

A LIBRARY OF THE FINE ARTS

by

Ramsay Traquair, M.A., F.R.I.B.A.

A Library of the Fine Arts

By Ramsay Traquair, M.A. (Hon.) F.R.I.B.A.

MacDonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

THE literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building, too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions, such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing, and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literatures apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other, and it is supplemented by a time classification, a place classification and a person classification. In some parts, particularly in Painting and Sculpture, the artist is of almost supreme importance; in other arts, as in costume, or Medieval Architecture, or plaster modeling, the artist is usually unknown and unconsidered. We do not search for information on Rembrandt under the author's name, nor on Salisbury Cathedral under the name of the architect. If we already know a good deal we may know enough to consult Doctor Bode upon Rembrandt, but for Salisbury Cathedral no one would ever look up Mr. Gleeson White, who wrote a book upon that building. Indeed, excepting in one or two groups such as art criticism, or Philosophy of Aesthetic, the class-

ification by authors is rather unimportant. Except in Painting and Sculpture the classification by artist is equally unimportant. It is in fact hardly possible to devise a thoroughly logical system of classification; we must arrange our catalog so that books will be found where they are looked for.

The library will serve three classes of readers: First, the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested, at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate moldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly, we have the scholar who is investigating some school, or period, or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question, I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even among those who attempt research. The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject-matter and upon the character of its author. We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first-hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second-hand,—photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is, nevertheless, second-hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on, are first-hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first-hand, but copies made by transcription are second-hand.

So in architecture, a library will at best have second-hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good pho-

A lecture delivered to the students of the McGill University Library School on Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

tographs, drawings, descriptions of the building and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second-hand authority is often of first-hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and XVIII Centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first-hand authority for (1) XVIII Century printing. (2) What le Sieur Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration le Sieur Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's *Livre d'Architecture* is in many respects a primary authority.

To take another example: In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published *The Antiquities of Athens* in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance: the curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of color, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Penne-thorne or Lethaby. Curiously enough, most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph—the entasis, the construction of the walls, the color, and so on.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures," that is, competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

But a library should have a good collection of first-class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the color and the texture of the originals, and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring to-

gether the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the color, and so on. Of course, this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time. There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student. For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs—the largest procurable.

Now, all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal. But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present-day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and textbooks of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority." In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many textbooks omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books—unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now, a textbook of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular handbooks have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular textbooks written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts—guides to further reading—some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some textbooks written for the use of university students. Some of these—not all, by any means—seem to concentrate all the dullness possible in the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works

discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may, for all that, be very useful—as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but, of course, the groups shade into one another—even a popular book may contain first-hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on medieval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Primary authorities are, of course, the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as *Vitruvius*, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived, the *Sketch Book* of Villars d'Honnecourt—the only medieval architect's sketch book in existence—and a number of references, odd drawings, and so on, which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in *Beowulf*, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done. Beginning with Alberti's famous book *Re Aedificataria*, *I Dieci Libri del Architettura*, they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi, Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII Century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings and a variety of esthetic theories which we find it difficult today to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII Centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX Century. Few of these, however, are of any save curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

We must not, however, forget T. B. Piranesi, who from the middle of the XVIII Century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the *Views of Rome* and the *Views of the Prison House*—the famous Carceri series—the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI Century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. *Les Plus Excellents Bâtimens de France*, by Du Cerceau, is our only record of many great buildings since destroyed. In the XVII Century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G. M. Oppenord, I. F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamentalists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII Century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately, the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII Century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's *Chief Grounds of Architecture*, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, *A Booke of Sundry Draughtes*, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898, should be available. The English architects of the XVII Century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian: *The Books of Monuments*, 4to, 1563, *Architectura Folio*, 1577, *Perspective*, 4to, 1604. In the XVIII Century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance owing to their influence on American colonial architecture. J. Gibbs: *Book of Architecture*, fol. 1728, was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. *The Vitruvius Britannicus*, in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's *Complete Body of Architecture*. Adams' *Works in Architecture*, 3 vols. folio, 1773, and his *Spalato* in 1 vol. folio, are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been republished recently.

In addition to these works, a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the

A Library of the Fine Arts

By Ramsay Traquair, M.A. (Hon.) F.R.I.B.A.

MacDonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

THE literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building, too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions, such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing, and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literatures apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other, and it is supplemented by a time classification, a place classification and a person classification. In some parts, particularly in Painting and Sculpture, the artist is of almost supreme importance; in other arts, as in costume, or Medieval Architecture, or plaster modeling, the artist is usually unknown and unconsidered. We do not search for information on Rembrandt under the author's name, nor on Salisbury Cathedral under the name of the architect. If we already know a good deal we may know enough to consult Doctor Bode upon Rembrandt, but for Salisbury Cathedral no one would ever look up Mr. Gleeson White, who wrote a book upon that building. Indeed, excepting in one or two groups such as art criticism, or Philosophy of Aesthetic, the class-

ification by authors is rather unimportant. Except in Painting and Sculpture the classification by artist is equally unimportant. It is in fact hardly possible to devise a thoroughly logical system of classification; we must arrange our catalog so that books will be found where they are looked for.

The library will serve three classes of readers: First, the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested, at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate moldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly, we have the scholar who is investigating some school, or period, or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question, I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even among those who attempt research. The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject-matter and upon the character of its author. We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first-hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second-hand,—photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is, nevertheless, second-hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on, are first-hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first-hand, but copies made by transcription are second-hand.

So in architecture, a library will at best have second-hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good pho-

A lecture delivered to the students of the McGill University Library School on Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

tographs, drawings, descriptions of the building and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second-hand authority is often of first-hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and XVIII Centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first-hand authority for (1) XVIII Century printing. (2) What le Sieur Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration le Sieur Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's *Livre d'Architecture* is in many respects a primary authority.

To take another example: In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published *The Antiquities of Athens* in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance: the curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of color, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Pennington or Lethaby. Curiously enough, most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph—the entasis, the construction of the walls, the color, and so on.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures," that is, competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

But a library should have a good collection of first-class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the color and the texture of the originals, and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring to-

gether the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the color, and so on. Of course, this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time. There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student. For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs—the largest procurable.

Now, all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal. But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present-day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and textbooks of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority." In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many textbooks omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books—unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now, a textbook of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular handbooks have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular textbooks written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts—guides to further reading—some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some textbooks written for the use of university students. Some of these—not all, by any means—seem to concentrate all the dullness possible in the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works

discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may, for all that, be very useful—as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but, of course, the groups shade into one another—even a popular book may contain first-hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on medieval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Primary authorities are, of course, the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as *Vitruvius*, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived, the *Sketch Book* of Villars d'Honnecourt—the only medieval architect's sketch book in existence—and a number of references, odd drawings, and so on, which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in *Beowulf*, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done. Beginning with Alberti's famous book *Re Aedificatoria, I Dieci Libri dell'Architettura*, they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi, Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII Century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings and a variety of esthetic theories which we find it difficult today to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII Centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX Century. Few of these, however, are of any save curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

We must not, however, forget T. B. Piranesi, who from the middle of the XVIII Century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the *Views of Rome* and the *Views of the Prison House*—the famous Carceri series—the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI Century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. *Les Plus Excellents Bâtimens de France*, by Du Cerceau, is our only record of many great buildings since destroyed. In the XVII Century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G. M. Oppenord, I. F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamentalsists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII Century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately, the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII Century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's *Chief Grounds of Architecture*, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, *A Booke of Sundry Draughtes*, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898, should be available. The English architects of the XVII Century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian: *The Books of Monuments*, 4to, 1563, *Architectura Folio*, 1577, *Perspective*, 4to, 1604. In the XVIII Century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance owing to their influence on American colonial architecture. J. Gibbs: *Book of Architecture*, fol. 1728, was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. *The Vitruvius Britannicus*, in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's *Complete Body of Architecture*. Adams' *Works in Architecture*, 3 vols. folio, 1773, and his *Spalato* in 1 vol. folio, are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been republished recently.

In addition to these works, a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the

XVIII and early XIX Century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the *Cabinet-makers and Upholsterers Guide*, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books, Asher Benjamin's *Country Builder* has been reproduced.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII Century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently, strictly speaking, not art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging. Popular zoology and natural history books are full of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people—by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present-day heraldry—the arms of the Canadian Provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately, the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the *Armorial de Gelre* of the XV and the *Lindsay Armorial* of the XVII Century.

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library—the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts printing and bookbinding. These are all library or literary arts—and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to

the monumental letterings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of medieval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people today, even among those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX Century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is, I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected,—the Kelmscott, the Doves and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced today.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. *Good Words* for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also excellent examples of the old art of wood engraving. The *Morte d'Arthur*, by Malory, with illustrations by Beardsley, is really far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book; it is an example of fine printing, an example of Beardsley's work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals because these contain beautiful wood cuts. So I suppose all one can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine books which may be scattered all over the library under various classifications. This I think one should do. Indeed, I feel that I am getting a little out of my depth. I can advise you on what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go to make a beautiful book.

A Library of the Fine Arts

By Ramsay Traquair, M.A. (Hon.) F.R.I.B.A.

MacDonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

THE literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building, too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions, such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing, and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literatures apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other, and it is supplemented by a time classification, a place classification and a person classification. In some parts, particularly in Painting and Sculpture, the artist is of almost supreme importance; in other arts, as in costume, or Medieval Architecture, or plaster modeling, the artist is usually unknown and unconsidered. We do not search for information on Rembrandt under the author's name, nor on Salisbury Cathedral under the name of the architect. If we already know a good deal we may know enough to consult Doctor Bode upon Rembrandt, but for Salisbury Cathedral no one would ever look up Mr. Gleeson White, who wrote a book upon that building. Indeed, excepting in one or two groups such as art criticism, or Philosophy of Aesthetic, the class-

ification by authors is rather unimportant. Except in Painting and Sculpture the classification by artist is equally unimportant. It is in fact hardly possible to devise a thoroughly logical system of classification; we must arrange our catalog so that books will be found where they are looked for.

The library will serve three classes of readers: First, the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested, at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate moldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly, we have the scholar who is investigating some school, or period, or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question, I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even among those who attempt research. The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject-matter and upon the character of its author. We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first-hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second-hand,—photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is, nevertheless, second-hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on, are first-hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first-hand, but copies made by transcription are second-hand.

So in architecture, a library will at best have second-hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good pho-

A lecture delivered to the students of the McGill University Library School on Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

A Library of the Fine Arts

By Ramsay Traquair, M.A. (Hon.) F.R.I.B.A.

MacDonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

THE literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building, too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions, such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing, and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literatures apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other, and it is supplemented by a time classification, a place classification and a person classification. In some parts, particularly in Painting and Sculpture, the artist is of almost supreme importance; in other arts, as in costume, or Medieval Architecture, or plaster modeling, the artist is usually unknown and unconsidered. We do not search for information on Rembrandt under the author's name, nor on Salisbury Cathedral under the name of the architect. If we already know a good deal we may know enough to consult Doctor Bode upon Rembrandt, but for Salisbury Cathedral no one would ever look up Mr. Gleeson White, who wrote a book upon that building. Indeed, excepting in one or two groups such as art criticism, or Philosophy of Aesthetic, the class-

ification by authors is rather unimportant. Except in Painting and Sculpture the classification by artist is equally unimportant. It is in fact hardly possible to devise a thoroughly logical system of classification; we must arrange our catalog so that books will be found where they are looked for.

The library will serve three classes of readers: First, the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested, at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate moldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly, we have the scholar who is investigating some school, or period, or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question, I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even among those who attempt research. The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject-matter and upon the character of its author. We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first-hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second-hand,—photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is, nevertheless, second-hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on, are first-hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first-hand, but copies made by transcription are second-hand.

So in architecture, a library will at best have second-hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good pho-

A lecture delivered to the students of the McGill University Library School on Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

tographs, drawings, descriptions of the building and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second-hand authority is often of first-hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and XVIII Centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first-hand authority for (1) XVIII Century printing. (2) What le Sieur Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration le Sieur Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's *Livre d'Architecture* is in many respects a primary authority.

To take another example: In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published *The Antiquities of Athens* in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance: the curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of color, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Penne-
thorne or Lethaby. Curiously enough, most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph—the entasis, the construction of the walls, the color, and so on.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures," that is, competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

But a library should have a good collection of first-class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the color and the texture of the originals, and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring to-

gether the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the color, and so on. Of course, this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time. There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student. For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs—the largest procurable.

Now, all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal. But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present-day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and textbooks of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority." In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many textbooks omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books—unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now, a textbook of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular handbooks have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular textbooks written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts—guides to further reading—some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some textbooks written for the use of university students. Some of these—not all, by any means—seem to concentrate all the dullness possible in the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works

discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may, for all that, be very useful—as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but, of course, the groups shade into one another—even a popular book may contain first-hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on medieval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Primary authorities are, of course, the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as *Vitruvius*, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived, the *Sketch Book* of Villars d'Honnecourt—the only medieval architect's sketch book in existence—and a number of references, odd drawings, and so on, which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in *Beowulf*, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done. Beginning with Alberti's famous book *Re Aedificatoria, I Dieci Libri del Architettura*, they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII Century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings and a variety of esthetic theories which we find it difficult today to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII Centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX Century. Few of these, however, are of any save curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

We must not, however, forget T. B. Piranesi, who from the middle of the XVIII Century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the *Views of Rome* and the *Views of the Prison House*—the famous Carceri series—the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI Century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. *Les Plus Excellents Bâtimens de France*, by Du Cerceau, is our only record of many great buildings since destroyed. In the XVII Century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G. M. Oppenord, I. F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamentalists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII Century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately, the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII Century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's *Chief Grounds of Architecture*, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, *A Booke of Sundry Draughtes*, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898, should be available. The English architects of the XVII Century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian: *The Books of Monuments*, 4to, 1563, *Architectura Folio*, 1577, *Perspective*, 4to, 1604. In the XVIII Century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance owing to their influence on American colonial architecture. J. Gibbs: *Book of Architecture*, fol. 1728, was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. *The Vitruvius Britannicus*, in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's *Complete Body of Architecture*. Adams' *Works in Architecture*, 3 vols. folio, 1773, and his *Spalato* in 1 vol. folio, are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been republished recently.

