REMARKS

ON THE

INTENDED RESTORATION

OF THE

PARTHENON OF ATHENS

AS THE

NATIONAL MONUMENT

OF

SCOTLAND.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED FOR
ARCHIBALD CONSTABLE AND CO. EDINBURGH;
AND HURST, ROBINSON, AND CO.
LONDON.

1824.

In a discussion on the various styles of architecture in the Quarterly Review, October 1822, the Reviewers take an opportunity of declaring their decided hostility to the restoration of the Parthenon as the National Monument of Scotland, and likewise to the introduction of pure Grecian architecture, as unsuitable to modern times. Though distinguished by much eloquence and research, and many excellent remarks, the general scope of the doctrines inculcated, and inferences attempted to be drawn, must appear to every unprejudiced reader, who has any acquaintance with the subject, full of paradox and sophistry. An able an-

swer appeared in the Edinburgh Review, (February 1823,) superseding the necessity of a particular refutation ; yet, in the following desultory remarks, the Author will occasionally find it necessary to allude to some of the subjects already discussed.

Edinburgh, 20th June, 1824.

REMARKS, &c.

At the conclusion of the late war, it was in contemplation to raise a splendid edifice in the Metropolis or its vicinity, as a National Monument, in commemoration of the Naval and Military Achievements of the British Arms. The proposal was at first countenanced by the Legislature, and a sum of money, it is believed, actually voted by Parliament, for carrying it into effect; but whether the enthusiasm excited by the battle of Waterloo was allowed to cool, or some unforeseen obstacle occurred, the scheme was ultimately abandoned, no farther proceedings having taken place.

In the northern part of the island a similar proposal was agitated, for erecting a Scottish National Monument at Edinburgh. A considerable sum was obtained by private contributions, before any definite plan was fixed. Some suggested a Modern Church, some a Roman Triumphal Arch, others a fanciful Gothic Edifice.* It occurred at length to a few public-spirited individuals, of more refined taste, that a restoration of the Parthenon of Athens would be the most eligible ; and that the Calton-hill, from its resemblance to the Acropolis of Athens, should be chosen as the site. This suggestion, which at first encountered violent opposition, continued gradually to gain ground, till, at a General Meeting of Subscribers, a resolution to that effect was at last carried by a great majority. Several in-

---

* Of this kind may be mentioned an ingenious and beautifully finished Gothic model, on a large scale, executed after the designs of Mr Spalding, Heriot Row

dividuals of the minority protested against the measure, and threatened to withdraw their contributions unless a Church were adopted. No idea, however, was then entertained of occupying the intended restoration as an ordinary place of public worship. The dissentients, it would appear, withdrew their support, because they had been originally led to suppose, that the plan would embrace a modern church, in which event they had calculated on acquiring a right to pews, in proportion to the amount of their subscriptions. This was the real ground of opposition. Matters remained in this state for nearly a year, when it was announced, probably with the view of uniting all parties, that a Meeting of the Committee of the "National Monument, held at London, the 24th April, 1822, had resolved, in unison with the original views and intentions of the Subscribers, to make it (the proposed restoration of the Parthenon) comprehend a place of divine worship,

where the Contributors, and also his Majesty's Forces, both Sailors and Soldiers, stationed in and about Edinburgh, who have no adequate provision of the kind, might be accommodated."

Lord Binning brought the subject before the House of Commons, Session 1822, by presenting a petition, praying that a sum of £10,000 might be granted, in aid of the National Monument, out of the funds already voted by Parliament *for the building of Churches.* Sir George Clerk supported the petition, and stated, as a powerful recommendation, that it was the *intention of the Committee to set apart* 1500 *seats gratis, for the use of the Public.* It was observed, by several members who opposed its reception, that the petition came with a bad grace from such a quarter, after the large grants already voted by Parliament for the Caledonian Canal, College of Edinburgh, and other public works. That it could not be expected the people of England and Ireland, al-

ready borne down by distress and taxation, should be burdened still more for the purpose of raising a National Monument for Scotland—much less under the plausible pretext of erecting a place of divine worship; for had that been their real object, it would have been incumbent on them, instead of applying £10,000 to the partial construction of one very expensive and ornamental structure for the embellishment of the city of Edinburgh, to have expended it on building several plain Churches, equally and perhaps better suited to every purpose of true religion. Mr Gurney opposed the grant, because he thought the building would turn out a "*poor meagre and miserable imitation of the Parthenon.*" His Lordship, finding such determined opposition, without a shadow of support even from the Ministerial benches, withdrew the petition, though, it is understood, with the intention of again presenting it at a more favourable opportunity.

