegel's *Aesthetik*. I. 206.
SPIRIT EXPRESSED IN TECHNIQUE.

In other words, if the artist possesses too little depth of spirit to infuse into his work any far-reaching thought, or profoundly moving sentiment, or subtly charming grace and tenderness, then he must be content to assume the humbler role of pleasing the eye and suggesting an agreeable sense of touch through the skillful representation of fine textures and the like. He must at least give thus much assurance of delicacy of spirit: that, if his work does not possess any further significance, at least it suggests a degree of self-control and of serious persistence of effort sufficient to develop this admirable skill in technical execution. This is by no means great art. It is, indeed, art of the humblest grade. But it cannot be denied the credit of being truly art. Yet here, as elsewhere, perfect sincerity is absolutely indispensable. The moment "effect" is sought by any other means than by faithful, honest execution the last remains of art vanish, and we find ourselves confronted with mere artifice, pretense, unreality—the very contradiction of spirit; and, let us repeat, it is the sole purpose of art to give appropriate sensuous expression to spirit, of which the very innermost essence is self-consistency, absolute honesty.

In landscape painting then, as in art generally—as in all human endeavor—freedom in the choice and use of materials will always prove coextensive with the power of the individual to choose
wisely and to use rightly. The artist, like every other man, realizes for himself a broader and richer freedom by deepening and widening his own individual culture. Whatever limits may restrain him, therefore, are in great measure self-imposed limits—limits which he might remove but which he allows to remain; for they consist essentially of the negative, unrealized state of his own spiritual being. This is of course not to ignore the fact that heredity plays its part; nor to deny that external circumstances have much to do in hedging up the way of many individuals to the attainment of absolutely great results. No two persons possess exactly equal natural endowments, nor are any two placed in the midst of pricely the same circumstances. But whatever the limits they are not absolute; and a resolute Will can, if not wholly remove, at least greatly modify them. "Fate" is real precisely in the degree that the individual permits himself to remain unrealized. But on the way to—nay, as a very essential means of—self-realization, many a truly admirable deed must be done with more or less admirable result. Each achievement honestly wrought out is but the stepping-stone to an achievement nobler still.

We are pausing to utter something very nearly akin to commonplace conceptions with which all might well be supposed to have long been familiar but there seems ample justification for repeating such utterances so long as the art of landscape
painting is looked upon, not only by the unreflecting portion of the public but even also by many landscape painters themselves, as a form of art making little demand upon natural ability and requiring no general and thorough culture. Vapid Intuitionism with its shallow work; coarse Naturalism with its soulless and often revolting work; and the union of these in vagrant Impressionism with its unblushing substitute of merest sham and pretense for work! To what fathomless abysses can the name of art be dragged! In place of real, substantial Freedom, the very uttermost insanity of caprice!

Fortunately, however, the irrational is necessarily self-destructive, and while these momentary hallucinations are running their course artists cannot fail to become more and more deeply impressed with the necessity of persistent and profoundly serious study of nature in order that its secrets may be truly seized, rightly interpreted and adequately represented. The greatest landscape painter will be he who possesses the most thoroughly scientific, and the most deeply penetrating poetic, knowledge of nature, in conjunction with the most masterly skill in technical execution. In other words he must be deeply versed in the philosophy of nature on the one hand, and in the philosophy of spirit on the other; in addition to which he must possess the genuine poetic power of forming perfectly appropriate pictorial concep-
tions of the phases of spirit which he has found vaguely suggested in nature, but which he has himself interpreted into the richest fulness and definiteness of significance; and, finally, he must of course possess the maturity and delicacy of manual skill needful to realize these conceptions in the subtlest and completest fashion upon his canvas.

But we have yet to consider somewhat more precisely the subjective or inner spiritual elements which are brought into definite form in the consciousness of the artist as he beholds them vaguely suggested or reflected in the external and comparatively abstract forms of nature.

In our enumeration of these elements we shall begin with the simplest and least transitory as they are found reflected in the forms of the outer world.

a. *Spiritual Element Reflected in Mountains.*

If fossil remains found in the structure of existing mountains prove to us that these belong to a comparatively recent phase of the development of our planet—that they are, so to speak, but the wrinkles on the face of a world grown old—it is nevertheless also true that these mighty masses have ever impressed mankind with the feeling that here is the type of the permanent, the changeless. Thus in the early religions of the world the dwelling-places of the gods were ever assumed to
SPRITUAL ELEMENT IN MOUNTAINS.

be fixed upon the "everlasting hills." Hindu faith located the cities of Brahma, of Indra and of the other divinities on the vast plane at the summit of the mythic Mount Meru. The Greek gods dwelt in serene majesty on Mount Olympus; while the whole range of mountains in the Arabian peninsula was held sacred by the Semitic tribes long before Moses gathered the people of Israel before Sinai* cloud-capped, flaming with lightnings and reverberating with thunders—the visible and audible manifestations of their invisible Deity to a comparatively primitive people who were but just emerging from a land of visible gods who gave no other sign of life than their stony, mute presence. So also we have but to recall the universal custom among the Cainaanite nations of building altars to and worshiping their gods upon "high places." In the North of Europe, it is true, the impressions produced by the view of mountains were of a mixed character, though always pointing to the superhuman. Odin, the chief divinity of the early Teutonic peoples, sometimes rides in his chariot over the "Milky Way,"† sometimes wanders over the earth, but is again called the "Man of the Mountain," while in the Edda it is said: "On the


mountain stood he with gleaming sword,* etc., doubtless referring to auroral phenomena. Whence we may infer with Simrock that "The heaven of the [Germanic] gods (Asen) was [also] situated originally on the mountains and was only at a later period removed to higher spheres." But, again, still another view found acceptance to the effect that heaven was within the mountains, in the bosom of the earth,†—to which are naturally joined on such later legends as that which tells how Charlemagne has only gone into the mountain to sleep until the day of resurrection.

But the mountains of the northern clime were not without a character to excite in the minds of the people dwelling among them a feeling that powers quite other than divine were connected with them. The impressions produced by the harsh aspects which they present were personified as fierce mountain-giants with whom Thor (Donar) was forever in conflict. ‡ Less dreadful aspects produced impressions which found fancied embodiment in dwarfs of repellent look but of utmost cunning.

Finally it may be mentioned that the giving the name "Devil's Gate" to a part of one of the passes in the Rocky Mountains through which, only a few

---

* Simrock's (German) version of the Edda. Sigdrifumal. 14.
‡ Few things in literature, either ancient or modern, equal in quaintness and fairly titanic humor the descriptions of these conflicts as given in the Younger Edda.
years since, so many gold-seekers made their way rich in dreams, toward the golden region of the setting sun, shows that the myth-making tendency of mankind has not even yet altogether ceased.

Thus, from time immemorial the view of mountains has stirred human thought and awakened far-reaching hopes and fears in the human soul. Let us endeavor to make out what are the characteristics of mountain scenery which so move man and lead him to the formation of such varied, and yet so similar, conceptions.—If we consider the mountains of the Sinaitic peninsula we will remember that they are vast masses of naked rock rising in solemn might and majesty out of a desert plain, with only here and there an oasis. * Nowhere else in the world is there a region that could so impress upon the mind the sense of simple, severe, unchanging grandeur. It is the fittest of all localities for the germination of the conception of a Supreme, omnipotent Divinity who is "without variableness or shadow of turning".

It is for the poetic scientist of the present age to trace these impressions—with all the impressions which nature gives—to their true source; to see in them the proof that the play of the special forces which produce these phenomena in nature are but the lower—the impersonal—modes of the all-creating Force of the Divine Spirit; and

* See descriptions of this region in Lepsius's *Egypt, Ethiopia and Sinai*. Also in Eber's *Homo Sum*. 

7
to discern that the feeling of awe and admiration which stirs within man as he contemplates the products of these lower modes of force and beholds in them unspeakable sublimity is but the initial step to the discovering that divine Reason constructs and governs the world and finds its truest and ever-brightening reflection in the unfolding spirit of man. On the other hand it is for the scientific poet to seize this concrete unity of the world, physical and spiritual, in such wise that in representing any part or phase of the world he will give, in his work, clear and vigorous expression to precisely that phase of the Universal Spirit which he had discerned in the portion of nature immediately before him. Thus each work will constitute a true artistic unity; for it will have for its vital element some particular and fairly individualized phase of the divine one. This is the true Infinity of art—as of all things positive and real. To behold the Universal Spirit in each particular phase of the world and to represent these particular phases so that each shall shadow forth the Universal Spirit as that which gives it unity and vitality—such is the task of the artist of the present day, and of all future days.

This is the true method of interpreting nature for the purposes of artistic representation. Science in and of itself, is simply the intellectual process of tracing out the modes of force which are manifest in the world. Art is more concrete
than the natural sciences in this: That it must not only trace out the modes of force manifest in the external world; but it must also consider the characteristics of the human spirit, and must bring clearly within its grasp the relation between nature and spirit. For the very innermost essence of the artistic representation of nature consists precisely in the wealth and clearness with which it expresses this subtle spirituality of relationship between the outer world and the soul of man. Thus religious conceptions are ever inextricably involved in the art of the world; and landscape painting finds its true significance and strictly legitimate task in the representation of those phases of nature that are most profoundly expressive of the Spiritual and Divine. Man's earliest interpretations of nature consist mainly of the unconscious projection of his own immediate spiritual characteristics into nature. This may be described as the process by which the spiritual, but impersonal, element in nature first impresses itself upon man, and then, in turn, is unconsciously reflected back by him upon nature, but in the personal form. The myths of the early world, therefore, furnish an excellent clue by which to trace out the character and causes of the impressions which nature makes in man. The gradual deepening of consciousness on the part of man in this process has resulted in steady increase in the adequacy and reasonableness of his interpretation of nature until at length
the phases of the spiritual in nature have come to be understood in their true character as simply so many modes of manifestation of the Divine Reason—until, in fact, the whole physical world, in the widest acceptation of the term, is understood as consisting solely of passing phases of the simplest, most abstract modes of activity of the absolute, divine Spirit. True, in the course of human progress, man’s interpretations of nature have been quite inadequate and altogether fragmentary. But his very ascription of finite personality to the various impersonal phases of spirit which nature presents exhibits those phases under the form of tangible symbols, and thus aids us greatly in our attempts to seize their essential characteristics.

With this as our clue—which again is but the further application of what we have already so often insisted upon: That one sees in the world only what one brings with him the eyes to see—we may return to the consideration of mountains, upon which some further observations should still be made. Man begins existence as an animal and moves about with eyes bent upon the earth in search of that which will satisfy his immediate physical necessities. At length the spiritual within him awakes. A new and subtler center of gravity is found. Invisible forces draw him upward. He stands erect. His eye follows elastic, upspringing curves that vanish in the summit of the mountain. By thousandfold repetition the
vague impressions of awe-inspiring immensity deepen and grow more definite. The divine sun rises from the far-off mountain in the morning or goes down upon it at night-fall. The vast, never-changing mountain must be the home of the mighty god! Even when the advance is made beyond this of looking upon the sky as the dwelling place of the divine powers—even then the summits of the mountains afford the nearest approach to the divinities (devas, shining ones) and the most sacred altars are therefore erected upon the "high places".

But mountains also exhibit exceptional appearances. The masses are sometimes strangely broken and lie in wildly confused, gigantic forms. What more natural for primitive man, accustomed to and largely dependent upon the hurling of missiles both in attack and defense, than to look upon these as indubitable evidence of some mighty conflict between the gods on the one hand, and evil-disposed powers on the other—between Zeus and the Titans, or between Thor and the mountain-giants? Add to this that primitive man did not in any at-all-adequate degree suspect the true nature of the complex action of light and shade and shadow upon these huge broken masses, modeling into strong relief semblances that to his unrestrained imagination were real giants striding across chasms or suddenly vanishing into the very mountain itself before the eyes of the be-
holder, and we may form some faint conception of the vividness of the impression which such phenomena produced upon him—especially when supplemented by an occasional earthquake-shock or the rolling in destructive fury down the mountain of some huge mass whose support had been slowly and silently removed by wind and frost and rain.

Everywhere and always the forces of the world have been instinctively classified into powers of construction, or creation, on the one hand; and powers of destruction or negation on the other; while a feeling (deepened and clarified, in modern times, into clear intellectual comprehension) has also prevailed, to the effect that it is in the equilibrium of these opposite modes of force that the preservation of an actual world—the true Conservation of Energy—consists. The Hindus have symbolized this in their Trimurti of Brahma (the Creator), Vishnu (the Preserver) and Shiva (the Destroyer). In their later theology indeed each of these involves the others, so that Shiva, for example, destroys only that he may create anew; and thus in renovating the universe he appears also as its preserver. But so long as the various phases of physical force were apprehended in isolation and personified accordingly, and thus the moral element was necessarily assumed to be involved in them, man saw—and could not fail to see—in the various phenomena about him the alternating signs of benevolence on the one hand and of destructive rage
on the other. It is on the plain of consciousness, of true personality, that the negative as such appears as moral evil. The just balance between the constructive and the solvent forces is lost. Spirit, in its struggle to realize its ideal, loses its equilibrium and the corrosive sublimates of rage and violence tend toward, without ever wholly resulting in, the complete dissolution of spirit. In the physical world, on the contrary—the world of the unconscious and therefore of the impersonal—moral evil has no existence; nor does even physical "evil" here find place save in relation to man. In this realm of the unconscious the moral element is vaguely foreshadowed but never truly attains to reality. Only man, only the truly spiritual being, can recognize these foreshadowings and rightly interpret them—that is, apprehend their true import and follow out their vague suggestions to the appropriate forms in which the complete realization of what is here dimly foreshadowed must (and can only) be attained. But when the moral becomes the immoral it is self-destructive. Instead of giving adequate expression to spirit it wholly contradicts the very notion of spirit. The immoral, therefore—the merely nugatory—cannot be made the theme of art.

Here, indeed, we must revert once more to the fact that whoever attempts to portray nature will certainly portray those phases of it which most nearly prefigure his own spiritual characteristics.
If these have assumed the negative, self-contradictory type then nature will wear the same aspect in the representations which he makes of it. Conspicuous examples of this are found in the wild, titanic elements in nature as exhibited in much of the poetry of Byron and in most of the landscapes of Salvator Rosa. In just so far as the individual spirit is arrayed against itself, in precisely the same degree will nature present to that spirit the same characteristic as the predominant one. To the bewildered soul of a Salvator Rosa nature will inevitably be pervaded by the spirit of chaos and prove to be composed only of a succession of fitting haunts for banditti, the chaotic element in humanity—a further confirmation of what has already been said respecting the absolute necessity that the artist should be thoroughly at one with himself and with the Divine Creative Spirit whose eternally harmonious activity it is that gives the world its existence and significance. Only he who possesses this stable spiritual equilibrium can seize the true meaning of nature; and to him it reveals itself in all its changeless sublimity and unfading beauty.

It is to be remarked finally that, as already intimated, the chief element of mountain scenery applicable in art is precisely this phase of calm, permanent immensity, in the midst of the mightiest strain of forces, which we are accustomed to call the Sublime. Other elements there are in such
scenery; but this is the chief, altogether over-mastering one. The forces of violence, of negation—the chaotic elements—even these may be introduced with advantage; but only upon the express condition that they appear as subordinated, completely subdued—like Enceladus beneath Ætna.

b. Spiritual Elements Reflected in Plains and in Vegetable Forms.

We have next to consider the spiritual significance expressed, or foreshadowed, in plains and in vegetable forms. Plains themselves have the significance of restful quietness. There is little to excite attention or to arouse the mind to heroic struggle. Of all the elements which nature supplies to art plains, simply as such, are least complex, least suggestive, least interesting. And yet their one chief quality—that of vast expanse—is itself a phase of the sublime. Here, assisted by various accompanying marks, the eye is led away into indefinite, vast distances, until the vanishing of all boundary in impalpable mists tends to awaken the feeling of the infinite and to elevate the soul above the merely visible and finite. It is here, indeed, that we may find the secret of many of the finest effects which Claude Lorraine produced. "By a sublime transmigration of soul Claude recollects having lived among the shepherds of Theocritus, having heard the flutes of Pan; and upon his canvas, bathed in light, he hol-
lows infinite distances that are not only depths of space, but perspectives of the soul."*

As elsewhere however—and we might almost say; even more than elsewhere—we have here an element that cannot possibly be taken in isolation, The plain, simply as such, is a desert. But even the desert is accompanied by air and by sun-light alternated with the milder radiance of moon and stars. It even possesses its mementoes of vanished seas; and here and there in its dead wastes are yet left the oasis—the blooming island in the sea of sand—with its supply of life-currents through hidden arteries that still connect it with the pulsing heart of the great world and hint prophetically that the desert but awaits the return of the waters to the depressions in its surface for the remaining portions to "rejoice and blossom as the rose!" At best, however, here is only barren material for art. Treeless plains, cloudless skies and vaporless atmosphere—only the sand-cloud raised by the hot, desolating winds which the ancient Egyptians very naturally attributed to the powers of Set (Typhon), the god of darkness and of desolating drought, in whose realms the delicate flower of art can never thrive.

On the other hand, plains having a luxuriant vegetation afford rich material for the landscape painter. Trees are not only endlessly varied in

forms, but they prove to be highly important aids in working out the problem of linear perspective in a picture—a value well understood by both Claude and Turner. So also the species of trees conform to conditions of climate and soil. The lofty, sombre pine is in unison with the solemn grandeur of the mountain and adds materially to the total effect of unchanging majesty; while the elm, with its large crown of gracefully curving and lightly swaying branches is in keeping with the sense of untroubled serenity belonging to the plains of temperate regions.

But vegetable forms possess a still more subtle value, to which we have already incidentally referred. They possess the element of life; and this brings them into a nearer relationship to humanity than that possessed by any of the forms of inorganic nature. Thus, from the earliest times, men have felt a peculiar sympathy for them and have developed the impressions received from them into many a charming myth and legend. In many parts of the world trees have been worshiped, and we can easily believe that the spirit of the tree was as much more approachable than the mightier spirit of the mountain, to the imagination of primitive man, as the outward and visible tree was more nearly within his physical grasp than was the towering, rocky mass. So again a most intimate relationship was imagined to exist between trees and the far more human than di-
vine race of nymphs; as witness the story of Daphne, beautiful daughter of the river Peneus, loved by Apollo and transformed into the Laurel by her father in answer to her cry for deliverence from the swiftly pursuing sun-god. The Greeks, indeed, looked upon every tree as being inhabited or animated by its nymph. Even the women by whom Orpheus was torn in pieces were transformed into trees. Again certain trees were thought to be specially suited to the manifestation of the will of a higher divinity through the rustling of their leaves—as in the sacred oaks of Dodona.

But other forms of vegetation were also considered to have their indwelling, or at least associated, spiritual principle akin to that of man. The beautiful youth Narcissus is changed by Venus into a flower for having despised the love of the nymph Echo. So also the beautiful hyacinth sprang up from the drops of blood that fell upon the earth from the wounds of the radiant boy whom Apollo had accidentally slain in hurling his disc.

As if to complete the conception of intimate relationship between man and vegetable forms man was thought to be born of “Mother Earth;” and the very name by which the Greeks designated man (anthropos) has been sometimes interpreted as having originally meant: “He who springs up like a flower!” So also in the myths of the early Teutonic peoples human beings were originally formed of trees—the man, of an oak tree, the
woman, of an ash; while the belief in fairies has scarcely ceased even in our own day. So that in spite of the studied efforts of the propagators of Christian doctrines during the Middle Ages to reduce every form of the supplanted heathen faith to the demonic type, the “white elves” still survive and “dance on the grass or sit in the leaves of trees.”*

Such myths but show how man has always, in however imperfect a fashion, recognized the struggling, inarticulate spirit of nature as in some mysterious way profoundly allied to his own; and how he has ever been,—for the most part unconsciously, but nevertheless irresistibly—drawn by his sympathy for it to put forth incessant efforts to give voice and utterance to this dumb, yet mighty, spirit. Viewed scientifically, indeed, these mythic interpretations, far from fading away as idle tales, are found only to need deepening and rationalizing to make of them no less true than beautiful expressions of the various phases of nature. And in this process the bond of sympathy between man and nature, far from dissolving, is found to have increased its strength immeasurably. The Nature-Spirit is found to be one with (because only a lower phase of) the Divine Spirit. Nature and Man are, therefore, alike the outgrowths of the creative activity of the Divine Spirit. Man does, indeed, actually begin his existence as an individual, quite

* Anderson’s Norse Mythology. p. 201.
within the realm of nature; but he is at the same time destined to completely transcend nature and free himself therefrom. His is the truly Herculean task* to "struggle upward out of nature into spirituality."† Thus, in a deeper sense than ever Greek dreamt of, man is earth-born and brother of the flowers.

This subtle, deeply-significant phase of life in nature, this dim foreshadowing of consciousness which we have already referred to as the human element in the forms of vegetation, is wholly wanting in the works of many landscape painters: a defect which can only be accounted for upon the presumption that they lack that delicacy of sentiment needful to the spontaneous recognition of this element on the one hand and, on the other, that they must have wholly neglected to acquaint themselves with the interpretations, mythological and scientific, which have been made of this phase of nature, and which could not fail to awaken, in some measure at least, a feeling of sympathy with the spiritual qualities present in nature. He who is not possessed of deep sympathy with and reverence for this element of the spiritual in nature, which, though obscure to human eyes, is nevertheless the very essence and vital principle of

---

* "Hercules is, among the Hellenes, that Spiritual Humanity which by native energy attains Olympus through the twelve far-famed labors". Hegel. *Philosophy of History* (Trans. J. Sibire) p. 248.

† Hegel. *Philosophy of Art* (Trans. Wm. M. Bryant) p. 82.
nature, ought never to touch brush to canvas with a view to painting a landscape. He whose vision does not penetrate to the soul of nature can at best only represent a lifeless, empty phantom-nature that must either repel or simply prove indifferent.

c. Spiritual Significance of Water.

We have seen that in the myths of the ancients nymphs were transformed into trees. We have now to remark that the original significance of the word nymph appears to have been simply "water."* We might almost regard this as a straw to catch at in proof of the proposition that primitive man was quite as familiar as are we of to-day with the secret workings of nature and that in saying nymphs (waters) become trees he only chose to express in poetic imagery his clear knowledge of the chemical processes involved in the growth of plants. Doubtless there was present in those beautiful myths the prophetic germ of scientific truth; but the very fact that these poetic forms were made use of exclusively in the explanations which man gave of natural processes is conclusive evidence that he had not yet learned to bring to bear the acromatic lens of reason upon the facts of the world about him and that the radiant truths of nature and spirit only entered fully into his consciousness after being dispersed into

* Cox's Mythology of the Arjan Nations. II. 257.
the thousand-hued spectrum of poetic imagery by the prism of human phantasy. Reason was present in high degree in all the works of the Greeks; but it was still involved in the forms of the imagination. Hence art, not science, was the form in which they gave expression to their profoundest conceptions. They recognized the evidences of intelligence in the growth of vegetation and in the flowing of waters; but, unable to rationally comprehend those evidences as pointing to the absolute Oneness of the Intelligence that rules the world,* they were apprehended under the form of multitudes of intelligent, semi-divine beings to whose presence in nature the life and movements of the outer world were attributable. Thus the bubbling up of springs, the playful babbling of the brook, the majestic, onward flow of the river, the heaving bosom, and the tossing waves, and the resistless might of the kingly sea—all were but the outer evidences of the indwelling presence of personal nymphs and river-gods and tritons and, above all, of earth-shaking Neptune.

The same feeling which led the Greeks to see in nature these myriad personal powers still holds its place in the human soul. Increased adequacy

* Even Anaxagoras, the loftiest mind among the Greeks up to the fifth century B. C., was unable to follow out the thought of the Universal Intelligence; but when he came to the applications of his sublime conception that "mind was the disposer and cause of all" he forsook "mind or any other principle of order" and "had recourse to air, and ether, and water, and other eccentricities". Plato's Phaedo. 97. (Jowett's translation).
of the interpretation of nature has but deepened the feeling while changing the form of its expression. Visher, whose great work abounds in the profoundest and most beautiful reflections, remarks that "Inorganic nature, in certain of its phases, reminds us of the vital processes of organic life. It appears as if contemplating itself, as if charmed with its own image.

"The transparent body permits the rays of light to pass through and scarcely causes its own texture to be observed by a noticable disturbance [in the transmission]. If lustre and reflection are united to this in so complete a degree as is the case in water and in the human eye, it cannot be deemed a matter of wonder that a thoughtful observer, deeply moved by the beauty of the effects of light in water, should cry out. 'It looks like the spirit'! or that the eye, that transparent gleaming, reflecting luminous-body, should appear to be the purest expression of spiritual depth in man." * Others, again, have declared that water is "the eye or the soul of landscape"; an expression that becomes more and more significant the more we reflect upon it. For even the pool, like the eye, reflects all before it: and, as the soul mirrors the whole universe, so every sheet of water reflects in its bosom the infinite depths of the sky with the myriad shining stars. So deeply

* F. T. Visher's Ἀσθετικ. II. 33.
significant is this element, indeed, that few artists in portraying landscape ever venture upon representing a scene that shows no trace of water. The only regions destitute of streams must also be destitute of clouds, and can therefore have no trees: they must be deserts.

The mere representation of a well and its moss-grown water-bucket, with which an artist here and there sometimes contents himself in this respect, might be accepted as symbolically suggesting (doubtless unconsciously on the artist's part) the Norse myth of the well of Mimir (the sea) and the pawned eye of the sky-god Odin who fares through heaven with his grey mantle (of clouds) and his single piercing eye (the sun) scanning the actions of men! Such symbolical representations, however, can at best be justified only in very restricted and simple landscapes of which the interest arises rather from association than from intrinsic significance: as, for example, in an old and cherished homestead where the buildings have been standing a sufficient length of time to give them something of the air of belonging to nature as among its own products and which thus seem the outgrowth of the combined efforts of man and of nature and afford a mystic, yet visible, connecting link between the human spirit and the spirit of nature.