In addition to these works, a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the

XVIII and early XIX Century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the *Cabinet-makers and Upholsterers Guide*, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books, Asher Benjamin's *Country Builder* has been reproduced.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII Century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently, strictly speaking, not art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging. Popular zoology and natural history books are full of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people—by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present-day heraldry—the arms of the Canadian Provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately, the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the *Armorial de Gelre* of the XV and the *Lindsay Armorial* of the XVII Century.

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library—the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts printing and bookbinding. These are all library or literary arts—and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to

the monumental letterings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of mediaeval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people today, even among those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX Century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is, I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected,—the Kelmscott, the Doves and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced today.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. *Good Words* for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also excellent examples of the old art of wood engraving. The *Morte d'Arthur*, by Malory, with illustrations by Beardsley, is really far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book; it is an example of fine printing, an example of Beardsley's work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals because these contain beautiful wood cuts. So I suppose all one can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine books which may be scattered all over the library under various classifications. This I think one should do. Indeed, I feel that I am getting a little out of my depth. I can advise you on what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go to make a beautiful book.

A Library of the Fine Arts

By Ramsay Traquair, M.A. (Hon.) F.R.I.B.A.

MacDonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

THE literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building, too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions, such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing, and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literatures apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other, and it is supplemented by a time classification, a place classification and a person classification. In some parts, particularly in Painting and Sculpture, the artist is of almost supreme importance; in other arts, as in costume, or Medieval Architecture, or plaster modeling, the artist is usually unknown and unconsidered. We do not search for information on Rembrandt under the author's name, nor on Salisbury Cathedral under the name of the architect. If we already know a good deal we may know enough to consult Doctor Bode upon Rembrandt, but for Salisbury Cathedral no one would ever look up Mr. Gleeson White, who wrote a book upon that building. Indeed, excepting in one or two groups such as art criticism, or Philosophy of Aesthetic, the class-

ification by authors is rather unimportant. Except in Painting and Sculpture the classification by artist is equally unimportant. It is in fact hardly possible to devise a thoroughly logical system of classification; we must arrange our catalog so that books will be found where they are looked for.

The library will serve three classes of readers: First, the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested, at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate moldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly, we have the scholar who is investigating some school, or period, or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question, I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even among those who attempt research. The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject-matter and upon the character of its author. We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first-hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second-hand,—photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is, nevertheless, second-hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on, are first-hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first-hand, but copies made by transcription are second-hand.

So in architecture, a library will at best have second-hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good pho-

A lecture delivered to the students of the McGill University Library School on Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

tographs, drawings, descriptions of the building and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second-hand authority is often of first-hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and XVIII Centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first-hand authority for (1) XVIII Century printing. (2) What le Sieur Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration le Sieur Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's *Livre d'Architecture* is in many respects a primary authority.

To take another example: In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published *The Antiquities of Athens* in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance: the curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of color, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Pennington or Lethaby. Curiously enough, most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph—the entasis, the construction of the walls, the color, and so on.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures," that is, competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

But a library should have a good collection of first-class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the color and the texture of the originals, and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring to-

gether the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the color, and so on. Of course, this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time. There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student. For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs—the largest procurable.

Now, all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal. But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present-day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and textbooks of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority." In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many textbooks omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books—unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now, a textbook of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular handbooks have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular textbooks written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts—guides to further reading—some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some textbooks written for the use of university students. Some of these—not all, by any means—seem to concentrate all the dullness possible in the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works

discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may, for all that, be very useful—as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but, of course, the groups shade into one another—even a popular book may contain first-hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on medieval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Primary authorities are, of course, the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as *Vitruvius*, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived, the *Sketch Book* of Villars d'Honnecourt—the only medieval architect's sketch book in existence—and a number of references, odd drawings, and so on, which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in *Beowulf*, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done. Beginning with Alberti's famous book *Re Aedificatoria, I Dieci Libri del Architettura*, they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi, Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII Century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings and a variety of esthetic theories which we find it difficult today to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII Centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX Century. Few of these, however, are of any save curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

We must not, however, forget T. B. Piranesi, who from the middle of the XVIII Century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the *Views of Rome* and the *Views of the Prison House*—the famous Carceri series—the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI Century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. *Les Plus Excellents Bâtimens de France*, by Du Cerceau, is our only record of many great buildings since destroyed. In the XVII Century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G. M. Oppenord, I. F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamentalists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII Century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately, the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII Century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's *Chief Grounds of Architecture*, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, *A Booke of Sundry Draughtes*, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898, should be available. The English architects of the XVII Century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian: *The Books of Monuments*, 4to, 1563, *Architectura Folio*, 1577, *Perspective*, 4to, 1604. In the XVIII Century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance owing to their influence on American colonial architecture. J. Gibbs: *Book of Architecture*, fol. 1728, was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. *The Vitruvius Britannicus*, in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's *Complete Body of Architecture*. Adams' *Works in Architecture*, 3 vols. folio, 1773, and his *Spalato* in 1 vol. folio, are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been republished recently.

In addition to these works, a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the

XVIII and early XIX Century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the *Cabinet-makers and Upholsterers Guide*, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books, Asher Benjamin's *Country Builder* has been reproduced.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII Century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently, strictly speaking, not art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging. Popular zoology and natural history books are full of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people—by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present-day heraldry—the arms of the Canadian Provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately, the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the *Armorial de Gelre* of the XV and the *Lindsay Armorial* of the XVII Century.

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library—the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts printing and bookbinding. These are all library or literary arts—and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to

the monumental letterings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of medieval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people today, even among those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX Century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is, I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected,—the Kelmscott, the Doves and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced today.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. *Good Words* for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also excellent examples of the old art of wood engraving. The *Morte d'Arthur*, by Malory, with illustrations by Beardsley, is really far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book; it is an example of fine printing, an example of Beardsley's work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals because these contain beautiful wood cuts. So I suppose all one can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine books which may be scattered all over the library under various classifications. This I think one should do. Indeed, I feel that I am getting a little out of my depth. I can advise you on what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go to make a beautiful book.

A Library of the Fine Arts

By Ramsay Traquair, M.A. (Hon.) F.R.I.B.A.

MacDonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

THE literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building, too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions, such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing, and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literatures apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other, and it is supplemented by a time classification, a place classification and a person classification. In some parts, particularly in Painting and Sculpture, the artist is of almost supreme importance; in other arts, as in costume, or Medieval Architecture, or plaster modeling, the artist is usually unknown and unconsidered. We do not search for information on Rembrandt under the author's name, nor on Salisbury Cathedral under the name of the architect. If we already know a good deal we may know enough to consult Doctor Bode upon Rembrandt, but for Salisbury Cathedral no one would ever look up Mr. Gleeson White, who wrote a book upon that building. Indeed, excepting in one or two groups such as art criticism, or Philosophy of Aesthetic, the class-

ification by authors is rather unimportant. Except in Painting and Sculpture the classification by artist is equally unimportant. It is in fact hardly possible to devise a thoroughly logical system of classification; we must arrange our catalog so that books will be found where they are looked for.

The library will serve three classes of readers: First, the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested, at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate moldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly, we have the scholar who is investigating some school, or period, or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question, I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even among those who attempt research. The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject-matter and upon the character of its author. We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first-hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second-hand,—photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is, nevertheless, second-hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on, are first-hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first-hand, but copies made by transcription are second-hand.

So in architecture, a library will at best have second-hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good pho-

A lecture delivered to the students of the McGill University Library School on Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

tographs, drawings, descriptions of the building and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second-hand authority is often of first-hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and XVIII Centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first-hand authority for (1) XVIII Century printing. (2) What le Sieur Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration le Sieur Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's *Livre d'Architecture* is in many respects a primary authority.

To take another example: In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published *The Antiquities of Athens* in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance: the curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of color, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Penne-thorne or Lethaby. Curiously enough, most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph—the entasis, the construction of the walls, the color, and so on.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures," that is, competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

But a library should have a good collection of first-class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the color and the texture of the originals, and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring to-

gether the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the color, and so on. Of course, this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time. There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student. For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs—the largest procurable.

Now, all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal. But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present-day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and textbooks of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority." In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many textbooks omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books—unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now, a textbook of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular handbooks have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular textbooks written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts—guides to further reading—some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some textbooks written for the use of university students. Some of these—not all, by any means—seem to concentrate all the dullness possible in the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works

discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may, for all that, be very useful—as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but, of course, the groups shade into one another—even a popular book may contain first-hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on medieval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Primary authorities are, of course, the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as *Vitruvius*, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived, the *Sketch Book* of Villars d'Honnecourt—the only medieval architect's sketch book in existence—and a number of references, odd drawings, and so on, which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in *Beowulf*, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done. Beginning with Alberti's famous book *Re Aedificatoria, I Dieci Libri del Architettura*, they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi, Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII Century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings and a variety of esthetic theories which we find it difficult today to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII Centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX Century. Few of these, however, are of any save curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

We must not, however, forget T. B. Piranesi, who from the middle of the XVIII Century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the *Views of Rome* and the *Views of the Prison House*—the famous Carceri series—the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI Century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. *Les Plus Excellents Bâtimens de France*, by Du Cerceau, is our only record of many great buildings since destroyed. In the XVII Century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G. M. Oppenord, I. F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamentalists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII Century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately, the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII Century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's *Chief Grounds of Architecture*, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, *A Booke of Sundry Draughtes*, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898, should be available. The English architects of the XVII Century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian: *The Books of Monuments*, 4to, 1563, *Architectura Folio*, 1577, *Perspective*, 4to, 1604. In the XVIII Century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance owing to their influence on American colonial architecture. J. Gibbs: *Book of Architecture*, fol. 1728, was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. *The Vitruvius Britannicus*, in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's *Complete Body of Architecture*. Adams' *Works in Architecture*, 3 vols. folio, 1773, and his *Spalato* in 1 vol. folio, are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been republished recently.

In addition to these works, a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the

XVIII and early XIX Century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the *Cabinet-makers and Upholsterers Guide*, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books, Asher Benjamin's *Country Builder* has been reproduced.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII Century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently, strictly speaking, not art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging. Popular zoology and natural history books are full of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people—by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present-day heraldry—the arms of the Canadian Provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately, the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the *Armorial de Gelre* of the XV and the *Lindsay Armorial* of the XVII Century.

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library—the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts printing and bookbinding. These are all library or literary arts—and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to

the monumental letterings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of medieval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people today, even among those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX Century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is, I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected,—the Kelmscott, the Doves and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced today.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. *Good Words* for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also excellent examples of the old art of wood engraving. The *Morte d'Arthur*, by Malory, with illustrations by Beardsley, is really far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book; it is an example of fine printing, an example of Beardsley's work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals because these contain beautiful wood cuts. So I suppose all one can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine books which may be scattered all over the library under various classifications. This I think one should do. Indeed, I feel that I am getting a little out of my depth. I can advise you on what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go to make a beautiful book.

A Library of the Fine Arts

By Ramsay Traquair, M.A. (Hon.) F.R.I.B.A.

MacDonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

THE literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building, too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions, such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing, and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literatures apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other, and it is supplemented by a time classification, a place classification and a person classification. In some parts, particularly in Painting and Sculpture, the artist is of almost supreme importance; in other arts, as in costume, or Medieval Architecture, or plaster modeling, the artist is usually unknown and unconsidered. We do not search for information on Rembrandt under the author's name, nor on Salisbury Cathedral under the name of the architect. If we already know a good deal we may know enough to consult Doctor Bode upon Rembrandt, but for Salisbury Cathedral no one would ever look up Mr. Gleeson White, who wrote a book upon that building. Indeed, excepting in one or two groups such as art criticism, or Philosophy of Aesthetic, the class-

ification by authors is rather unimportant. Except in Painting and Sculpture the classification by artist is equally unimportant. It is in fact hardly possible to devise a thoroughly logical system of classification; we must arrange our catalog so that books will be found where they are looked for.

The library will serve three classes of readers: First, the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested, at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate moldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly, we have the scholar who is investigating some school, or period, or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question, I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even among those who attempt research. The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject-matter and upon the character of its author. We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first-hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second-hand,—photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is, nevertheless, second-hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on, are first-hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first-hand, but copies made by transcription are second-hand.

So in architecture, a library will at best have second-hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good pho-

A lecture delivered to the students of the McGill University Library School on Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

tographs, drawings, descriptions of the building and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second-hand authority is often of first-hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and XVIII Centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first-hand authority for (1) XVIII Century printing. (2) What le Sieur Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration le Sieur Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's *Livre d'Architecture* is in many respects a primary authority.

To take another example: In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published *The Antiquities of Athens* in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance: the curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of color, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Penne-
thorne or Lethaby. Curiously enough, most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph—the entasis, the construction of the walls, the color, and so on.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures," that is, competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

But a library should have a good collection of first-class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the color and the texture of the originals, and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring to-

gether the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the color, and so on. Of course, this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time. There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student. For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs—the largest procurable.