The Quarterly Reviewers, with much naiveté, assign a different and rather extraordinary motive for the rejection of the petition :—" Our readers are aware, that upon a late application for Parliamentary aid, a proposed grant of £10,000 was refused to the Committee of Subscribers. Upon financial grounds, the opposition was captious and futile in the extreme, and such as could never have been engendered but by the comfortable spirit of contradiction, which it is difficult to resist; but if we are to examine the project as lovers of architecture, we must cordially acknowledge, that the propriety of sanctioning such a restoration as is now proposed, deserves serious consideration. In a circular printed letter, to which several signatures, purporting to be the signatures of the Sub-committee, are affixed, it is stated."—(Here follows a quotation from the circular, which it is unnecessary to repeat.) " The names subscribed to the letter command so much of our respect and esteem,

that we feel considerable difficulty in venturing to state our doubts respecting the expediency of the scheme. *We confess, however, that we earnestly hope that it will prove abortive;* but our ill wishes arise solely from the respect which we bear towards the country, which has produced the worth and excellence of those by whom the plan is understood to have been recommended." —Should such reasons appear not altogether satisfactory or conclusive to our northern capacities, we must at least concede to the learned authors the praise of candour, and the merit of having expressed their dissent, with all the insinuating flattery, and polished address, of the most finished courtiers.

In the *Courier* of the 31st July, 1822, it was stated, that the Royal assent had been given to the Bill for erecting the National Monument of Scotland, as a *fac simile* of the Parthenon, and that the *public was to be accommodated with* 3000 *seats.* But the

Act of Parliament makes no provision whatever for the restoration of the Parthenon, to which there is not throughout the slightest allusion. It declares, (page first,) " And, whereas it is expedient that this Monument should comprehend a place of divine worship, for the use of the Contributors to its erection, and of his Majesty's Naval and Military Forces, stationed in its vicinity, thus increasing the number of places of public worship, and thereby furthering one great object of the Royal and paternal solicitude of his Majesty, and of the wishes of Parliament." It is afterwards enacted, (page 25,) " That the said Association, or their Committee of Management, shall and may build and erect, or cause to be built or erected, upon the grounds and premises to be acquired by them, as before mentioned, a building or erection, buildings or erections, of ornamental architecture, *appropriate to the purposes of a National Monument as aforesaid, in such manner, and upon such*

plan or plans, as they shall see fit. Provided always, and be it enacted, That part of the said building or erection, buildings or erections, shall be appropriated as a Church, or place of divine worship, to be maintained in all time by the said Association."—A Church, or place of divine worship, is thus most anxiously provided for, *whatever plan may be adopted;* but there is no notice taken *of* 3000, *or even* 1500 *seats, or* any seats at all, being set apart for the accommodation of the public. Perhaps we may be told it is not the custom in such Acts of Parliament, to restrict the parties to any precise plan. Be it so; yet why then should the Contributors be tied down to make the building comprehend a place of divine worship? for a National Monument does not necessarily include a Church. The truth is, this clause seems to have been introduced in so prominent a manner, for the sole purpose of securing a participation in the Parliamentary fund for the building of

churches, and "thereby *furthering one great object of the Royal and paternal solicitude of his Majesty, and of the wishes of Parliament.*" Whether it will have the desired effect remains to be seen.

If, however, the interior must be converted into an ordinary place of worship, it is to be hoped a large part of the area will be thrown open to the public, without any reservation. With regard to the boon held out to his Majesty's Forces, on which so much stress is laid, when we consider the average peace establishment, naval and military, on this station—the military consisting of half a regiment of foot in the Castle of Edinburgh, two or three troops of dragoons at Piershill, and a handful of artillery-men at Leith Fort—all of whom have convenient access to divine worship, which, in point of fact, they regularly attend—the naval consisting of the crew of one guard ship, moored in Leith Roads, at the distance of four miles from the Calton-Hill—when we consider all

these circumstances, it is really not very probable that either description of his Majesty's Forces will be in a situation to avail themselves of such a privilege.*

Should the application for parliamentary aid be again resumed, it ought not to appear under the questionable shape of a claim on the fund set apart for the building of Churches—a pretext which must be at once seen through—but an appeal to the Legislature in its real and proper character of a National Monument. It has been publicly announced, on the authority of the Committee, that his Majesty, when in Scotland, recommended a renewal of the application to Parliament. If his Majesty really patronizes the measure, the result cannot, of course, be doubtful. The Committee would, however, do well not to

---

* Though the site on the Calton-hill be peculiarly appropriate for a Grecian Temple and National Monument, it must be exceedingly inconvenient for an ordinary place of worship. The ascent on either side is very much exposed to the weather, besides being so steep as to preclude all access to carriages and chairs, without making a long circuit.