Returning to the direct significance of water: it is to be observed that the incessant onward
flow of the river bears in itself a suggestion not only of the irreversible current of individual human life destined, so far as it is external and physical, to be swallowed up in the all-dissolving universal ocean of world-forces; but also of the ever-flowing stream of the thought of man which perpetually joins itself with and no less perpetually receives its substance from the infinite ocean of Divine Truth—and yet in all this process never loses its own identity. In all the world there is no finer symbol than this of the relation between the human soul and the Divine Spirit. It was the taking one-half the total process and considering that alone that led to the river being looked upon as a symbol of the soul losing itself in the Infinite. Here again, indeed, we see the recurrence, under a changed and deepened form, of the ancient interpretation. When we consider the sea—the might of it and the vastness of it—we are ready to exclaim: No wonder that, in the thought of the ancient Greek, mere nymphs were sufficient to animate the woodland stream while none but a mighty god could sway the billows of the ocean! To us of the modern world “The sea gives the idea of the indefinite, the unlimited, and infinite; and in feeling his own infinite in that Infinite man is stimulated and emboldened to stretch beyond the limited.” * The infinity of the sea, indeed, is

* Hegel's Philosophy of History. p. 94.
not merely nor mainly suggested by its expanse. Its infinite *mobility* and its consequent infinite variability of aspect are far more profoundly impressive. It is non-resisting, and yet irresistible. "It looks boundlessly innocent, submissive, friendly, and insinuating; and it is exactly this submissiveness which changes the sea into the most dangerous and violent element." Thus well-nigh every phase of the human spirit also is reflected in the sea. The calm sea is like a profound and friendly spirit inviting to the quiet but boundless joy of genuine companionship. The stormy sea is like the soul of man stirred to its depths and roused to the putting forth of the super-human might which it holds in reserve and of which it is perhaps itself quite unconscious until the occasion of some heroic deed lacking a doer calls for its utmost effort. The stormy soul of man is grand when its forces are directed to the accomplishment of some great and heroic purpose—just as the stormy sea is sublime in its exhibitions of might and only becomes terrible when it destroys. But again, the sea is like the spirit in that it is the all-embracing element and remains eternally one with itself in the midst of all its changes. Its very mobility results from the fine balancing of the reciprocal modes of force—attraction and repulsion; just as the never-ceasing activity of the spirit is due to the subtle interaction between attraction under the form of eager desire to
know on the one side; and repulsion, on the other under the form of dissatisfaction with any partial phase of truth. The heat of the sun perpetually destroys, and the gravitative force of the earth as perpetually restores the equilibrium of the waters of the ocean. Thus their very equilibrium consists precisely in their perpetual motion. Similarly the central Sun of Truth draws to itself the spirit of man in its entirety and at the same time not only warms it into a constantly expanding mobility but also gives to it its own center of gravity whereby it is able to actually draw into its own currents all the vital elements of the world and thus to assimilate them to its own essential being. Here indeed the soul proves itself to be unlike the sea. It transcends nature, becomes its own center of gravity, draws the whole world to itself and thus perpetually intensifies its own self-identity or personality at the same time that it deepens and enriches its identity with the Divine ALL of Truth. Nature falls short of this sublime end; and yet nature in general, and the sea in particular, possesses a high degree of sublimity precisely because there is contained within it a premonition of this end.

But the sublimity of the sea, that ceaselessly changing element so "like the spirit"—who can feel surprise that artists have ever found it one of the most difficult of all the phases of nature to seize and adequately portray? Who that has not
probed deep into the mysteries both of nature and of spirit can hope to paint the fleeting splendors of the sea and make them shadow forth the richer and abiding splendors of the human soul?

But neither is the sea to be taken in isolation. Each phase of nature—each phase, indeed, of the total universe—is linked indissolubly with every other; and no one of these can be understood, or be what it is, save in its relations to the rest. Thus, many of the finest and even grandest effects of marine views are due largely to atmospheric influences together with the action of sun-light. To these elements then we have next to give our attention.

d. **Spiritual Significance of the Atmosphere.**

Here again we meet with an element of deep and subtle significance. Itself invisible the air sighs through the pines of the mountain solitude and whispers mysteriously amid the leaves of the sacred oaks of Dodona; again it sweeps over plains, hurling down forests or wildly flinging aloft the dust of the desert—like a mourner over the dead waste;—or cleaves the ocean to its depths, as if seeking for hidden treasure. So the sad soul breathes itself forth in sighs; the soul charged with deep secrets whispers enigmatically; the soul that is maddened with great wrongs, or hopeless griefs, or unrestrained ambitions, rages at the perpetrators of wrong, shrieks forth its de-
spair, or rushes wildly after the objects of its overmastering desire. Not the "boy's will" only, but the man's will also "is the wind's will!" Man was conscious of the existence of the air before he knew himself to be in possession of a soul. But this invisible, powerful agent was seen to be in some mysterious way connected with man. Man breathed, and his breath was like the movements of the air. But the air, ever active, never dies. Could it not be that the "breath" of man was also immortal? Thus by degrees it dawned upon man that within him there was a deathless portion the separation of which from the body meant death to the latter only. And this deathless portion he named animus, simply changing the form of the word anima, air! True, this derivation goes no farther back than the Latin. But the term has been traced back to the root *an* "which, in the Sanskrit," as Max Mueller tells us, "means to blow, and which has given rise to the Sanskrit and Greek words for wind an-ila and an-emos. Thus the Greek thymos, the soul, comes from thyein, to rush, to move violently, the Sanskrit dhu to shake. * * * In Greek the same root supplied thyella, the storm-wind, and thymos, the soul, as the seat of the passions."* It is thus shown, as the same writer points out, that Plato guessed correctly that thymos, soul, is so called

---

"from the rushing and seething of the soul" (Crat. 419). So also the English term "soul" is the Gothic saivala, and this is clearly related to another Gothic word, saivs, which means the sea. The sea was called saivs from a root si or siv, the Greek seio, to shake; it meant the tossed-about water in contradistinction to stagnant or running water. The soul being called saivala, we see that it was originally conceived by the Teutonic nations as a sea within, heaving up and down with every breath, and reflecting heaven and earth on the mirror of the deep."* Again, in the ancient Hebrew legend God "breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Similarly the term spirit which has come to be used as signifying the totality of the immortal principle, including the three phases of Intellect, Sensibility and Will, is merely the anglicised form of Spiritus which, as Max Mueller has said, is certainly derived from a verb spirare, which means to draw breath.

Consistently with this mysterious character of the wind, of which in earlier times no one could tell "whence it comes or whither it goes," it was regarded as possessing many and various attributes. The Vedic Aryans addressed a multitude of hymns to the Maruts or storm-gods (winds) who were the constant associates of Indra "the wielder of the thunderbolt." With the Greeks the child-

---

god Hermes—the swift one—who, before he is an hour old leaves his cradle and stealthily drives the cattle of Apollo from their pastures, is the morning breeze which grows rapidly in strength and sweeps the clouds from the sky before the sun rises; while the music of the tortoise-shell lyre with which he softens the anger of the sun-god is the gentle whispering of this same, soft, seductive breeze!*

On the other hand, in the severer climate of Northern Europe, "the father of winter is called sometimes Windloni (wind-bringer), sometimes windsvalr (wind-cold), and the race is grim and cold-hearted, and like them is the winter."† In short the special characteristics pertaining to the winds of a given region have impressed the people of that region with the idea that those winds were personal powers benevolent or malevolent as the case might be.

Even this invisible element becomes visible in shimmering mists, in swaying grass, in bending boughs of trees, in drifting clouds, in driven snow, and in tossing, foaming waves. To the atmosphere indeed properly belong mists and clouds which are of chief importance in the atmospheric effects of landscape. Mists are in truth but clouds of extreme attenuation. They fill the whole space of a

* For a fuller interpretation of this charming myth see Cox's *Mythology of the Aryan Nations*. II. 230. See also Shelley's translation of the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*.

† Simrock's *Handbuch der deutschen Mythologie*. p. 31.
landscape and as it were render the air palpable. Im them lies one of the chief secrets of aerial perspective. The colors fade away by degrees and are lost at length in the grays of the infinitely penetrable mists in the distance; and through this buoyant, non-resistant medium the soul penetrates with supersensuous eyes beyond all bounds. The infinitely distant point to which things converge in linear perspective, becomes an infinitely extended sphere through the magic of aerial perspective. Linear perspective is the anatomical side of landscape painting; aerial perspective, the very breath of its indwelling spirit. The former is the simple prose of a picture and may be wrought out to perfection by the mere mechanic; the latter belongs to and involves all the most subtle of the poetic elements and can only be woven into the texture of a landscape by him whose soul is in unison with the most delicate pulsings of the inner life of nature.

Deep significance may also be given to a landscape by the forms and hues of its clouds. As for the "sky" with its far-off mystery of blue, that is indeed altogether subjective and has for its outer complex cause only a peculiar relation between the refracting and diffusing power of the air on the one hand, with the "ethereal undulations" on the other—a subject which need not here be discussed. The sky, nevertheless, bears the appearance of having an objective existence; and in art—which
is only a shadowing forth of the spirit—this outer seeming, whose reality is precisely within the mind or spirit of the beholder, must be treated as itself possessing reality. Furthermore, if the "sky" is allowed to have reality just because it is in truth a creation of the perceiving spirit, so a multitude of spiritual qualities are constantly ascribed to it. The sky is "cheerful," or "gloomy," or "threatening," or "capricious;"—it is the seat of emotions of the landscape! It has been significantly said (though we forget by whom) that: "In nature the sea is sometimes lashed into fury beneath a cloudless sky; but no artist would make the mistake of so representing it in a picture." But why would such a representation be a mistake? The answer is contained in what has already been said. For, as we have more than once repeated, it is the aim of every true work of art to give expression to some one predominating phase of spirit; it must constitute within itself a complete whole, an indissoluble unity. But there would be infinite contradiction instead of indissoluble unity in a picture representing a furious sea beneath a smiling sky! And this applies equally to all things representable beneath the sky. A cold coloring and evidences of high wind in grass and in trees could only harmonize with dull sky and "threatening" clouds above. So, on the other hand, the delightful effect produced upon the beholder by brightly-colored
foliage, and warm, shimmering atmosphere could only be intensified if on looking above and beyond he were here and there to

—"See a cloud all fervent with the sun,
Washed with the light, and sailing slow afar;
"
or if again, upon the sea shore, he were to notice that:

"On the verge
Where the horizon gray curves to the sea,
A thinnest vapor speeds; 'tis scarce a cloud,
And more like light slow-hardening."*

These words of a poet thoroughly imbued with the finest phase of the modern scientific spirit point in beautiful simile to the wondrous ethereal web of which the clouds are woven. As we see them, indeed, the sun-light is by far the finest part of their texture. Nor is this all; for in actual vision every sun-beam is a compound thread whose chief strand of strength and beauty is unwound from the reel of answering consciousness in the spirit of the beholder. Is it strange, then, that cloud-land should have been from time immemorial an enchanted world? Thus with the ancient Hindus, the Eranians and the Greeks, clouds were the cattle of Indra the storm-god, of Mithra "with wide pastures," of Apollo the god of light. In the Odyssean myth "Of all the clouds which are seen in the heavens the delicate vapors

which float like islets through the blue seas of air would be the friends of the sun [Ulysses] the black clouds which rudely thrust these aside, or blot them out of sight, would be the enemies who devour his men.” * These gloomy storm-clouds with straggling dark vapors were looked upon as gigantic beings, with rough, shaggy locks, moving fiercely about “with war-clubs as high as a ship’s mast” and bringing destruction upon the hapless way-farer. So too “the Kyklopes of the Odyssey is the son of Poseidon and the nymph Thoosa; in other words, he is emphatically the child of the waters, and of the waters only—the huge mists which wrap the earth in a dark shroud.” And again, “The flocks of the Kyklopes are the rough and misshapen vapors on which no sunshine sheds its glory, while the Kyklopes himself is the oppressive and blackening mist, through which glares the ghastly eye of the shrouded sun.”†—In contrast with these the lightly-floating clouds of a summer sky were fleets of magic ships that moved swiftly through mysterious seas without oars or rudder and which on occasion were vast enough to serve as a transport for a whole hierarchy of divinities and yet could be folded like a napkin and carried in the owner’s pocket! ‡ as is told in Norse legend of Skidbladnir, the ship

* Cox’s Mythology of the Aryan Nations. II. 175.
† Ibid. p. 213.
‡ Ibid. p. 277.
of Freya; while *Hringhorn*, the ship of the sun-god Baldur and “the largest of all ships” could not, with Baldur's dead body thereon, be moved by all the gods, though a giantess with a single thrust sent it into the sea with such force that “fire leapt from the rollers and the whole earth trembled.”* We shall scarcely go far wrong if we understand this to mean that the dead sun is thrust into the western sea of night by the mighty storm-cloud amid lightnings and thunder.

But again, as man began to build cities on the earth he also discovered cities in the clouds—only, these were more vast and of greater splendor than any whose pavements the foot of man had ever trod. Before he thought of building cities man fought battles, and accordingly saw superhuman heroes in the sun and other bright celestial beings doing battle against the demons of darkness. Himself at length a dweller in cities the bright clouds assumed betimes the forms of cities of the gods. A new Jerusalem built by unseen hands, and having pearly gates and gold-paved streets arose before his eyes.—So true is it that man sees in the world about him and above him precisely what he brings with him the eyes to see!

Thus in their perpetually changing aspects the sky and clouds are like the sea in the wide range of their adaptability to reflect the varying states

* Younger Edda. Gylfaginning. 49.
SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE OF LIGHT.

of the human soul; and for this reason they constitute one of the most deeply significant elements in landscape representation. Besides, the very mobility and Protean changefulness of this element, while they necessitate a correspondingly higher degree of skill to master it, yet at the same time they bring it only so much the more absolutely into subjection to the will of him who has caught the secret of discerning the myriad subtle phases of spirit which this element shadows forth, and of compelling each and all to reveal themselves in their appropriate, indefinable, and yet infinitely suggestive forms and hues upon his canvas.—But only a Prospero may command the Ariels and fill the sky with tempest or with sunshine at his will! Where there is one Turner who can paint a really fathomless sky and float therein vast volumes of clouds whose mystic significance is no less fathomless than the sky, there are scores of puny spirits who are content to substitute, in place of sky, impenetrable, curtain-like backgrounds the coarse monotony of which is only varied in degrees of dullness.—From such we hasten to the all-cheering Light!

e. Spiritual Significance of Light.

We have already referred to Light as the "the most ethereal, the most spiritual of all the elements;" and as suggesting the Divine in contrast with vegetable forms which rather suggest the human. We have now to consider somewhat
more fully those characteristics of Light which justify these assumptions.

In tracing out the physical elements of landscape as such we observed a gradual upward progression from solid masses through liquid forms and impalpable vapors to the "imponderable fluid," Light; and it was intimated that solid, liquid, vapor, and "imponderable fluid" are only so many phases of inter-relation between the two great reciprocal modes of force—namely: Attraction and Repulsion. Light, then, is only the highest tone in the grand harmonic scale of the physical universe. But just because of its very delicacy and intensity it is the all-penetrating, the truly radiant, mode of force. And in penetrating everywhere it becomes the universalizing, and universally unifying, agency of the outer world. Here again we have but to repeat the significant words of Visher. "Light and shade," as he tells us, are perpetually undergoing separation, and yet are as constantly blending together. It is by this means that individual bodies are manifest in all the manifold intricacies of their structure as well as in their unity; and that in a collection of objects which the eye runs over, the multiplicity is comprised in a unity and yet at the same time retains its manifoldness. * * * The highest light which plays over all leads up to the one point from which the light emanates; and this one luminous point now becomes the unity, the individu-
ality, in which the multiplicity of illuminated bodies is comprised. Or, by a fortunate accident, it happens that the most significant among these bodies—the one which dominates the others—stands in the strongest light; in which case it [the dominating body], as the focus of light, assumes the significance of this latter [i.e. of the strongest light]. The multiplicity of objects now group themselves about the light-unity like the forms [or members] of a single body: the light models the many into one.” * We need scarcely remark that Visher is here simply treating of the elements present in nature, where it does, indeed, depend very much on “fortunate accident” to determine whether the effects of light are such as to emphasize the unity of a given scene. The artist, on the contrary, must leave nothing to accident but independently determine the relations of the elements in his work so that all shall combine harmoniously in adding to the depth and in strengthening the unity of the whole. In illuminating his picture, indeed, the freedom of the artist reaches the utmost limit. And here, as elsewhere, true freedom—that is, conscious conformity to Reason—is precisely commensurate with the developed capabilities of the individual. As the artist penetrates more and more profoundly into the secrets of nature so he sees more and more

* Aesthetik. II. 29, 3.
clearly how light penetrates everywhere, and that light and shade are after all only relative degrees of light. Thus every object in the visible world is, to the beholder, because the all-pervading "Light" is reflected from its surface to his eye. In this sense we may accept without reserve the words of Visher that "To be, and to be in the light, are inseparable;" * that is, they are synonymous terms.—Here appears once more, and in still more striking form, that marvelous interrelation of elements to which we have already several times referred. We have found the light to be involved in every element that can enter into a work of art addressed to the mind through the eye. To the painter light is the magic agency with which he models all his forms, makes the very air visible and creates space itself! He seizes the sun-beam and with it, as with a wizard's wand, calls the whole world into being.—But here again modern science reveals to us a most significant interdependence that had not previously been suspected. Light as such, that is, as illumination; is absolutely subjective. It has no existence save in the mind of the beholder. Externally there is only a wondrously complex play of vibratory force. It is only when these infinitessimal vibrations of varying frequency and intensity impinge upon the eye and set the finely adjusted visual nerves throbbing with

* "Sein und im Lichte sein ist untrennbar."
like rapidity that there suddenly arises in the awakened spirit the splendors of the world of illumination and color. It is this outer vibratory force rebounding in every direction from every portion of all surfaces that penetrates the eye of man and gathers the countless isolated images of the parts of this extended world into vital unity in the spaceless focus of the human soul. But this takes place in such wise that the unity thus attained is instantly reflected back again in the true and full proportions of the corresponding outer world's immensity—only, it now bears the added glories of the thousand-hued actual illumination which only the spirit's god-like might could give it. This, then, is the reason why light is "the most spiritual of all the elements." As light, as illumination, as color, it is literally the creation of the perceiving spirit, aside from which light is simply and solely a mode of undulatory force. There is a premonition of self-movement, of consciousness, in the plant; but it remains after all only an analogy, however profoundly significant that analogy may be. The forces that undergo transformation in the plant still remain physical forces. They never complete the electric circle of self-consciousness which bursts into light the moment its poles are joined. It is the spirit itself that seizes on mere mechanical energy and transforms it into world-illuminating radiance. The sun and the stars are but vast centres of phy-
sical force: the spirit alone is a center of Light; it alone is truly "self-luminous."

But light is not simply fraught with spiritual significance in the sense thus far indicated. Its universality, its all-penetrating power, coupled with the possibility of being collected out of its space-filling immensity into a focus or non-extended point; its infinite variability in the midst of absolute unity; its perfect purity, incorruptible in the midst of decay; its infinitely vitalizing power, transforming decay itself into teeming life—all point to the very highest conception of the Spirit; to the Divine.

It is one of the most beautiful confirmations of the trustworthiness and genuine universality of human reason that these now scientifically demonstrated characteristics of light should have been in some degree anticipated in the early intuitions of the race. Without in the least suspecting the important part which his own spirit was ever playing in the creation of light primitive man yet recognized this element as something truly spiritual and divine, and worshiped it with never-flagging enthusiasm. Not only so, but precisely as his conception of his own spiritual nature deepened, so his conception of the spiritual qualities involved in light became richer and more adequate. At first the light was conceived of under the form of a multitude of bright but purely physical divinities who waged an incessant warfare against the
dreadful powers of darkness. By degrees man became conscious that illumination is spiritual as well as physical. The order of the *avataras* (incarnations) of Vishnu, the Hindu sun-god, is not a little suggestive in this connection. The first three involve little else than the idea of mere physical force; the fourth (in the form of a man-lion) exhibits the transition from mere brute force to intelligence; the fifth (in the form of a dwarf) shows a further stage of progress, but still it is spirit in the form of cunning—that is, of intelligence without corresponding moral sense; the sixth and seventh are characterized by chivalrous, superhuman courage and strength, but still limited to the mere individual exercise of these; the eighth is an embodiment of spirit as directive force, though of the military type; the ninth is in the form of a sage and thus rises to the conception of intellectual and moral leadership. This is, according to the legend, the highest to be reached in the present world. The tenth is yet to come when Vishnu will appear truly as a god and "renovate creation by an age of purity."* This kindly divinity who brought the all-gladdening light is thus shown to have passed (in the increasingly adequate conceptions of his worshipers)

* For a full enumeration (but without the above interpretation) of these *avataras* according to Hindu belief see Garrett's *Classical Dictionary of India*. Art. Vishnus. A short account of them is also given in Monier Williams' *Indian Wisdom*. p. 329.
through a series of stages of progressive development, from the mere brute-physical to the Divine-Spiritual. So also among the Greeks Apollo was at first simply the sun-god, but by degrees came to be the god of spiritual enlightenment; and in the outcome his worship in the latter capacity exercised a controlling and profoundly elevating influence in the unfolding of Greek culture. *— Similarly, when Christ came with his infinitely penetrating gaze into the true nature of spirit it was but inevitable that he should comprehend in all its fulness the profound symbolism of this element and, with his own absolute clearness of conviction respecting the high purport of his mission, should declare in his whole life, even had he omitted the direct statement in words, that he was come "a Light into the world." It was quite in accordance with this, too, that the author of the Fourth Gospel should look upon and represent his transfigured Master as preeminently embodying that "true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

The symbolism of Light is, in short, woven inextricably into the texture of all language and all literature, its significance becoming more and more distinctly spiritual as the consciousness of the race has become more and more thoroughly

* See the admirable remarks of Curtius in his History of Greece respecting the influence of the worship of Apollo on Greek civilization.
awakened, more and more profoundly reflective, more and more perfectly enlightened.

But again, just because of the infinite subtlety of this element its representation on canvas was utterly beyond the power of man until he had fairly arrived at the comprehension of himself as a spiritual being on the one hand, and of nature as but the embodiment of a lower phase of spirit on the other. So long as light continued to be worshiped as a divinity all attempts at representing it in art could only result in its condensing, so to speak, into a petrified image of Apollo; and this image, however beautiful it might be in itself, must still fall infinitely below the Light in its unapproachable sublimity. Only after that mighty transformation had been wrought in the human spirit by which, from having but dimly discerned the spiritual in the physical, man came at length to comprehend the physical as but a phase, and that the lowest phase, of the spiritual—only after the light had ceased to be apprehended as a god and God had come to be comprehended as the only actual source of Light—could man catch the true significance of the radiant beauties of the world of nature and paint at last the Transfiguration of the this lower Manifestation of the eternally creating Father.

This transformation once fairly completed however the matured poetic mind discovers that all nature is incessantly throbbing with an infinite
harmony every tone of which finds an echo in his own soul and proves the indissoluble unity of the human spirit with the spirit of nature. Only the eyes of a modern poet for example could behold in nature a scene like the following:

"Out of the windows of rock are peering the eyes of the flowers,
Wishing to see the fair world, wishing themselves to be seen;
They make the tapestry which is now hanging adown from the hill-tops,
All their bright colors you see melting to beauty the cliffs.
Over them hover Parnassian bees, the merry musicians,
In a thousand-fold hum striking the note of the flowers;
All with variance, from the big drum of the bumble-bee's pinions
To the small pipe of the fly in yon acacia's blooms.
Air and sky to the melody are most deeply accordant,
They have a festival too, for they are married to day,
And they now kiss in the bridal embrace, while lofty Phloumbouki
Blandly his shaggy old sides sways in the waves of the song.
Leave me not out, I have also my place in the symphony Delphian,
For my body is changed into a many stringed harp
Which is struck by the throbs that are sent from the soul of this nature,
Till I am one with it too, chanting the music I feel."

The poet, fully possessed of this exclusively modern mode of viewing and interpreting nature will

---

give some such gayly beautiful and at the same time deeply significant form as Mr. Snider has done to the harmony he has discovered; or, if he be a tone-poet, he will give utterance in a charming composition of pastoral music to the state of mind awakened within him; if a poet of color he will blend upon canvas his own soul with the soul of nature in a brilliant musical landscape.

Thus, as all hues of color blend into the unity of Light; so all the elements of beauty of the outer and inner world blend into the unity of the supreme radiance of the spirit. Such is the conclusion at which we arrive through a consideration of the outer and the inner elements of the art of landscape painting.

§ 3. Accessory Elements of Landscape Painting,

We have already referred incidentally to the restriction that should be placed on the use of accessories in the representation of landscapes. It will now be well to indicate somewhat more precisely the limits within which these elements should be confined. They are, of course, like other elements, partly subjective, partly objective but their peculiar relation to the work of art as a whole obviously necessitates their consideration in a separate class.

We have in the first place to recall the principle already more than once referred to, that every work of art must be an individual whole, in order
to be a work of art at all. With this principle as our guide we are prepared to assert with confidence that the moment an accessory element begins to withdraw attention from the central theme of the work of art into which it has been introduced it ceases to be really an accessory—an element the presence of which aids in heightening the total effect—and becomes an element of weakness which, according to the importance it assumes, simply disturbs or wholly destroys the work by the division of interest which it introduces. The accessory element must be absolutely subordinate to the central interest of the work of art as a whole. Whatever this central interest may be—whatever the predominant thought or sentiment—this must be faithfully, and with loyaldest simplicity, reflected or echoed in the accessory. When, therefore, man is introduced as an accessory element into a landscape representation this must be done in such wise that the soul of Nature will be rendered only so much the more manifest in its glory and supremacy by his humble presence. Strictly speaking, therefore, it is only as the docile child of Nature that man can be properly admitted into representations where the chief interest centers in the landscape.

Similarly with architectural accessories as well as with those consisting of animal forms: in every case their absolute subordination to the central interest must be rigidly insisted upon. Whatever
phase of nature the artist has chosen to represent, the architectural accessories made use of must be so managed as to bear the appearance of being quite as much the product of the forces involved in this phase of nature as of being the work of man; while the animals must appear as if sprung from the very soil on which they walk.

This brief indication of the limits of accessory elements in landscape representation must suffice for the present, though we shall find use further on for the basis of judgment which it supplies.
CHAPTER II.

RELATION OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING TO THE OTHER FORMS OF ART.