Now, all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal. But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present-day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and textbooks of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority." In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many textbooks omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books—unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now, a textbook of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular handbooks have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular textbooks written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts—guides to further reading—some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some textbooks written for the use of university students. Some of these—not all, by any means—seem to concentrate all the dullness possible in the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works

discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may, for all that, be very useful—as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but, of course, the groups shade into one another—even a popular book may contain first-hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on medieval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Primary authorities are, of course, the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as *Vitruvius*, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived, the *Sketch Book* of Villars d'Honnecourt—the only medieval architect's sketch book in existence—and a number of references, odd drawings, and so on, which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in *Beowulf*, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done. Beginning with Alberti's famous book *Re Aedificatoria, I Dieci Libri del Architettura*, they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII Century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings and a variety of esthetic theories which we find it difficult today to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII Centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX Century. Few of these, however, are of any save curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

We must not, however, forget T. B. Piranesi, who from the middle of the XVIII Century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the *Views of Rome* and the *Views of the Prison House*—the famous Carceri series—the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI Century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. *Les Plus Excellents Bâtimens de France*, by Du Cerceau, is our only record of many great buildings since destroyed. In the XVII Century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G. M. Oppenord, I. F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamentalists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII Century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately, the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII Century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's *Chief Grounds of Architecture*, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, *A Booke of Sundry Draughtes*, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898, should be available. The English architects of the XVII Century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian: *The Books of Monuments*, 4to, 1563, *Architectura Folio*, 1577, *Perspective*, 4to, 1604. In the XVIII Century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance owing to their influence on American colonial architecture. J. Gibbs: *Book of Architecture*, fol. 1728, was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. *The Vitruvius Britannicus*, in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's *Complete Body of Architecture*. Adams' *Works in Architecture*, 3 vols. folio, 1773, and his *Spalato* in 1 vol. folio, are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been republished recently.

In addition to these works, a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the

XVIII and early XIX Century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the *Cabinet-makers and Upholsterers Guide*, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books, Asher Benjamin's *Country Builder* has been reproduced.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII Century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently, strictly speaking, not art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging. Popular zoology and natural history books are full of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people—by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present-day heraldry—the arms of the Canadian Provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately, the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the *Armorial de Gêbre* of the XV and the *Lindsay Armorial* of the XVII Century.

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library—the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts printing and bookbinding. These are all library or literary arts—and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to

the monumental letterings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of medieval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people today, even among those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX Century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is, I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected,—the Kelmscott, the Doves and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced today.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. *Good Words* for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also excellent examples of the old art of wood engraving. The *Morte d'Arthur*, by Malory, with illustrations by Beardsley, is really far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book; it is an example of fine printing, an example of Beardsley's work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals because these contain beautiful wood cuts. So I suppose all one can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine books which may be scattered all over the library under various classifications. This I think one should do. Indeed, I feel that I am getting a little out of my depth. I can advise you on what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go to make a beautiful book.

A Library of the Fine Arts

By Ramsay Traquair, M.A. (Hon.) F.R.I.B.A.

MacDonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

THE literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building, too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions, such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing, and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literatures apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other, and it is supplemented by a time classification, a place classification and a person classification. In some parts, particularly in Painting and Sculpture, the artist is of almost supreme importance; in other arts, as in costume, or Medieval Architecture, or plaster modeling, the artist is usually unknown and unconsidered. We do not search for information on Rembrandt under the author's name, nor on Salisbury Cathedral under the name of the architect. If we already know a good deal we may know enough to consult Doctor Bode upon Rembrandt, but for Salisbury Cathedral no one would ever look up Mr. Gleeson White, who wrote a book upon that building. Indeed, excepting in one or two groups such as art criticism, or Philosophy of Aesthetic, the class-

ification by authors is rather unimportant. Except in Painting and Sculpture the classification by artist is equally unimportant. It is in fact hardly possible to devise a thoroughly logical system of classification; we must arrange our catalog so that books will be found where they are looked for.

The library will serve three classes of readers: First, the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested, at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate moldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly, we have the scholar who is investigating some school, or period, or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question, I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even among those who attempt research. The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject-matter and upon the character of its author. We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first-hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second-hand,—photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is, nevertheless, second-hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on, are first-hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first-hand, but copies made by transcription are second-hand.

So in architecture, a library will at best have second-hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good pho-

A lecture delivered to the students of the McGill University Library School on Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

tographs, drawings, descriptions of the building and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second-hand authority is often of first-hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and XVIII Centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first-hand authority for (1) XVIII Century printing. (2) What le Sieur Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration le Sieur Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's *Livre d'Architecture* is in many respects a primary authority.

To take another example: In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published *The Antiquities of Athens* in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance: the curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of color, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Penne-thorne or Lethaby. Curiously enough, most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph—the entasis, the construction of the walls, the color, and so on.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures," that is, competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

But a library should have a good collection of first-class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the color and the texture of the originals, and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring to-

gether the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the color, and so on. Of course, this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time. There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student. For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs—the largest procurable.

Now, all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal. But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present-day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and textbooks of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority." In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many textbooks omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books—unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now, a textbook of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular handbooks have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular textbooks written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts—guides to further reading—some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some textbooks written for the use of university students. Some of these—not all, by any means—seem to concentrate all the dullness possible in the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works

discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may, for all that, be very useful—as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but, of course, the groups shade into one another—even a popular book may contain first-hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on medieval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Primary authorities are, of course, the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as *Vitruvius*, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived, the *Sketch Book* of Villars d'Honnecourt—the only medieval architect's sketch book in existence—and a number of references, odd drawings, and so on, which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in *Beowulf*, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done. Beginning with Alberti's famous book *Re Aedificataria*, *I Dieci Libri del Architettura*, they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi, Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII Century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings and a variety of esthetic theories which we find it difficult today to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII Centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX Century. Few of these, however, are of any save curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

We must not, however, forget T. B. Piranesi, who from the middle of the XVIII Century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the *Views of Rome* and the *Views of the Prison House*—the famous Carceri series—the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI Century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. *Les Plus Excellents Bâtimens de France*, by Du Cerceau, is our only record of many great buildings since destroyed. In the XVII Century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G. M. Oppenord, I. F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamentalists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII Century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately, the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII Century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's *Chief Grounds of Architecture*, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, *A Booke of Sundry Draughtes*, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898, should be available. The English architects of the XVII Century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian: *The Books of Monuments*, 4to, 1563, *Architectura Folio*, 1577, *Perspective*, 4to, 1604. In the XVIII Century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance owing to their influence on American colonial architecture. J. Gibbs: *Book of Architecture*, fol. 1728, was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. *The Vitruvius Britannicus*, in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's *Complete Body of Architecture*. Adams' *Works in Architecture*, 3 vols. folio, 1773, and his *Spalato* in 1 vol. folio, are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been republished recently.

In addition to these works, a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the

XVIII and early XIX Century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the *Cabinet-makers and Upholsterers Guide*, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books, Asher Benjamin's *Country Builder* has been reproduced.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII Century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently, strictly speaking, not art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging. Popular zoology and natural history books are full of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people—by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present-day heraldry—the arms of the Canadian Provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately, the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the *Armorial de Gelre* of the XV and the *Lindsay Armorial* of the XVII Century.

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library—the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts printing and bookbinding. These are all library or literary arts—and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to

the monumental letterings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of medieval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people today, even among those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX Century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is, I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected,—the Kelmscott, the Doves and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced today.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. *Good Words* for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also excellent examples of the old art of wood engraving. The *Morte d'Arthur*, by Malory, with illustrations by Beardsley, is really far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book; it is an example of fine printing, an example of Beardsley's work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals because these contain beautiful wood cuts. So I suppose all one can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine books which may be scattered all over the library under various classifications. This I think one should do. Indeed, I feel that I am getting a little out of my depth. I can advise you on what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go to make a beautiful book.

A Library of the Fine Arts

By Ramsay Traquair, M.A. (Hon.) F.R.I.B.A.

MacDonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

THE literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building, too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions, such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing, and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literatures apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other, and it is supplemented by a time classification, a place classification and a person classification. In some parts, particularly in Painting and Sculpture, the artist is of almost supreme importance; in other arts, as in costume, or Medieval Architecture, or plaster modeling, the artist is usually unknown and unconsidered. We do not search for information on Rembrandt under the author's name, nor on Salisbury Cathedral under the name of the architect. If we already know a good deal we may know enough to consult Doctor Bode upon Rembrandt, but for Salisbury Cathedral no one would ever look up Mr. Gleeson White, who wrote a book upon that building. Indeed, excepting in one or two groups such as art criticism, or Philosophy of Aesthetic, the class-

ification by authors is rather unimportant. Except in Painting and Sculpture the classification by artist is equally unimportant. It is in fact hardly possible to devise a thoroughly logical system of classification; we must arrange our catalog so that books will be found where they are looked for.

The library will serve three classes of readers: First, the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested, at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate moldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly, we have the scholar who is investigating some school, or period, or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question, I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even among those who attempt research. The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject-matter and upon the character of its author. We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first-hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second-hand,—photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is, nevertheless, second-hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on, are first-hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first-hand, but copies made by transcription are second-hand.

So in architecture, a library will at best have second-hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good pho-

A lecture delivered to the students of the McGill University Library School on Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

tographs, drawings, descriptions of the building and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second-hand authority is often of first-hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and XVIII Centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first-hand authority for (1) XVIII Century printing. (2) What le Sieur Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration le Sieur Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's *Livre d'Architecture* is in many respects a primary authority.

To take another example: In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published *The Antiquities of Athens* in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance: the curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of color, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Penne-thorne or Lethaby. Curiously enough, most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph—the entasis, the construction of the walls, the color, and so on.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures," that is, competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

But a library should have a good collection of first-class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the color and the texture of the originals, and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring to-

gether the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the color, and so on. Of course, this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time. There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student. For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs—the largest procurable.

Now, all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal. But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present-day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and textbooks of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority." In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many textbooks omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books—unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now, a textbook of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular handbooks have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular textbooks written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts—guides to further reading—some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some textbooks written for the use of university students. Some of these—not all, by any means—seem to concentrate all the dullness possible in the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works

discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may, for all that, be very useful—as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but, of course, the groups shade into one another—even a popular book may contain first-hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on medieval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Primary authorities are, of course, the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as *Vitruvius*, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived, the *Sketch Book* of Villars d'Honnecourt—the only medieval architect's sketch book in existence—and a number of references, odd drawings, and so on, which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in *Beowulf*, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done. Beginning with Alberti's famous book *Re Aedificatoria, I Dieci Libri del Architettura*, they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi, Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII Century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings and a variety of esthetic theories which we find it difficult today to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII Centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX Century. Few of these, however, are of any save curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

We must not, however, forget T. B. Piranesi, who from the middle of the XVIII Century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the *Views of Rome* and the *Views of the Prison House*—the famous Carceri series—the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI Century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. *Les Plus Excellents Bâtimens de France*, by Du Cerceau, is our only record of many great buildings since destroyed. In the XVII Century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G. M. Oppenord, I. F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamentalists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII Century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately, the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII Century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's *Chief Grounds of Architecture*, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, *A Booke of Sundry Draughtes*, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898, should be available. The English architects of the XVII Century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian: *The Books of Monuments*, 4to, 1563, *Architectura Folio*, 1577, *Perspective*, 4to, 1604. In the XVIII Century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance owing to their influence on American colonial architecture. J. Gibbs: *Book of Architecture*, fol. 1728, was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. *The Vitruvius Britannicus*, in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's *Complete Body of Architecture*. Adams' *Works in Architecture*, 3 vols. folio, 1773, and his *Spalato* in 1 vol. folio, are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been republished recently.

In addition to these works, a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the

XVIII and early XIX Century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the *Cabinet-makers and Upholsterers Guide*, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books, Asher Benjamin's *Country Builder* has been reproduced.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII Century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently, strictly speaking, not art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging. Popular zoology and natural history books are full of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people—by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present-day heraldry—the arms of the Canadian Provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately, the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the *Armorial de Gelre* of the XV and the *Lindsay Armorial* of the XVII Century.

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library—the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts printing and bookbinding. These are all library or literary arts—and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to

the monumental letterings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of medieval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people today, even among those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX Century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is, I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected,—the Kelmscott, the Doves and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced today.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. *Good Words* for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also excellent examples of the old art of wood engraving. The *Morte d'Arthur*, by Malory, with illustrations by Beardsley, is really far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book; it is an example of fine printing, an example of Beardsley's work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals because these contain beautiful wood cuts. So I suppose all one can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine books which may be scattered all over the library under various classifications. This I think one should do. Indeed, I feel that I am getting a little out of my depth. I can advise you on what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go to make a beautiful book.

tographs, drawings, descriptions of the building and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second-hand authority is often of first-hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and XVIII Centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first-hand authority for (1) XVIII Century printing. (2) What le Sieur Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration le Sieur Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's *Livre d'Architecture* is in many respects a primary authority.

To take another example: In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published *The Antiquities of Athens* in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance: the curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of color, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Pennington or Lethaby. Curiously enough, most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph—the entasis, the construction of the walls, the color, and so on.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures," that is, competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

But a library should have a good collection of first-class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the color and the texture of the originals, and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring to-

gether the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the color, and so on. Of course, this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time. There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student. For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs—the largest procurable.

Now, all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal. But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present-day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and textbooks of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority." In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many textbooks omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books—unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now, a textbook of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular handbooks have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular textbooks written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts—guides to further reading—some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some textbooks written for the use of university students. Some of these—not all, by any means—seem to concentrate all the dullness possible in the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works

XVIII and early XIX Century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the *Cabinet-makers and Upholsterers Guide*, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books, Asher Benjamin's *Country Builder* has been reproduced.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII Century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently, strictly speaking, not art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging. Popular zoology and natural history books are full of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people—by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present-day heraldry—the arms of the Canadian Provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately, the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the *Armorial de Gelre* of the XV and the *Lindsay Armorial* of the XVII Century.

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library—the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts printing and bookbinding. These are all library or literary arts—and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to

the monumental letterings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of medieval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people today, even among those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX Century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is, I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected,—the Kelmscott, the Doves and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced today.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. *Good Words* for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also excellent examples of the old art of wood engraving. The *Morte d'Arthur*, by Malory, with illustrations by Beardsley, is really far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book; it is an example of fine printing, an example of Beardsley's work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals because these contain beautiful wood cuts. So I suppose all one can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine books which may be scattered all over the library under various classifications. This I think one should do. Indeed, I feel that I am getting a little out of my depth. I can advise you on what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go to make a beautiful book.

"Art Teaching" and Drawing in Schools

RAMSAY TRAQUAIR, F.R.I.B.A., M.A.

Macdonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

IN the Curricula of our Elementary and High Schools a certain amount of time is set apart for "Art" or for "Drawing." This indicates, at any rate, that drawing is regarded as of some importance or interest in future life, but to me it raises some very difficult questions as to the place of "Art" in the teaching of young children and as to the general importance of drawing.

Art is the expression of emotion through a material by means of a technique. This is, of course, not a complete definition; no one has yet produced a complete definition of Art. But it is a statement of certain quite definite facts about Art in whatever way we look at it. A love of beauty is not Art. The ability to draw or to represent the appearance of things in any medium is not Art. Art is the expression of an emotion. Artists must have a technique, a skill of hand, through which to express their emotion and they must use some material—paint, paper, marble, bricks, words, sounds, or what not.

We usually suppose that the artist has his own emotions to express. It is only in the most academic periods that some emotions or subjects have been regarded as more worthy of attention than others. Nowadays the artist is supposed to look after his emotions for himself. So the teaching of "Art" usually resolves itself into the teaching of "technique."

Of course, the attention of the pupil may very well be drawn to the great masterpieces of past art, to the "beauties of nature," to the principles of aesthetic, in fact, to the appreciation of beauty. This study may be to the amateur almost of greater importance than the study of technique, but in the training of the Artist it is usually subordinated to technique.

The appreciation of beauty is not a thing which can be taught in a lesson of one hour a week. It is a way of thought which should penetrate all life, all teaching. It can be taught as well in the Latin, or the English lesson as in any other, and I confess that I find it hard to believe that any one-hour school course can affect a child who is brought up in a home devoted to material and commercial ideals. Is it possible to teach anything which can be called Art to little children of six or seven or eight years old, who have no emotions worth considering, no emotions which are not simple surface reactions. Dancing and singing are the best Arts for them, as, indeed, they are the most natural Arts for a great deal of simple humanity.

The idea of Art as a pretty addition to life, suited to girls and small children, is one of the most preposterous which has ever got into addled heads. These little children have no emotions to express, they can, indeed, be made to give an ape-like copy of their elders' sentimentality. This they often do with a naif and ignorant

unconsciousness which these elders regard as most charming and innocent. I have never been able to regard these exhibitions as very good for the children and I do not believe that any child under fourteen can understand what Art is.

So, in general, elementary Art teaching reduces itself to the teaching of drawing in some form or another.

Very interesting results have been obtained by some European teachers by letting children draw "out of their heads." They often produce very charming little drawings with a distinct feeling for decorative balance and a surprising degree of observation. Yet it has been noticed that these artistic infant prodigies rarely retain their abilities as they grow up. When they do they often become great artists. But, as a rule, this faculty, even if carefully encouraged, fades away at exactly that age when a real appreciation of Art might be expected to begin. So this "direct expression" method, which, at one time, seemed to open the door to great possibilities, has been found actually of little use as "Art teaching." It probably has its value in education and may be the very best way of occupying some part of a child's working hours.

Now, I have said that elementary art teaching reduces itself in general to the teaching of drawing, and it is here that the most serious misunderstanding is made. The teaching of Art to children may or may not be possible, but drawing is not Art at all, and has only a secondary connection with Art.

Drawing is, like writing, a medium for the conveyance of information. This information may be emotional and artistic or it may be practical and utilitarian or it may be all these things at once, but an artist is not an artist because he can draw any more than a poet is a poet because he can write.

Drawing is the recording of certain facts about the appearance of things. It is a scientific process whose main virtue is accuracy. It may be made the vehicle of artistic expression, in which case it becomes the accurate recording of the artist's emotion. But drawing in itself is not Art.

The ability to draw accurately is one of the most useful which any person can have. There is hardly any profession or calling (excepting possibly a commission agent's) in which a power for drawing is not useful. The medical man draws his diagrams, the lawyer often requires to understand plans or sections, the joiner, the plumber, the electrician, all require to be able to draw if they are to rise in their callings. To everybody the power of accurate observation and the memory of form, which are trained by drawing, are of value. And this drawing has nothing to do with Art.

Drawing is very difficult to teach. Good teachers are rare and very valuable. For drawing must be taught hard and close. Accuracy must be sought from the beginning, and this requires a trained eye and hand in the teacher. These pretty blobs, made like flowers or grasses with a paint brush, are not drawings. Playing with coloured chalks is not drawing. Producing symmetric curves on a blackboard with both hands may be a graceful and healthy calisthénic exercise—it is not drawing.

Drawing is a very difficult subject both for teacher and pupil and one which it would be cruel to attempt with young children. Experience seems to show that fourteen is the youngest age at which drawing can be taught and this is about the age at which I am informed that drawing in school ceases for most boys.

It is possible that modelling may profitably be taught earlier than this. It is a simpler process and without the complicated convention of drawing. It gives training in observation, form memory and hand dexterity. At present it is not taught at all.

Now, coming to the actual teaching of drawing, experience shows that the best way is to require the pupil to draw from the solid at once. Simple objects should be selected for the first attempts, so graded that the pupil has not too many difficulties to overcome at one time, but these drawings should be in full light and shade with the background as carefully drawn as the object. They should be from the first complete representations of the appearance of the object.

It has been found best to light the model, in these first stages, by artificial light, so that the shadows may be simple and firm and so that the pupil may not be confused by cross shadows.

This drawing in full light and shade is really easier for the beginner than outline drawing. The thing he sees is a combination of light and shade and he has only to draw what is before him. Outline drawing is really an advanced convention to be learned later when some comprehension of form and mass has been obtained.

Although really easier for the pupil, this method is, of course, much more difficult for the teacher. The old school method of my boyhood was to provide each pupil with a drawing, usually ruled in squares. This he was required to copy on a larger scale. Many boys attained considerable skill in this amusing occupation and made almost facsimile copies of hens and chickens, dogs, farmyards and the like. As drawing it was all quite useless and I had to begin from the very beginning later on and learn from the cast, but, of course, from the teacher's point of view, such copies were easy to compare with the original, to mark (horrid practice), and

made a wonderful show in the annual exhibition. The principal use of drawing in the school curriculum was to prevent small boys from being overworked, without the scandal of just letting them play. Yet even five hours a week, spent upon real drawing, would have saved a great deal of time in later years.

Whether drawing is regarded as a preparation for Art, for Engineering, for Mechanics or as a training in observation and form memory—no matter what its ultimate purpose—it should be commenced from the solid object, in full light and shade and to the size of nature.

Geometrical drawing is of course valuable, particularly the drawing of solids in projection and their intersections, but this is very easily mastered by anyone who has learned to draw in the natural way from the object.

There is no greater mistake than to think that because a boy is to be a mechanic he should begin by drawing cog-wheels and machines or because he is to be an architect he should begin with "architectural drawing." The basis of all drawing is the power to set down on paper the facts about the appearance of things and this is best learned by drawing real things.

At present boys come up to the universities quite unable to draw. They either produce as evidences of their abilities the most trivial and helpless attempts at sketches, or nothing at all. In view of the time given in the curriculum to "drawing" this appears strange. It costs them at present certainly one-half session of valuable time during which they must be taught at the university what they should have learned beforehand.

But more important than this is the value of drawing as a training in practical observation and in the memory of what things look like. Most men pass through life with their eyes shut. They simply do not see things, and very often their blindness costs them dear. Drawing properly taught is a training in how to see and in how to remember and record things seen. It is wise to forget all about "Art" in thinking of drawing. We do not teach writing only to prospective authors; why should we confine drawing to prospective artists, architects or "scientists."

Real drawing is one of the most valuable educational methods of mental training, and a very useful accomplishment in later life. As such it should be taught and taught strictly. Art, the expression of emotion and the appreciation of beauty, should be taught in every subject in the curriculum from 9.00 a.m. to 3.30 p.m.

But, I am told, I am forgetting all about the requirements of the McGill Matriculation Examination and, as a McGill Professor . . .

"Art Teaching" and Drawing in Schools

RAMSAY TRAQUAIR, F.R.I.B.A., M.A.

Macdonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

IN the Curricula of our Elementary and High Schools a certain amount of time is set apart for "Art" or for "Drawing." This indicates, at any rate, that drawing is regarded as of some importance or interest in future life, but to me it raises some very difficult questions as to the place of "Art" in the teaching of young children and as to the general importance of drawing.

Art is the expression of emotion through a material by means of a technique. This is, of course, not a complete definition; no one has yet produced a complete definition of Art. But it is a statement of certain quite definite facts about Art in whatever way we look at it. A love of beauty is not Art. The ability to draw or to represent the appearance of things in any medium is not Art. Art is the expression of an emotion. Artists must have a technique, a skill of hand, through which to express their emotion and they must use some material—paint, paper, marble, bricks, words, sounds, or what not.

We usually suppose that the artist has his own emotions to express. It is only in the most academic periods that some emotions or subjects have been regarded as more worthy of attention than others. Nowadays the artist is supposed to look after his emotions for himself. So the teaching of "Art" usually resolves itself into the teaching of "technique."

Of course, the attention of the pupil may very well be drawn to the great masterpieces of past art, to the "beauties of nature," to the principles of aesthetic, in fact, to the appreciation of beauty. This study may be to the amateur almost of greater importance than the study of technique, but in the training of the Artist it is usually subordinated to technique.

The appreciation of beauty is not a thing which can be taught in a lesson of one hour a week. It is a way of thought which should penetrate all life, all teaching. It can be taught as well in the Latin, or the English lesson as in any other, and I confess that I find it hard to believe that any one-hour school course can affect a child who is brought up in a home devoted to material and commercial ideals. Is it possible to teach anything which can be called Art to little children of six or seven or eight years old, who have no emotions worth considering, no emotions which are not simple surface reactions. Dancing and singing are the best Arts for them, as, indeed, they are the most natural Arts for a great deal of simple humanity.

The idea of Art as a pretty addition to life, suited to girls and small children, is one of the most preposterous which has ever got into addled heads. These little children have no emotions to express, they can, indeed, be made to give an ape-like copy of their elders' sentimentality. This they often do with a naif and ignorant

unconsciousness which these elders regard as most charming and innocent. I have never been able to regard these exhibitions as very good for the children and I do not believe that any child under fourteen can understand what Art is.

So, in general, elementary Art teaching reduces itself to the teaching of drawing in some form or another.

Very interesting results have been obtained by some European teachers by letting children draw "out of their heads." They often produce very charming little drawings with a distinct feeling for decorative balance and a surprising degree of observation. Yet it has been noticed that these artistic infant prodigies rarely retain their abilities as they grow up. When they do they often become great artists. But, as a rule, this faculty, even if carefully encouraged, fades away at exactly that age when a real appreciation of Art might be expected to begin. So this "direct expression" method, which, at one time, seemed to open the door to great possibilities, has been found actually of little use as "Art teaching." It probably has its value in education and may be the very best way of occupying some part of a child's working hours.

Now, I have said that elementary art teaching reduces itself in general to the teaching of drawing, and it is here that the most serious misunderstanding is made. The teaching of Art to children may or may not be possible, but drawing is not Art at all, and has only a secondary connection with Art.

Drawing is, like writing, a medium for the conveyance of information. This information may be emotional and artistic or it may be practical and utilitarian or it may be all these things at once, but an artist is not an artist because he can draw any more than a poet is a poet because he can write.

Drawing is the recording of certain facts about the appearance of things. It is a scientific process whose main virtue is accuracy. It may be made the vehicle of artistic expression, in which case it becomes the accurate recording of the artist's emotion. But drawing in itself is not Art.

The ability to draw accurately is one of the most useful which any person can have. There is hardly any profession or calling (excepting possibly a commission agent's) in which a power for drawing is not useful. The medical man draws his diagrams, the lawyer often requires to understand plans or sections, the joiner, the plumber, the electrician, all require to be able to draw if they are to rise in their callings. To everybody the power of accurate observation and the memory of form, which are trained by drawing, are of value. And this drawing has nothing to do with Art.

Drawing is very difficult to teach. Good teachers are rare and very valuable. For drawing must be taught hard and close. Accuracy must be sought from the beginning, and this requires a trained eye and hand in the teacher. These pretty blobs, made like flowers or grasses with a paint brush, are not drawings. Playing with coloured chalks is not drawing. Producing symmetric curves on a blackboard with both hands may be a graceful and healthy calisthenic exercise—it is not drawing.

Drawing is a very difficult subject both for teacher and pupil and one which it would be cruel to attempt with young children. Experience seems to show that fourteen is the youngest age at which drawing can be taught and this is about the age at which I am informed that drawing in school ceases for most boys.

It is possible that modelling may profitably be taught earlier than this. It is a simpler process and without the complicated convention of drawing. It gives training in observation, form memory and hand dexterity. At present it is not taught at all.

Now, coming to the actual teaching of drawing, experience shows that the best way is to require the pupil to draw from the solid at once. Simple objects should be selected for the first attempts, so graded that the pupil has not too many difficulties to overcome at one time, but these drawings should be in full light and shade with the background as carefully drawn as the object. They should be from the first complete representations of the appearance of the object.

It has been found best to light the model, in these first stages, by artificial light, so that the shadows may be simple and firm and so that the pupil may not be confused by cross shadows.

This drawing in full light and shade is really easier for the beginner than outline drawing. The thing he sees is a combination of light and shade and he has only to draw what is before him. Outline drawing is really an advanced convention to be learned later when some comprehension of form and mass has been obtained.

Although really easier for the pupil, this method is, of course, much more difficult for the teacher. The old school method of my boyhood was to provide each pupil with a drawing, usually ruled in squares. This he was required to copy on a larger scale. Many boys attained considerable skill in this amusing occupation and made almost facsimile copies of hens and chickens, dogs, farmyards and the like. As drawing it was all quite useless and I had to begin from the very beginning later on and learn from the cast, but, of course, from the teacher's point of view, such copies were easy to compare with the original, to mark (horrid practice), and

made a wonderful show in the annual exhibition. The principal use of drawing in the school curriculum was to prevent small boys from being overworked, without the scandal of just letting them play. Yet even five hours a week, spent upon real drawing, would have saved a great deal of time in later years.

Whether drawing is regarded as a preparation for Art, for Engineering, for Mechanics or as a training in observation and form memory—no matter what its ultimate purpose—it should be commenced from the solid object, in full light and shade and to the size of nature.