trust too much to ministerial promises or Parliamentary aid, but use their most strenuous exertions to fix the attention, and rouse the enthusiasm, of the public. It is now more than a year and a half since the act of Parliament was passed. The foundation of the edifice has been already laid, with all due circumstance of pomp and ceremony, by Commissioners specially appointed by his Majesty. Contributions to a large amount have been obtained. The Directors and Committees hold frequent meetings. The structure is on the eve of being commenced. Yet it is not a little extraordinary, that in none of the circulars or notices published by the Committees, or Sub-committees, is there the slightest allusion to the subject of sculpture, or how it is proposed to reconcile the usual conveniences and accompaniments of a modern Church, with the simple grandeur and severe beauty of a Grecian Doric Temple. In a question of so much importance, involving so much difficulty and delicacy of exe-

cution, and on which the ultimate success of the undertaking may possibly hinge, it is matter of surprise that they should not have been more explicit. There can be no excuse for precipitation; but, in the mean time, without relaxing their efforts to obtain contributions, their duty, both to the Contributors and the Public, should prompt them to lose no time in procuring the designs and opinions of the most eminent artists and architects, in reference to the details and execution of the plan, *and particularly to the subject of a national sculpture.* After giving them publicity, along with the result of their own deliberations, let them patiently await the opinion of the public, and avail themselves of the suggestions of men of taste and learning wherever they are to be found.

It is easy to talk of *restoration and imitation*—of a work of art being *after the model or manner* of another, and so forth—modes of expression in high favour with dilettanti

and professional men, and admitting of much latitude and modification, according to their different tastes and opinions. We are told, for instance, in the Guide to the Metropolis, when describing the façade of Covent-Garden Theatre, Bow Street, that the architect, Mr Smirke, junior, took *for his model the finest specimen from the ruins of Athens, the grand Temple of Minerva*, situated on the Acropolis. In a recent periodical publication, the new church of St Pancras is mentioned, as "the finest edifice that has been built in England on *purely Grecian principles of architecture*, and with *strict adherence to the Grecian model.* It is designed from the Erectheum, or Triple Temple, on the Acropolis of Athens, the eastern portico of which was dedicated to Erectheus, the sixth King of Athens—the western to Minerva Polias, and the wing to Pandrosus, the grand-daughter of Erectheus. The tower, or steeple, is *after the manner* of the Temple of the Winds, also at Athens, *and follows as*

closely as possible the classic beauty of that celebrated building—its form being octagonal, *consisting of two stories*, supported by eight pillars—the whole surmounted by a cross. The vestibule of the Church is *a correct representation* of the interior of the Temple of the Winds. The interior is chaste and appropriate. Its form is semicircular, in the recess of which is the altar. There are two side galleries, supported by eight antique pillars. The whole of the pews are of oak!" Accordingly, we have only to betake ourselves to Bow Street, of classic notoriety, and then to the purlieus of Russel Square and the City-road, to behold modern restorations of the finest edifices that anciently adorned the Acropolis, viz. the Parthenon, the Temples of Erechtheus and Pandroseum, with the Temple or Tower of the Winds into boot. A difficulty, indeed, might be started as to the propriety of clapping the Tower of the Winds, which was situated in Athens, but not on the Acropo-

lis, on the top of another temple, with which it had no connexion or analogy. But then this would be regarded as mere envy and cavilling at the superior taste and original conceptions of modern architects. Unfortunately, however, when we compare them with their originals, we must be convinced, after making ample allowance for transposition and modification, that they bear little or no resemblance in form or general character. The only points of similarity are, in the one the Grecian proportions of the four Doric columns and entablature of the scanty portico of Bow Street, in the other the mere portico of the church and the four caryatides of the little temple of Pandrosus, attached, without any meaning, to each flank of the Cella. But does the addition of a Grecian portico transform a building into Grecian, which could, in other respects, have no pretensions to the title? or do four pillars and a pediment of the order and proportions of those of the Parthenon, attached to a fa-

çade of a totally different kind, metamorphose it into that of the building from which the columns were borrowed? Restoration implies a strict adherence to general form and character, as well as an attention to minute details of proportion and execution. Both must combine to ensure success. A finical and affected display of the latter in particular parts cannot compensate a total neglect of the former. With regard to Caryatides or Persians, the Temple of Pandrosus at Athens, and the celebrated Persian portico at Sparta, alluded to by ancient authors, (of which no vestige now remains,) are the only examples in Grecian architecture of human figures being substituted for columns in the support of an entablature. The remains of Thessalonica described by Stuart, though apparently of the same kind, are suspected to have been the production of a later age. Besides, the Temple of Pandrosus owed its origin to the casual circumstance of a laurel, sacred to Minerva, having

flourished on the spot over which the portico was raised as a protection. It has no affinity in style or character with the edifice to which it is attached. It was hardly, therefore, a legitimate subject for restoration; especially when united to a modern building like St Pancras. It might with equal propriety be applied to St Martin's, St George's, or any other church of the metropolis. The Tower of St Pancras has three stories, and, except its octagonal shape, bears no similarity whatever to the Tower of the Winds, which is an octagon of one story, and celebrated chiefly for its roof and sculpture. The Tower of the Winds, too, is a detached building, standing on its own foundation; nor would it have entered into the imagination of a Greek architect of the most corrupt period to have hoisted it on the top of an Ionic temple of the Acropolis. To atone for such trifling deviations and anomalies, we are presented with a *correct restoration of the interior of the Tower of the*