It will be of the greatest service to refer here, however briefly, to Hegel's fundamental classification of the various forms of art. This classification is completely organic and indestructibly vital. It involves the very same fundamental principle that underlies the entire classification which modern scientists have discovered in the organic world of nature and which they have formulated in the Natural-History sciences. It has been observed (1) that the simpler forms or phases of the finite world—whether animate or inanimate—precede the more complex; (2) that the more complex forms involve, or presuppose, the existence of those simpler forms; and (3) that these more complex forms render explicit or actual certain phases which were present only implicitly or potentially in those simpler forms. Thus the whole world is essentially a vast process of development or evolution; and no theory of the world can be adequate or true that is not substantially a "Development-Theory." It may be, indeed, that the men who
have done most to trace out and formulate the proofs of this general theory as regards the physical world have in some—perhaps most—instances become so completely occupied with and absorbed in the splendors of this great truth even in its physical aspects as to forget to look beyond to the far diviner glories it unfolds on the spiritual side; but that would assuredly be a very insufficient reason for our withholding the admiration and gratitude due them for the valid and inestimably valuable revelations they have made. Nevertheless it needs but to trace the most indubitably legitimate results of the Natural Sciences to their necessary logical outcome (which is at the same time their necessary presupposition) to see that each new phase of the great World-process, as this unfolds in time, is but a richer development of the Divine Idea which is itself the infinitely self-conscious Potency that gives reality to the whole and hence is present in every part; that this Divine Idea is, in fact, the actual, substantial energy of Reason which (or rather Who) constructs and governs the world and is therefore eternally complete in its own infinite Unity, and eternally beginning in its own infinite multiplicity. Its absolute completeness necessarily involves at every moment the actual existence of the whole infinite series of relative degrees or stages of completeness. Hence Geologists, for example, have but followed out the manifest course of absolute
Reason in characterizing the period of the formation of the earliest known fossiliferous rocks from the abundant remains of the simplest type of life found in them, and also in classifying the successive periods in accordance with the structural types of organisms that are found to have *predominated* therein. Hence it is that this classification of periods or epochs in the development at once of the stratification of rocks and in the stratification of life on the earth is not in the least invalidated by the fact that the type of organism which gives to each period its distinguishing character overlaps indefinitely both forward and backward—even so far that *all the fundamental types* of animal life were not only actually present within the limits of the earliest of the ages characterized by organic structures but those types have even survived to the present day without losing their fundamental distinctions. At the same time no one doubts that mollusks are structurally more complex, and therefore higher in their type, than are radiates; nor that articulates are superior to mollusks, and vertebrates to articulates for the same reason. Further, if the question is considered chronologically it is found that the simplest type attained to its ultimate (typical) completeness first, and was for a long period the dominant type; that next in order of time the next simplest type reached the fulness of its development and became in turn the predominant and therefore
characteristic type of the age; and so on in succession to the last and highest type. On the other hand there is much force in the argument of Agassiz that "If all the primary types appeared simultaneously one cannot have grown out of another." To this, indeed, it might be answered that the argument as stated is open to the objection that we are not bound to believe all these types to have "appeared simultaneously" because they are all found represented within the limits of a geologic age extending over one knows not what stretch of millennia. But the chief point to be insisted upon in any case, and the one of central interest to us here is: that whatever the particular mode of its unfolding, the Plan, the System, is beyond controversy; and the evidences which this plan bears of progression from lower to higher structural types are no less incontestible. So also each fundamental type includes its several classes which again range unmistakably from lower to higher; and when we come to the type of Vertebrates we find that it was actually represented in the primal age only by its lowest class, (viz. Fishes), and that the other classes have appeared successively in the order of their structural rank. And, let us repeat, the fact of this fundamentally progressive development is by no means interfered with nor is its significance in any wise weakened by the equally incontestible fact of the simultaneous existence of re-
presentatives of all these fundamental types in every age since the dawn of life on the earth. The Idea is present in all its fundamental forms even in the primal, potential stage.

We may now turn from this meagre intimation of the essential order in the unfolding of the life-forms of the natural world to a consideration (which must also be as brief as possible) of the essential order exhibited in the unfolding of the thought-forms of the spiritual world. And since the immediate purpose here is to show the unfolding of these thought-forms as they appear in the realm of art we shall repeat with little change what we have elsewhere* said by way of condensed summary of Hegel's Ästhetik.

The entire work published by Hegel under the title of Ästhetics is divided into three portions. The first treats of the Ideal in Art. The idea of the beautiful is here philosophically accounted for, its characteristics fully traced, and the course of its development foreshadowed.

The second division treats of the Development of the Ideal in the Various Forms of Art. The profound historical significance of art is here fully set forth. Art-activity is but one phase of the development of spirit. Ästhetics is, therefore, but one branch of the Philosophy of Spirit. Hence the forms developed through æsthetic endeavor will

* Journal of Speculative Philosophy. 137. p. 400.
be found to conform to the successive stages of the development of spirit. During the early period of human history, the spirit of man was crude, and, so to speak, altogether in the potential mode. Here, thought could at best be but vague and abstract. Properly speaking, it could not as yet be said to be *expressed*; it was only vaguely *suggested* in sensuous form. Such sensuous forms, vaguely manifesting spirit, are *symbols*. The Orient—the cradle of the race—and above all, Egypt, is the land of the symbol.

But with the progress of spirit, the inadequacy of these forms becomes apparent. Man gradually recognized himself as a spiritual being, and the higher powers as intelligences. Schiller's epigrammatic saying that

"While the gods remained more human
The men were more divine"

should be reversed. The truth is that as man became more godlike the gods became more human. Thought became at once definite and *finite*, and it here found its perfectly adequate *expression* in the finite human form. This is the stage of the absolute perfection of sensuous beauty. Form and Idea are now, for a moment in the world's history, absolutely blended; and the product is Greek Plastic Art.

It is manifest, however, that the infinitely progressive spirit of man must ultimately pass beyond this stage of finite sensuous thought. Finite
divinities can be supreme only for a limited period. The vigor of Greek thought itself, indeed, was quite sufficient of itself to transcend this limited sphere, and to reach and fairly grasp the conception of the necessary, absolute, self-differentiating unity of the supreme World-Force. Thus Idea is once more separated from Form. Christianity completed the realization of this conception, but in such wise as to afford abundant material for art. The absolute, divine *One* was manifest sensuously in an actual human being. The anthropomorphism of Greek religion, and hence of Greek art also, was dissolved only to give place to an anthropomorphism of a vastly higher significance. With the Greeks, man discovered in himself the ideal of his gods. Christianity shows man that his own infinite Ideal is found realized once for all in the supreme Divinity. The human and the divine are now united by an absolute bond—a spiritual bond—and the beauty which art seeks in this new realm is, above all, the *beauty of the spirit*. The art which develops within this sphere is thus appropriately styled Christian or Romantic Art.

We have thus three necessary stages in the development of spirit, and three fundamentally distinct phases of art corresponding severally thereto. With three strides the dwarf of Hindu mythology takes possession of the world. The dwarf proves to be Vishnu, who is, indeed, first of all the *Preserver*, but who also wields and em-
bodies within himself both the destructive power of Shiva and the creative energy of Brahma. Spirit, dwarfish and impotent at the outset, so soon as it realizes and formulates its own demands speedily reveals its god-like might, and proves, in its ultimate potency, to be itself both the universal solvent and the vital element of the world.

The third part of the Æsthetics presents the System of the Particular Arts. Of this third part we can here say little more than that it is but the carrying out, in detail, of the system presented in the second general division, as the second is itself foreshadowed and contained in germ in the first.

Architecture, with its abstract mathematical forms and vast, ponderous masses, is peculiarly adapted to symbolism. Sculpture, still occupying the three dimensions of space, yet solves the problem of reducing heavy matter to the most exquisitely refined representation of the human form which, of all sensuous forms, is the most perfect and most beautiful manifestation of spirit. Form and content, spirit and its manifestation, are here viewed as constituting one and the same totality. It is the point of mediation between the simple, abstract infinity of oriental symbolism on the one hand, and the concrete, vital infinity of the Romantic World on the other. Painting possesses, in respect of its material, practical freedom from the law of gravity; to it belong the powerful effects
of color, the magic of light and shade, and the two-fold miracle of perspective. These render it capable of satisfying demands immeasurably beyond the reach of the other arts of visible representation—immeasurably beyond any demands that were definitely made of any form of art during the period of the predominance of symbolism or of that of classicism. Hence, it was only after the human spirit had reached the profoundly concrete stage of a well-defined and vital faith in the personal immortality of the individual, with all that is implied by this, that the utmost capabilities of this richly endowed form of art were called into activity, and its loftiest achievements realized. Painting is thus an essentially modern form of art. Its highest purpose is to express spiritual beauty, independent of, and often in opposition to, sensuous beauty; nay, at times, even by means of the physically ugly and repulsive.

Of Music and Poetry we can here permit ourselves to utter but a single word, and that mainly by way of comparing the one with the other. Music wholly rejects sensuous form from its products. Poetry retains such forms, but presents them only for the imagination, through the subtle medium of language. Speaking generally, music may be said to be the more subjective of the two, since in its realization it is a series of states of the soul. Poetry, on the contrary, is more objective, since it excites definite images, which appear
to the imagination as external realities. Music may, in short, in comparison with poetry, be called the manifestation of spirit under the (comparatively) passive form of feeling, while poetry is the manifestation of spirit under the more active form of intellectual comprehension. In their total range, however, these two forms of art are each commensurate with the entire range of the human spirit, in so far as spirit manifests itself under appropriate sensuous form. They are the wings on which the human phantasy first fluttered from its nest, and which carry the full-fledged imaginative spirit nearest the sun of truth. Music expresses, with exquisite exactitude, every phase of feeling, from the simplest to the subtlest. It is the absolute philosophy of the emotions. Poetry expresses, with equal power and skill, every phase of thought from the child-like fanciers of the Arcadian shepherd to the loftiest conceptions within the range of imagery. This immense range and subtlety of power to sensuously manifest spirit, proves the superiority of these two forms of art over the arts of visible representation; and of these two, poetry as the more active and virile, must unquestionably be recognized as holding the first rank.

Thus, from architecture to poetry we have an ascending series, at each progressive stage of which there is less dependence upon the material, and greater power to express the spiritual.

Such, in brief, is the general purport of Hegel's
Æsthetic, and from it may be inferred the principle upon which his classification of the arts depends.

To this we shall now add some further observations with a view to rendering the general conception of the progressive development of the types of art more explicit. We shall thus be able to show more precisely and conclusively the place which Landscape Painting occupies in a reasoned classification of the various forms of art. And first it is to be observed that the course of human development presents us with three, and only three, distinctly marked types of thought and hence the same number of distinctly marked types of thought-forms; and in art these thought-forms become art-forms. Each type, again, has its clearly distinguished classes, and the distinctions, both in the types and in their classes, are such as to exhibit a clear and unmistakable progressive development. The first type of thought is characterized by vagueness. The spirit is but half-awakened. It is dazed by the new light that is dawning upon it. It yearns to comprehend the world and to give expression to the significance which the world dimly presents to it. Under such conditions thought can never actually arrive at expression; it can only be vaguely suggested or shadowed forth. The result will be, not a clear statement, but only a voiceless symbol. But every new phase of thought is seized at first in a similar way. Hence
every new epoch of intellectual activity will be characterized by a preliminary twilight stage of comprehension, the utterances of which will necessarily be of the symbolic type. And as each new phase of thought is broader, deeper, richer, each new phase of symbolism will present a corresponding superiority over the preceding phases. Meanwhile clearness of conception is attained in certain directions and thought actually arrives at expression in those directions. The first form of this is the plastic; which proves its superiority over the symbolic and supercedes it as the dominant type; though here, as elsewhere, that which is superceded is by no means destroyed. On the contrary symbolism actually maintains its existence in the perfectly developed classic World of Greece—but only as a subordinate type.

The Classic, again, is found to be not a final, but only an intermediate or transition type. It gives expression to thought, but only to thought that is finite. At length spirit passes beyond this limit, discovers the inadequacy and even the impossibility of polytheism as the final term of faith, and learns at last the true relation of man to the Divine. In this latest stage man becomes aware by slow degrees that the Divine has not been present merely here and there, and only at widely separated periods, among men, but the Divine is perpetually present in man with ever-increasing vital truth as man continues his successful
struggle upward out of nature into spirituality. Here, then, is a wholly new mode of viewing the world—a new and richer type of thought that must inevitably in its turn assume predominance over the preceding types: while the art-forms specially appropriate to it will now for the first time arrive at their complete development. At the same time the forms previously predominant must as inevitably fall into subordinate rank, though they still maintain their existence. Here at least (wherever may be said of the relation between the types of the vegetable and animal kingdoms) the new actually grows out of the old and does so by bringing into reality what was present only potentially in the old.

Now, as we have already seen, the characteristic art form of the first or symbolic type of thought was Architecture; that of the classic type was Sculpture; while the third and most complex—the Romantic—type gives proof of its completer freedom by unfolding its greater wealth of spiritual substance in the three refined and now for the first time perfected modes of expression: Painting, Music, and Poetry.

To this we must now add that just as all the types of life in nature are found to have been represented in each of the geologic ages of the world, yet without in the least affecting the essentially progressive character of those types themselves, or lessening their significance as successively
characterizing the geologic ages; so, on the other hand, the fundamental types of thought are found to have been in some degree all present in every age of man, while at the same time the essential distinctions between these types remain in full force and become deeper in significance with the advance of time; for it is evident that as the types of thought have unfolded from abstract simplicity to concrete richness and fulness so the corresponding thought-forms must necessarily have unfolded in like order—as they are shown historically to have done—and that these forms afford the best, and, indeed, the only thoroughly rational, basis for the classification of the successive epochs of human development. Thus, as already suggested, what the new phases successively bring into full reality was present in potential form in the earlier phases. In the field of art, indeed, all the forms were present in reality within the limits of the earliest ages, though the forms appropriate to the richer phases of thought only attained to a superficial reality so long as the richer phases of thought themselves remained unrealized. We may cite as an example of this the fact that under the very shadow of those mighty symbols, the temples of Egypt, a Pentaur could write a noble hymn to Amon-Ra and declare with utmost distinctness the oneness of the Divine; but even this finest specimen* of the poetry of Egypt cannot

* See the translation of it in Records of the Past.
for a moment compare with that grand and beautiful hymn *The Celestial Country* which Bernard of Cluni wrote in the quiet of his cloister near the middle of the twelfth century A. D. Pentaur’s poem is pervaded by the spirit of symbolism. Every phrase in it is a symbol! Bernard’s hymn, on the contrary, is radiant with the perfect self-consciousness of the spirit. Symbolism is not wanting in it; but its symbols are reduced to transparent *similes* whose spiritual significance is clearly understood.—So also the colossal statues of the Egyptians, with their inorganic stiffness and sphynx-like solemnity are but symbols of the struggling spirit which had as yet but half emerged from the fatality of mere physical nature; while the statues of the Greeks—those of Apollo in particular—were like solidified light which became the nucleus whence radiated the diviner light of the spirit. The poetry of the Greeks, again, was unmistakably of the plastic type, as were also their painting and even their architecture. Each of these forms of art was carried by the Greeks to the utmost limit of its possibilities of expression so far as these possibilities were applicable to the plastic phase of thought. Whatever possibilities of expression they might possess for another and more complex phase of thought must of necessity re-

* The text, accompanied by the metrical translation of Dr. John Mason Neale, is contained in *The Seven Great Hymns of the Mediæval Church* New York (7th Ed.) 1868.
main unrealized until that phase should itself become developed. Thus it was only after man had *completed* his struggle upward out of nature into spirituality that it became possible to bring into perfect exercise the utmost powers of expression belonging to those forms of art which from their extreme delicacy and complexity were specially adapted to give utterance to the most subtle and at the same time the most deeply penetrating phase of spirit—phases which must, from the very nature of the case, be latest in their development. It is thus that painting and music in particular, together with dramatic and all forms of reflective poetry, have only attained to completeness of realization as forms of art in quite modern times.

While, therefore, Architecture is the form of art specially adapted to give expression to the symbolic phase of thought, and Sculpture is best suited to the requirements of the plastic phase, it becomes evident that Painting, Music, and Poetry as distinctly pertain to the Romantic or modern phase of thought both because they are specially adapted to giving expression to that phase and because no other phase possessed the spiritual substance and vital energy that were indispensable to the bringing of those forms into perfect realization.

It thus becomes evident that the classification which Hegel has made of the various forms of art,
so far from being "arbitrarily constructed" to bring it into conformity with his general system of philosophy is not his classification at all; but only the classification inherent in the very nature of thought and hence inherent also in its necessary forms or modes of expression. True, the classification is in perfect harmony with the general system of Hegel. But the only legitimate conclusion to be drawn from this is that of increased admiration for and confidence in that system as a comprehensive and adequate interpretation of the facts of the world as a whole including the two phases of Nature and Spirit.

But we must cut short this digression—sufficient having been said (we trust) to show that the general principle upon which Hegel's classification of the arts depends for its vitality is throughly rational. This much it was essential to do in the present connection, since that principle has been and will be kept constantly in view as the guide throughout the whole course of the present essay; and the validity of the conclusions to which we are here led could be made most clearly apparent by tracing out, even thus briefly, the evolution of human thought as exhibited in the whole course of the development of Art.

One thing remains to be done before proceeding to consider more precisely the relation of Landscape Painting to each of the other forms of art. It is to determine precisely the phase of
spirit which the art of Landscape Painting is best adapted to express. We have already shown that while painting, music, and poetry have existed as forms of art from the dawn of civilization to the present time, they have, nevertheless, attained to maturity only within, and have been specially characteristic of the art-side of the final period of human development; and that it is to this period therefore that they essentially belong.

Now, these three forms of art stand in the most intimate relationship to one another. In their maturity they are pervaded by, and are themselves but so many modes of expressing, the same essential phase of spirit. On the other hand, their modes are fundamentally different. The representations of painting are subject to the conditions of coexistence in space; those of music, to the conditions of succession in time; while those of poetry combine these two orders of conditions harmoniously in the completest possible form of artistic expression. Painting accomplishes its highest task by portraying in visible form some lofty and permanent truth; but with its representations of various phases of thought will always be combined the various phases of corresponding sentiment. Music performs its highest task by awakening in the soul, by means of sound, some deep, pure sentiment which will, at the same time be sur-charged with earnest thought. In both forms of art thought and sentiment are insep-
rably combined; but in painting thought predominates, while in music sentiment is the ruling element. Music, again, enters into poetry as rhythm, while the two forms blend inseparably in the song. The music then becomes a means of conveying most effectually the substance of the poetry, while the poetry is at the same time but a text to the music, rendering the sentiment of the latter more explicit, richer, and more effective.

But again, the relation between thought and sentiment is extremely variable in the actual productions of these several phases of art. Painting may present us with a group mechanically accurate in drawing, and expressing with clearness some highly valuable thought, and yet the whole be unaccompanied with sentiment. Such work is coldly intellectual. It is the result of reflection rather than of imagination and belongs rather to science than to art. It is a prosaic thought in an artistic form and thus corresponds to didactic poetry. On the other hand the artist may be so far overborne by the fervor of sentiment that, in the impassioned process of the conception and execution of his work, forms and colors seem to fuse and blend into a rhythmic expression of sentiment pervaded by thought, rather than of thought pervaded by sentiment. Here then we have painting that, so far as materials and methods of execution permit, actually becomes transformed into music. So on the other hand, music may be-
come descriptive and seem to paint in tints of sound! We may mention in this connection the works of Correggio which have more than once been cited as illustrating the extreme musical expression to which painting can attain. It cannot be doubted that the works of this artist exhibit the transition from thought to sentiment as the predominating characteristic. The scenes he depicts are characterized by child-like innocence. His personages beam with unclouded gladness. They have never known evil and cannot suspect its existence. They are children of nature; and nature knows no irreconcilable conflicts. True the forces of nature are perpetually arrayed against each other; and so long as they are personified the moral element will be attributed to them. Not only so but even after the scientific spirit has shown that inertia, indifference, un consciousness is the characteristic of the physical world it is manifest nevertheless that the spiritual element is still foreshadowed or symbolized in nature. It is this, indeed, that constitutes the substance of the myths of the early world, and thus those myths are the first rude attempts to trace out and formulate the Reason that is everywhere present in the world. But in the physical world, as just intimated, Reason (which is the substance of the world) is present only in the external and unconscious form. Hence the violence of the physical forces is innocent simply because the unconscious
does not involve the moral. Here we have but the interaction between opposite modes of force neither of which could exist without the other. Similarly in the realm of the conscious, the spiritual as such, the modes of force are also opposite and reciprocal; but the phase of consciousness bears with it necessarily the phase of morality. The positively moral is the proper adjustment—the equilibrium as we have expressed it on an former page—between these modes of force. The ill-adjustment of them constitutes the immoral, the evil, and demands a struggle to bring the opposing forces into reconciliation, into equilibrium, into harmony. Human life, in its ideal type, is the grandest of symphonies. The composition is perfect. Only in its unskillful performance can discords arise. But, as we have insisted throughout the present essay, the same Universal Spirit pervades both the unconscious world of nature and the conscious world of humanity. Hence the same harmony which it is the purpose of man to realize within himself in the fullest degree is present in its grand outlines in nature also; though, as so often repeated, it is present there only in the unconscious stage. Nature is indeed a phase of Spirit; but a phase which perpetually struggles toward, without ever wholly arriving at, consciousness. It is pervaded by sublime and beautiful thoughts and sentiments, but these never attain to clear utterance within this realm. They must be
interpreted in order to be understood by man. They correspond to the emotional rather than to the intellectual side of truly spiritual nature. In short the harmony of the world of external nature is *predominantly musical*, and landscape painting is precisely the field in which painting approaches most nearly to music. If Correggio’s works partook of the character of the musical it is because they were essentially nothing else than the expression of the beautiful, unruffled harmony of nature. That is, they were thoroughly pervaded with the very *spirit* of landscape painting, though the outer, formal elements of landscape were not given special prominence in them.

It thus appears that landscape painting stands in the most intimate relationship to music. Each accepts as the predominating spiritual element of its works the comparatively passive phase of emotion. But emotion itself can never exist separately; and it becomes deepened and enriched precisely in the degree in which it is pervaded by intellect. Hence every great production—whether of music, or of painting, or of any other art—must not merely “please”; it must also be significant. Indeed, it cannot even please the cultivated mind save through being significant. And its greatness will be measured by the degree in which it arouses both emotion and thought in which, indeed, the will is also inextricably involved.

If, now, we reflect upon what has previously
been said respecting the spiritual significance of the various outer elements of landscape painting we will see that the various phases of significance which those elements express have always appealed to the poetic imagination; and that the appeal has always been of such vague type that man has always unconsciously mingled with his interpretations of it, first of all his emotions, whether of admiration, of reverence, of fear, or of love. In short, that the appeal was answered by the emotions is proof of how decidedly the appeal was addressed to the emotions. True, man was especially an emotional being in the earlier stages of his development; but it was also precisely in those stages that man was most overwhelmingly impressed by nature.

We may assume, therefore, that emotion is the predominant spiritual element in landscape painting and that in point both of subject-matter and of general treatment it occupies substantially the same rank as music. On the one hand the emotional character of these two forms of art gives them a kind of general popularity. On the other hand the vagueness inseparable from that character prevents them from being clearly understood or rightly appreciated in their richest development save by the few.

But not only do landscape painting and music stand closely related to one another as the highest and most adequate mode of expressing emotion; they also prove to be nearly allied in the
external means of which they make use. The chief means or physical element of music is sound; that of landscape painting is light. But both sound and light are, externally, nothing but modes of vibration differing from one another chiefly in degrees of intensity and velocity. It is in the soul alone that aerial vibrations become sound, and ethereal vibrations become light. Thus the human soul is a diviner Æolian Harp that not only transforms the vibrations of the atmosphere into the enchanted world of musical harmony, but also breaks up the tense, tremulous radiance of the rising or the setting sun into the anthems or the requiems of the music of color.

What has now been said will suffice to show in a general way the rank which landscape painting holds in the classification of the various forms of art. There remains to show more precisely its relation to each of these forms.

§ 1. Relation between Landscape Painting and Architecture.

It is to be observed at the outset that the principal external elements of both these arts are taken from the inorganic world. But while architecture makes use of the actual materials of inorganic nature, landscape painting includes in its work only the semblance of outer materials. The former constructs a symbol suggestive of vague conceptions of the powers that rule the world.
The latter exhibits the forces of nature, as it were in their actuality. Both are expressive of spirit in its passive modes; but the one only vaguely points to a beyond—to an incomprehensible infinite; * while the other unfolds the outer physical infinity before our eyes and awakens within us the inner and richer infinity of the spirit through the subtle medium which the soul transforms into light.

But the landscape is necessary to architecture as its foundation. Architecture makes use of vast masses of solid, heavy materials. Its structures are completely subject to the law of gravity and must therefore be definitely located and firmly fixed upon the solid earth. Thus, at first view, it would seem that architecture must constitute an especially appropriate element in landscape representations; and Ruskin expressly declares that he so considers it. Nevertheless this view is not without the gravest difficulties. For, it must be borne in mind, the central purpose of landscape representation is to deepen and render explicit some phase of sentiment which is more or less vaguely suggested by this or that view of nature. But buildings are erected with the view of satisfying either the outer or the inner needs of man—they are constructed either as a shelter from external

* As in the pyramids and temples of Egypt, and in the Cathedrals of Europe.
violence * or as an abstract symbol of the vague, inner longings of the soul. It can be only the result of fortunate accident, therefore, that pronounced harmony can exist between the edifice and the general aspect of the landscape in the midst of which it is placed. Topographical and climatic influences are by no means wholly inoperative either in the determination of the general type of architectural construction, or in the characteristic development of the inhabitants of a country. But these influences are dominant only in the earliest ages, and become relatively less and less potent as civilization advances. It can, therefore, be only in comparatively rare instances that the admission of the element of architecture into landscape representation will have any other effect than to disturb the harmony of the work considered as the portrayal of a particular phase of nature.

It cannot be doubted, indeed, that true, and admirable, works of art exist which are usually and properly classed as examples of landscape painting and of which architecture nevertheless constitutes one of the chief elements. But the finest specimens of such work will be found to be wholly idealized compositions and to be pervaded by the

* Man shields himself both from the violence of nature and from the violence of his fellow man by enclosing a portion of space within which he is undisputed master. The violence of nature is due to the natural course of climatic changes; the violence of man consists in his unnatural invasions of his neighbor's domain and plundering and putting to vicious uses his neighbor's property—whether in "goods" or in facts pertaining to personal honor and reputation.
essential characteristic of architecture—that is, *symbolism*. We need but mention, as illustrative of this statement, Turner's *Ancient Italy*.

As an accessory properly speaking therefore architecture can be given place in landscape representations only to a very limited extent; and when introduced it must of course be made to conform to the principle governing the employment of accessories in art generally; that is, it must be kept distinctly subordinate to the general tone of the picture into which it is introduced and thus be made to heighten the total effect.

§ 2. *Relation of Landscape Painting to Sculpture.*

The highest products of sculpture consisted in the representation of the forces of nature under the resplendent forms of the Greek gods. The highest products of landscape painting consist in the representations of the physical world in all its complexity of earth and sea and sky and atmosphere and light, but in such wise that in every phase there is shadowed forth the premonition of the divine, unpicturable Reason whose activity constitutes the world both physical and spiritual. In the immeasurable contrast between the two modes of viewing nature exhibited in these two modes of representing the Divine in nature there is manifest again the reason why true landscape representation was impossible to the Greeks. And yet it is essentially the same poetic spirit of
humanity in either case that beholds the evidences of the Divine in the phenomena of the outer world. The difference in the interpretation and consequent representation is due to the increased degree in which that poetic spirit is permeated in modern times by the all-regulating element of self-conscious Reason. Considered as an expression of spirit, landscape painting is very far superior to sculpture; for it belongs to a far higher and more complex phase of spiritual development. Sculpture is more *definite*, but on this side alone can it be considered as the superior art. But just because of its clearness and precision, sculpture is so much the farther removed from any close relationship with landscape painting. If, then, architecture, which is like landscape painting in being an outgrowth of a relatively passive spiritual state, has nevertheless so little in common with the latter form of art as to give little scope to its use as an accessory in landscape representations, so much the less can sculpture serve any legitimate purpose as an accessory element in such views. A statue must be elevated upon a pedestal—must be a world complete in itself. A work of sculpture may be freely admitted into a work of architecture, for thus the edifice becomes in higher or lower degree the temple of a god. Indeed the god demands a temple which shall close him in from the vulgar gaze of profane eyes.* Nothing, there-

* Here again the ancient conception is but a symbol of the higher truth.
fore, could be more inconsistent with the true conception of sculpture itself than to represent statues in an open landscape composed in the modern spirit, as was done in one or two instances by Turner himself.