Geometrical drawing is of course valuable, particularly the drawing of solids in projection and their intersections, but this is very easily mastered by anyone who has learned to draw in the natural way from the object.

There is no greater mistake than to think that because a boy is to be a mechanic he should begin by drawing cog-wheels and machines or because he is to be an architect he should begin with "architectural drawing." The basis of all drawing is the power to set down on paper the facts about the appearance of things and this is best learned by drawing real things.

At present boys come up to the universities quite unable to draw. They either produce as evidences of their abilities the most trivial and helpless attempts at sketches, or nothing at all. In view of the time given in the curriculum to "drawing" this appears strange. It costs them at present certainly one-half session of valuable time during which they must be taught at the university what they should have learned beforehand.

But more important than this is the value of drawing as a training in practical observation and in the memory of what things look like. Most men pass through life with their eyes shut. They simply do not see things, and very often their blindness costs them dear. Drawing properly taught is a training in how to see and in how to remember and record things seen. It is wise to forget all about "Art" in thinking of drawing. We do not teach writing only to prospective authors; why should we confine drawing to prospective artists, architects or "scientists."

Real drawing is one of the most valuable educational methods of mental training, and a very useful accomplishment in later life. As such it should be taught and taught strictly. Art, the expression of emotion and the appreciation of beauty, should be taught in every subject in the curriculum from 9.00 a.m. to 3.30 p.m.

But, I am told, I am forgetting all about the requirements of the McGill Matriculation Examination and, as a McGill Professor . . .

"Art Teaching" and Drawing in Schools

RAMSAY TRAQUAIR, F.R.I.B.A., M.A.
Macdonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

IN the Curricula of our Elementary and High Schools a certain amount of time is set apart for "Art" or for "Drawing." This indicates, at any rate, that drawing is regarded as of some importance or interest in future life, but to me it raises some very difficult questions as to the place of "Art" in the teaching of young children and as to the general importance of drawing.

Art is the expression of emotion through a material by means of a technique. This is, of course, not a complete definition; no one has yet produced a complete definition of Art. But it is a statement of certain quite definite facts about Art in whatever way we look at it. A love of beauty is not Art. The ability to draw or to represent the appearance of things in any medium is not Art. Art is the expression of an emotion. Artists must have a technique, a skill of hand, through which to express their emotion and they must use some material—paint, paper, marble, bricks, words, sounds, or what not.

We usually suppose that the artist has his own emotions to express. It is only in the most academic periods that some emotions or subjects have been regarded as more worthy of attention than others. Nowadays the artist is supposed to look after his emotions for himself. So the teaching of "Art" usually resolves itself into the teaching of "technique."

Of course, the attention of the pupil may very well be drawn to the great masterpieces of past art, to the "beauties of nature," to the principles of aesthetic, in fact, to the appreciation of beauty. This study may be to the amateur almost of greater importance than the study of technique, but in the training of the Artist it is usually subordinated to technique.

The appreciation of beauty is not a thing which can be taught in a lesson of one hour a week. It is a way of thought which should penetrate all life, all teaching. It can be taught as well in the Latin, or the English lesson as in any other, and I confess that I find it hard to believe that any one-hour school course can affect a child who is brought up in a home devoted to material and commercial ideals. Is it possible to teach anything which can be called Art to little children of six or seven or eight years old, who have no emotions worth considering, no emotions which are not simple surface reactions. Dancing and singing are the best Arts for them, as, indeed, they are the most natural Arts for a great deal of simple humanity.

The idea of Art as a pretty addition to life, suited to girls and small children, is one of the most preposterous which has ever got into addled heads. These little children have no emotions to express, they can, indeed, be made to give an ape-like copy of their elders' sentimentality. This they often do with a naif and ignorant

unconsciousness which these elders regard as most charming and innocent. I have never been able to regard these exhibitions as very good for the children and I do not believe that any child under fourteen can understand what Art is.

So, in general, elementary Art teaching reduces itself to the teaching of drawing in some form or another.

Very interesting results have been obtained by some European teachers by letting children draw "out of their heads." They often produce very charming little drawings with a distinct feeling for decorative balance and a surprising degree of observation. Yet it has been noticed that these artistic infant prodigies rarely retain their abilities as they grow up. When they do they often become great artists. But, as a rule, this faculty, even if carefully encouraged, fades away at exactly that age when a real appreciation of Art might be expected to begin. So this "direct expression" method, which, at one time, seemed to open the door to great possibilities, has been found actually of little use as "Art teaching." It probably has its value in education and may be the very best way of occupying some part of a child's working hours.

Now, I have said that elementary art teaching reduces itself in general to the teaching of drawing, and it is here that the most serious misunderstanding is made. The teaching of Art to children may or may not be possible, but drawing is not Art at all, and has only a secondary connection with Art.

Drawing is, like writing, a medium for the conveyance of information. This information may be emotional and artistic or it may be practical and utilitarian or it may be all these things at once, but an artist is not an artist because he can draw any more than a poet is a poet because he can write.

Drawing is the recording of certain facts about the appearance of things. It is a scientific process whose main virtue is accuracy. It may be made the vehicle of artistic expression, in which case it becomes the accurate recording of the artist's emotion. But drawing in itself is not Art.

The ability to draw accurately is one of the most useful which any person can have. There is hardly any profession or calling (excepting possibly a commission agent's) in which a power for drawing is not useful. The medical man draws his diagrams, the lawyer often requires to understand plans or sections, the joiner, the plumber, the electrician, all require to be able to draw if they are to rise in their callings. To everybody the power of accurate observation and the memory of form, which are trained by drawing, are of value. And this drawing has nothing to do with Art.

Drawing is very difficult to teach. Good teachers are rare and very valuable. For drawing must be taught hard and close. Accuracy must be sought from the beginning, and this requires a trained eye and hand in the teacher. These pretty blobs, made like flowers or grasses with a paint brush, are not drawings. Playing with coloured chalks is not drawing. Producing symmetric curves on a blackboard with both hands may be a graceful and healthy calisthenic exercise—it is not drawing.

Drawing is a very difficult subject both for teacher and pupil and one which it would be cruel to attempt with young children. Experience seems to show that fourteen is the youngest age at which drawing can be taught and this is about the age at which I am informed that drawing in school ceases for most boys.

It is possible that modelling may profitably be taught earlier than this. It is a simpler process and without the complicated convention of drawing. It gives training in observation, form memory and hand dexterity. At present it is not taught at all.

Now, coming to the actual teaching of drawing, experience shows that the best way is to require the pupil to draw from the solid at once. Simple objects should be selected for the first attempts, so graded that the pupil has not too many difficulties to overcome at one time, but these drawings should be in full light and shade with the background as carefully drawn as the object. They should be from the first complete representations of the appearance of the object.

It has been found best to light the model, in these first stages, by artificial light, so that the shadows may be simple and firm and so that the pupil may not be confused by cross shadows.

This drawing in full light and shade is really easier for the beginner than outline drawing. The thing he sees is a combination of light and shade and he has only to draw what is before him. Outline drawing is really an advanced convention to be learned later when some comprehension of form and mass has been obtained.

Although really easier for the pupil, this method is, of course, much more difficult for the teacher. The old school method of my boyhood was to provide each pupil with a drawing, usually ruled in squares. This he was required to copy on a larger scale. Many boys attained considerable skill in this amusing occupation and made almost facsimile copies of hens and chickens, dogs, farmyards and the like. As drawing it was all quite useless and I had to begin from the very beginning later on and learn from the cast, but, of course, from the teacher's point of view, such copies were easy to compare with the original, to mark (horrid practice), and

made a wonderful show in the annual exhibition. The principal use of drawing in the school curriculum was to prevent small boys from being overworked, without the scandal of just letting them play. Yet even five hours a week, spent upon real drawing, would have saved a great deal of time in later years.

Whether drawing is regarded as a preparation for Art, for Engineering, for Mechanics or as a training in observation and form memory—no matter what its ultimate purpose—it should be commenced from the solid object, in full light and shade and to the size of nature.

Geometrical drawing is of course valuable, particularly the drawing of solids in projection and their intersections, but this is very easily mastered by anyone who has learned to draw in the natural way from the object.

There is no greater mistake than to think that because a boy is to be a mechanic he should begin by drawing cog-wheels and machines or because he is to be an architect he should begin with "architectural drawing." The basis of all drawing is the power to set down on paper the facts about the appearance of things and this is best learned by drawing real things.

At present boys come up to the universities quite unable to draw. They either produce as evidences of their abilities the most trivial and helpless attempts at sketches, or nothing at all. In view of the time given in the curriculum to "drawing" this appears strange. It costs them at present certainly one-half session of valuable time during which they must be taught at the university what they should have learned beforehand.

But more important than this is the value of drawing as a training in practical observation and in the memory of what things look like. Most men pass through life with their eyes shut. They simply do not see things, and very often their blindness costs them dear. Drawing properly taught is a training in how to see and in how to remember and record things seen. It is wise to forget all about "Art" in thinking of drawing. We do not teach writing only to prospective authors; why should we confine drawing to prospective artists, architects or "scientists."

Real drawing is one of the most valuable educational methods of mental training, and a very useful accomplishment in later life. As such it should be taught and taught strictly. Art, the expression of emotion and the appreciation of beauty, should be taught in every subject in the curriculum from 9.00 a.m. to 3.30 p.m.

But, I am told, I am forgetting all about the requirements of the McGill Matriculation Examination and, as a McGill Professor . . .

"Art Teaching" and Drawing in Schools

RAMSAY TRAQUAIR, F.R.I.B.A., M.A.
Macdonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

IN the Curricula of our Elementary and High Schools a certain amount of time is set apart for "Art" or for "Drawing." This indicates, at any rate, that drawing is regarded as of some importance or interest in future life, but to me it raises some very difficult questions as to the place of "Art" in the teaching of young children and as to the general importance of drawing.

Art is the expression of emotion through a material by means of a technique. This is, of course, not a complete definition; no one has yet produced a complete definition of Art. But it is a statement of certain quite definite facts about Art in whatever way we look at it. A love of beauty is not Art. The ability to draw or to represent the appearance of things in any medium is not Art. Art is the expression of an emotion. Artists must have a technique, a skill of hand, through which to express their emotion and they must use some material—paint, paper, marble, bricks, words, sounds, or what not.

We usually suppose that the artist has his own emotions to express. It is only in the most academic periods that some emotions or subjects have been regarded as more worthy of attention than others. Nowadays the artist is supposed to look after his emotions for himself. So the teaching of "Art" usually resolves itself into the teaching of "technique."

Of course, the attention of the pupil may very well be drawn to the great masterpieces of past art, to the "beauties of nature," to the principles of aesthetic, in fact, to the appreciation of beauty. This study may be to the amateur almost of greater importance than the study of technique, but in the training of the Artist it is usually subordinated to technique.

The appreciation of beauty is not a thing which can be taught in a lesson of one hour a week. It is a way of thought which should penetrate all life, all teaching. It can be taught as well in the Latin, or the English lesson as in any other, and I confess that I find it hard to believe that any one-hour school course can affect a child who is brought up in a home devoted to material and commercial ideals. Is it possible to teach anything which can be called Art to little children of six or seven or eight years old, who have no emotions worth considering, no emotions which are not simple surface reactions. Dancing and singing are the best Arts for them, as, indeed, they are the most natural Arts for a great deal of simple humanity.

The idea of Art as a pretty addition to life, suited to girls and small children, is one of the most preposterous which has ever got into addled heads. These little children have no emotions to express, they can, indeed, be made to give an ape-like copy of their elders' sentimentality. This they often do with a naïf and ignorant

unconsciousness which these elders regard as most charming and innocent. I have never been able to regard these exhibitions as very good for the children and I do not believe that any child under fourteen can understand what Art is.

So, in general, elementary Art teaching reduces itself to the teaching of drawing in some form or another.

Very interesting results have been obtained by some European teachers by letting children draw "out of their heads." They often produce very charming little drawings with a distinct feeling for decorative balance and a surprising degree of observation. Yet it has been noticed that these artistic infant prodigies rarely retain their abilities as they grow up. When they do they often become great artists. But, as a rule, this faculty, even if carefully encouraged, fades away at exactly that age when a real appreciation of Art might be expected to begin. So this "direct expression" method, which, at one time, seemed to open the door to great possibilities, has been found actually of little use as "Art teaching." It probably has its value in education and may be the very best way of occupying some part of a child's working hours.

Now, I have said that elementary art teaching reduces itself in general to the teaching of drawing, and it is here that the most serious misunderstanding is made. The teaching of Art to children may or may not be possible, but drawing is not Art at all, and has only a secondary connection with Art.

Drawing is, like writing, a medium for the conveyance of information. This information may be emotional and artistic or it may be practical and utilitarian or it may be all these things at once, but an artist is not an artist because he can draw any more than a poet is a poet because he can write.

Drawing is the recording of certain facts about the appearance of things. It is a scientific process whose main virtue is accuracy. It may be made the vehicle of artistic expression, in which case it becomes the accurate recording of the artist's emotion. But drawing in itself is not Art.

The ability to draw accurately is one of the most useful which any person can have. There is hardly any profession or calling (excepting possibly a commission agent's) in which a power for drawing is not useful. The medical man draws his diagrams, the lawyer often requires to understand plans or sections, the joiner, the plumber, the electrician, all require to be able to draw if they are to rise in their callings. To everybody the power of accurate observation and the memory of form, which are trained by drawing, are of value. And this drawing has nothing to do with Art.

Drawing is very difficult to teach. Good teachers are rare and very valuable. For drawing must be taught hard and close. Accuracy must be sought from the beginning, and this requires a trained eye and hand in the teacher. These pretty blobs, made like flowers or grasses with a paint brush, are not drawings. Playing with coloured chalks is not drawing. Producing symmetric curves on a blackboard with both hands may be a graceful and healthy calisthenic exercise—it is not drawing.

Drawing is a very difficult subject both for teacher and pupil and one which it would be cruel to attempt with young children. Experience seems to show that fourteen is the youngest age at which drawing can be taught and this is about the age at which I am informed that drawing in school ceases for most boys.

It is possible that modelling may profitably be taught earlier than this. It is a simpler process and without the complicated convention of drawing. It gives training in observation, form memory and hand dexterity. At present it is not taught at all.

Now, coming to the actual teaching of drawing, experience shows that the best way is to require the pupil to draw from the solid at once. Simple objects should be selected for the first attempts, so graded that the pupil has not too many difficulties to overcome at one time, but these drawings should be in full light and shade with the background as carefully drawn as the object. They should be from the first complete representations of the appearance of the object.

It has been found best to light the model, in these first stages, by artificial light, so that the shadows may be simple and firm and so that the pupil may not be confused by cross shadows.

This drawing in full light and shade is really easier for the beginner than outline drawing. The thing he sees is a combination of light and shade and he has only to draw what is before him. Outline drawing is really an advanced convention to be learned later when some comprehension of form and mass has been obtained.

Although really easier for the pupil, this method is, of course, much more difficult for the teacher. The old school method of my boyhood was to provide each pupil with a drawing, usually ruled in squares. This he was required to copy on a larger scale. Many boys attained considerable skill in this amusing occupation and made almost facsimile copies of hens and chickens, dogs, farmyards and the like. As drawing it was all quite useless and I had to begin from the very beginning later on and learn from the cast, but, of course, from the teacher's point of view, such copies were easy to compare with the original, to mark (horrid practice), and

made a wonderful show in the annual exhibition. The principal use of drawing in the school curriculum was to prevent small boys from being overworked, without the scandal of just letting them play. Yet even five hours a week, spent upon real drawing, would have saved a great deal of time in later years.

Whether drawing is regarded as a preparation for Art, for Engineering, for Mechanics or as a training in observation and form memory—no matter what its ultimate purpose—it should be commenced from the solid object, in full light and shade and to the size of nature.

Geometrical drawing is of course valuable, particularly the drawing of solids in projection and their intersections, but this is very easily mastered by anyone who has learned to draw in the natural way from the object.

There is no greater mistake than to think that because a boy is to be a mechanic he should begin by drawing cog-wheels and machines or because he is to be an architect he should begin with "architectural drawing." The basis of all drawing is the power to set down on paper the facts about the appearance of things and this is best learned by drawing real things.

At present boys come up to the universities quite unable to draw. They either produce as evidences of their abilities the most trivial and helpless attempts at sketches, or nothing at all. In view of the time given in the curriculum to "drawing" this appears strange. It costs them at present certainly one-half session of valuable time during which they must be taught at the university what they should have learned beforehand.

But more important than this is the value of drawing as a training in practical observation and in the memory of what things look like. Most men pass through life with their eyes shut. They simply do not see things, and very often their blindness costs them dear. Drawing properly taught is a training in how to see and in how to remember and record things seen. It is wise to forget all about "Art" in thinking of drawing. We do not teach writing only to prospective authors; why should we confine drawing to prospective artists, architects or "scientists."

Real drawing is one of the most valuable educational methods of mental training, and a very useful accomplishment in later life. As such it should be taught and taught strictly. Art, the expression of emotion and the appreciation of beauty, should be taught in every subject in the curriculum from 9.00 a.m. to 3.30 p.m.

But, I am told, I am forgetting all about the requirements of the McGill Matriculation Examination and, as a McGill Professor . . .

"Art Teaching" and Drawing in Schools

RAMSAY TRAQUAIR, F.R.I.B.A., M.A.

Macdonald Professor of Architecture, McGill University

IN the Curricula of our Elementary and High Schools a certain amount of time is set apart for "Art" or for "Drawing." This indicates, at any rate, that drawing is regarded as of some importance or interest in future life, but to me it raises some very difficult questions as to the place of "Art" in the teaching of young children and as to the general importance of drawing.

Art is the expression of emotion through a material by means of a technique. This is, of course, not a complete definition; no one has yet produced a complete definition of Art. But it is a statement of certain quite definite facts about Art in whatever way we look at it. A love of beauty is not Art. The ability to draw or to represent the appearance of things in any medium is not Art. Art is the expression of an emotion. Artists must have a technique, a skill of hand, through which to express their emotion and they must use some material—paint, paper, marble, bricks, words, sounds, or what not.

We usually suppose that the artist has his own emotions to express. It is only in the most academic periods that some emotions or subjects have been regarded as more worthy of attention than others. Nowadays the artist is supposed to look after his emotions for himself. So the teaching of "Art" usually resolves itself into the teaching of "technique."

Of course, the attention of the pupil may very well be drawn to the great masterpieces of past art, to the "beauties of nature," to the principles of aesthetic, in fact, to the appreciation of beauty. This study may be to the amateur almost of greater importance than the study of technique, but in the training of the Artist it is usually subordinated to technique.

The appreciation of beauty is not a thing which can be taught in a lesson of one hour a week. It is a way of thought which should penetrate all life, all teaching. It can be taught as well in the Latin, or the English lesson as in any other, and I confess that I find it hard to believe that any one-hour school course can affect a child who is brought up in a home devoted to material and commercial ideals. Is it possible to teach anything which can be called Art to little children of six or seven or eight years old, who have no emotions worth considering, no emotions which are not simple surface reactions. Dancing and singing are the best Arts for them, as, indeed, they are the most natural Arts for a great deal of simple humanity.

The idea of Art as a pretty addition to life, suited to girls and small children, is one of the most preposterous which has ever got into addled heads. These little children have no emotions to express, they can, indeed, be made to give an ape-like copy of their elders' sentimentality. This they often do with a naif and ignorant

unconsciousness which these elders regard as most charming and innocent. I have never been able to regard these exhibitions as very good for the children and I do not believe that any child under fourteen can understand what Art is.

So, in general, elementary Art teaching reduces itself to the teaching of drawing in some form or another.

Very interesting results have been obtained by some European teachers by letting children draw "out of their heads." They often produce very charming little drawings with a distinct feeling for decorative balance and a surprising degree of observation. Yet it has been noticed that these artistic infant prodigies rarely retain their abilities as they grow up. When they do they often become great artists. But, as a rule, this faculty, even if carefully encouraged, fades away at exactly that age when a real appreciation of Art might be expected to begin. So this "direct expression" method, which, at one time, seemed to open the door to great possibilities, has been found actually of little use as "Art teaching." It probably has its value in education and may be the very best way of occupying some part of a child's working hours.

Now, I have said that elementary art teaching reduces itself in general to the teaching of drawing, and it is here that the most serious misunderstanding is made. The teaching of Art to children may or may not be possible, but drawing is not Art at all, and has only a secondary connection with Art.

Drawing is, like writing, a medium for the conveyance of information. This information may be emotional and artistic or it may be practical and utilitarian or it may be all these things at once, but an artist is not an artist because he can draw any more than a poet is a poet because he can write.

Drawing is the recording of certain facts about the appearance of things. It is a scientific process whose main virtue is accuracy. It may be made the vehicle of artistic expression, in which case it becomes the accurate recording of the artist's emotion. But drawing in itself is not Art.

The ability to draw accurately is one of the most useful which any person can have. There is hardly any profession or calling (excepting possibly a commission agent's) in which a power for drawing is not useful. The medical man draws his diagrams, the lawyer often requires to understand plans or sections, the joiner, the plumber, the electrician, all require to be able to draw if they are to rise in their callings. To everybody the power of accurate observation and the memory of form, which are trained by drawing, are of value. And this drawing has nothing to do with Art.

Drawing is very difficult to teach. Good teachers are rare and very valuable. For drawing must be taught hard and close. Accuracy must be sought from the beginning, and this requires a trained eye and hand in the teacher. These pretty blobs, made like flowers or grasses with a paint brush, are not drawings. Playing with coloured chalks is not drawing. Producing symmetric curves on a blackboard with both hands may be a graceful and healthy calisthenic exercise—it is not drawing.

Drawing is a very difficult subject both for teacher and pupil and one which it would be cruel to attempt with young children. Experience seems to show that fourteen is the youngest age at which drawing can be taught and this is about the age at which I am informed that drawing in school ceases for most boys.

It is possible that modelling may profitably be taught earlier than this. It is a simpler process and without the complicated convention of drawing. It gives training in observation, form memory and hand dexterity. At present it is not taught at all.

Now, coming to the actual teaching of drawing, experience shows that the best way is to require the pupil to draw from the solid at once. Simple objects should be selected for the first attempts, so graded that the pupil has not too many difficulties to overcome at one time, but these drawings should be in full light and shade with the background as carefully drawn as the object. They should be from the first complete representations of the appearance of the object.

It has been found best to light the model, in these first stages, by artificial light, so that the shadows may be simple and firm and so that the pupil may not be confused by cross shadows.

This drawing in full light and shade is really easier for the beginner than outline drawing. The thing he sees is a combination of light and shade and he has only to draw what is before him. Outline drawing is really an advanced convention to be learned later when some comprehension of form and mass has been obtained.

Although really easier for the pupil, this method is, of course, much more difficult for the teacher. The old school method of my boyhood was to provide each pupil with a drawing, usually ruled in squares. This he was required to copy on a larger scale. Many boys attained considerable skill in this amusing occupation and made almost facsimile copies of hens and chickens, dogs, farmyards and the like. As drawing it was all quite useless and I had to begin from the very beginning later on and learn from the cast, but, of course, from the teacher's point of view, such copies were easy to compare with the original, to mark (horrid practice), and

made a wonderful show in the annual exhibition. The principal use of drawing in the school curriculum was to prevent small boys from being overworked, without the scandal of just letting them play. Yet even five hours a week, spent upon real drawing, would have saved a great deal of time in later years.

Whether drawing is regarded as a preparation for Art, for Engineering, for Mechanics or as a training in observation and form memory—no matter what its ultimate purpose—it should be commenced from the solid object, in full light and shade and to the size of nature.

Geometrical drawing is of course valuable, particularly the drawing of solids in projection and their intersections, but this is very easily mastered by anyone who has learned to draw in the natural way from the object.

There is no greater mistake than to think that because a boy is to be a mechanic he should begin by drawing cog-wheels and machines or because he is to be an architect he should begin with "architectural drawing." The basis of all drawing is the power to set down on paper the facts about the appearance of things and this is best learned by drawing real things.

At present boys come up to the universities quite unable to draw. They either produce as evidences of their abilities the most trivial and helpless attempts at sketches, or nothing at all. In view of the time given in the curriculum to "drawing" this appears strange. It costs them at present certainly one-half session of valuable time during which they must be taught at the university what they should have learned beforehand.

But more important than this is the value of drawing as a training in practical observation and in the memory of what things look like. Most men pass through life with their eyes shut. They simply do not see things, and very often their blindness costs them dear. Drawing properly taught is a training in how to see and in how to remember and record things seen. It is wise to forget all about "Art" in thinking of drawing. We do not teach writing only to prospective authors; why should we confine drawing to prospective artists, architects or "scientists."

Real drawing is one of the most valuable educational methods of mental training, and a very useful accomplishment in later life. As such it should be taught and taught strictly. Art, the expression of emotion and the appreciation of beauty, should be taught in every subject in the curriculum from 9.00 a.m. to 3.30 p.m.

But, I am told, I am forgetting all about the requirements of the McGill Matriculation Examination and, as a McGill Professor . . .

A LIBRARY OF THE FINE ARTS

by

Ramsay Traquair, M.A., F.R.I.B.A.
Head of the Department of Architecture,
McGill University

A lecture delivered to the students of
the McGill University Library School on
Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

A LIBRARY OF THE FINE ARTS

The literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory, or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literature apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the

major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts, a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other provided that we do not try to stretch it too far, for both artists and the public use very different classifications for the different arts, and so our classification must follow theirs. We must classify according to place, time, artist and author.

In painting or sculpture the artist is of supreme importance. His works are often better known by his name than by their subject or by the place where they may happen to be. So we talk of "a Velasquez", of "Velasquez' King Philip", making Philip of Spain quite subordinate to the artist. But in architecture as a rule the building, or the place in which it stands is more important than the architect. We do not speak of a "fine Wren" or of "Wren's cathedral" when we mean St. Paul's in London. It is only scholars who ever study the works of Wren or of Sanmicheli or of any other great architect.

In the minor arts, such as costume or plaster modelling or stained glass, the artist is usually unknown and quite unconsidered, for such work is often the outcome of tradition and must be classified by place and time. So we talk of "English XVII century embroidery".

We do not attempt therefore to devise a logical system

of classification for books on the fine arts. Each art, each subject, will have its own suitable method based upon the manner in which the student is accustomed to approach the subject. Yet, even with the most elastic and carefully considered scheme, you will always find books which refuse to fit and readers who cannot find - perhaps more in the Fine Arts than in any other subject.

The library will serve three classes of readers; firstly the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate mouldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly we have the scholar who is investigating some school or period or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question

I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even amongst those who attempt research.

The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject matter, and upon the character of its author.

We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second hand. Photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is nevertheless second hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on are first hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first hand, but copies made by transcription are second hand.

Photo-
drawing -

So in architecture a library will at best have second hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good photographs, drawings, descriptions of the building, and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second hand authority is often of first hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and

Boffrand

XVIII centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first hand authority for (1) XVIII century printing. (2) What Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's Livre d'Architecture is in many respects a primary authority.

Stuart &
Revett

To take another example. In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published "The Antiquities of Athens" in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance. The curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of colour, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Pennethorne or Lethaby. Most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph - the entasis, the construction of the walls, the

colour and so on; it required the minute examination of the archaeologist to discover them and to appreciate their importance.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures", that is competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

Painting
reproduction

But a library should have a good collection of first class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the colour and the texture of the originals and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring together the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the colour and so on. Of course this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time.

Illus. London
News

There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student.

Now all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that

the scholar must always appeal.

For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs and colour reproductions, - we cannot turn a library into a museum. Some of the illustrated papers of to-day publish magnificent colour plates and from the museums we can get collections of plates, catalogues and post-cards. These should be collected and classified. A big "scrap" collection of photographs, prints and illustrations out from all kinds of publications is invaluable to the scholar and can be kept in a big file. It is unfortunately rather tiresome and difficult to keep up though thoroughly worth the trouble. Its classification should be as simple as possible. The scholar does not mind hunting a little. The collection of mounted photographs should be as large and as comprehensive as it can be made.