§ 3. Relation of Landscape to other Forms of Painting.

a. Relation of Landscape to Historical Painting.

We have already seen that landscape representation only assumed the character of a genuine portrayal of nature after the movement of the Renaissance had fairly set in; and that during the period of the Renaissance proper such portrayal of nature was attempted only in connection with, and as a background and support to, the figures of historical paintings. True landscape painting, therefore, made its first appearance in the humble rank of a mere accessory possessing no significance save such as it borrowed from the personages placed within it and who constituted the sole object of interest. It was, however, also seen that the artists of that period were by no means slow to discover the possibilities of beauty and grandeur

The whole universe is the "temple" of the true God. The profane—the vulgar, the sensually minded—can never penetrate beyond the outer walls, the material side of the world. He alone whose vision has become purified, spiritualized, is able to discern the dissolving process of the physical world—to see the material heavens "rolled together as a scroll"—and know himself admitted to the inner shrine of the one true Divinity who is Wisdom, Love, and Power.
that lay concealed in this newly unfolded blossom of art. We might say that nature and perspective were discovered at the same time with man. For it is only in modern times that man has truly and completely discovered himself. True, these discoveries were brought to maturity only by slow degrees. As to perspective, indeed, we might repeat what was said on a former page: that its discovery was itself the discovery of nature, since perspective is on the one side the power of properly seeing nature, and, on the other, the true mode of representing nature. But this power of properly seeing nature includes the right understanding of the spirit of nature. Its exercise leads to the discovery of a genuine and independent significance in nature. But once conscious of this significance the artist must be irresistibly drawn to give it expression in his representations of nature. And yet in so doing he inevitably introduced into his work (the chief interest of which centered in the personages represented) a second and independent center of interest. The accessory element (the landscape) possessed too great vitality to long remain subordinate. With its maturity it must be freed from its position of mere servitude and be recognized as a coordinate form of art.

Both historical and landscape painting have each for its central purpose to express spirit; but in the one of these forms of art spirit is conceived of and represented upon a wholly different plain
from that upon which it is conceived of and represented in the other. In historical painting the artist finds his subject-matter in scenes representing a typical deed or a culminating point in the career of some grandly gifted human character. It is his task to portray some eternal truth that has become vital in the deed and visible in the form of this or that divinely inspired and world-inspiring man or woman. Spirit, developed to the utmost fulness and radiance of its powers—that is the central theme of the historical painter. On the other hand the landscape painter seeks to put himself in sympathetic relation with the outer world of nature. He knows that the mighty World-spirit is present there and that if he but approach the shrine with due reverence and sincerity he may become its truly inspired prophet. By contemplating a given scene he presently beholds in it a glory that belongs directly neither to rock, nor sky, nor sea, nor air. It is that diviner light of the inner Spirit of nature which vivifies while it illumines the outer world and which yet can be discovered only by the reverently poetic soul.

In short, as so often already urged, the Nature-spirit as such is characterized by precisely that vagueness and measureless immensity that finds its readiest and most perfect response in the emotional rather than in the distinctively reflective phase of the human spirit. Hence the necessity
that the landscape painter should constantly associate himself with nature in order that he may gather inspiration from the touch of balmy airs and from the odor of fragrant flowers, no less than from the view of sun-lit skies, and of hills and valleys melting away and mixing inextricably with distant deepening mists. For to the genuine artist—to the true poet of nature—soft airs are like the touch of invisible spirits, and waving grass and flowers are like swinging censers that give forth the perfumes of paradise. On the other hand, after the first vigorous seizure and fusing of the outer elements together with their inner significance under the immediate inspiration of nature, the landscape painter must complete his work by infusing into it more distinctly the element of regulative reason—as the inspired but incoherent utterances of the Pythia* were afterward interpreted into consistency of form by the keen-witted priest.

Thus again we find confirmation of the view that landscape painting is predominantly emotional in its character. But all the phases of spirit are ultimately infinite. Spirit is, in its very nature (that is, in its true ideal) self-limited so far as external bonds or restraints are concerned. We do, indeed, speak of setting limits to thought, and it is

* The Pythia was the priestess of Apollo at Delphi. When uttering oracles she sat upon a tripod and breathed intoxicating vapors.
even one of the imperative demands made upon thought that it should be definite; that it should, in other words, be clear and precisely bounded. But thought, again, is only bounded by thought and hence, in the outcome, thought proves again to be self-limited—like the spirit, of which it is only a phase. In landscape painting, indeed, linear perspective* seems to attempt the actual enclosure of the phase of spirit there represented, within a space bounded by lines—which lines, however, only converge in a point, infinitely distant. And even this point, as before intimated, only becomes a center which expands as it were in the mists of aerial perspective into an infinite sphere! So too the emotional phase of the spirit is focused in the spaceless center of the soul and nevertheless is boundless as the universe! It is, if we may so say, this infinite elasticity of the emotional phase of spirit which answers to the elasticity of air and ether and that thus the spirit becomes capable of translating the vibrations of these two outer media into sound and light—into the music of tones and the music of color.

But if historical and landscape painting thus separate into two fundamentally distinct and inde-

* A remarkably clear and simple method of linear perspective is presented in Professor Conrad Diehl's Grammar of Form-Language—a work as yet in manuscript but which cannot fail to be widely received and highly valued so soon as its publication makes it possible for its great merit to become generally known. It is at once culmination and summary of an admirable course of what Prof. Diehl very significantly calls Form-Study.
ependent forms of art as representing quite different phases of spirit—the one being predominantly intellectual, the other, predominantly emotional—we have also to observe that they both belong to the same great fundamental phase of spiritual development; to that phase in which the right comprehension of nature and the right comprehension of man are reached. While, therefore, landscape painting and historical painting are distinct and independent forms of art there is nothing absolutely discordant between them. This is rendered especially apparent in the fact that landscape painting was actually brought to maturity as a direct consequence of its extreme appropriateness as an accessory in the representation of historical scenes. But, as an accessory, landscape must none the less conform to the general law of accessories in art—it must remain distinctly subordinate.

We have next to inquire whether, on the contrary, historical scenes can with equal propriety be introduced as accessories into independent landscape representations? This may be answered at once in the negative; for "historical" scenes are such precisely because of their involving some universal principle that is itself of absorbing interest. Such scenes cannot, therefore, become accessory under any conditions; and so much the less in a landscape, for this represents spirit in the vague forms of the unconscious world, which are reflected in the comparatively passive phase of
the emotions of man; whereas the historical scene represents spirit arrived at the stage of perfect self-consciousness in the form of some grandly representative Person and thus appeals to the intellect even more than to the emotions of the beholder. This, indeed, is but stating more explicitly the grounds upon which we have already declared that so soon as landscape representation became developed to the point of involving within itself a general theme of interest—a true and profound phase of spirit—it had become essentially an independent form of art. It might be and remain, in certain of its phases, a perfectly legitimate and highly important accessory to historical painting. On the other hand it could never reverse this relation and reduce historical scenes to the level of an accessory in landscape views.

But what, more precisely, are we to understand by the "historical" in this connection? To this it may be answered in the most general way: that History is the universal Ideal in the infinite process of its realization. More definitely: Human history is the process of the realization of the human Ideal. And again this general process involves an endless series of struggles on the part of man to realize ever new phases of his own Ideal as these phases gradually unfold to his view. History, then, resolves itself into a state of unrest, of agitation. Man forms abstract, partial ideals of what he ought to become. The consciousness of
the unreality of his ideal goads him on to its realization. But in realizing it he discovers its incompleteness, rises above it, forms a larger ideal, at once enters upon the struggle toward the realization of this—and thus he continues throughout his existence.

Now, this being true alike of races, of nations, and of individuals, it becomes evident that in the strict sense of the word the "historical" includes every phase of this intensely serious and infinitely significant conflict. Wherever man shows himself to be torn by the contrast between what he is and what he ought to be, there the mighty struggle of history is in progress. But the very highest significance pertaining to the collision of the elements in nature is precisely the shadowing forth—the more or less vague suggestion merely—of just this infinitely significant struggle of history which reaches its culmination in the grandly typical deeds of heroism that from time to time are wrought by man. The sole rational relation, therefore, that landscape and historical painting can sustain toward each other in the same work of art is that in which the former is accessory to the latter.

Nevertheless landscape may still admit man into its representations upon one condition. It is that he shall appear there as the child of nature who knows no profound conflicts—to whom nature itself wholly suffices.
b. *Relation of Landscape to Genre Painting.*

A further consequence is found to be involved in what has just been said respecting the relation of landscape to historical painting. Intense human interests of *whatever kind* are such as to overbalance the interests which nature excites in us. Even hilarity partakes of the character of a triumph; for it is only after a more or less successful conflict with immediate necessities that the peasant can join his comrades and, by finding his fullest satisfaction in the enjoyment with them of the simplest pleasures, furnish themes suited to the finest productions of an Ostade or a Teniers. The successful representations of such scenes are genuine portrayals of the human soul characterized by the infinite serenity of perfect self-complacency. At the same time the naive attitudes and gestures give evidence of an inner vigor which, though altogether untutored, is nevertheless abundantly present and is the stuff that heroes are made of on occasion. So too the twinkling of the eye here and there betrays the inner, latent fire of the spirit whose proper destiny it is to flame at last like a star and awaken gladness by its light.

But it is precisely this concentrated light of the human spirit that is incapable of being subordinated to the mild, vague, vastly diffused, mysterious light of the Spirit of Nature. Thus again it becomes evident that landscape representation
can only be brought into direct connection with scenes involving intense human interests—whether of the historical or genre type—by laying aside all claim to independence and becoming distinctly accessory.

This brings us to repeat once more that man can properly appear as an accessory element in landscape painting only as a simple child of nature itself. His presence must excite no special interest apart from the landscape. The predominant conception or sentiment must be already, and manifestly, present in nature. Whatever human interest is admitted must be perfectly in harmony with and distinctly subordinate to, and lend itself unreservedly to heighten this predominant conception or sentiment of the landscape.

c. Relation of Landscape to Animal Painting.

It is obvious that since animals belong distinctly to the sphere of nature, they constitute a specially appropriate accessory to landscape representations. Domestic animals, on the one hand, suggest the presence of man and tend to give to the landscape the air of agreeable familiarity. They belong to the general class of "human interests." Wild animals, on the contrary, suggest the absence of man and tend to give to the landscape the air of loneliness. They ought, therefore, to be introduced only into such views as are already pervaded by this sentiment. Again, the
suggestion of mere loneliness is given by the introduction of timid herbivorous animals; while wildness is added to loneliness by the introduction of fierce carnivorous beasts. According, therefore, as the landscape is expressive of simple solitude or of threatening wildness, the one or the other of these classes of animals will be chosen from as affording appropriate accessories.

But here again even animals may be so "spiritedly" represented—that is, they may be rendered so expressive of some definite phase of spirit in the representation—as to compete with the landscape portion of the picture and thus, by dividing its interest, destroy its value as a work of art. The moment the artist loses sight of the fundamental difference of rank between the significance of the accessories and the central significance of his work as a whole that moment he loses possession of himself as an artist, and the product of his labors can scarcely fail to be a monstrosity instead of a genuine work of art. Accessories must not only be in harmony with the predominant sentiment but they must also, as we have already so often insisted upon, be unmistakably subordinate to that sentiment as expressed in the essential elements of the work itself. Thus the representation of a landscape by one artist, and the introduction of animals into it by another (who can scarcely become fully imbued with precisely the same phase of sentiment prevailing therein, and who, besides, will
naturally be ambitious to prove his utmost skill in the part of the work he has undertaken) must almost inevitably result in a picture which is a perpetual enigma. For the beholder can never bring himself to finally decide whether what is before him should be considered a representation of animals with a landscape as accessory or of a landscape with animals as accessory. In this way two excellent works of art may be destroyed by the attempt to combine them into one with the vain hope that the elements thus brought together on equal terms might mutually strengthen one another and highten the value of the work as a whole.


This phase of the subject has been so far discussed in determining the relative rank of landscape painting that little further need here be said. It has been shown that a very close and vital relationship exists between these two forms of art in respect both of subject-matter and of the media by which the works of each are brought to perfection. The source of the subject-matter of both is in great measure the realm of human emotions; but neither of these forms of art could attain to any high degree of perfection until this realm had been deepened and vitalized by the long process of human culture which has at length brought the human spirit to the stage of comple-
teness in the sense of full and clear self-consciousness—and in which therefore the emotional phase has become thoroughly permeated by matured Reason. The whole human spirit has become enlarged and enriched; so that the works of art which have been produced in modern times, instead of becoming more dryly intellectual and hence abstract have become more profoundly emotional at the same time that they have become more perfectly rational. It is for this reason that the two modes of art most perfectly adapted to expressing the emotional phase of spirit have attained, and could only have attained, to maturity in modern times—after the human spirit had unfolded such wealth of subject-matter for those modes as to call into activity all their previously latent powers.

We have also traced out the analogy between the physical materials or media* of landscape painting on the one hand and of music on the other—an analogy rich in its varied beauties as well as in its suggestiveness, so that no doubt can remain as to their being one in spirit, though presenting such manifold and fundamental differences in the methods by which their results are attained.

§ 5. Relation of Landscape Painting to Poetry.

Poetry, it is true, is no less distinctly character-

---

* An analogy still further strengthened by the fact recently discovered that light itself is capable of producing sound.
ized by the predominance of intellectual than are landscape painting and music by the predominance of emotional qualities. But all these arts are still modes of expression of spirit which, whether its prevailing mood be intellectual or emotional, is nevertheless essentially always the same, since it is the inseparable unity of intellect, sensibility and determining power or will. Either of these phases may predominate in a given individual or in the individuals generally of a given age; but neither can exist save in absolutely blended unity with the other two. Spirit is in its very nature a Trinity of Thought, Emotion, and Will; and when we speak of this as the product of the intellect, of that as the product of the emotions, or as the result of the will, we only mean—or ought only to mean—that what we are speaking of is a product of the activity of Spirit in a predominantly intellectual, or emotional, or volitional mood. Everything produced by the spirit will bear as its distinguishing characteristic the impress of one or other of these modes of the activity of spirit; but nothing produced by the spirit will or can be wholly destitute of traces of the other two modes of the spirit's activity. Every work of art will therefore be found to express in greater or less degree—but always in some degree—at once and inseparably, all these phases: thought, emotion, and will.

This, indeed, is the secret of the arts blending so inextricably and imperceptibly into one another.
At the same time it explains why there is traceable in each and all the forms of art the same general course of development—a fact which is more or less obscured by the striking differences also manifest in the unfolding of the several arts; differences which constitute the distinguishing characteristics of those arts; and give to each of them an independent rank. Nor must it be forgotten that those very differences are themselves largely dependent upon the varying relations between the three fundamental phases of spirit which we have just been considering. Thus, notwithstanding the fact that poetry is predominantly intellectual while landscape painting is essentially emotional in its character; notwithstanding the fact that the one addresses the spirit by means of visible forms and appearances placed before the eyes while the other presents its creations involved in and conveyed to the mind through the subtle medium of language—notwithstanding these and many other differences poetry and landscape painting prove to have passed through the same general stages of progress as modes of the utterance of spirit. And this is especially evident when we consider them as parallel modes of expressing that phase of spirit which is manifest in nature. So long as the mystic stage of thought predominated the world was looked upon as a vast congeries of isolated phenomena each of which was due to the activity of some separate di-
vinity. Men failed to comprehend that nature is itself simply a lower mode of manifestation of the one absolute, divine Spirit which both makes the world and rules it. They therefore sought to discern the "noumenon" or reality which they imagined must be hidden behind the "phenomenon" the latter seeming to them to be but the mere outer and illusory appearance in contrast with the mysterious reality. But even here it is evident that man was already, in the earliest times intently seeking for, though his search proved but a blind groping after, the spiritual as that alone which is truly worthy of his interest. And yet it was wholly impossible that nature could, on its own account, prove attractive or significant to man so long as he looked upon it from the mythical standpoint. The representations he might find occasion to make of it (whether in painting or in poetry) during this stage could not be otherwise than conventional and could possess interest only in prosaic relation to man.

This has already been sufficiently illustrated in respect of painting. It may be well in the present connection to give some brief intimation of how completely the course of the development of poetry also confirms the same statement. The poetry of the early world was largely devoted to giving expression to the mythic conception of the powers of nature; while it is safe to say that not a passage can be found expressive of a clear and hearty
appreciation of the distinctively picturesque in the outer world. Thus the first two volumes of Max Mueller’s translation of the Rig-Veda contain only hymns to the Maruts or storm-gods. Again, the heroine of the Hindu drama Sakuntala (already referred to) is represented in one of the scenes as watering the plants in a sacred grove. She names a young jasmine “the Moonlight of the Grove”, and calls it the “self-elected wife of the mango-tree.” “fresh blossoms of the jasmine resemble the bloom of a young bride, and the newly-formed shoots of the mango appear to make it her natural protector.”* So again; to the hermits in the same poem the sun and the moon are

—“co-eternal orbs, that rise and set,
And set to rise again; symbols divine
Of man’s reverses, life’s vicissitudes.” †

Similarly in the Ramayana,‡ references to nature are incidental and prosaic. Trees are worshiped, the divinity of the sea is duly chastised, whole mountains are removed from their foundations and

* See Monier Williams’s English version, p. 19.
† Ibid. p. 92.

The best of the few indications of real sympathy with nature shown in the Ramayana is found in connection with the description of one of the battles during the siege of Lanka. The day had been full of conflict. With its close the poet draws breath and casts his eye skyward.

“Then sank the sun with dying flame,
And soft the shades of twilight came,
And the full moon’s delicious light
Was shed upon the tranquil night.”
borne through the air many leagues at will by miraculous beings, etc. etc. Only the descriptions of clouds of dust rising from the highway as the multitudes pass over it seem quite natural and in comparison almost picturesque! So on the contrary the early Hindu poets referred quaintly to the bright celestial beings—the heavenly bodies—as pursuing their way along “dustless paths!” Again, the sea in its turn was simply the dwelling place of a divinity and, among the Greeks and Romans especially, it was looked upon as “a high road,—more useful for trade and travel than any other road.” * The very names pontus and pontos are “metaphorical expressions” as applied to the sea, and meant originally path or way. “The sea presents itself naturally to the [unreflecting] imagination as a vast, sterile and desert surface; it is the pontos atrygetos (unfruitful sea) of Homer, the vastum mare (waste sea) of the Latins, the vast, voest (properly desert) of the Scandinavians. Maru, in Sanskrit, signifies desert, and presents itself (allowing for the difference between suffixes) as the true correlative of mare, etc.”† The saltiness of the sea and the saltiness of the desert appear to have intensified the conception of barrenness which arose in the mind of primitive man respecting these (to him) vast regions in the

* Max Mueller’s Chips from a German Workshop. II. 47.
† Pictet. Les Origines Indo-Europeennes. I. 131.
primitive sense of waste regions. That which gives to the sea its beauty and grandeur in the eyes of the modern—namely, the infinite mobility and resistless might manifest therein—these belonged, in the estimation of the ancients, not to the sea as such, but to the divinity whose dwelling was the sea; and the waves with their ever changing shapes and hues were rather the evanescent forms of the countless other personal beings who instead of constituting parts of, only chose to disport themselves within, this "barren" element. Thus the sea was robbed of all its picturesque significance and a complete revolution of human thought was necessary before this or any other portion of nature could be conceived or represented—whether in picture or in poem—in its true spirit and vital significance. Ruskin has himself pointed out the fact that the Homeric descriptions of landscape are suggestive simply of pleasantness of touch. To this, finally, we may add the following lines to show how utilitarian "Homer" himself became when he turned to nature—even though it were to picture a sun-rise:

"Now from the fair broad bosom of the sea
Into the brazen vault of heaven the sun
Rose shining for the immortals and for men
Upon the foodful earth." *

In short the people of antiquity had not yet become aware of the beauties of nature. They had

* Odyssey. (Trans. W. C. Bryant.) Book III. (opening lines.)
not escaped from a radically inadequate mode of viewing the outer world.

Even Dante, the contemporary of Giotto and the mightiest spirit of the early period of the Renaissance, shows little or no interest in landscape beauty as such. To both these men, indeed, the earth was merely the pathway over which mankind walk—the bridge between the mysteries of birth and death. Humanity with its unthreaded labyrinthine problems completely occupied the thoughts of these divinely gifted minds. Even Bocaccio with his lighter mood still saw little to interest him in the outer world of nature though the sensuous world of man was full of attraction for him.

Not until the maturity of the scientific comprehension of nature was fairly realized did the poetic spirit prove itself capable of rightly appreciating and adequately representing nature. It was, in fact, only with the present century that the beauties of nature came to be actually studied by poets and consciously made the object of poetic representation. "The Seasons" were indeed made the theme of an extended series of poems by Thomson in the last century; but it will scarcely be claimed that he succeeded in representing nature with anything approaching the discernment of a Wordsworth, a Byron, or a Shelley. When one reads the beautiful and deeply significant descriptions which these three contemporaries give of natural scenery and observes and feels how the
very Spirit of nature pervades so much of what they wrote one is tempted to suspect that somehow the sun had suddenly begun to rise in a new and more glorious fashion with the birth of these great men. And indeed this is far from being a mere fancy. Man had long been steadily advancing toward, but could now for the first time be said to have fairly and fully arrived at a truly rational mode of viewing the world; and accordingly it was now for the first time that the world could be said to present him in turn with a truly rational significance. Turner possessed little education in the ordinary sense of the term; but his mode of viewing nature was gathered largely from those who were thoroughly imbued with the spirit which constitutes the inmost essence of modern science. Much of his grandest inspiration was avowedly drawn from Byron’s Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage. So again the poems of Wordsworth have supplied the text for many of the charming landscapes by artists of the English school, and no one who has read The Excursion can have failed to be deeply impressed with the magnificence of nature which constitutes the very soul of the poem. The following lines from Book IX may suffice as illustration:

"The valley, opening out her bosom, gave
Fair prospect, intercepted less and less,
O'er the flat meadows and indented coast
Of the smooth lake, in compass seen:—far off,
And yet conspicuous, stood the old church tower,
In majesty presiding over fields
And habitations seemingly preserved
From all intrusion of the restless world
By rocks impassable and mountains huge."

Gazing on this view each member of a happy company discovers some new beauty and directs attention toward it "merely from a wish to impart a joy, imperfect while unshared." But all this diffused attention is suddenly united and concentrated by the effect of light: *

"Already had the sun,
Sinking with less than ordinary state,
Attained his western bound; but rays of light—
Now suddenly diverging from the orb
Retired behind the mountain-top or veiled
By the dense air—shot upwards to the crown
Of the blue firmament, aloft, and wide;
And multitudes of little floating clouds,
Through their ethereal texture pierced,—ere we,
Who saw, of change were conscious,—had become
Vivid as fire; clouds separately poised,—
Innumerable multitude of forms scattered
Through half the circle of the sky;
And giving back, and shedding each on each,
With prodigal communion, the bright hues
Which from the unapparent fount of glory
They had imbibed, and ceased not to receive.
That which the heavens displayed, the liquid deep
Repeated, but with unity sublime!

* * * * * * * *

* Respecting Light as the element of unity in landscape see p. 112 of this volume.
We gazed, in silence hushed, with eyes intent
On the refulgent spectacle, diffused
Through earth, sky, water, and all visible space."

This sublime unity which light introduces with such powerful effect and which is still duplicated in the placid lake beneath—like the spirit which, in its indivisible unity, is nevertheless an essential duality, being self-luminous, self-reflected, self-conscious, at once knowing subject and self-known object—this unity which light introduces gives a strongly prevailing tone to the picture and thus develops imperceptibly a powerful musical element which again tends to concentrate all in the undistinguishable unity of sentiment. Thus the group represented in the foregoing lines seem to listen as well as gaze, "in silence hushed." It recalls forcibly two of the stanzas* in which Byron describes Lake Leman:

"All heaven and earth are still—though not in sleep,
But breathless as we grow when feeling most;
And silent, as we stand in thoughts too deep:
All heaven and earth are still;
From the high host
Of stars, to the lulled lake and mountain-coast,
All is centered in a life intense,
Where not a beam, nor air, not leaf is lost,
But hath a part of being, and a sense
Of that which is of all Creator and defence.

"Then stirs the feeling infinite, so felt
In solitude, where we are least alone;

* Childe Harold's Pilgrimage. Canto III. 89, 90.
A truth, which through our being then doth melt,
And purifies from self; it is a tone,
The soul and source of music, which makes known
Eternal harmony, and sheds a charm,
Like to the fabled Cytherea’s zone,
Binding all things with beauty.” * *

There is no little significance, indeed, in the various ways by which the all-pervading Unity in nature—clearly seen and deeply felt only in modern times—impresses itself upon the poet. Looking forth from Zitza Byron exclaims:

“Where’er we gaze, around, above, below,
What rainbow-tints, what magic charms are found!
Rock, river, forest, mountain, all abound,
And bluest skies that harmonize the whole.” *

And again:

“There is a pleasure in the pathless woods,
There is a rapture on the lonely shore,
There is society where none intrudes,
By the deep Sea, and music in its roar:
I love not Man the less but Nature more,
From these our interviews, in which I steal
From all I may be, or have been before,
To mingle with the Universe, and feel
What I can ne’er express, yet cannot all conceal.” †

He would seek to identify himself with the absolute Totality within which alone each separate thing “hath a part of being.” Thus again and again the unity of nature is declared; while on the other hand, as so often already pointed out,

† Ibid. Canto IV. 178.
the eyes of antique faiths beheld in it all only an *indefinite multiplicity of independent existences*. It is the light of modern science that gathers the whole external world out of its feeble isolation and multiplicity of mutually contradictory parts into the mighty harmony of an infinitely varied but absolutely undivided and indivisible world. From this vantage ground nature is seen to be radiant with beauties that must forever remain hidden from the eyes of the polytheist, however charming in their way may be the myths which he constructs out of the fragmentary materials furnished him by nature. Thus a landscape painting like Turner's *Mercury and Argus*, or his *Crossing the Brook*, or like Church's *Heart of the Andes* was impossible to the ancients in the same degree and for the same reason as were poetic descriptions of natural beauty like those just quoted, or like the following which we add as a further illustration of the modern mode of viewing nature and also as an example of the exquisite delicacy and purity of spirit exhibited in the descriptions given by Shelley of the external world.

"The point of one white star is quivering still
Deep in the orange light of widening morn
Beyond the purple mountains: thro' a chasm
Of wind-divided mist the darker lake
Reflects it: now it wanes: it gleams again
As the waves fade, and as the burning threads
Of woven cloud unravel in pale air;"
'Tis lost! and thro' yon peaks of cloudlike snow
The roseate sun-light quivers.”* 

Whatever the creed Shelley may have professed; growing up, as he did, so near the focus of the wild worship of misnamed “Reason,” and under such baneful paternal influence; he nevertheless clearly recognized the rational unity and absolute system of the universe and was thus able with his marvelously delicate, subtle, and powerful spirit, to see and feel the beauties of the external world as few have ever given evidence of either seeing or feeling them. His writings are throughout surcharged with the spirit of nature in its richest significance and utmost purity. We doubt whether any lyric has ever been written upon a subject chosen directly from external nature that will compare in exquisite beauty with The Cloud, which is so treated that this infinitely changeable element, ever dissolving yet ever recombining, becomes a deeply significant symbol of the immortal and infinitely mobile human soul.

We have thus seen that, as expressions of the phases of spirit exhibited in nature, landscape painting and poetry have developed in precisely parallel lines. It has also become apparent that the former is characterized by the emotional, the latter by the intellectual, as the predominating element. In other words both the landscape painter

* Prometheus Unbound. Act II. Scene I.
and the poet recognize in nature the vague fore-
shadowings of spirit, and thus find in the outer
world a perpetual stimulus that awakens ever new
states in their own consciousness. The one, how-
ever, receives an *impression* not translatable into
words, but to which he gives expression in the
musical, though mute, harmony of forms and col-
ors; while the other gathers up and develops the
spiritual substance of the scenes before him into
the clearer thought-forms of poetic language.
CHAPTER III.

FUNDAMENTAL TYPES OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING AS DETERMINED BY THE ELEMENTS OF THIS FORM OF ART.

The divisions or types arising in this form of art may be considered from two points of view: first that of external forms; and, second, that of internal substance.

§ 1. Divisions of Landscape Painting as Determined by External Forms.

The divisions arising from this point of view have already been partially foreshadowed in our consideration of the objective elements of this form of art.

a. Mountains were seen to characterize certain views. Their immense mass, their rugged forms, and the evidences of overwhelming force which they present to view render them especially appropriate as the predominant feature of a whole class of landscape-representations—a class that has long been popularly recognized as and properly named Mountain Landscapes.

b. Other landscapes again consist simply of
views of level lands varied mainly by vegetable forms, or simple old buildings, or a quiet stream, or a glimpse of lake or sea. Here everything has found a point of comparative rest—and to such views may be given the name of Level Landscapes.

c. Finally the glimpse of sea introduced into the landscape may so far increase in extent and be rendered so highly expressive as to become the chief element. Thus the landscape shades imperceptibly into the Marine View.

Common to all these views are, of course atmosphere, and light, and sky. Nor will any one forget—nor be troubled by the recollection—that these fundamental types approach one another through endless gradations; just as the various species of the organic world, or the colors of the solar spectrum, blend into one another inextricably and yet forever remain distinct.

It is more likely to be thought a matter of surprise that we should consider marine views as simply forming one of the divisions of landscape painting. We believe, however, that those who have most carefully considered the relation between marine views and ordinary landscape will be least likely to question the classification. As we have just remarked, atmosphere and light and sky are the universal elements common to both phases of the representations of nature. Not only so but water is itself essential to all phases of landscape, of which (as mentioned on a former
MARINE VIEWS.

page) it has aptly been styled the eye or soul. A true artist will scarcely represent even a mountain landscape without its gleam of water. So, on the other hand, a marine painter will seldom venture out of sight of land in his representations of the sea. A rock in the foreground; a harbor, a headland, or a light-house in the distance, will still assure us that there yet remains somewhere firm footing, fresh water, and food for those who wander on the unfruitful sea. The land pours its waters into the sea. The sea rolls back upon the land. The same sky covers them, the same atmosphere enfolds them, the same light pervades them. They are but different phases of the same nature and are inextricably involved and mingled therein. But it is the especial business of landscape painting to give expression to those intimations of spirit that appear in the various phases of nature as such—phases which, as we have just seen, are intermingled beyond the possibility of separation. Thus even the representation of ordinary landscape must perpetually involve the representation of a greater or less portion of the sea. It is evident, therefore, that there is no fundamental distinction between these two phases of the portrayal of nature, and that marine views simply constitute a species coordinate with views of mountains and views of plains, and that the representations of these specifically different views are all properly classed under the generic name of Landscape Painting.
§ 2. Divisions of Landscape Painting as determined by Internal Substance (Ideal Significance.)

a. Epic Landscapes.

In considering the subjective elements of Landscape views we found that from time immemorial mountains have been associated in the minds of men with the Eternal and Divine. From Meru to Olympus mountains have been the dwelling-place of the gods. From Sinai to Tabor and the Mount of Olives—everywhere and always the High Places of the physical world have led to spiritual elevations in terrifying thunders of the Law, in mild, hope-inspiring Beatitudes, and in sudden outbursts of spiritual illumination that fall upon the inner eyes of those who have gone onward to the summit and reveal to them the true Transfiguration of the Divine-Human.

If now we turn to the precise features of mountains that have always impressed man in these various and yet substantially similar ways we will see that permanency, overruling majesty, sublime calmness, are the phases of the nature-spirit which are most clearly manifest in these forms and which most powerfully impress the beholder. Changes there are, indeed, in the aspects of mountains, but these are only changes on the face of the Permanent—as with the self-same look Divinity himself frowns upon the evil and smiles upon the good. The same eternal, unchanging Justice wears a
threatening aspect only to him whose spiritual eyes have been dimmed by his own violations of eternal Right; while on the contrary it proves to be the fulness of infinite Grace to him whose will is conformed to the Universal Will.

Mountains, then, suggest the presence in and rule of the world by eternal principles and the certain final subjection of all things to those principles. The progress may be slow—like the movement of a glacier—but it is likewise resistless. It is the steady, onward march of what men in their half-views of the world have called Destiny. But this movement which, with whatever delays or hindrances, must still in the outcome prove ever irresistible, and, with whatever of avalanche-catastrophes, still proceeds in infinite calmness to the end, this is precisely what characterizes the Epos. Thus landscapes which, from the side of external forms, are called mountain landscapes, may also, from the side of internal substance, be styled Epic landscapes.

b. *Lyric Landscapes.*

On the other hand level landscapes, as we have already seen, present no vast strain of forces. Here the external world is comparatively at rest. And nevertheless this "rest" is involved in ceaseless and rapid change—just as the mighty strain of forces in the upheaved mountains holds them aloft in changeless grandeur. On the mountain-sum-
mits the perpetual whitness of the snow; on the plain the myriad changing hues of grass and flowers fading at length into brown, then giving place to snowy whitness which in turn vanishes into the earth to nourish the next growth of flowers. On the mountain-sides, lofty pines, unyielding in form, unchanging in color; on the plains, endless varieties of graceful trees with vast crowns of flexible branches and infinitely varied and varying foliage. Here also atmosphere and sky present new aspects almost from moment to moment. The whole presents an external picture profoundly suggestive of the incessant fluctuations of the human spirit. Thus the deeply poetic spirit will receive from such views subtlest impressions of infinitely various states of the human soul and represent each of them in the rythmic beauty of a landscape painting or of a poem or of a musical composition. In the first and second of these cases also the representation will be strongly pervaded by the musical element; for it is the inner harmony of the increasingly complex and subtly varying spirit that the scene suggests; and the more internal, the more perfectly subjective, the state of the spirit, the more distinctly does the emotional phase predominate; and the emotional is the very essence of music. It is in this musical element, indeed, that poetry and landscape painting approach most nearly to each other. But the type of poetry specially adapted to the expression of the inner or
subjective phases of spirit is the *Lyric*. We may therefore, without hesitation, apply the same term to that phase of landscape painting which seeks to portray this internality of the spirit. And since, as a rule, level landscapes are the ones which most clearly and powerfully suggest the inner states of the soul it is evident that, speaking generally, those views of nature which possess and are dominated by this inner or subjective quality should be designated as *Lyric Landscapes*.

c. *Dramatic Landscapes.*

Finally, marine views present us with the three-fold universality of the resistless ocean, the all-embracing atmosphere, and the all-penetrating light. In its mobility we have the lyrical element repeated; just as, in its universality, the chief characteristic of the epic again makes its appearance. So also, stars and sun, smiling skies and raging storms are duplicated here. It is as if the physical universe, reflecting all its phases in these depths, were on the point of recognizing itself and rising into consciousness! Similarly this three-fold universality is no longer the abstract universality of Destiny. Rather, in the might of the ocean, the all-embracing character of the air, and the all-penetrating quality of the light we have deeply significant symbols of Infinite Power, Infinite Love, and Infinite Reason, the three essential phases of the infinitely concrete Divine Being
or Person who eternally creates, cherishes, and illumines the universe in all its aspects, physical and spiritual.

But one phase of the Universal may come into collision with another phase. Indeed it is only by the self-opposition of the Universal that an actual world is possible at all. But in the physical world this conflict between different phases of the Universal as manifested in nature can only result in a clashing of the elements—just as, in the world of humanity, the exclusive pursuit of this or that particular aim, entirely legitimate in itself and involving a true universal principle, may nevertheless result in conflict with others pursuing equally valid aims. Thus arises the dramatic situation: and it is precisely in marine views that this sudden grappling of opposite forces in fierce struggle is most strikingly exhibited. The subtle and yet tremendous force of the air—which the Greeks personified in the wily but at the same time swift and mighty Hermes; the infinitely yielding and yet resistless sea—whose ever-changing phases perhaps it was that suggested to the Greeks the conception of Nereus, the old Man of the sea who shifts his shapes at will—these come into violent collision and the struggle between them is dramatic in the extreme. It is even highly tragic if we allow entrance to the thought of the moral element as here shadowed forth; for with the culmination of the struggle the eternal forces are ever
found to remain in their indestructibility while the elements are at the same time purified—the evil, the impure, and that alone has perished.

But we need not extend these remarks further; it being (as we trust) already sufficiently apparent that while mountain landscapes, in their objective calmness and grandeur, and in their suggestiveness of an over-ruling destiny, are *epic* in character; and while level landscapes, with their multifarious and perpetually changing aspects suggestive of the subjective phases of the spirit, are predominantly *lyric* in tone; so, marine views, by their more or less complete combination of these phases and by the precipitation with which the action that takes place in them is brought on and developed to its culmination, contain the elements of highly *dramatic* representation—elements which no other phase of nature possesses in any, at all comparable, degree.

Before passing to the next topic, however, it may be well to add this reminder: That considered from the side of inner substance no less than when considered from the side of outer form, these fundamental types of the pictorial representation of nature blend imperceptibly into one another. The epic may soften into the idyll (which still remains epic in substance), and into the idyll something of the lyric may find its way; just as the lyric may approach the epic on one side and
enter into the drama on the other. And yet a true work of art will not mingle two modes of representation so as to admit of any real division in the work itself. One mode of representation may come to the aid of another—may be admitted as accessory—but in such case it must in no wise be permitted to assume a value on its own account. It must give itself exclusively to heighten the central interest. Thus, for example, both epic and lyric elements will always be found in dramatic representation, whether in a poem or in a landscape; but always so subordinated, adapted to and merged in the dramatic development that they claim no attention in competition with the central interest of the work in which they have found place.

On the other hand, while a given work of art may be faultless in this respect, doubt as to its proper classification may still be permitted to him who has not yet clearly discerned the proper standard of judgment, or who may not have become specially skillful in its application.
PART III.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE FUNDAMENTAL TYPES OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING.
INTRODUCTION.

THE completion of our task requires that we should glance rapidly over the whole course of the historical development of landscape painting and indicate the essential characteristics of the types it has assumed in the work of the various schools.

Each form of art, though it will always be found specially adapted to the expression of one or other of the three great fundamental types or phases of thought which Hegel has styled respectively the Symbolic, the Classic, and the Romantic, is itself, nevertheless, adapted in some measure to the expression of each of the other two. Hegel himself has repeatedly called attention to this fact, and has shown extendedly and with utmost clearness how Architecture on the one hand, and poetry on the other, have each been first predominantly symbolic, then prevailingly classic, and finally essentially romantic in its spiritual significance. Architecture, it is true, never arose above symbolism. Even in adapting itself to the classic and to the romantic spirit it still only symbolized these phases of thought. On the other hand the clearest
phases of artistic thought in each of these stages of the progress of spirit have always struggled for utterance through poetry which has above all in the romantic stage proved itself the most adequate of all forms of art to give utterance to spirit. Similarly, sculpture, painting, and music have each also passed through all these phases.*

As to landscape painting, we have already seen that among people who never passed beyond the stage of symbolism (for example, with the Egyptians and the Assyrians) attempts at representing landscape resulted in rude, purely conventional.

* In view of this it is surprising, if not also amusing, to find a writer (Mr. Vernon Lee) in the Contemporary Review for August 1880 giving utterance to the following assertion:

"Hegel also overlooked the fact that all the arts have at one time or another attained to absolute perfection of form; that Greek architecture and Mediaeval architecture, Renaissance painting and eighteenth century music, have each left us forms as complete and as completely satisfying to the purely artistic faculties as those of sculpture; while sculpture, on the other hand, has at certain periods produced extremely unsatisfactory forms. Hegel, therefore, evades the difficulty, shows us only Egyptian and Indian architecture, which is, indeed, symbolic, Greek sculpture, which is certainly classic, and mystic or realistic painting and sentimental suggestive music, which are undeniably romantic; but he does not let us know that there is other architecture besides the Egyptian and Indian, other sculpture besides the Greek, other painting besides mystic and realistic, other music besides the sentimental and suggestive. (1) If he did, the false application of his true system would become manifest and we should see that no art has aims differing essentially from the aims of another art, that no one art is more inherently symbolic, or classic, or romantic than any other; but that every art has been, by turns, symbolic, classic and romantic", All which goes to show that Mr. Vernon Lee has evolved out of his own inner consciousness a Hegel that never existed in fact and has thus saved himself the trouble of reading the Aesthetik of the real Hegel. Had he read the third general division of that work he would never have ventured to make the absurd assertions here quoted.
map-like portrayls that show no sympathy with nature as such and rise in no degree above the rank of mere hieroglyphics having for their purpose to aid in giving a prosaic account of some event in natural or individual (human) life. With the Greeks, again, the classic type of thought so completely predominated that while they felt a lively sympathy with the outer world the finest sentiments awakened within them by their communings with nature inevitably took shape as personifications. They discerned a charming significance in many of the phases of the spirit of nature, but immediately abstracted them from nature itself and embodied them in human form. Thus it was only after the repose of the classic spirit had been broken once for all, and after the decline of classic art, along with the decline of the Greek religion, had become far advanced that attempts were made to represent nature on its own account and in its own forms; while even here the finest examples of landscape painting produced in the classic world (as pointed out by Dr Woerman; * who has given special attention to the landscape painting of antiquity) were accompanied with mythological accessories—a fact which points unmistakably to the still predominating influence of the mythological mode of viewing the world. Personality had not yet arrived at completeness;

* See Woltman's Geschichte der Malerei. Chap. I.
so that in the representations of nature trees and brooks might still be said to be half-human and nymphs to be half-vegetable. In other words the human spirit was not yet sufficiently advanced to rationally seize the spirit of nature and freely represent its manifold phases in appropriate natural forms.

It was, let us once more repeat, only after the human spirit had arrived at complete self-consciousness—only after it had come to fully know itself—that it could rightly apprehend nature. This, however, involved the unfolding and maturing of the romantic type of thought the essential characteristic of which is precisely the unfolding of the perfect self-consciousness of the spirit. But the romantic spirit has not simply passed beyond the symbolic and classic stages and left them behind as obsolete. It involves those phases of spirit within itself. It renders explicit and actual what was only implicit, (i.e. present only potenti ally) in them. It is just for this reason that the romantic phase of spirit is richer and more adequate than were the preceding phases. Without them, indeed, it could not be what it is. It transcends them, but also includes them. It not only includes them, it also assimilates them and thus renders them absolutely subordinate to itself as mere elements within itself. They have thus ceased altogether to be independent. They no longer constitute a center of interest on their own
account and in their original significance but lend themselves simply and loyally to heighten the one chief interest which, in whatever work of art, must henceforth be of the Romantic type.

But again, this romantic type is itself a growth—an organic evolution. Otherwise it would not possess this assimilative power. At the outset it was characterized by a certain vagueness and obscurity; and while this phase continued symbolism was the mode of representation best adapted to its expression. This is the stage to which Byzantine art properly belongs. Then followed a period of classically clear formulation, the outgrowth of which, on the side of art, was the painting of the Renaissance. Finally the most adequate artistic expression has been given to the Romantic spirit as such in the poetry of Shakespeare, of Goethe, and of Schiller.
CHAPTER I.
SYMBOLIC PHASE OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING
(ACCESSORY LANDSCAPE).

NOW, landscape painting, which we have shown to pertain essentially to romantic art, has also within the romantic period passed through the three phases corresponding severally to the successive stages in the advancing clearness of self-consciousness on the part of spirit. When the stiff, symbolic figures of Byzantine art began to give place to personages animated with the breath of life these personages were represented as standing or walking on the earth; for embodied spirits must have breathing-space and firm footing. Thus the representation of nature was demanded as an accessory in the new mode of representing spiritualized, vital humanity. But the accessory element, as we have already more than once insisted, must breathe the same spirit as the chief object of interest—must add its tone to the general harmony of the whole. Accessories are, indeed, but the "overtones" that enrich the quality of the fundamental tone of a work of art. The accessory landscape, therefore, must not be chosen at
random, but must be in unison with the spirit of the personages appearing therein and whose temporal world it represents. In other words it is essentially symbolic, though, in this sphere, always and exclusively a symbol of romantic conceptions.

Such exclusively was landscape painting from the time of Giotto to that of Titian. The forms of nature which Giotto himself introduced were little more than suggestions or symbols of the physical world in general. They were too abstract to present either any very striking harmony or noticable discord with the central conception. With Masaccio a decided advance is perceptible; for example, in his Payment of the Tribute Money where the mountainous background corresponds well with the stateliness of the group of personages and adds materially to the total effect of the scene. Again Raphael, with his divine gift of discerning utmost harmonies in all phases of truth, has scarcely failed to give a fine symbolic significance to every one of the accessory landscapes which he painted. Perhaps among his Madonnas the Madonna del Passeggio illustrates this most strikingly. The little St. John, already emerging from childhood, meets the holy family in a landscape of charming freshness and simplicity. They pause while the children greet each other with an embrace. It is one of the most beautiful of all the pictures of this class which even Raphael painted.
A stream of water flows by, adding its suggestiveness of purity to the dewy freshness of the grass and the clearness of the atmosphere. In the left foreground a small, yet vigorous-looking tree is growing up from the roots of a larger trunk that shows signs of exhaustion and decay. This would seem to symbolize the springing up of a new and richer faith from the roots of the decaying religions of the world. Again, on the right, and a little removed from the immediate foreground, crumbling rocks partly overgrown with delicate plants seem to typify the melting away of the severities of the formal law through the tender and yet mighty influences of the dawning era of the Law of Love. And yet, without the central object of interest to develop and focus its symbolic significance this little landscape, though perhaps the most elaborate of all those that Raphael painted, would remain vague and unsatisfactory. Da Vinci seemed well-nigh as indifferent to landscape as did Michael Angelo. And yet he gave to the portrait known as Mona Lisa a background consisting of the most singular landscape representation. The only sign of vegetation in the picture is a few trees in the extreme background. The whole view save a stream and the few trees dimly appearing in the distance, is that of a wilderness of Plutonic rocks—as if he would declare thus symbolically that in comparison with the magic, untranslatable charm of the beauty that appears in the world of the conscious,
the spiritual; the beauty of the unconscious, the merely physical world fades out of sight until we behold therein only barren, shapeless masses. So, too, a road is represented as extending through many curves from some indefinite distance up to the foreground—as if to suggest that all the winding paths of nature still lead upward to humanity as the central point of interest for the finite world.

Further examples will suggest themselves to the mind of the reader and need not be given here. Our present purpose will have been served by calling attention to the fact that accessory landscape representation is essentially symbolical; that this symbolic phase was the first to develop; and that though landscape painting has long since attained to independence as a form of art its accessory, and hence symbolic, value still remains undiminished.

The Transition to Independent Landscape Painting is also the emergence from the exclusively symbolic stage. It is to be observed that, as previously intimated, the possibilities for significant and beautiful expression in landscape representations on their own account were speedily recognized. In Italy Benozzo Gozzoli, in the latter half of the fifteenth century, executed a series of paintings in the Campo Santo at Pisa the subjects of which were chosen from the Old Testament. But the treatment was altogether independent of the more serious significance of the themes. "In the
countless groups of youthfully graceful and manly figures who crowd his pictures, in the rich costume of his time, and engaged in every conceivable employment, the true purport, the Biblical incident, passes into the background, and the history of the patriarch Noah, with his vineyard and his drunkenness, only affords the merry artist an occasion to depict the lively doings of the vintage." * It is evident that, while human interests as such still predominated, the comprehension of and sympathy for nature were reaching such advancement that the real interest of the artist was already beginning to concentrate in the representation of nature to the neglect of the deeper and more serious religious import that had hitherto been the almost exclusive, as it was unquestionably the central and essential, object of interest. "No longer because the work of art contained those well-known sacred stories but because it comprised a world of independently conceived beauty, did it become a matter of value and admiration." †

So also in the North in the first half of the sixteenth century the same change was manifest. Here it was Joachim Patenier who "for the first time made the backgrounds, which had been already an object of special care with the Netherlanders, the principal matter, treated the sacred

---

stories as unimportant accessories, and thus became the creator of modern northern landscape painting.” * It is considered, indeed, that influences from the Netherlands were not without effect upon the Venitians, though the region of Venice itself possessed exceptionally favorable conditions tending to foster the independent development of landscape representation. “Light, color, air, space: these are the elemental conditions of Venitian art; of these the painters weaved their ideal world for beautiful and proud humanity.” † And it was in the works of Giovanni Bellini that coloring can be said to have attained to “that splendor, that mild power and brilliancy, which henceforth remain the inalienable property of the Venitian school.” ‡ If now these intimations be connected with what was said on a former page respecting the natural surroundings and the spiritual characteristics of the Venitians in general, it must seem especially significant of the native vitatily of the tendency of their art to find its subject-matter in external, natural forms that of the two great pupils of Bellini—Giorgione and Titian—the former should prove to be “the first master in whose works landscape is conceived in a poetic manner,” § and that Titian should

‡ Luebke. History of Art. II. 179.
§ Ibid. p. 275.
be generally allowed to have been the first (at least of Italian artists) to treat landscape independently. It has been well said that "the spirit of the scene as a whole is what is desired, and this painting of a scene as a whole, instead of the different parts, is the essence of Titian's discovery in landscape painting." *

Meanwhile, through the labors especially of Paolo Ucelli, Andrea Mantegna, and Ghirlandajo, perspective had been reduced to a scientific basis and applied "on grand and general principles." †

Thus it is evident that the tendency of landscape painting to rise out of the merely accessory and symbolic stage was already upon the point of being fully realized; and yet, as previously shown, the knowledge of nature had not yet become sufficiently deepened and clarified to render the next step immediately possible.

But we need not repeat here, or even extend, what has already been said by way of characterization of the sixteenth century as a period of transition in the thought of Europe. During that period the views entertained respecting nature had undergone a complete transformation in the minds of the people of that country. From being mythological those views had become rational.

* J. Comyns Carr. Drawings by the Italian Masters. p. 27. Compare what has been said above (p. 7) respecting the inability of the ancients to conceive or even apprehend a landscape as a whole.
† Crowe and Cavalcaselle. History of Painting in Italy. I. 541.
CHAPTER II.

CLASSIC PHASE OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING.

BUT again, neither did this transition take place suddenly and at a single bound. Compared with previous intellectual revolutions this was, it is true, wrought rapidly. And yet, even a hundred years after the actual circumnavigation of the globe, Giordano Bruno was burned at the stake in Rome for persistently declaring his belief in the truth of the Copernican Theory; and Galileo only escaped a like fate by publicy asserting on his knees the truth of the Geocentric Theory and the consequent stationariness of the earth; only compensating himself for this humiliation with such small satisfaction as he could extract from secretly muttering as he arose: "For all that, it does move!"

On the other hand, again, it must be admitted that Rome was the very focus of reaction against the new mode of viewing the physical world; and this new mode of viewing the physical world was, as we have already shown, in special harmony with the new mode of viewing the spiritual world that had unfolded with extraordinary vigor among the Teutonic peoples. Thus in spite of all hindrances the freedom of man and the profound
spirituality of nature were fairly seized and philosophically formulated by the intellect of Europe before the first half of the seventeenth century had closed.—We have next to consider the development of landscape painting properly speaking as a phase of this general intellectual movement.

§ 1. Formal, Initiatory Phase of Landscape Painting as an Independent Form of Art.

It was but natural that these conceptions which we have just been considering, and which had reached so rich a development through the philosophic sciences, aided by confirmatory discoveries, should penetrate more and more deeply into the art-activity of the time as well as into all other modes of human endeavor. This is especially manifest in the development of landscapes painting in the period we are now considering. Already before the close of the sixteenth century, Annibale Caracci (1560—1609) was impelled by the new spirit to venture upon independent landscape representation. But that he had not succeeded in freeing himself from the older, and now vanishing modes of viewing nature is sufficiently clear from Luebke's statement that "The frescoes of a mythological character which he executed in the gallery of the Farnese Palace in Rome, are Annibale's principal work." * Other evidences appear in the works of various pupils of the Caracci.

* History of Art. II. 378.
Among these pupils there are a number in whom "the inclination to landscape, and especially to idyllic representations with mythological accessories, prevails almost exclusively."* The significance of this tendency can scarcely be regarded as obscure. Italy had long been the center of art. It was also the home of the enthusiastic revival of the study of the antique in all its phases. With the beginning of the seventeenth century the process of assimilation had long been complete, as regards the artistic value of the human form; it had become far advanced on the side of classic literature and philosophy; but was scarcely begun on the side of the interpretation of nature. Here there was as yet adoption rather than assimilation, besides the fact that the ancient mode of viewing nature was altogether inadequate. Thus while the modern view of nature was gradually unfolding and exhibiting ever nearer approaches to maturity, in the artistic representations of nature the charm of the ancient myths in their immediate, unassimilated form, was still irresistible; and mythological accessories were constantly made use of and as constantly influenced the whole tone of the pictures in which they appeared. Thus landscape painting emerged from the phase of symbolism in which it could only occupy the rank of an accessory, into an independence which was deeply tinged

with and even essentially characterized by the classic spirit. Thus far, however, landscape painting remained formal and failed to attain to the expression of any deeply significant phase of spirit.

§ 2. Culmination of Classic Landscape in the Epic Type.

This tendency toward the classic in landscape painting attained to its utmost development of wealth and subtlety of power to express spirit in the French-Italian school of the seventeenth century of which Nicholas Poussin and Claude Lorraine are the chief representatives. Indeed the very forms of nature with which these artists were mainly surrounded, and which afforded them the material for their representations were calculated to powerfully foster this tendency; for, as Luebke remarks, "Southern landscape, with its grand and beautifully curved mountain outlines, has a predominantly plastic character."* These, indeed, were such scenes as those amid which nymphs and heroes, fauns and satyrs, were formerly imagined to have actually dwelt in untroubled peace. What more natural than that these mythic beings should be recalled to life and made to people these idealized realms as in the long-past Golden Age?