But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and text-books of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority". In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many

text-books omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books - unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now a text-book of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular hand-books have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular text-books written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts - guides to further reading - some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some text-books written for the use of university students. Some of these - not all by any means - seem to concentrate all the dullness possible to the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may for all that be very useful - as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but of course the groups shade into one another - even a popular book may contain first hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on mediaeval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Vitruvius Primary authorities are of course the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as Vitruvius, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived. The

Villars Sketch Book of Villars d'Honnecourt - the only mediaeval architect's sketch book in existence - and a number of references, odd drawings and so on which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in Beowulf, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done.

text-books omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books - unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now a text-book of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular hand-books have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular text-books written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts - guides to further reading - some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some text-books written for the use of university students. Some of these - not all by any means - seem to concentrate all the dullness possible to the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may for all that be very useful - as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but of course the groups shade into one another - even a popular book may contain first hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on mediaeval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Vitruvius Primary authorities are of course the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as Vitruvius, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived. The Villars Sketch Book of Villars d'Honnecourt - the only mediaeval architect's sketch book in existence - and a number of references, odd drawings and so on which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in Beowulf, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done.

Beginning with Alberti's famous book "Re Aedificataria". I dieci libri del Architettura", they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

Palladio

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi, Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings, and a variety of aesthetic theories which we find it difficult to-day to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX century. Few of these, however, are of any save of curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

Piranesi

We must not, however, forget T.B. Piranesi who from the middle of the XVIII century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archaeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the Views of Rome and the Views of the Prison House - the famous Carceri series, - the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

Du Cerceau

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. "Les Plus Excellents Bastiments de France" by Du Cerceau is our only record

Beginning with Alberti's famous book "Re Aedificataria". I dieci libri del Architettura", they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

Palladio

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi, Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings, and a variety of aesthetic theories which we find it difficult to-day to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX century. Few of these, however, are of any save of curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

Piranesi

We must not, however, forget T.B. Piranesi who from the middle of the XVIII century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archaeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the Views of Rome and the Views of the Prison House - the famous Carceri series, - the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

Du Cerceau

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. "Les Plus Excellents Bastiments de France" by Du Cerceau is our only record

of many great buildings since destroyed. In the seventeenth century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G.M. Oppenord, I.F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamental-ists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

Grand Blondel

Petit Blondel

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's Chief Grounds of Architecture, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, A booke of Sundry draughtes, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898 should be available. The English architects of the XVII century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian. The books of Monuments 4to, 1563, Architectura folio 1577, Perspective 4to, 1604. In the XVIII century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance owing to their influence on American colonial architecture.

J.Gibbs

J. Gibbs: Book of Architecture, fol. 1728 was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. The Vitruvius Britannicus in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's

Adams

Complete body of architecture. Adams' Works in Architecture, 3 vols. folio 1773, and his Spalato in 1 vol. folio are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been republished recently.

In addition to these works a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the XVIII and early XIX century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the Cabinet-makers and upholsterers guide, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books: Asher Benjamin's Country builder has been reproduced.

Asher B.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently not, strictly speaking, art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging, popular zoology and natural history books are full

Animals

of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people - by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present day heraldry - the arms of the Canadian provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the Armorial de Gelre of the XV and the Lindsay Armorial of the XVII century.

Lindsay
Memorial

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library - the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts, printing and book-binding. These are all library or literary arts - and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to the monumental letterings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of mediaeval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

Wood
blocks &
prints

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people to-day, even amongst those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is, I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected. The Kelmscote, the Doves, and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced to-day.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. Good Words for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains

illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also excellent examples of the old art of wood-engraving. The Morte-d'Arthur by Malory with illustrations by Beardsley is really far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book; it is an example of fine printing, an example of Beardsley's work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals because these contain beautiful woodcuts. So I suppose all one can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine books which may be scattered all over the library under various classes. This I think one should do. Indeed I feel that I am getting a little out of my depth. I can advise you on what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go to make a beautiful book.

A LIBRARY OF THE FINE ARTS

by

Ramsay Traquair, M.A., F.R.I.B.A.
Head of the Department of Architecture,
McGill University

A lecture delivered to the students of
the McGill University Library School on
Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

A LIBRARY OF THE FINE ARTS

The literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art, or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory, or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literature apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the

major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts, a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as any other provided that we do not try to stretch it too far, for both artists and the public use very different classifications for the different arts, and so our classification must follow theirs. We must classify according to place, time, artist and author.

In painting or sculpture the artist is of supreme importance. His works are often better known by his name than by their subject or by the place where they may happen to be. So we talk of "a Velasquez", of "Velasquez' King Philip", making Philip of Spain quite subordinate to the artist. But in architecture as a rule the building, or the place in which it stands is more important than the architect. We do not speak of a "fine Wren" or of "Wren's cathedral" when we mean St. Paul's in London. It is only scholars who ever study the works of Wren or of Sanmicheli or of any other great architect.

In the minor arts, such as costume or plaster modelling or stained glass, the artist is usually unknown and quite unconsidered, for such work is often the outcome of tradition and must be classified by place and time. So we talk of "English XVII century embroidery".

We do not attempt therefore to devise a logical system

of classification for books on the fine arts. Each art, each subject, will have its own suitable method based upon the manner in which the student is accustomed to approach the subject. Yet, even with the most elastic and carefully considered scheme, you will always find books which refuse to fit and readers who cannot find - perhaps more in the Fine Arts than in any other subject.

The library will serve three classes of readers; firstly the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate mouldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly we have the scholar who is investigating some school or period or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question

I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even amongst those who attempt research.

The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject matter, and upon the character of its author.

We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second hand. Photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is nevertheless second hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on are first hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first hand, but copies made by transcription are second hand.

Photo-
drawing -

So in architecture a library will at best have second hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good photographs, drawings, descriptions of the building, and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second hand authority is often of first hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and

I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even amongst those who attempt research.

The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject matter, and upon the character of its author.

We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second hand. Photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is nevertheless second hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on are first hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first hand, but copies made by transcription are second hand.

Photo-
drawing -

So in architecture a library will at best have second hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good photographs, drawings, descriptions of the building, and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second hand authority is often of first hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and

Boffrand

XVIII centuries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood it and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first hand authority for (1) XVIII century printing. (2) What Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's Livre d'Architecture is in many respects a primary authority.

Stuart &
Revett

To take another example. In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published "The Antiquities of Athens" in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance. The curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of colour, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Pennethorne or Lethaby. Most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph - the entasis, the construction of the walls, the

colour and so on; it required the minute examination of the archaeologist to discover them and to appreciate their importance.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures", that is competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

Painting
reproduction

But a library should have a good collection of first class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the colour and the texture of the originals and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring together the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the colour and so on. Of course this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time.

Illus. London
News

There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student.

Now all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that

the scholar must always appeal.

For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs and colour reproductions, - we cannot turn a library into a museum. Some of the illustrated papers of to-day publish magnificent colour plates and from the museums we can get collections of plates, catalogues and post-cards. These should be collected and classified. A big "scrap" collection of photographs, prints and illustrations cut from all kinds of publications is invaluable to the scholar and can be kept in a big file. It is unfortunately rather tiresome and difficult to keep up though thoroughly worth the trouble. Its classification should be as simple as possible. The scholar does not mind hunting a little. The collection of mounted photographs should be as large and as comprehensive as it can be made.

But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and text-books of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority". In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many

text-books omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books - unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now a text-book of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular hand-books have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular text-books written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts - guides to further reading - some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some text-books written for the use of university students. Some of these - not all by any means - seem to concentrate all the dullness possible to the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may for all that be very useful - as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but of course the groups shade into one another - even a popular book may contain first hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on mediaeval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and acholarly works.

Vitruvius Primary authorities are of course the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as Vitruvius, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived. The **Villars d'Honnec.** Sketch Book of Villars d'Honnecourt - the only mediaeval architect's sketch book in existence - and a number of references, odd drawings and so on which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in Beowulf, but, for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were self-conscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done.

Beginning with Alberti's famous book "Re Aedificataria". I dieci libri del Architettura", they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

Palladio

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi, Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings, and a variety of aesthetic theories which we find it difficult to-day to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX century. Few of these, however, are of any save of curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

Piranesi

We must not, however, forget T.B. Piranesi who from the middle of the XVIII century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archaeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the Views of Rome and the Views of the Prison House - the famous Carceri series, - the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of architecture ever produced.

Du Cerceau

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. "Les Plus Excellents Bastiments de France" by Du Cerceau is our only record

of many great buildings since destroyed. In the seventeenth century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G.M. Oppenord, I.F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamentalists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

Grand Blondel

Petit Blondel

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's Chief Grounds of Architecture, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, A booke of Sundry draughtes, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898 should be available. The English architects of the XVII century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian. The books of *Momuments* 4to, 1563, *Architectura* folio 1577, *Perspective* 4to, 1604. In the XVIII century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance owing to their influence on American colonial architecture.

J. Gibbs

J. Gibbs: Book of Architecture, fol. 1728 was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. The *Vitruvius Britannicus* in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's

Adams

Complete body of architecture. Adams' Works in Architecture, 3 vols. folio 1773, and his Spalato in 1 vol. folio are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been re-published recently.

In addition to these works a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the XVIII and aearly XIX century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the Cabinet-makers and upholsterers guide, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books: Asher Benjamin's Country builder has been reproduced.

Asher B.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently not, strictly speaking, art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging, popular zoology and natural history books are full

Animals

of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people - by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present day heraldry - the arms of the Canadian provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the Armorial de Gelre of the XV and the Lindsay Armorial of the XVII century.

Lindsay
Memorial

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library - the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts, printing and book-binding. These are all library or literary arts - and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to the monumental letterings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of mediaeval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

Wood
blocks &
prints

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people to-day, even amongst those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is, I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected. The Kelmscote, the Doves, and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced to-day.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. Good Words for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains

illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also excellent examples of the old art of wood-engraving. The Morte-d'Arthur by Malory with illustrations by Beardsley is really far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book; it is an example of fine printing, an example of Beardsley's work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals because these contain beautiful woodcuts. So I suppose all one can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine books which may be scattered all over the library under various classes. This I think one should do. Indeed I feel that I am getting a little out of my depth. I can advise you on what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go to make a beautiful book.

A LIBRARY OF THE FINE ARTS

by

Ramsay Traquair, M.A., F.R.I.B.A.
Head of the Department of Architecture,
McGill University.

A lecture delivered to the students of
the McGill University Library School on
Wednesday, March 21, 1928.

A LIBRARY OF THE FINE ARTS

The literature of the Fine Arts forms a very large class, so large indeed that independent libraries have been formed dealing only with quite small branches of the subject, whilst, if we were to attempt to include in our library every book which might be useful to the artist, the historian of art or to the enquiring public we should soon find our library expanding far beyond the reasonable limits of the subject, and probably of the building too.

The Fine Arts is the name which we give to all methods of conveying our emotions in a beautiful or an expressive manner; this is the full scope of the subject, but in practice a library of the Fine Arts includes only the visual arts. It does not include music, oratory, or poetry, the auditory arts or any arts which may be founded upon our less important emotions such as touch or smell or taste. For this there is good psychological reason. Our principal senses are sight and hearing and our principal emotions are derived from these senses. So we have raised these emotions to a very high point in our scheme of culture. But sight and hearing are quite distinct, so we keep their literatures apart and, by common consent, although a musician is an artist and music one of the great Fine Arts, yet the Library of the Fine Arts will devote itself to the Visual Arts.

The usual classification of these arts is into the major arts, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and the minor arts, a vague group including everything and every subject which can be made susceptible to artistic treatment. This classification is as good as ~~any other, and it is supplemented by a time classification, a place classification and a person classification.~~ In some arts, particu-

any other provided that we do not try to stretch it too far, For both artists and the public use very different classifications for the different arts and so our classification must follow theirs. We must classify according to place, time, artist and author.

In painting or sculpture the artist is of supreme importance. His works are often better known by his name than by their subject or by the place where they may happen to be. So we talk of "a Velasquez" of "Velasquez' King Philip," making Philip of Spain quite subordinate to the artist. But in architecture as a rule the building, or the place in which it stands is more important than the architect. We do not speak of "a fine Wren" or of "Wren's cathedral" when we mean St Paul's in London. It is only scholars who ever study the works of Wren or of Sanmicheli or of any other great architect.

In the minor arts, such as costume or plaster modelling or stained glass, the artist is usually unknown and quite unconsidered For such work is often the outcome of tradition and must be classified by place and time. So we talk of "English XVII century embroidery."

We do not attempt therefore to devise a logical system of classification for books on the fine arts. Each art, each subject, will ~~have~~ have its own suitable method based upon the manner in ~~which~~ which the student is accustomed to approach the subject. Yet, even with the most elastic and carefully considered scheme, you will always find books which refuse to fit and readers who cannot find- perhaps more in the Fine Arts than in any other subject.

larly in Painting and Sculpture, the artist is of almost supreme importance; in other arts, as in costume, or Mediaeval Architecture, or plaster modelling, the artist is usually unknown and unconsidered. We do not search for information on Rembrandt under the author's name, nor on Salisbury Cathedral under the name of the architect. If we already know a good deal we may know enough to consult Dr. Bode upon Rembrandt, but for Salisbury Cathedral no one would ever look up Mr. Gleeson White, who wrote a book upon that building. Indeed, excepting in one or two groups such as art criticism, or Philosophy of Aesthetic, the classification by authors is rather unimportant. Excepting in Painting and Sculpture the classification by artist is equally unimportant. It is in fact hardly possible to devise a thoroughly logical system of classification; we must arrange our catalogue so that books will be found where they are looked for.

*Expand?
or
place
later?*

The library will serve three classes of readers; firstly the general enquiring public who want a rapid oversight of the subject in a form easily understood and accessible. Not for them the finer points of historical accuracy or artistic criticism. They must have something easily assimilated, with plenty of illustrations and only a few dates. Then we must supply the student with accurate and scholarly information, partially digested at any rate, thorough and as exhaustive as possible, but made accessible for him. The practising architect who wants to get accurate mouldings and drawings of specific old buildings, the theatrical producer who wants to know exactly how to costume and set an Elizabethan drama; these people want exact and accurate information, but it must be prepared for them in most cases by scholars. Thirdly we

have the scholar who is investigating some school, or period, or style of art; he must have the best authority that can be obtained, first hand if possible.