Before all others the two artists last named were swayed by this tendency and in turn gave to it the deepest significance. Poussin, it is true,

* History of Art. II. 411.
was somewhat anomalous. He rose far above his contemporaries and was great both in historic and in landscape painting. Cousin saw in this artist "the painter of thought," and adds: "He is in some sort the philosopher of painting." There is, indeed, little that can be thought extravagant in this judgment, when we remember that it is expressed in a lecture devoted to "French Art in the seventeenth century," and that Poussin is here directly contrasted with Le Sueur as "the painter of sentiment." A single example will suffice to indicate the characteristic of Poussin's representations of landscape, and thus to show their true place in the special type of landscape painting which we are here considering. The picture to which we refer presents a pleasing view of nature in the midst of which is a group of shepherds pausing before a tomb. Cousin describes it as follows: "The most aged of the group with one knee on the ground, reads these words graven upon the stone: *Et in Arcadia ego,* and I also lived in Arcadia. At the left a shepherd listens with serious attention. At the right is a charming group, composed of a shepherd in the springtime of life, and a young girl of ravishing beauty. An artless admiration is painted on the face of the young peasant, who looks with happiness on his beautiful companion. As for her, her adorable face is not even veiled with the slightest shade; she smiles, her hand resting carelessly upon the
shoulder of the young man, and she has no appearance of comprehending the lecture given to beauty, youth and love."* To this, however, we may add that with all the plastic beauty at once of the figures and of the landscape—a beauty which imbues it so strongly with the classic spirit—there is yet, in the very fact that the picture contains "a lecture given to beauty, youth and love," an element which raises the work quite above the merely classic type of antiquity (a type requiring absolute repose and self-sufficiency in its works) and places it in a far higher order—namely: in the order wherein classic forms are applied to the expression of Romantic conceptions. And what is the central conception here, if not that the mystery of death has come to have an irresistible fascination for the thoughts of the living—that he who once dwelt in Arcadia still speaks, and speaks in a tone of deepest pathos? It is the entering in of reflection into the world—the dawning of a consciousness of serious responsibilities and of a momentous destiny for the individual. The more mature ones of the group plainly indicate this. They are intensely interested in the deeply suggestive words they are spelling out. Only the spiritually immature ones whose interest is wholly absorbed in the gladness of mere present, sensuous existence fail to realize something of the disquiet

* Lectures on the True, the Beautiful and the Good. (Trans. O. W. Wight.) p. 196.
and indefinable yearning to which the serious contemplation of death must ever give rise. But even so—we see that this mythological "accessory" actually constitutes the true center of interest and that strictly speaking the landscape itself, however excellent in its own way, is subordinate to this group in which there is shadowed forth so pathetic a significance.

Such is the inevitable tendency when a philosophically minded painter attempts the representation of landscape and at the same time finds himself impelled to introduce human figures as accessories. It is scarcely possible for him to avoid centering the interest of his picture in these figures. The human interest thus dominates the less clearly definable interest of the landscape and renders it impossible for the latter to rise above the level of a mere accessory and symbol. Thus we see that while Poussin treated landscape in accordance with the plastic or classic type, his philosophic tendencies of mind together with his predilection for figure-pieces of the classic style caused him to subordinate even his best landscapes to the human interests which he introduced into them.

Strongly contrasted with Poussin in this respect is Claude Lorraine. His soul is undisturbed by any vexing philosophic problems. He beholds nature and loves it for its own sake. He associates himself perpetually with its forms and never
wearies with watching its incessantly changing phases. In turn nature reveals many of her rarest secrets to him—but they are always charming, gladdening secrets and awaken no mistrust or anxiety. The wooded hills and lovely vales of his landscapes are also peopled with nymphs and heroes and Arcadian shepherds—but these never fall upon tombs in their holiday wanderings. Death has never entered the land he pictures. Its people are immortal! No shadow of care has ever fallen upon them. They have never tasted of the fruit of the tree of knowledge and have experienced none of the torturing fevers which the eating of that fruit produces. This is the secret of the air of eternal leisureliness which pervades his pictures and which would seem to be the characteristic that has led Moritz Carriere to say that "Claude Lorraine paints in Sabbath-day mood."* Instead of this, however, it appears to us that there is here unfolded to our view a highly appropriate representation of that state of neutral innocence which characterizes the primal paradise, out of which the flaming sword of the awakened consciousness of a higher destiny had not yet driven mankind. It is to be remembered too that this effect is still further heightened by the perfect plastic freedom which he exercised in the shaping of the earth-masses in his pictures. True, in his

*Æsthetik. (Leipzig, 1873.) II. 271.
landscapes, no less than in those of Poussin, human figures are constantly introduced and given great prominence; so that here also the human interests might seem to encroach upon and even dominate those of the landscape. A moment's consideration, however, is sufficient to see that the human interests which Claude represents are always *diffused*. They appear in the form of vague, peaceful sentiment; never as tense, definite thought. The human beings he introduces into his representations are unmistakably the children of nature and are swayed solely by the spirit of nature. Thus they lend themselves unreservedly to heighten the interest of the landscape; and this interest is always clearly predominant, even where the figures introduced are in greatest number and in liveliest action. This feature again is strengthened by the subtle use he makes of the ruins of ancient temples. These are never allowed to become obtrusive. If they appear in the foreground it is at the extreme right or left. Otherwise they are removed to the middle distance. They always serve admirably to increase the linear perspective; but as ruins they also suggest, quietly indeed, and yet eloquently, that the old nature-divinities have departed and that a new kingdom is already come—albeit “without observation.” Zeus has given place to the fathomless sky. Apollo no longer appears in bodily form. He is now the universal spirit of illumination that penetrates everywhere.
and gladdens all things. Here indeed we have a significant parallel suggested by the magnificent perspectives of this artist. On the one hand the lenses which Spinoza busied himself with grinding were enabling men to penetrate beyond the brazen boundary of the mythic sky; the physical properties of light were already beginning to be scientifically explained; and the universality of this splendid medium of unity for the outer world was coming to be poetically understood and sublimely represented, in accordance with the new spirit, by a Claude Lorrain. So, on the other hand, the limits which had so long been manifest in human personality as superstition and other forms of human imperfection were gradually disappearing and the human spirit was awaking at last to a clear consciousness of the infinite perspective of its own destiny as an absolutely free and hence immortal being—a perspective glorified with the mists of yet unpenetrated realms of thought; mists which were likewise already seen to be bathed in the splendors of the all-pervading sunlight of Truth and thus also to be penetrable throughout their infinite depths by the ever-striving spirit of man. Such is the far-reaching significance suggested by, because implicitly contained in, the art of Claude Lorrain.

True, he presents it in wholly objective form; there is no evidence of a deeply reflective spiritual consciousness in his work; but just for this reason
his work constitutes a sublime epic of which the central theme is man in action, and acting in such wise that he shows himself to be unconsciously submissive to an overruling destiny under the form of the Spirit of Nature.

Nevertheless this Spirit of Nature is so presented as to lead up to the intimation of the Universal and Divine Spirit who, as we have more than once been brought to repeat, forms, on one side, the substance of the Spirit of Nature and, on the other, the substance of the human spirit, and is thus at once both the absolute Unity of the world and also the ultimate and infinite Ideal of man. The final culmination of the epic as here presented then, proves to contain within it the clear intimation of the arrival of man at complete self-consciousness, in which is involved his identification of himself with Destiny in that highest sense of the free realization of his own Ideal. We must, however, emphasize the fact that this is here intimated only; not explicitly set forth. But its very intimation, though it were but remote and shadowy, must still prove how completely the work of this artist was pervaded by the modern or Romantic spirit; while on the other hand the plastic forms of the earth-masses in his pictures, the Acardian simplicity of the accessory human figures, and above all the mild gladness which pervades the pictures he painted—all these combine to render his work the final and perfect culmination of truly Classic Landscape Painting.
§ 3. Transition to the fully developed Romantic Type of Landscape Painting.

The whole of the antique spirit was characteristically objective. Its thoughts were directed to the external phases of things. If these thoughts were prosaic the forms in which they found utterance were fixed by the abstract reflection of the understanding and thus proved to be symbols; if poetic, the forms they assumed were forms of the imagination, beautiful images, externalized phases of comparatively concrete modes of spirit. In either case the spirit of man looked outward and busied itself with the external, the objective. Consistently with this, outer movements and their description rather than inner motives and their analysis, attracted the attention of the people of antiquity. It was thus that the most perfect type of epic poetry reached its culmination in the antique world of Greece.

On the other hand the Christian world turned away from the external as something illusory and evil. The ideally perfect soul was the one that had become perfectly concentrated within itself—absorbed in the spiritual and eternal, and wholly oblivious to the material and perishable. Nevertheless this was still a predominantly emotional and hence comparatively abstract phase of the new and intensely subjective attitude of the human spirit. It was this new phase of spirit that, in its abstract, undeveloped phase, gave rise to those
magnificent symbols, the cathedrals of Europe. Not until the spirit of the Renaissance had fairly permeated the mind of Europe with its vitalizing influence did the tendency to mere concentration upon self of the modern spirit transform the prevailingingly emotional, abstract introspection which had previously characterized it, into vigorous and clear intellectual self-analysis and clear, precise, concrete self-comprehension. Not until the seventeenth century was this transition from the predominance of the emotional to that of the intellectual in the self-contemplation of the spirit so far advanced that a Des Cartes could announce the proposition: *Cotigo, ergo sum,* I think therefore I am, as expressing the one absolutely unquestionable truth, and hence as the one secure point of departure from which one might hope to develop a philosophy that should prove unassailable because absolutely true.

It is of course no part of our present purpose to discuss this proposition. On the other hand it illustrates most happily the attitude of the modern mind which, in the midst of all its perplexities and misgivings still finds itself unable to doubt that it doubts to deny that it thinks, to be otherwise than absolutely certain of its own existence. Individuality, genuine subjectivity or personality—that would seem to be the one irrepresible, perpetually self-emphasizing *fact* to the man of the modern world. Subjective analysis appears everywhere in
the philosophy, the literature, the art, the very life, public and private, of modern times. The modern world are busied about and interested in, not so much external movements and their descriptions, as inner, subjective motives and their analysis. Hence, just as the *epic* was specially adapted to the contemplative character of the classic world, so the *lyric* is the true type of utterance for the modern spirit so far as, on the one hand, that spirit is concentrated upon self; and on the other, so far as the lyric is a spontaneous cry of the spirit, an utterance of its inmost essence. Here indeed, the spirit is completely reflected into itself or has fully *come to itself*. It is perpetually making discoveries within its own self and cries out in exultation or dismay according as its discoveries are of a beatiful and grand, or of a terrible and revolting type. Even its very cry is again an intensification of its own subjectivity; for, as a discoverer, it cries out in the first place, not to another, but *to itself* to behold the discovery, while at the same time it recognizes itself as that which is discovered.

Finally, these two extremes of epic and lyric, of objective and subjective, blended together, give us the richest, most complex phase of all—the *dramatic*, as we have shown elsewhere.

We have already seen how the classic type of landscape painting was in part a result of the Renaissance; that is, of that phase of the Renaissance
which consisted in the revival of the study of classic literature and art. But it is evident that landscape painting, like other forms of art, must develop new types in accordance with the advancing phases of the spirit's evolution. Hence just in proportion as the phase of subjectivity became pronounced, so the objective, epic type of landscape must fail to satisfy, and a new type must be sought in which the new phase of spirit could find more adequate expression. It would be but natural to look for the development of this new phase of landscape painting expressive of the subjective or lyrical, among the people who were first to carry subjectivity to an extreme point of development; and it is among such a people—the Netherlanders—that we actually find the first examples of landscape painting of the lyric type.
CHAPTER III.

ROMANTIC TYPE OF LANDSCAPE PAINTING.

§ 1. Dutch School (Prevailing ly Lyrical.)

As we have already seen it was among the Teutonic nations that the idea of individual, personal freedom belonging to man as man was first clearly seized in its full significance and held up as the ideal toward the realization of which each man should constantly and consciously struggle. On the other hand, however, it was but inevitable that this idea should at first be seized in its more immediate and comparatively superficial phases. This again would depend in part on local characteristics and circumstances.

Now, it was among the Netherlanders that the external phases of the idea of individual freedom were seized with the utmost determination and adhered to with unwavering tenacity. We have but to recall their conquests from the sea of the very land on which they dwelt, on the one hand; and their heroic defence of that land from the inroads of all hostile human forces on the other, together with their great success in commercial enterprises—reminding us in so many respects of
the Venetians—to see how powerfully these severe and generally successful conflicts must have here reacted upon the individual spirit by way of re-enforcing its otherwise strong tendency to self-satisfaction and undoubting assurance of being recognized always and everywhere as a completely realized person worthy of all honor.

Thus it happened that among the Netherlanders of the seventeenth century the claim of the individual was, in general, not so much that of the right to struggle unhindered toward the realization within himself of an infinitely exalted spiritual Ideal, as the right to be, and to be recognized as, precisely what he was. He was himself, then and there, the already realized ideal of a free man. It was precisely this infinite assumption and imperturbable self-complacency that constituted the comic phase of the new direction which human progress had taken and which, therefore, afforded inexhaustible material for the most extraordinary development of genre painting in the whole history of art—material the value of which men of sufficient discernment to look below the surface (men like Adrian von Ostade and David Teniers) were by no means slow to perceive and to make the most of. Men claimed the right to be what they were, and these artists claimed the right to paint men as they seemed in the light of their naive pretentions! The ideals that rule in men's lives will be the ideals that rule in their art. Whence
the inimitable Dutch comedies on canvas.

Now the same frankness which did not hesitate to recognize and represent men precisely for what they were and claimed to be was exhibited unchanged in the representations which the Dutch artists made of nature; but with a very important difference, nevertheless, in the result. Nothing can, after all, be painted absolutely as it is; and the artist who perceives the comic phase of a company of peasants enjoying themselves in the full assurance of their own perfect self-sufficiency cannot fail, even if he would, to weave more or less of this comic phase into his representation of the scene. But the comic is, in such case, really the very essence of the theme; and instead of diminishing this, the artist will seek with the utmost zest to give it fullest expression.

On the other hand it is evident that nature is never comic. The most cheerful of its phases have still the character of genuineness and sincerity. Its "assumptions" are never above the reality. But again, the aspects of nature in the Netherlands present nothing of the grand plastic outlines characteristic of the landscapes of Italy, while the skies are more sombre and the forms of vegetation less luxuriant and less graceful. Thus it is evident that the objective and idyllic—the epic—could not, even on the side of external form, constitute the basis of Dutch landscape painting. The selection which the artist might
make of a view to serve as the outer form for his representation would not, therefore, be determined so much from its immediate, objective beauty as from something contained in or suggested by it answering to or echoing some phase of his own inner or subjective experience. Hence Dutch landscape painting was destined even from its external side to be characteristically subjective and therefore essentially *lyrical* in tone. Not only so, but since, to the substantial genuineness of nature everywhere, there was here added a certain tinge of sombreness; the comic, which appeared as the characteristic of the representations of human life with this school, could scarcely fail to find its antithesis in a certain shade of the pathethic in its representations of landscape.

To this we have also to add that just as, on the side of human interests, the comic was, of all the elements there presented, the one best suited to the purposes of artistic representation and must therefore prove especially attractive to those artists whose native tendencies led them in this direction; so, on the contrary, the seriousness of the themes presented by nature must inevitably draw into the ranks of landscape painters, those artists whose tastes were most refined and whose minds were of most earnest and reflective habit. These artists, deeply imbued with the true spiritual import of the newly expanded conception of the individual freedom of man, and tinged more or less
with melancholy by the consciousness of the grave responsibilities which that conception implies, were in precisely that mood which was surest to respond unerringly to every pulsation of the pathetic in nature. Thus, for example, the landscapes of Rembrandt are full of the mysteries of light and shade—the obscure things of the world forever inextricably mingled with the manifest, and threatening, as it were, to overwhelm them. So, in particular, his landscape known as The Three Trees seems, with all its admirable qualities, to suggest the isolatedness that must ever in some measure, be inseparable from genuine independence. The more vigorous and pronounced the freedom of the individual—the more marked the degree in which he gives character to his place and time—by so much the more must he have room in which to act; and thus, in a measure, must consent to remain in a social vacuum.

If, again, we turn to the landscapes of Ruysdael we find ourselves here also confronted with unmistakable evidence that the paradise of primitive unconsciousness and innocence no longer exists on the earth. The consciousness of the immeasurable contrast between the ultimate Ideal and the immediate present Real penetrates everywhere. Hence the music of his pictures is predominantly in the minor key. He presents us with the view of a lone wood with an angry torrent rushing through it. The trees sway in the wind. A cold
rain has fallen. Gray clouds float through the sky. Through a break in these, sun-beams struggle into the midst of the gloom and along their upward track, the mind is led to see that enduring light and warmth must come from above. It is a picture of a soul struggling in the midst of adversity and yet suddenly catching a gleam of truth that lifts it above all that opposes its progress. So also in his Jewish Cemetery the very tombs are perishing. But a brook flows through the midst of them—as if the restless activity of the imperishable spirit were thus incessantly asserted here in the very midst of the decay of the physical. At the same time a shower is falling. This might, on one side, symbolize the sorrow of the living for the departed. On the other hand, however, it brings new supply to the brook which, as we have just seen, is a symbol of the perpetuated life of the soul. Still further: the sunlight plays through the descending drops and paints the hope-inspiring “Bow-of-Promise” on the sky. The entire picture thus proves to be a hymn that begins as a dirge looking earthward; and ends as a pæan looking heavenward.

Such are typical examples of the innermost essence of Dutch landscape painting. Other phases there are, to be sure, but these are far less essentially characteristic of that peculiar type of spiritual development which presented itself in the Hollanders of the seventeenth century. Nicholas
Berghem, for example, produced many admirable examples of homely landscapes animated by a cheerful and even gay sentiment that sometimes, in the figures he introduced so freely, approached very near to the comic quality of the works of the masters of genre painting. But in our estimate of his work it must be borne in mind that Berghem was early brought under Italian influences which could not fail to strengthen his natural gayety of spirit; a gayety which, as we have just mentioned, found utterance in the cheerful and sometimes even genre-like figures which he introduced and which harmonize so well with the untroubled serenity of his landscapes.

So again Philips Wouverman gave a light, cheerfully dramatic quality to his representations, though here also this was accomplished through figures rather than directly through developing any dramatic significance in the landscape itself.* Indeed Wouverman's chief skill really lay in the painting of figures; and his landscapes are, strictly speaking, accessory. While on the other hand the significance expressed in his figures is not of sufficient force to give them a decided predominance over the landscape. Thus his works often lack repose and give the impression of an artist struggling unsuccessfully toward the expression of a sentiment with which he is not deeply pene-

* Compare Crowe's Kugler's *Handbook of Painting* (German, Flemish and Dutch schools.) London, 1880. II. 431.
trated, or of a thought which he has not closely grasped. Hence he multiplies details to the overcrowding of his pictures and strives by aggregation to make up for lack of intensity and vital originality. It is to be observed, at the same time, that Wouverman seems always drawn to represent action. His work thus exhibits the objective or epic element. But the action he represents has its ultimate motive, not in external destiny, but in the subjective will of the actors. Here then we have also the lyrical element. But once more the combination of the epic with the lyrical element is precisely the condition necessary to the unfolding of the dramatic situation, in which the objective action arises from a subjective motive. If this motive is feeble or commonplace, the action itself must be wanting in vigor and can present little interest. The representation in such case can only be mechanical. However skillfully the parts may be brought together and portrayed they possess no inner, vital bond of union. Hence, however great the show of action in such works, they fail to hold, even if for a moment they excite, the interest of the observer; while the more thoughtfully they are examined the more apparent do their shallowness and utter insufficiency become. This appears to us to be the rational and sufficient ground, not for the unmeasured scorn which Ruskin pours out upon Wouverman, but for the criticism to which he gives utterance with
true Ruskinian dogmatism, to the effect that the works of this artist are extravagantly overloaded with details and manifestly wanting in respect of powerfully unifying sentiments.*

Finally we must not omit the remark that this comparatively extended notice of the works of Wouverman is here given because he presents one of the most conspicuous examples of the tendency among Dutch landscape painters to pass beyond the limits of the lyrical and to enter the realm of dramatic representation. On the other hand, as already pointed out, he failed to catch the secret of true dramatic landscape, and hence worked out the impulse he felt in this direction through the introduction of figures in action—the feebleness of the result presenting an immeasurable contrast with such magnificently dramatic scenes as Raphael's *Battle of Constantine* or Leonardo da Vinci's group of *Knights Fighting for the Standard*; in each of which the landscape is of course distinctly subordinate to the powerful human interests which are there present in intensest struggle.

This impulse toward the dramatic in landscape representation, however, found a truer direction and more successful method in the Marine views

* See *Modern Painters*. Y. 293-5. On the other hand Luebke speaks with approval of the "complete blending of genre and landscape" by Wouvermann and others—an approval for which we are wholly unable to discover any real justification. See *Luebke's History of Art*. II. 420.
of Jacob Ruysdael and of Backhuysen, but especially in those of Willem von de Velde the younger "who represented, first in Holland the naval victories of his countrymen over the English, and afterwards in England, the victories of the English over the Dutch; and who not merely depicted the sea in the play of lightly agitated waves, but especially amid the excitement of the elements, in the fury of the tempest, and the breaking of the billows." *

Even here, however, human interests manifestly predominate in the representations of naval engagements, though the dramatic elements of the sea were also fairly understood and represented with a good degree of success by this artist.

We have thus seen landscape painting assume successively, (1) the Symbolic type in accessory landscapes; (2) the Classic type in the first phase of its independence, where its objective characteristics gave to it a distinctly epic tone, and (3) the Romantic type in which it was at first predominantly subjective and therefore lyrical, but afterward came to blend the objective with the subjective—the epic with the lyric—into a new order of representation of which the fundamental tone is essentially dramatic.

With this, indeed, our survey of the historical development of the fundamental types of Land-

* Luebke. History of Art. II. 419.
scape Painting might close, were it not for the fact that these types have attained to so specially rich and fine a development at the hands of the schools of the present century. Our task would therefore be incomplete without some notice of the work of these schools. On the other hand this notice will be necessarily brief and restricted to the characterization of these several schools through a consideration of the work of but two or three representative artists in each.

§ 2. **English School of Landscape Painting.**

In comparing the English with the Dutch school of landscape painting there is an important fact that should be constantly borne in mind. It is this: The culmination of the English school took place in the midst of conditions immeasurably more favorable than were those in the midst of which the Dutch school attained to its maturity. The idea of individual freedom for man as man had been undergoing rapid development for nearly two hundred years longer and had attained to a complexity and refinement of realization that would have been inconceivable alike to the Dutch and the English of the seventeenth century. So far as subjective elements enter into a landscape painting, therefore, we would expect the English school to prove itself possessed of far greater wealth and subtlety of power to express the inner and spiritual than was the Dutch school. On the
other hand, physical science had advanced with even greater rapidity and nature was understood with far greater clearness and completeness. Both the outer and the inner elements of landscape painting were therefore now far more easily and completely within the grasp of the truly gifted artist than was the case in the previous period.

With this in mind we may proceed to briefly consider the characteristics of the English school of landscape painting as these characteristics appear in the works of its chief representative—Turner. An examination of the Turner Gallery is sufficient to satisfy one that Turner swept the whole field of landscape representation. He was at times epic, then lyric, and again, dramatic in his moods; and his works, accordingly, exhibit alternately these various phases of spirit. The *Golden Bough*, the *Bacchus and Ariadne*, the *Temple of Jupiter*, and the *Mercury and Argus* are charming scenes that are predominantly objective and epic in character. Each of these pictures draws its motive from the wholly ideal world of mythology. They are purely idylic. Their untroubled serenity is reflected above in the mild sky, and below in the unruffled surface of the water, and is felt in the undisturbed freedom with which each slenderest twig of a tree hangs in its place; while the hills and mountains represented give the air of serene grandeur appropriate to
such scenes. The mythological element in each aids more or less effectually in rendering clear and forcible the central significance of the picture. The *Mercury and Argus*, for example, is an epic of the wanderings of the moon (Io.) The setting sun sends his splendors through the sky and already marks out the path along which Io must proceed. Mercury, the subtle breeze, is already awakening his soothing Æolian music and gathering the mists that must close the starry eyes of Argus (the evening sky) and free Io from their gaze; though Mercury himself cannot free her from her wanderings nor from her transformations, now into her perfect, rounded form of beauty (the full moon,) and again into a mythic animal with slender horns (the new moon.) The accessories are not given undue prominence and the landscape itself is grand in its simplicity as a whole, while the rich beauty of the foreground finely reflects the subtle play of light in the misty sky.

But again, in a number of other pictures belonging to the same general type, Turner has permitted human interests to become wholly predominant. We may mention as examples of this the three well-known pictures: *Ancient Italy, Modern Italy,* and *Heidelberg.* In the first of these a river flows from the right foreground down through the middle distance where it is spanned by a bridge, beneath the arches of which it is lost to view—the mists illuminated by the setting sun already ren-
dering all things indistinct at that remove. Architecture completely covers both the ground on the more distant side of the river and also the bold eminence at the left. In the latter case the architecture is so arranged as to bear the appearance of one vast structure built by superhuman might. On both sides the buildings reach down to the water's edge. Only a narrow strip of pebble-covered ground appears in front, indicating that the sea is not far distant and that the tide rises sufficiently to cover this narrow space. Just now, however, it is strewn with articles of merchandise which, together with the boats lining the shores farther down, point to the widely extended commercial activity of Ancient Italy. So also in the middle distance on the left and just beneath what would seem to be a temple of Victory two personages are seated in imperial state upon a lofty throne about which a multitude are gathered and doing homage by tribute and by other acts of obedience. Again this regal might is exhibited or reflected in a group of persons that have evidently just departed from the presence of the Augustus and are approaching the water's edge to enter a boat. One of their number is a prisoner condemned apparently to banishment. It is said to be intended as a representation of the exile of Ovid. This is, however, a mere incident—an accessory symbolizing the power of the Caesars. Finally every feature and incident combine harmo-
niously to make of the picture as a whole, a grand symbol of Ancient Italy as the mighty center from which power radiated and to which wealth and honor were drawn. It is the epic of the splendor of Rome. Nevertheless it is, as just intimated, altogether symbolic and conventional when considered as an example of landscape painting. Indeed, with its studied composition and its fine architectural finish—shining with a borrowed light—it may be said to bear the same relation to landscape properly speaking that the *Ænead* bears to the Homeric epic.

With this picture the *Modern Italy* presents the most striking and significant contrast. In the former everything points outward. In the latter everything points inward. The very center of the picture is a depression toward which the ground slopes from either side. But this inward bent also finds its culmination in the human interests represented. Modern Italy appears as a vast monastery filled with processions of monks, and here and there women kneeling at the feet of priests confessing. It represents complete isolation from the world of action, and that sluggish, abstract concentration upon self which reaches its climax in the unconsciousness of sleep. It is a new version of *Paradise Lost*.

The *Heidelberg* is in itself less satisfactory than either of the other two; though the picturing of an assemblage of the people of a center
of learning under the very shadow of the halls where free thought reigns would seem to suggest that here we have a glimpse into the opening gates of *Paradise Regained*—but with the primal sensuous phase replaced by vital, spiritual realities.

Finally, a further psychological thread of connection may be seen to unite these three pictures. The *Ancient Italy* represents the abstract life of the Will as embodied in the formal law of the Roman state. The *Modern Italy* represents the abstract life of Emotion as exhibited in the formal aspects of religious life; while the *Heidelberg* suggests the union of these two phases (which are necessarily more or less abstract when developed so one-sidedly) into the rich, concrete life of Reason gradually unfolding to reality in the present century.

But we must hasten to consider a single example of the lyrical type. One of the finest of these produced by Turner is the *Approach to Venice*. A calm sea rippled only by the gently moving gondolas, the space filled with mists below and with filmy clouds floating in the sky above, the city of lagunes dimly outlined in the distance, and all illumined with the splendors of the setting sun—such is the immediate view. It is as if there were here pictured before us the Sun of Truth sending its mighty radiance into the depths of the soul which, thus roused, sends forth its thoughts like invisible vapors into the universe to combine everywhere
with subtlest forces, to play with sunbeams, to weave rainbows, to gather in clouds of beauty, to float on the breath of the inmost Spirit of Nature and, infinitely enriched, to return at length, in a rain of joy, into the bosom of the soul whence it sprang. So again the sun will have set by the time the gondolas enter the city, and their occupants will there provide their own light—just as the soul, at first guided by external lights, finds itself at last within the New Jerusalem where there is no night because the soul has itself gradually so woven the radiance of Truth into its own being as to become self-luminous and thus dwell in the midst of Eternal Day. This, indeed, is but the culmination of the "infinite reflection-into-self" of the spirit, of which we have just seen the symbol in the sea with its sun-evolved and sun-illumined mists and clouds which return in rain to the sea again.

Of the dramatic type also Turner's work furnishes us many examples, such as the Battle of Trafalgar, the Death of Nelson, The Shipwreck, and The Snow-storm. In each of these also the human interest forms an important element and even wholly predominates in the first two. In the last, which has been much and severely criticised, we have a representation of the fiercest battle of the elements, the interest being infinitely intensified by the introduction of a ship plunging through and almost completely enveloped by the tempes-
tuous sea. Here man seems puny and altogether helpless, so that his presence makes the titanic forces of nature seem all the more resistless. Whatever fault may be found with this picture or with *The Shipwreck* both are, beyond question, powerful representations of the intensely dramatic and perpetually repeated struggle between the infinitely mobile elements of the aerial and electric currents above, and the watery floods beneath.

Much that is interesting and admirable is certainly to be found in the work of many other artists of this school—among whom Birket Foster reminds us frequently of Turner himself—but no specially new feature of landscape painting has been developed beyond those which Turner had already wrought out to a high degree of perfection. It is not to our present purpose, therefore, to further extend our notice of the English school of landscape painting.

§ 3. German Schools of Landscape Painting.

It can scarcely be counted a matter of surprise that, after the chaos of the Thirty Years War, there should develop sooner or later, amidst the multiplicity of small German principalities, a powerful tendency toward an extreme of centralization in government. But this tendency, nevertheless, bears within it the characteristics of a reaction towards Oriental despotism. It is in some measure the re-enthronement of Destiny, and
hence the denial of the right of individual freedom. On the contrary individual freedom was already too far developed to admit of its total repression. Indeed on the purely subjective side there has even been encouragement rather than repression. And yet this again has been upon the express condition that the subjective freedom thus granted shall not attempt to objectify itself in forms otherwise than favorable to the existing political organization.

Thus the objective and the subjective are here held asunder by a strain which wholly contradicts the modern spirit. For the modern spirit would unite these opposite factors—instead of repressing or canceling either of them—so as to bring the outer and formal into free unision with the inner and rational. The ideally perfect world is that in which the objective is but the form which the subjective and truly spiritual assumes through its own unconstrained activity.

This opposition between the outer and the inner in the modern German world is manifest even in the art-activity which is there unfolded. The whole of modern German art may be considered as substantially divided into that of the Munich School on the one hand and that of the Duesseldorf School on the other—the former being pervaded by a "plastic character," the latter by a "musical tone" as Carriere has suggested. This distinction is more or less evidenced even in the
landscape painting of these schools. It is evident also that in landscape representations the "plastic character" of the one school could scarcely fail to manifest itself in objective views of an epic type; while the "musical tone" of the other must as certainly be realized in the portrayal of scenes deeply permeated by the lyrical quality.

Finally, let it be repeated that the harmonious union and blending of the objective and the subjective—of the epic and the lyric phases—is precisely what is demanded for the attainment of the highest and the richest unity; at the same time it should not be forgotten to what fulness of realization the subjective phase of freedom has long since attained among the Germans. For it is evident that these opposite phases of what should be a completely realized unity must sooner or later coalesce into products of rare perfection and that this must take place in the direction of least resistance. In art, as in other things, resistance must, under such conditions, prove to be least where the theme or motive is farthest removed from an immediate political significance.

Doubtless the finest example in German art of this blending of the objective with the subjective in a landscape representation has been produced by Karl Rottman whose early development took place under the influences of the Munich school. For the description of this work we are indebted to Moritz Carriere whose words we simply trans-
late. Adducing it as an example of what he considers the true type of historical landscape painting he says: "Karl Rottman who, turned from the very beginning, through his mode of view,* more to the beauty of earth-forms than to the life-breath of nature in tree and forest, gave with plastic clearness a picture of the classic ground in Italy, and then added to this in Greek landscapes the full brilliancy of color in order to unfold the splendor of the morning or the glow of the evening. In the combined effects of drawing and light and shade, of earth and atmosphere, he shows us above the plains of Marathon a storm which the brisk wind drives forward—a symbol of the battle which was here fought for Hellenic freedom. The cleft heights of the Tagus bear up against each other, rugged, firm, united, like the ancient Spartans themselves; and, like them again, full of courage, rise aloft in the pure ether. With what fulness of mystery does the sun stand behind the clouds while a magic radiance lies upon the plain of Eleusis where men turn toward the light! It seems to us as if even yet we were about to be initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries. Thus these pictures produce effects like songs that are sung. As, in the latter case, the clearness of the words is added to the melody; so, in the former, the objectively true form of a particular land, of a

* The view characteristic of the Munich school.
significant region, combines with the tone in air and light, [thus constituting] a harmony between the color and its tone-unison (Zusammenklang) [on the one hand] and the thought of the picture [on the other].*

We cannot, indeed, agree with this interpretation in so far as a picture like the one described is compared to a song merely. True, the artist has here undoubtedly, in spite of his predilection for the objective and epic, been drawn irresistibly to a most subtle appreciation of the intensely subjective and lyrical phase of the scene before him. At the same time he has also been equally impressed with its objective and epic grandeur. But he has not felt himself bound to choose the one and reject the other of these contrasted elements. On the contrary these elements fuse together in the crucible of his imagination and, thus combined, freely unfold in the splendid unity of a highly idealized scene possessing marvelous dramatic significance. The whole picture presents the external action of the forces of nature, but in such wise as to suggest the thought of a powerful internal or subjective motive. The swift wind—that subtle, spiritual element the air—drives before it the cloud which again is here a symbol of darkness, of grossness, of evil. So also the sun-light—the divine element—is obscured by the cloud, but only

* Carriere's *Æsthetik*. II. 273.
temporarily; and he who turns resolutely toward the light finds at last that obscurity passes away and that all "mysteries," whether of Eleusis or of Patmos, dissolve one by one into transparency before the all-penetrating radiance of the ever-advancing spirit of man.

Respecting the more immediate theme of the picture—its central significance—that may be described summarily as the struggle of conscious personality (under the form of the Greek people) for freedom from external domination. And this theme is the very core of all history, and history is the perpetual drama of the world.

Thus understood it appears to us that Rottman has here marked out once for all the true method for the employment of landscape representations for dramatic and historical purposes; for history in its outer movements steadily becomes less and less epic and more and more dramatic in character precisely in the same degree that the human spirit advances in the realization of that complexity, depth and intensity which pertain essentially to spirit as self-unfolded through external deeds performed consciously from internal and yet universally valid motives.

On the other hand the three great names of the Duesseldorf school are connected with cycles of landscapes on a grand scale but depending for their deeper spiritual significance upon human accessories. K. F. Lessing presents rugged views
with a sense of conflict in them and, with the aid of human figures, concentrates the whole upon the theme of the Reformation. Friederick Schirmer, reflecting upon the external conditions of a primitive revelation, selects from nature in general such of its aspects as seem to him to suggest most powerfully the conceptions pertaining to this or that Biblical narrative and borrows from Schnorr's Bible illustrations the figures which seem to him requisite to give voice to the otherwise inarticulate landscape. Preller, charmed with the stately beauty of the classic type, devoted the best part of his life to the maturing of a cycle of paintings in illustration of the Odyssey; his central aim being "the union of landscape and figure into an indissoluble whole." "These compositions," says J. Beavington Atkinson, "will forever remain a triumph of the creative imagination: they manifest the elements of the supernatural; they depict an earth, a landscape, fitted for the habitation of giants, heroes, gods. The rocks are grandly designed and distributed, as in Turner's boldest conceptions. The trees are equable in proportion, graceful and subtle in flowing curves and in a network letting through the light of day into slumbrous shadows and quiet places. Foreground plants—cactuses and flowers—are treated sensitively, as if possessing life and individual being. The figures are in strictest symmetry, both in themselves and in relation to their surroundings;
they are possessed of an ideal form in keeping with the beauty of the hills, and seas, and skies. In like manner Grecian temples and other edifices conform to the daily life and faith of a poetic age. The whole landscape with its human tenantry constitutes one vital creation, issuing as a vivid conception from the artist’s brain.”

In the work of Lessing, as also in that of Schirmer, there is manifest a strong dramatic and romantic element; while in that of Preller the epic and classic quality seems to predominate. This is explicable not merely on the ground of difference of individual tendencies but also from the influences to which these men were severally subjected. Preller was personally associated with Goethe and was greatly esteemed by him. Eckermann reports that immediately after Preller had left Weimar for Italy (in 1825) Goethe said of him: “Preller is an important talent and I have no fear of him. He appears to me, besides, of a very earnest character. I am almost certain that he will rather incline to Poussin than to Claude Lorraine; still I have particularly recommended him to study the latter—and not without reason; for it is with the cultivation of an artist as with the cultivation of every other talent. Our strong points, to a certain extent, develop themselves; but those germs of our nature which are not in

* The Schools of Modern Art in Germany. London and New York 1881. p. 86.
daily exercise, and are therefore less powerful, need particular care, in order that they may become strong likewise." And again: "I am certain that Preller will one day succeed admirably in the solemn, the grand, and perhaps also the wild. Whether he will be equally happy in the cheerful, the graceful and the lovely, will be another question; and therefore have I especially recommended to him Claude Lorraine, in order that, by study he may acquire that which does not lie in the actual tendencies of his nature." * We have already referred to the distinctly classic character of Claude's work and it is evident, from the remarks just quoted, that the whole force of Goethe's influence was brought to bear upon Preller so as to impel him as far as possible in the same direction.

But Preller, like Lessing and Schirmer, introduced figures into his landscapes; and it cannot be too strongly emphasized that however skillfully figures may be combined with landscapes, we have still a combination which may indeed produce an agreeable effect but which still must in some measure fail of being an absolutely perfect organic unity. We may enjoy one of Wagner's Music Dramas and admire it as the work of a true genius. On the contrary when we would secure the finest effects of music as

* Eckermann's Conversations of Goethe (Bohn's library.) p. 156.
music poetic language can avail nothing as an accessory. A sonata or a symphony would only be disturbed and weakened by a text; or rather the very idea of such music forbids a text. Similarly, landscape painting as such must depend for its finest effects upon its own resources within the realm which nature supplies. And, as we have previously shown, this is gradually becoming apparent to landscape painters who are making less and less use of accessories in proportion as they obtain more accurate knowledge of the artistic qualities pertaining to nature and acquire greater skill in their interpretation.

Thus the whole realm of nature is unfolded to the landscape painter as the outer material of his art and the German artist makes use of this material freely and independently for the purpose of working out a definite motive or artistic conception. Fine epic landscapes are produced by the later representatives of the Munich school, the scenes being generally chosen from the Alps. So, again, smaller views of level landscapes are produced in great numbers and seem to be sometimes of an idyllic, sometimes of a distinctly lyrical tone. Atkinson refers to the works of Herr Lier who, it is to be noted, studied several years in Paris under Jules Dupre. He says, "The eye of his composition is placed on a low and distant horizon, and sometimes, as in a scene of 'evening twilight,' attention is drawn skywards, where per-
chance a flock of fleecy clouds, white as sheep in fields, or silvery as bright breakers on a shore, wait windlessly in the zenith watching the sunset die.”

* The lyrical quality is here manifestly predominant, and this is doubtless due, in part at least, to French influences.

On the other hand the Duesseldorf school appears to continue up to the present time, and even to intensify, its tendency (strongly expressed in the works of Lessing and of Schirmer) toward the dramatic treatment of landscape; though of course, here as elsewhere greater familiarity with the subtleties of nature must have the effect to increase the number of artists capable of seizing and portraying the delicate, yet intense, lyrical phases of nature on canvases of appropriately limited proportions. We need only quote the words of Atkinson to show the extent and strength of the dramatic tendency also of this school at the present day. He says: "The painters of Duesseldorf find congenial sketching-ground among the wild fiords of Norway, and are accustomed to bring back from their autumn excursions among mountains, scenes heroic and effects phenomenal. Such landscapes are usually ponderous and tempestuous: dark precipices frown over perilous depths and stormy clouds threatening what John Constable used to call great-coat weather.  

* * *

* Schools of Modern Art in Germany. p. 49.
Sometimes the artist rises from a mere transcript to a creation; the scene before him he does not copy literally, but uses the materials as motives and thus works out the suggestion or idea to its logical consequences. And so the composing of a picture becomes analogous to the solving of a problem.”*

In all this it is evident that while each of these two celebrated schools has its fundamental tone, that tone is enriched by a wide range of harmonic chords and that the landscape-painting of the present day in Germany is at a high point of excellence and possessed of possibilities for still further advance.

Nor is the characteristic difference between these schools so difficult to account for as might at first view appear. The Munich school was created by the King of Bavaria and has continued to receive royal support. It is, therefore, literally a child of Destiny; but of destiny in the sense of an externally dominant power. Hence from the first authority has been manifest even in the inner workings of the school. The Duesseldorf school, on the contrary, was of spontaneous growth and has been self-supporting. Here, therefore, artists have been free to work out their own inner sentiments and convictions. Hence variety in unity—harmony, the “musical tone”—has been charac-

* Schools of Modern Art in Germany. p. 87.
teristic of this school; while centrilization, desti-
ny—the epic or "plastic" quality—has character-
ized the Munich school. This more perfect free-
dom also goes far to explain (what seems a problem
to Atkinson) the fact that the Duesseldorf school
is the greatest in Germany.

§ 4. Modern French School of Landscape Painting.

_L'état, c'est moi_, the State, that is me, said Louis
XIV. And the French Revolution was the long-
delayed but inevitable counter-proposition. In
Germany the tendency has long been toward the
extreme of political depotism as a reaction from
the social chaos of the Thirty Years War. In
France the reverse process has been exhibited. By
a sudden and violent revulsion the extreme ab-
stract unity of despotic government was trans-
formed into anequally extreme and abstract multi-
plicity consisting of a social chaos. The worship
of finite reason proves in the outcome to be the
worship of infinite caprice. The French, dissatis-
fied with a political universal under the form of a
state (or governing power) concentrated in the per-
son of the King; dissatisfied also with the religious
universal under the form of divine authority con-
centrated in the person of a Pope, rejected the uni-
versal altogether as a mere abstraction and de-
voted themselves to "reality" under the form of
particular facts and events. But these particular
facts and events taken apart from the universal
spiritual element that gives vitality to the whole prove to be only external and sensuous—mere bodies without souls. This has shown itself above all in the polished rather than cultivated society of France, and in so much of French art as chooses its subject-matter from this phase of society. Even the historical paintings produced in the great academic schools of Paris, faultless in all things technical and mechanical, are generally wanting in soul, in spiritual significance.* Thus instead of being truly great works of art they are rather to be looked upon as extraordinarily elaborated anatomical studies. Admirable exceptions there are, indeed, but these are works produced by artists who, in spite of the popular tendency, perceive and feel the necessity of the universal and spiritual as the vital element in all things and who make of this element the central motive of their work.† In portraying real or ideal scenes from human life such artists turn instinctively for their subject-matter to the humbler walks of life where sincerity and earnestness of spirit are found in full vigor. On the contrary the French artist who is himself indifferent to the spiritual element invariably presents us with a picture representing one or more figures dressed

* The works of Gerome and those of Coomans are examples of this superficial tendency.

† In this connection may be mentioned especially J. F. Millet and Jules Breton whose pictures are the very embodiment of charming sincerity and unconquerable will.
in the richest textures, the latter being painted often with the most marvelous technical skill. Thus far all is well. But when we look for spiritual significance we find that to be exhausted in the form of an arch smile of a witless woman, or in a quarrel between equally witless lovers! It would seem as if the whole of French art, so far as that consists of figure-painting, were (in these contrasted ways) unconsciously but perpetually advertising to the world that just in proportion as French society becomes more highly "cultivated" in precisely the same degree is it found to be only so much the more excessively frivolous.

Now the tendencies manifest in French landscape painting are precisely the same as those which characterize the other phase of French art. Those artists who select the subject-matter of their representations from external nature are also divided into two broadly distinguished classes. On the one hand are those who revolt from academical traditions because these seem to be (and doubtless in many cases are) altogether arbitrary and irrational. A higher, a truly rational standard is felt to be necessary. Human reason as such is appealed to; and yet this is done in such wise that in effect the ancient and wholly ambiguous first principle of the Greek Sophists is re-affirmed. "Man is the measure of all things." And just as, anciently, so here, the anti-traditionists in but too many cases take up the principle on its false, su-
perficial, wholly untenable side. Instead of understanding the term "man" to signify the universal, permanent and perfectly self-consistent principle of Reason that lies at the basis of human nature itself, they rather understand that term to mean the immediate individual whatever the degree in which he may be distinguished by mere crudeness and eccentricity and mutually contradictory whims. Thus with this class the individual artist is far from regarding himself merely as an embodiment, more or less imperfect, of reason. In such case he must freely exercise, and patiently submit to, severe self-criticism. On the contrary he regards himself as the embodiment, and for him the only embodiment of reason. He is himself therefore his own supreme and sole guide not only in choice of subject-matter but also in mode of execution. He is his own fully realized ideal. He has taken the measure of himself and however small that measure may be he is wholly satisfied. Whatever monstrosity he may produce his unfailing and unanswerable justification is that it gives his impression; it is pleasing to him. Thus individual caprice, under the name of reason, assumes the absolute dictatorship in matters of art. In which case it must assuredly be idle enough to enter into any dispute upon questions of taste! Whatever the "artist" may choose to portray that the spectator is bound to admire as a matter of course. For not the spectator but only the di-
vinely gifted "artist" is the one truly perfect embodiment of reason. Not only so, but in order that the admiration may the more certainly be turned upon the "artist" nothing whatever that from the standpoint of the spectator can be called admirable is permitted to intrude itself into the subject-matter of his picture. Indeed his purpose is not to set forth an idea or sentiment; not to portray some charming and otherwise inexpressible phase of spirit. On the contrary he would compel admiration for just his own technical skill, for his power to cover a canvas with the perfect representation of "things as they are." Perfect, that is, save the incidental absence of any trace whatever of soul. One step beyond this (the disregard even of technical finish) suffices to arrive at the impudence of mere vulgar "Impressionism." Some startling examples of this latter kind of work by Daubigny have found their way to America.

But the landscape painting of France also presents a thoroughly healthy phase. The pictures of Corot, with their indefinable mists and filmy, nebulous trees, are like the first notes of a prelude to the grander harmonies of a new world of spirit just waking into consciousness. The French Revolution with the resultant Napoleonic dynasty might be described as a long and frightful period of somnambulism on the part of that splendidly endowed people—with Sedan and the Prussian occu-
pacy of Paris as the painful awakening. Corot's landscapes seem like clairvoyant glimpses into the dewy freshness and indefinable dawn of the morning of political freedom for France.

But Corot, even at his best, is still only a premonition. Somewhat akin to him in style, but far bolder and more aggressive in his conceptions, was Diaz of whose work "The Passing Storm" may be cited as a fine example. Assuredly, for delicacy of finish, for purity of tone in coloring, for subtle management of light and shade, this picture is fairly indescribable. Nor is it wanting in richly poetic, fairly tragic symbolism. A collision of mighty forces has been taking place. Separated from each other these forces were out of balance and destructive in character. They were positive forces and yet negative toward each other. They have clashed together with violence, and yet as the storm clears away it is evident that while there has been a dissolution of lower forms or phases of the forces in play this has been the very means by which those same forces might assume, and have actually assumed, still higher and nobler forms. Old antagonisms have given place to restful unity. The atmosphere is purified, the earth is refreshed with the generous rain; the sun shines with a clearer light and this again blends with all things and reveals their subtlest elements and most winsome graces. So too there come periods in the life of every honest human being
when opposite and seemingly destructive motives shake the soul to its center, and yet combine at length in a broader, finer view, and lead to a richer, purer life.

Many points of similarity are manifest between the works of Diaz and those of Rousseau. The works of the latter exhibit a spirit full of earnestness as well as a fine power of seizing and portraying the lyrical and dramatic aspects of nature. Some of his landscapes, with their ragged trees and storm-torn clouds and rough, almost grassless earth seem like songs of mourning amidst the echoes of battle in the land still scarred and rent by the trampling millions of the Napoleonic wars. And yet after all these tempestuous clearings of the atmosphere the elements become readjusted and assimilated into a higher and richer unity—the unity of the French Republic which it is to be devoutly hoped may prove to be permanently vital and self-sustaining.

Meanwhile this richer unity fails to make its appearance in the later landscape art of France. One needs but look through the catalogues of the Salon from year to year to find only too abundant confirmation of this statement. Indeed that recent French landscape, is not of a high order is clearly recognized by French critics themselves. M. Rene Menard refers to this in the following terms.* "The great school of landscapists which

* See L'Art for iSSi. Vol. III.
Jules Dupre, Rousseau, Diaz, Troyon, Daubigny, Corot, were the unquestioned leaders, has of late years undergone an important transformation. They impressed upon art a character of boldness and power; and if, in certain respects, their works appear incomplete and even sometimes of a somewhat coarse (brutale) execution, one always finds in them an animated and vigorous originality.* At the present day landscape painting is singularly cautious (assagie,) but in becoming more restrained, more equilibrated, it has lost its revolutionary and passionate character. Our contemporary landscapists finish their pictures and no longer content themselves with those brilliant rough sketches which called forth outcries and sometimes caused their authors to be excluded from the Salon. But if they are more perfect in execution they do not rise to so great a height in their aspirations; for at the same time that the defects disappear the great qualities tend to grow less. The public accepts their work without discussion, admits the incontestable talent exhibited, but no longer becomes excited with controversy; and landscape painting, which seemed for a moment to take its place at the head of the French school, assumes a modest role in our exhibitions."

Among examples cited from the last Salon of

* In Daubigny the "brutale" execution is evident enough; and perhaps the originality also—in works of his that have not passed beyond the borders of France.
"estimable works" is one by Emile Michel of Metz which "shows very well how conscientiously (avec quelle conscience) he studies nature and with what sentiment he renders its effects." A carefully executed pen-drawing of this work made by M. Michel himself is reproduced in facsimile in the same number of L'Art as that in which the notice is given. The drawing shows a minute study of foreground with scarcely a suggestion of distance or of breadth and solidity of land-masses. It is neat, careful, narrow, pretty. It is a well-polished ballad as compared with the far more richly toned lyrics of Corot or Diaz, or Rousseau. And yet the unqualified sincerity of the work and the careful exclusion from it of any suggestion of coarse elements show that though this is far from being a great work its author has nevertheless preserved himself from adopting radically false theories in art, and that the products of his brush will at least be pure and worthy of respect if not also of admiration. Other evidences are not wanting that French landscape painting is developing an altogether healthy spirit and that while its products are not at present of a very high order it still may posses latent powers that will sooner or later unfold in such measure as to produce really great works of art in this field.

It is to be noted in passing that landscape of the epic type is quite wanting to French art of the present century and that but few works
of real dramatic power have been produced.

§ 5. American Landscape Painting.

In the Oriental world the centralizing forces gathered all political power into the hands of one. This one alone, therefore, was free. But he again was dominated wholly by his own whims and caprices. Instead of being truly free he was a creature of mere blind necessity. The unity of the Oriental world was an abstract, empty unity. The freedom found there was a merely possible and altogether unrealized freedom.

With the Greeks the gods were conceived of as rational beings and as possessing thus far a realized freedom. But these gods dominated and wielded the merely blind, wholly irrational forces of nature; and yet the gods themselves were but higher phases of these same forces. Hence they possessed only a partial and relative freedom. So the Greeks also arrived at an important stage of self-consciousness and recognized freedom as an attribute belonging to every member of the Hellenic race; while on the other hand they looked upon the non-Hellenic peoples as composed of (relatively) irrational beings fit only for slaves—the mere unreasoning instruments of the essentially superior Greek.

It remained for the more advanced thought of modern times to discover, under the influence of Christianity, that in comparison with their helots
or slaves the Greeks were only a relatively more advanced type of humanity just as their gods were the subtlest, most beautiful, and therefore personified phases of the forces of nature in general. Only in modern times has it come to be fully understood that the Divine is necessarily One and that all men have one and the same infinite Ideal—that man as man, man as a spiritual being, is absolutely necessitated to be free. For what is freedom but conscious conformity to Reason, as we have already expressed it? And what is Reason but the absolute, irreversible order, the infinitely consistent, vital and systematic Process of the world, physical and spiritual?

Now it is in America that for the first time in the history of the world a government has been established upon the express principle that "all men are created equal;" that, in other words, all men have one and the same infinite Ideal. Here therefore it would be reasonable to look for the most perfectly unhindered development of personal freedom. True, any lofty ideal for humanity is realized only through a long process of culture; and the idea of freedom in its highest significance is precisely the central, the one truly vital idea of the spiritual world. The ideal of man as a perfectly free being, therefore, can be only relatively realized at any given stage of history. But to have become clearly conscious of this ideal and to have woven the whole social fabric of
a nation in accordance with it as the one true pattern—that is to have marked an epoch for all time in the history of the world; and the sun has risen with a new light upon humanity ever since the declaration and vindication of American Independence.

After all the French King was right in declaring the state to be himself. He was wrong only in denying that every other citizen was also an embodiment of the state. So likewise the French Revolutionists were right in asserting, in effect, that each man was the state; but wrong in asserting this of each only in his isolation. The fatal error was the practical denial of the social organism. In America all are free, but the freedom of each is found to involve necessarily precisely this social organism. Man is free only in relation to a rationally constituted society. Here each is the state and the state is all. The dutiful citizen commands the state to the full extent of its powers for protection of his person and property. So also he commands society to the full extent of its skill—its printing presses, its telegraphs, its railways, its factories—for his own pleasure and advantage.