So we come to the question of authority, a question I am sorry to say, only very partially understood by many even amongst those who attempt research.

The authority of a book depends upon its nearness to the subject matter, and upon the character of its author.

We may consider this as it applies to architecture. The only first hand authority in this case is the building itself. No opinion or writing obviously can have the authority of the building. If I want to know something about it, I go and examine it.

But the building may have been altered or destroyed. In that case the best available authority is second hand, Photographs, drawings and descriptions made before the alteration. If these were made by a skilled architect their value is very great indeed, but it is nevertheless second hand. Contemporary records, building accounts, and so on are first hand records for what they tell us, facsimile copies of them may be regarded as first hand, but copies made by transcription are second hand.

Photo -

Drawing -

So in architecture a library will at best have second hand authority. We cannot have the building, we can rarely have the originals of historic documents, but we can have good photographs, drawings, descriptions of the building, and carefully transcribed copies of documents. If we are specializing in any particular epoch we may try to have facsimiles of important documents.

Second hand authority is often of first hand value. For instance, the architects and decorators of the XVII and XVIII cent-

uries in France published a very large number of very large and elaborately illustrated books dealing with architecture as they understood^{it} and illustrating work done by them. Le Sieur Boffrand published in Paris in 1745 a volume giving complete drawings of the Hôtel Soubise. Now this book is a first hand authority for (1) XVIII century printing. (2) What ~~le Sieur~~ Boffrand and his contemporaries thought about architecture. (3) What decoration ~~le Sieur~~ Boffrand wanted to use in the Hôtel Soubise. On examining the building we can discover what he was actually allowed to execute and what alterations, if any, he had to make. So Boffrand's Livre d'Architecture is in many respects a primary authority.

Stuart &
Revett

To take another example. In 1762 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett published "The Antiquities of Athens" in four folio volumes. These are composed of large engraved plates very carefully drawn, measured to the second decimal of an inch and fully figured. They include all the important buildings of Greek antiquity in Athens. Now these volumes are undoubtedly of great value still, but careful examination of the buildings has since shown that Stuart and Revett did not see, or did not notice, many points of importance. The curved entasis of the column, the construction of the frieze, the use of colour, and so on. So Stuart and Revett's great work has had to be supplemented by many later writers, such as Pennethorne or Lethaby. Curious [?] ~~ly enough~~ most of the points unnoticed by Stuart would have been equally unnoticed in any ordinary photograph - the entasis, the construction of the walls, the colour and so on; ~~It~~ it required the minute examination of the archaeologist to discover them and to appreciate their importance.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures", that is competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

Painting
Reproduction

But a library should have a good collection of first class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the colour and the texture of the originals and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring together the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the colour and so on. Of course this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time.

Ill. Lond.
News

There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student.

Modern illustrated papers. - For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs - the largest procurable.

cf. Nat. Mus.
P. art +
N.Y. P.L.

Now all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal.

In the art of Painting we leave to the Art Galleries the task of collecting original works, though a few typical pictures might well form a part of an art library. Such pictures should be what are known as "good school pictures", that is competent works of known periods chosen to show the technique and by unknown or unimportant painters. There is no need for a collection of old masters.

Painting
Reproduction

But a library should have a good collection of first class reproductions. The best of these reproduce in an astonishing degree the colour and the texture of the originals and as they can be handled much more freely than the originals, they enable certain examinations to be made which could hardly be attempted otherwise. A critic, for instance, can bring together the work of a painter whose pictures are scattered throughout the galleries of Europe and America; he can examine them side by side and draw his conclusions from the technique, the manner of drawing, the colour and so on. Of course this does not take the place of an examination of the originals, but it may save the critic a great deal of expense and loss of time.

Ill. Lond.
News

There is already in London a library of reproductions which has proved its value to the student.

Modern illustrated papers. - For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs; it is impossible to turn a library into a museum, but it should have a large classified collection of mounted photographs - the largest procurable.

cf. Nat. Mus.
P. art +
N.Y. P.L.

Now all this body of material constitutes what we may call primary authority, and it is to primary authority that the scholar must always appeal.

For the minor arts and for sculpture we must depend upon photographs and colour reproductions,- we cannot turn a library into a museum. Some of the illustrated papers of today publish magnificent colour plates and from the museums we can get collections of plates, catalogues and postcards. These should be collected, and classified. A big "scrap" collection of photographs, prints and illustrations cut from all kinds of publications is invaluable to the scholar and can be kept in a big file. It is unfortunately rather tiresome and difficult to keep up though thoroughly worth the trouble. Its classification should be as simple as possible. The scholar does not mind hunting a little. The collection of mounted photographs should be as large and as comprehensive as it can be made.

But the ordinary student requires to have his material digested for him. He cannot undertake the task of collating the contemporary descriptions, building accounts, inscriptions, drawings, present day photographs and sketches which form the primary literary authorities for, let us say, Chartres Cathedral. This task is done for him by scholars. So we have standard works and textbooks of every variety of quality and treatment. When these have been written by competent men they form "secondary authority". In books of this class every important statement will be supported by a reference, usually a footnote, to the primary source. Many textbooks omit this mass of references, substituting generally a good bibliography of the authoritative works on the subject, and most of us accept the statements and conclusions of these books - unless we have reason to suspect otherwise. Now a textbook of this description is much too heavy reading for the person who wants only a casual knowledge of some form or period of art. So, to suit him, a very large number of popular handbooks have been produced dealing with the history, development, forms and uses of every branch of the fine arts. These vary from popular textbooks written by genuine scholars to compendiums written by industrious compilers. Some are well written, are a pleasure to read and give a wide view of the subject useful to the scholar, the student and the public alike, some are mere dictionaries of the arts - guides to further reading - some are so full of mistakes that they are worthless for any serious reading. The very worst, I am afraid, are some textbooks written for the use of university students. Some of these - not all by any means -

seem to concentrate all the dulness possible in the subject without attaining any accuracy thereby.

A very large number are compendiums. The writers have no direct knowledge of the works discussed, and have merely brought together facts discovered and theories originated by others. Such works, even if by eminent names, cannot be quoted as authorities, but they may for all that be very useful - as compendiums.

Finally, of course, there is a great deal of literature on the Fine Arts which is of no value whatever, books and articles written up from popular works, generally full of mistakes and to be avoided carefully.

I have enumerated three main groups of literature, but of course the groups shade into one another - even a popular book may contain first hand information. I once found the foreshadowing of an interesting artistic theory in a volume of the Home University Library. It was written by a very distinguished authority on mediaeval art, and the theory was not mentioned at all in his more important and scholarly works.

Vitruvius

Primary authorities are of course the most difficult to get. There are very few contemporary books on the arts previous to the Renaissance. We have such books as Vitruvius, the only Roman book on architecture which has survived. The Sketch Book of Villars d'Honnecourt - the only mediaeval architect's sketch book in existence - and a number of references, odd drawings and so on which have been collected and published. Pliny gives a description of his villa in one of his letters; there are descriptions of old Viking houses in Beowulf, but,

Villars

d'Honnec.

for the arts before the year 1500 we are in the main dependent upon the remains of the works which have come down to us.

With the coming of the Renaissance this changed completely. The Renaissance artists were selfconscious and had a passion for explaining why and how everything should be done. Beginning with Alberti's famous book "Re Aedificataria. I dieci libri del Architettura", they poured out a flood of books which, with variations in the manner of production, has continued to this day.

Palladio

The principal early Italian authors were Alberti, whom I have mentioned, Serlio, Scamozzi Vignola and Palladio. All of these were translated into English during the XVIII century. Their works contain dissertations on the Orders, drawings of buildings, and a variety of aesthetic theories which we find it difficult today to understand.

For the painters we have Vasari's famous lives published in 1550. It has also been translated. A number of drawings of celebrated pictures were published during the XVII and XVIII centuries, culminating in the steel engravings of the XIX century. Few of these, however, are of any save curiosity value. They have been completely superseded by modern reproductions.

Piranesi

We must not however forget T.B. Piranesi who from the middle of the XVIII century produced a most magnificent series of etchings of buildings in Rome and Italy. These are of considerable archaeological value, in addition to their purely artistic merits. His most famous works are the Views of Rome and the Views of the Prison House - the famous Carceri series, - the latter considered to be the finest imaginative drawings of

architecture ever produced.

Du Cerceau

French architects were even more prolific. For the XVI century we have de l'Orme and Du Cerceau. "Les Plus Excellents Bastiments de France" by Du Cerceau is our only record of many great buildings since destroyed. In the seventeenth century the number is too great to enumerate. The most important are perhaps Le Muet, Le Pautre, I. Maret, D. Maret, G.M. Oppenord,

Grand Blondel

Petis Blondel

I.F. Blondel. Many of these were ornamentalists of that great school of decorators who flourished in France during the XVIII century. It is quite impossible to gain any knowledge of French Renaissance architecture without reference to these books. Fortunately the most important have been reproduced in facsimile.

English architecture is less extensively illustrated. The earliest known authority is the collection of drawings in the Sloane Museum known as John Thorpe's. These were drawn during the XVII century and represent both actual houses and designs not carried out. These have been published in part in various periodicals. John Shute's Chief grounds of Architecture, 1563 folio, W. Gedde, A booke of Sundry draughtes, 1612, 8vo. reissued in 1898, should be available. The English architects of the XVII century took much inspiration from the Dutch books on architecture, and ornamental pattern-books and the works of Jan Vredeman de Vries are of first importance to the historian. The books of Monuments 4to, 1563, Architectura folio 1577, Perspective 4to, 1604. In the XVIII century a number of important books were issued, some of which are of great importance

owing to their influence on American colonial architecture.

Gibbs

J. Gibbs: Book of Architecture. fol. 1728 was in the library of every eighteenth architect on this continent. The Vitruvius Britannicus in 5 vols. folio of 1715 to 1771. Ware's Complete body of architecture. Adams' Works in Architecture, 3 vols. folio 1773, and his Spalato in 1 vol. folio are all of great importance. Adams' drawings and almost all the original drawings of Sir Christopher Wren's work have been republished recently.

Adams

In addition to these works a large number of engravings representing buildings and public monuments were published during the XVIII and early XIX century. These should be obtained whenever possible.

There are not very many early publications on the minor arts. Some of the English furniture makers published books illustrating their products. Heppelwhite produced the Cabinet-makers and upholsterers guide, and we have publications by the famous Chippendale. Of American books: Asher Benjamin's Country builder has been reproduced.

Asher B.

It would be impossible in any but the very largest library to form a really good collection of these old books. Many of them are very rare and very expensive. Some of them only occasionally come into the market. It is possibly the best plan to concentrate upon one particular class, say French XVIII century or English source books until that class has been fairly well represented. In all cases facsimile reproductions are quite as good as original editions.

In the so-called minor arts the librarian has another difficulty. The source books for these are frequently not strictly

Animals

speaking not art books at all. The designer requires a good illustrated botany, books on ship construction and rigging, popular zoology and natural history books are full of photographs of animals which are of use to him; he requires an occasional reference to classic mythology, and one has to decide how much of this varied material should be included in an art library. Good illustrated books on zoology and botany are certainly a necessity.

The literature of Heraldry must not be forgotten, though I believe that it is now usually classed as history. Heraldry is studied by two kinds of people - by genealogists and by decorative artists. The genealogist is interested mainly in persons and in the past, the artist requires good information on present day heraldry - the arms of the Canadian Provinces, of the American States, the flags and badges of states and countries. He must have for his use the best possible drawings of all these, and they must be correct. Fortunately the literature of Heraldry is fairly complete. Many of the early rolls and armorials have been reproduced, for instance the Armorial de Gelre the XV and the Lindsay Armorial of the XVII century.

Lindsay
Armorial

Amongst the minor arts is a group which is peculiarly the property of the library - the arts of the book. Regardless of subject books may be works of art in themselves, and the group includes Manuscript, Epigraphy, Illumination, the reproductive arts printing and bookbinding. These are all library or literary arts - and in them the library must be its own museum.

So we should include cut, painted or stamped characters from cuneiform and hieroglyph to the monumental letterings of

the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Manuscripts will include not only the beautifully written and illuminated works of mediaeval times, but also good examples of typical handwritings of all procurable periods.

Wood
blocks
&
Prints

The reproductive arts require not only books describing the methods and technique of production, but also examples of prints in various stages and of the plates or blocks from which they are printed. Very few people today, even amongst those who profess some artistic perception, can tell the difference between an engraving and a mezzotint, a soft ground etching, a hard ground etching and a dry point, or know exactly how a lithograph is produced.

Bookbindings need only be mentioned. Until the XIX century the publishers did not usually bind the books; this was done for each customer as he wished it, and the result was a great profusion of private bindings, many of them very beautiful.

Types and presses are another large subject. We may only have a page from a Caxton book, but it is I believe, now possible to get in portfolio form actual pages from most of the old presses, showing the type, the spacing and placing. The modern presses should not be neglected. The Kelmscote, The Doves, and so on. Some very fine printing is being produced today.

It is difficult to know how to handle this material. Much of it occurs in publications now of no value save for their illustrations or type. Good Words for 1868, for instance, is not sought after as a magazine, but it contains illustrations by Millais, Burne-Jones, Whistler and Tenniel which are also ex-

cellent examples of the old art of wood-engraving. The Morte-
d'Arthur by Malory with illustrations by Beardsley is really
far more important as a Beardsley book than as a Malory book;
it is an example of fine printing, and example of Beardsley's
work rather than a famous romance.

But many books belong equally to two places. The botanists
would hardly like you to rob them of all their old herbals be-
cause these contain beautiful woodcuts. So I suppose all one
can do is to make a cross index giving references to the fine
books which may be scattered all over the library under various
classifications. This I think one should do. Indeed I feel
that I am getting a little out of ^{my} depth. I can advise you on
what architectural books or what fine reproductions should be
in a library of the fine arts, but you should know far better
than I do the history of typography and all the arts which go
to make a beautiful book.