With political freedom, religious freedom, social freedom, and freedom in scientific investigation, under a government requiring only that the freedom of the individual in these several respects shall exhibit itself in a rational citizenship, in morality of conduct, in honorable dealing with others
in all things, the conditions would seem to be favorable in the highest degree to the development of all the finest modes of human activity.

Of these modes it would of course be aside from our present purpose to consider more than one—that of art; and of this we must confine our attention to the one division: Landscape Painting.

We have already seen that just in proportion as, on the one hand, the idea of individual freedom advanced toward realization; and as, on the other hand, the conception of nature in its various aspects became more rational so the art of landscape painting grew more significant and came to be more generally and highly esteemed. But we have also seen that it has been precisely in America that the idea of individual freedom for man as man has been most distinctly grasped and brought home most clearly to the general consciousness. It is true also that in America the best results of modern science have become more widely diffused then in any other country in the world. Here, therefore, it was but inevitable that landscape painting should assume special prominence. It is not because America is wanting in themes for historical painting, not because sacred subjects are less sacred to American than to other artists; but because the conditions in this country have been so exceptionally favorable to landscape painting that the latter form of art has assumed such exceptional prominence among us. In this connection
we come upon another significant fact. We have already seen that just in proportion as the artist clearly comprehends and enters into perfect sympathy with, nature; so, in his representations of nature he will rely more and more upon the expressiveness belonging to the various phases of nature itself, and less and less upon accessories, whether these consist of architecture, or animals, or human figures. As a matter of fact American landscape painting has made comparatively little use of such accessories and is making still less.

It is observable also that all the essential phases of landscape art are abundantly represented in the work of American artists.

But let us now attempt to characterize the work of a few of our representative artists. And first it is to be observed that the works of Cole, who may be regarded as the type of the earliest American landscape painters, exhibit a distinctly epic character, softened frequently into idylic grace and beauty. Following Cole and taking his departure from Cole's school, possessed of the same calm seriousness and of far greater genius, Church has produced some of the finest landscapes ever painted. Indeed if the fundamental principles which we have endeavor to make plain in these pages are to be relied upon as substantial and true it must be said that the work of this artist is, in the strictest sense of landscape painting, decidedly superior to that of Turner. Assuredly
Turner's was a mighty spirit, but whatever his intellectual powers they were still dominated in too great a degree by the might of his emotional nature. Hence the vagueness manifest in many of his works—a vagueness which even extends to the fantastic in some of them. This is also, as we believe, the chief secret of his profuse employment of architecture and of human figures as accessory; though of course the influence of Claude must also be reconed as accounting for this in part. The impressions he received from nature bore a rich and powerful content but he was never (or at least seldom) able to perfectly translate these impressions into sufficiently definite form to express without external aids the central conception of his work. In other words he was unable to transform the emotional element of a landscape into an intellectually apprehended content without taking it partly out of the forms of nature. Thus there was always more or less of dualism in his work, the highest spiritual element being brought in for the most part under the form of humanity; the result being, necessarily, a more or less manifest intimation of the contrast between the spiritual and conscious on the one hand and the material and unconscious on the other. In other words many of his works lack the repose of perfect unity.

If now we turn to the works of Church we can scarcely fail to recognize in them great clearness and vigor of intellectual penetration as well as
breadth of comprehension, along with the utmost refinement and wealth of emotional element. We might say of him that his thought vibrates as feeling and his feeling glows as thought—just as the same pulsations of the "aether" made visible to us in the solar Spectrum are at once calorific and luminous, the heat-vibrations grading up imperceptibly into light and the light shading just as imperceptibly down into invisible rays of heat.

We have but to refer to Church's *Heart of the Andes* or to his *Chimborazo* in illustration of this fine unison of thought and feeling in his work. The former is the more definite of the two and constitutes the more perfect unity. But both exhibit in a remarkable degree the clearness, vigor, and breadth of thought with which his work is characterized. It is thus that each of his pictures comes to be, as has been suggested, a sort of epitome in which are summed up all that is significant in an entire region. He generalizes his theme, abstracting or omitting from it all insignificant or irrelevant matter; he enriches it by bringing together all the truly characteristic details of the locality he would represent. His theme thus becomes a truly universal one. At the same time he sees with perfect clearness not only the whole superficial breadth of that theme, but also all the possibilities contained in it; and he finds himself perfectly able to realize those possibilities *without going noticeably beyond the forms already present in*
nature. If man appears here at all it is rather as the simple child of nature, floating on the current, submitting cheerfully and without thought to the destiny which bears him onward like an infant to a goal he recks not of.

But let us endeavor to ascertain precisely what is the universal theme prevailing the pictures we have named and constituting their unifying element. In both the Chimborazo and the Heart of the Andes this central and unifying theme is substantially the same. The mountain-masses stand there in their changeless grandeur as if embodying the eternal principle of the world. As the eye moves away from these focusing peaks an ever-increasing variety of forms is encountered until from the barren crags of the summit we find ourselves in the midst of liquid, flowing activity and teeming life. But the stream itself we trace back to those same barren peaks, and these, in turn, gleam with the radiance and vibrate to their depths with the force of that other phase of the universal which envelopes the whole. That phase is the radiant force which is at once heat and light and chemical energy. So too the very soil of the river-plain upon whose wealth and mobility of elements the subtle radiant forces act in such wise as to bring into realized existence the infinitely varied forms of life—that soil with all its elements is also the gift of the mountain. Thus if on one hand the mountain represents the univer-
sal principle in its abstract unity; so, on the other the river-plain with its multiple complex of life and activity represents, not the phase of particular existences in contrast with the universal principle or vital Force of the world, but rather it represents that universal principle diffusing itself, realizing itself in those particular existences. So too the clouds, ethereal in texture and prevaded by light, hover about the summit of the mountain—the source whence began their onward flow the waters from which these clouds arose. These clouds too are borne upward by gravitation—the very force that drags the grosser forms of existence downward. For the lower forms of existence the principle of unity is one of external relation of part to part in space; and the actual arrival of those forms of existence at the center of gravity toward which they perpetually struggle must unfailingly result in the cancellation of their identity. The raindrop reaches the ocean and instantly loses itself therein. The earth could arrive at the sun only at the sacrifice of being fused with the sun's mass. But for the higher and highest forms of existence—the spiritual—of which the clouds are here a symbol, the principle of unity assumes the phase of likeness. Cloud-forms are like mountain-forms; and the human spirit is the image of the Divine Spirit of whose might and majesty mountains have ever been a symbol to man. So also the approach of
the soul to its center of gravity is no longer through space, but through spiritual acquisition; and the soul's identity is only so much the more absolutely assured the nearer it approaches to that center.

Thus in these pictures there is not only the representation of the outer characteristics of a particular region in nature; there is also plainly intimated the total round of the whole movement of the world. The universal principle is seen, as it were, in the very process of unfolding itself into all forms of existence, which forms become richer and subtler as they are apparently further removed from the central source until at length there arises a form which is no longer subject to this mere out-putting tendency but which is exalted into likeness to that source. Looked at in this way the Heart of the Andes and the Chimborazo are magnificent symbols of the evolution of the world in its richest import. They seem actually to introduce the time element, and to exhibit the progressive movement from the vague, abstract phase of the universal principle in its merely potential form, through all the intermediate stages to its full and sublime realization in self-conscious existence. Of all the arts of visible representation landscape painting alone is capable of accomplishing such a task. It is to be remarked too that in this introduction of the time element we have another subtle connecting link between
landscape painting and music. And yet in such deeply significant examples of landscape the time element is not merely introduced; it is also transcended. The evolution of the world is progressive, but also simultaneous. The activity of the universal Principle of the world is an infinite process in which every possible phase of existence is realized at every moment. The Totality of the universe is "without variableness or shadow of turning." This is the "eternal now." Such is the significance symbolized in these great works; and the Heart of the Andes especially may justly be ranked among the greatest epic landscapes ever put upon canvas. The soul of nature is here seized in one of its sublimest and most comprehensive phases while at the same time the artist has proven himself possessed of that deep, perfectly self-poised fervor of soul necessary to the completely adequate representation of so great a theme. The majestic repose of the picture as a whole can only be accounted for by presupposing the artist to be in possession of the most extraordinary power in perfect self-restraint. It could only be a superficial view of the work that could lead one to infer (as some have actually inferred) the absence of genuine artistic fervor from the fact that agitation is nowhere manifest in the execution. Nor can we agree with those who find "too much science" in this great work. It is indeed by no means easy to conjecture just what is meant by
this expression. If it is meant that there is too much in the picture to which utterance can be given in words we would reply that language in the ordinary sense of the term is only the most adequate among many modes of expressing clear thought; that sentiment is itself thought in a less developed stage, and that, finally, a work of art that has nothing in it capable of translation into the precise language of reflective thought is a contradiction of terms. It is precisely the greatest, the richest work of art, that contains most in it capable of translation into specific terms of thought. If on the other hand it is meant that the artist has simply pieced together mechanically a number of heterogeneous parts the answer is given in what has already been said respecting the splendid vital unity that characterizes the work and gives it its deep and wide-reaching significance. So far from bearing the stamp of a mechanically constructed work it presents a unity and consistency that could have been given only by the truly creative act of an artist possessing genius of a high order and of genuinely poetic type.

If now we compare the epic landscapes of Church with those of Claude Lorraine the difference is striking in the extreme. The latter really shows himself dominated by the modern spirit only in his management of light and atmosphere and sky. In all else he remained subject to the influences of the classic age. Church, on the con-
trary, is imbued throughout with the spirit of the present time. He approaches nature only the more reverently as he has clearer knowledge of of her grand characteristics. His vision penetrates to the inmost soul of the physical world. Hence the forms of nature become wholly plastic in his hands and he finds it possible to express the subtlest and profoundest intimations of the world-spirit by means of the forms of nature alone. Nevertheless much of his finest work remains distinctly epic in tone because it represents the grand progress of Destiny. But Destiny is here no longer a relentless Fate. It is seen to be the world-order of Reason unconscious conformity to which in the physical world is simple necessity, while conscious conformity thereto in the world of spirit is the highest freedom. In other words the physical, the unconscious, is only a lower stage of the same infinite Reason of which the spiritual and conscious is the higher—and highest. Hence the phases of that Reason manifest in the lower or unconscious stage of the physical world are still intimations or premonitions of those phases belonging to the higher or conscious stage of the spiritual world. The very fatality of nature foreshadows the freedom of spirit.

But Church's genius is by no means confined to the sphere of the epic. He has also shown himself a master in the creation of lyric landscapes. Of these it must here suffice to adduce a single ex-
ample. It is the *Sunset at Mount Desert.* It is a large canvas in which there is little that is striking on first view so far as form is concerned; while the splendor of its coloring seizes the attention instantly. And while the spectator is held by this magic power, it begins at length to dawn upon him that the simple forms of the picture are not without their mystic significance also. The foreground is the shore of an arm of the sea. Immediately in front the ground is low and covered with rock-masses. To the right the ground rises somewhat abruptly and is covered with a growth of dwarf pine. Near the foot of the slope a spring issues from the ground thus giving occasion for the representation of fresh grasses and of a single deer which has come forth from its hiding-place to quench its thirst at the spring and to crop the tender grass. To the left the ground rises again somewhat abruptly in rocky masses, while across the bay or inlet a point of land extends from the extreme left into the distance and toward the right, forming the farther shore. Past the terminus of this point of land the bay opens out into the sea. A single sail is seen upon the bay. The sky is filled with greatly varied cloud-forms all radiant with the splendors of the sinking sun. The rich tones of color deepen gradually toward the horizon and at the same time converge to a focus of

---

* Owned by Charles Parsons Esq. of St. Louis.
intense crimson glow at the point below which the sun has just disappeared.

We have thus far simply enumerated what the eye sees almost at first glance. But, as we have already intimated, the very simplicity of the composition is the secret of its significance. The land is little varied and converges toward the simple and self-identical as represented by the unruffled sheet of water. Even the varied tones of color in the clouds all center in the unity of the sun's glow. So also the timid deer ventures out in this undisturbed calm, while the lonely sail on the bay suggests that here the spirit of man also finds rest from its conflicts. All that is particular and specialized seems about to blend utterly into the indefinite and universal. It would seem that the next step would be the vanishing of all things into the abyss of nothingness. Could we but turn Buddhist and pause with this stage of the interpretation we should accept this picture with enthusiasm as a solemn and sublime hymn to Nirvana.

But the picture itself contradicts this merely negative interpretation. The land and water are positively distinguished from one another whether enveloped in shadow or in sun-light. The sea indeed exists only because the land is hollowed out to receive it. The water dashes as if in fury against the land, and yet the land is the very cradle in which all this tempestuous agitation is lulled to rest. So at times the spirit of man rises in
wrath against its limitations and at length attains to calmness and peace by adjusting itself to those limits. Such would be the suggestion of the calm sea. But the deep glow of the sunset presents a still further suggestion. The light is, after all, not focused: it is diffused, and in being diffused is enriched with the utmost magnificence of color by the very energy it exerts in passing through the atmosphere and the cloud-forms that fill the sky. Similarly the self-luminous spirit diffuses its rays through the realms of reason and by its own activity perpetually adds to the strength and splendor of its own powers.

If now we observe the relation between the calmness of the spirit, represented by the unruffled waters of this inlet of the sea; and the wealth which the spirit acquires through its own activity, as indicated in the rich coloring of the picture; we may see that this calmness of the spirit on the one hand is but the self-possession, the dignity that belongs essentially to the fully developed, self-centered power of the spirit on the other. Thus we have in this picture the representation, not of exhaustion and dissolution, but of rich, vast achievement and multiplied vigor. Besides, the sun sets only relatively, and in the same moment is also rising. So, too, the human spirit glows with the sunset glories of its achievements, and nevertheless in the self-same instant turns its rising radiance upon other worlds, and enters upon
new and still grander schemes of conquest.

Thus again do we find that the repose characterizing this artist's work is by no means indicative of the absence of artistic power, but rather does it prove the presence of that power in rich fullness and self-centered maturity.

Another artist of remarkable gifts, and whose works are prevailingly of the epic type, is Thomas Moran. His idealism, like that of Church, consists in apprehending and portraying the real under its ideal—that is, its richest, most adequate—form. Mere idealism apart from the real leads to empty conventionalization of forms. Such was the only way in which landscape was, or could be, treated so long as the inner soul of nature remained hidden from men's eyes; just as in later times, "artists" who still remain blind to everything spiritual in nature, represent, in their pride of "realism," nothing but the dry husk of the outer world. What the genuine poet of color can accomplish through the combination of the ideal and the real is shown in such works as Moran's *Morning on the Colorado*. In this picture bold mountain masses rise abruptly to the right while through a deep cleft at the left hand a torrent rushes on its headlong way to the sea. About the summit the mists of the night still hover. But through these mists the light of the rising sun is already quivering and suffusing them with its splendors. In the foreground a solitary Indian turns toward the light and
shades his eyes with his hand. His dog turns from the light and cowers before an eagle that hovers in the air and seems about to swoop down upon him.

One might almost imagine that the artist had intended at once to portray and to interpret the old legend in which the Red Swan, shot by an Indian, flew far away to the west, but being secured after many days of adventurous search, became a beautiful maiden and was borne away by the hero as his bride. The legend is transparent as a solar myth with personal elements intermingled. But the sun with its universal diffusion of physical light is a symbol of the all-illumining power of truth, and was so recognized in very early ages. The Indian's dog sees nothing to adore in the light! He only recognizes higher powers that are to him powers of destruction. The merely animal nature sees nothing divine or spiritual in the world and seeks to appease the destructive powers—the only "higher powers" it knows of—by a worship of fear. But the human and spiritual is destined to awake to a consciousness of the splendors of Truth; and when once awakened it turns to that divine Light with an irresistible attraction and never ceases to gaze upon it no matter how dazzling its brightness may be. But this awakening also brings with it agitation, unrest. A violent contradiction arises. The soul discovers that the phases of existence it has thus far realized fall
immeasurably below the ideal toward which it is the soul’s destiny to strive. The resultant distress is the “fall” of man from his mere paradisiac, child-like innocence of unconsciousness. Thus in the picture we are considering the mountain-torrent which seems rushing down and away from the very source of light itself may fitly be taken as representing the phase of transition and struggle that necessarily follows the sudden awakening of the soul to a consciousness of the infinitely solemn import of its own destiny. And yet, as we have already more than once intimated, the river presently acquires a calmer movement and at length joins the sea, to be sooner or later so sublimated by the sun’s radiant forces as to rise above all obstructions and hover in clouds of golden glory about the loftiest heights—a beautiful symbol of the regenerated soul returned to the source of its existence.

What we have thus far said of this picture is but a more extended form of what occurred to us while standing before it: That as, from the earliest ages, mountains have ever impressed men with a sense of the divine, and as the sunlight itself has ever been an object of worship; so the artist has here portrayed the forms and elements which he has chosen from nature in such wise as to awaken in the spectator the feeling that there is something superhuman and divine behind it all and in it all. *Morning on the Colorado* might well be styled the “Opening Song of the Epic of
Spiritual Life." It is thus, in some sense, the complementary antithesis of Church’s splendid lyric: *Sunset at Mt. Desert.*

Another and much larger canvas (*Ponce de Leon in Florida*) presents a different phase of this artist's work. It exhibits the majesty of the primeval forest, adorned with its native wealth of tropical foliage. The coloring is rich, but also subdued in tone, as belongs to the stateliness of the scene. The lofty trees, indeed, suggest centuries of scarcely changing serenity; while, on the other hand, the rich foliage plants, and the whole appearance of luxuriance, call to mind the swift succession of tropical growth and decay. But this antithesis leads up to one still more significant. In the open space which extends, with fine effect, through the midst of the picture, from the foreground back into the mists of indefinite distance, and leading out and up to the clear blue sky, the artist has introduced the troop of Europeans with their bright costumes, while a party of natives are seen to the left, beneath the trees. The white race, the "children of the sun,"—possessors alike of trained reason, that compass which guides through all seas, and of complete spiritual consciousness, that lighted lamp which illumines all worlds,—these, the heralds of that perpetual change which belongs to eternal youth and vigor, these set foot upon the new world, and at once find themselves masters of the free, open way
from sea to sea; while the dusky man of the forest at once falls into shadow,—a shadow that must steadily deepen for him, until all his kind are lost in final night. We have here a picture in which the artist has shown great power. And yet we are bound to add that the giving the landscape a historical significance by means of the introduction of human figures in a historical relation inevitably tends, as we have already shown, to subordinate the landscape to the human interests. The latter really constitute the focus and culminating point of significance in the picture. At the same time the figures are relatively to the whole extent of the picture so small as to show that they are really intended to be accessory to the landscape; and the latter, in turn, is so elaborate as to show at once that the chief interest is meant to be centered therein. We cannot avoid the conclusion, therefore, that the artist is in error so far as he has chosen this method of treating historical landscape. It is the same error, indeed, into which the German artist Lessing (referred to on a former page) allowed himself to fall and which Carrière has criticised on somewhat similar grounds. "The interest is drawn now from nature to the historical significance, and again from the historical significance back to nature." The artistic unity of the work is weakened if not destroyed. "To make of a great event an accessory in a representation of nature is contrary to the
truth and dignity of the spirit." * And, as we have already shown, it is from the very nature of the case impossible for the forms of nature to compete in spiritual significance with the human form when the latter is put forward in any truly historical attitude. The only way in which landscape as such can be properly employed for historical purposes is to make the very forms of nature themselves express the historical conception that constitutes the theme of the work, from which the human form should be rigidly excluded—as in the previously cited example by Karl Rottman.

Aside from this combination of incompatible elements the *Ponce de Leon in Florida* possesses as a landscape the stateliness and breadth that belong to the grandest epic style.

Less elaborate but still of the epic type are many charming idyllic representations by artists like A. W. Hubbard, A. F. Bellows and Geo. L. Brown—their works often tending also to the lyric tone.

But we must now turn our attention to a brief consideration of the work of a few representative artists of the distinctively subjective type, and whose productions are therefore exclusively, or prevailingly, lyrical.

Of these Sanford R. Gifford (by whose recent death American art has suffered a loss greatly to

*Æsthetik. II. 274.*
be lamented) was one of the worthiest. His management of sunlight and atmospheric color was remarkable at once for its delicacy and its power. Mr. Benjamin happily says of him: "If he had lived in Persia or Peru two thousand years ago he might well have been an enthusiastic fireworshipper, or daily welcomed the rising sun with reverent adoration. To him landscape painting, whether of scenes in our Far West, or on the legendary Hudson, or in the gorgeous East, has been alike the occasion for giving expression to his feeling for glowing atmospheric effects, for lyrics which on canvas reproduce the splendor of the sunset sky."* Few finer effects of luminous, glowing atmosphere have been produced than his *Sunset on the Hudson*. It is a song without words, if we may so apply Mendelsohn's paradox. It is brilliant, joyous, as if uttering the prophesy of the sun's return and the bringing in of a new day. So, again, in his *Coming Storm* we have a fine example of purity and buoyancy of spirit. In the foreground is a sheet of water, still placid, indeed, but reflecting in its depth something of the darkness of the cloud that seems drifting to the front. The edge of the land is still glowing in the light of the not yet wholly obscured sun. A heavy mist sweeps down from the advancing cloud, and both fills and obscures the distance. Nevertheless it is far from

* Art in America. p. 80.
being an "angry sky." Nature, indeed, knows neither anger nor smiles. Whether in nature or in human life, the same cloud that appears dark and portentous when beheld from below, would, if viewed from above, be seen blazing with light. The storm is but the momentary acceleration of the perpetual change that goes on in the world; and change is not annihilation, it is renovation—making new.

Another and characteristic delineator of American scenery is J. F. Cropsey. His best pictures are idealizations of nature in rich, radiant maturity—not the maturity that forebodes decay, but which is in full possession of buoyant power. His brilliant coloring is often managed in so masterly a way that the contemplation of his work gives one a sense of invigoration as if he were breathing the crisp air of a clear, frosty morning.

Finally, a remarkable species of lyrical compositions has been created by J. R. Meeker. He appears to have been the first to discern, as he has certainly been the only one to successfully represent on canvas, the artistic possibilities of the swamps of our Southern States. That he should be able to take this subject, so forbidding in nature to most eyes, and idealize it into a "thing of beauty," proves, beyond question, the genuineness of his artistic power. A few strongly and beautifully finished trees, with characteristic pendent mass, in the foreground; a sweep of less and less strongly
defined trees, graded down in perspective; a mist that deepens in the distance, and yet which appears to fill the whole space up to the very foreground; clouds that grade off into smaller and still smaller forms, and less and less pronounced tints, so as to constitute a no less marked perspective above than below; finally, the play of sunlight on the clouds, and through the foliage, and in the mist,—all these are combined with such delicacy and skill as to produce, in most cases, a picture which is simply charming. It is a world enveloped in mists, but these mists are penetrated and illumined by the rays of the sun—as the rays the spirit pierce through and set aglow the mists of time.

We may now turn to the consideration of Dramatic representations of nature by American artists; and of these two examples must suffice. Little has been done by way of representing dramatic situations by means of the portrayal of natural forces in landscapes in the stricter sense. The Coming Storm of Gifford, already mentioned, contains dramatic elements in its atmospheric effects but these are not sufficiently pronounced to remove the picture from the lyric class. It thus happens that as yet we have to look to marine views for the artistic exhibition of the forces of nature in such tense relation as to suggest dramatic action. We shall content ourselves with describing two admirable works which we have
chanced to see on exhibition at the same time and hung opposite to each other in the same gallery.

The one is *The Vasty Deep* by W. T. Richards. The sea is represented as rolling in upon rocks that rise above the surface in the left foreground. The waves are not high but seem the embodiment of resistless force. In the far distance to the left a long line of shore is seen. The mist is gathering in the distance and toward the right is already condensing into a dark, formless cloud that sweeps down to the surface of the sea and forebodes a furious storm. Thus with the unyielding rocks as representing the unchanging in the midst of the inconstant, with the swelling force of the sea, and with the gathering might of the storm-cloud and the insidiousness of the lurking winds about to rush upon the scene with their sudden violence, we have a fine portrayal of a grandly dramatic situation. The elements are already combining. It is the opening act of a tragedy, and might serve well as an illustration of Southey's poem on "The Inchcape Rock," where the evil deed comes back in tragic form upon the doer. He who would violate a law—an eternal principle—is himself broken by the law.

The other example referred to of dramatic marine views is *Taking the Wreck in Tow*, by Harry Chase. Here a rugged shore limits the sea to the right. The sky is covered with heavy clouds that are just breaking away. The waves below are
still high and are admirable as exhibiting elastic, heaving, unconquerable power. Riding upon these waves is a large fine vessel that has been well-nigh destroyed in its unequal struggle with the tempest. And yet the conflict has not been absolutely final. The ship is disabled, it is true, and could now offer no further resistance. But so too the storm has spent its force and just above the masts of the vessel is a gleam of clear sky that guarantees a truce. Here we have the closing scene of a dramatic struggle. And yet the clouds and other elements of the storm are but withdrawing temporarily, just as the ship is already seen to be on its way to undergo repairs. Both will return to the conflict. Thus man is ever voyaging upon a "sea of troubles," and with whatever arms he may oppose its hostile forces he can never wholly "end them." The frail vessel of his physical embodiment is destined sooner or later to sink beneath the waves. But the real wealth accumulated in the course of all these journeyings and struggles is of the kind to be "taken ashore in a ship-wreck." * It is the imperishable wealth of the spirit.

The examples thus far given will suffice to indicate the range and character of the work produced by the Americal School of landscape paint-

* An ancient philosopher being asked his advice respecting preparations for a sea-voyage said: Take nothing with you but what you can carry ashore in a ship-wreck.
The representation of the epic type of landscape has here attained to its grandest realization; while lyrics on canvas have been unfolded in a rich variety of characteristic phases, each possessed of deep significance and genuine beauty; and lastly the artistic appreciation of the dramatic elements so abundantly present in nature has given rise to an extended series of marine views possessing in many instances a force and delicacy of spiritual expression that is truly admirable. But our artists not only exhibit a remarkably subtle power of penetrating to the inner depths of nature and revealing in their works the divine might of the world-spirit; they also recognize the absolute necessity of perfect sincerity and accuracy in the technical part of their work. And with this richly unfolded power of artistically interpreting nature on the one hand, and the technical skill to accurately represent natural forms on the other the art of Landscape Painting would seem destined to reach the utmost limits of its possible triumph in America at the hands of American artists. On the other hand the obligations of our American artists to all that is excellent in the art-culture of Europe is only so much the greater as they have been able to resist with almost perfect success, whatever is misleading in the influences of the European schools.

THE END.
ERRATA.
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22. Line 5 from below, for *formulation*, read *formulation*.
24. " 9 " above, for *personage*, read *personages*.
133. " 13 " below, for *fanciers*, read *fancies*.
136. " 11 " above, for *wherever*, read *whatever*.
139. " 10 " " for *phase*, read *phases*.
166. " 4 " below, for *mystic*, read *mythic*.
168. " 10 " above, insert *The* before *fresh*.
173. " 4 " below, for *form*, read *from*.
239. " 6 " below, for *motions*, read *milles*. 