Winds in the vestibule of the church! and *two ranges of tapering windows* in the walls of the Cella, in imitation of three in the west front of the Minerva Polias!—the only example of windows in such a situation to be found in the Grecian remains. In short, the classical effect of the Portico of St Pancras, how handsome soever it may be in itself, is completely neutralized by the tower or spire, and the other accompaniments of a modern church.

Since the revival of Roman architecture by the great Italian architects, and the access in later times to the purer models of Greece, how few of the celebrated ruins of antiquity have been successfully imitated, far less restored. Architecture is, for obvious reasons, more limited by fixed principles and mathematical precision, and affords, in the proportions of its component parts, as well as their combination, less legitimate scope for the fancy than any of the other

arts. Yet, unfortunately, its professors have in all ages been remarkable for capricious innovation and vain attempts, from a desire of originality, to alter what they cannot improve—propensities " that would seem to prevent perfection from being stationary for any length of time in the works of man." This rage for novelty and repugnance to correct imitation, has introduced a variable and corrupt taste, and engendered a species of architecture in modern Europe, —Italy even not excepted,—neither Grecian nor Roman, but a vicious compound of both, mixed up with many later innovations. It is remarked by Gibbon, that " genius may anticipate, but the artist cannot hope to equal or surpass, till he has learned to imitate the works of his predecessors." The Pantheon and its unrivalled Portico, " shining inimitable upon earth,"—designed and measured by architects and amateurs of all nations, have never yet been restored, either

in whole or in part, in their purity and real dimensions.*

Before proceeding to the subject of the Restoration of the Parthenon as the National Monument of Scotland, it may be necessary, for the sake of perspicuity, to enter into a short detail of the different styles of architecture.

---

* Forsyth observes, when treating of the modern architecture of Rome, that "man, though the child of imitation, imitates with reluctance: his ambition as an artist, is to invent. In architecture, however, the grand objects of invention are anticipated—the constitutive parts and portions are already fixed; the mind must circulate round those, and must be satisfied with innovations only in combinations. The artist must recur to the models established in his art, and from them he derives notions of excellence which confine him but the more. He cannot safely depart from those models; yet he grudges every approach that he makes. 'His poverty, and not his will consents.' Whatever he steals he disfigures. He changes the scale; he transposes the parts; he tries to efface the marks of the original master, and inserts something of his own to hide the theft. No other principle can account to me for the degenerate architecture of a city which contains the Pantheon; or why *artists should daily borrow the details of that edifice,* and never adopt the simplicity of its design."—FORSYTH'S *Italy, p.* 178.

The Greeks are supposed to have been indebted to the Egyptians for their first knowledge of architecture, and probably to the Phœnicians for the subsequent improvement of the column. From the slight allusions to architectural subjects in the Iliad and Odyssey, it would appear that the art had made little progress, except in the working and carving of wood. Mr Wilkins* is of opinion, that according to the most probable results, its origin in Greece may be fixed at some interval between the 863 and 821 years before Christ. Before that period temples and public buildings were constructed chiefly of wood; and it was only the walls of cities, treasuries, and other buildings calculated for protection or defence, that were built of vast blocks of stone, such as the walls of Tiryns and remains of Mycenæ, a species of masonry

---

* Topography of Athens.

which has been designated Cyclopean. But whatever may be the precise era of its introduction, it must have arrived, in a comparatively short period, at great perfection —affording a remarkable contrast to the gradual progress of the Gothic. The Grecian orders indeed, continued to receive in after ages additional lightness, symmetry, and elegance, till sculptural decoration shed its highest grace. Yet the general character and leading features are to be found in the early specimens of the Doric of the European, and the Ionic of the Asiatic Greeks, which remained unimpaired for many centuries.* And it is astonishing with what invincible constancy, and almost

---

* Modern writers on the art seem to think nothing more is required, than to lay down certain precise and pedantic rules, for the relative proportions of the different orders, the slightest infringement of which they regard as downright heresy. Yet among the Greeks and Romans there was no fixed standard; the examples of each being found to vary more or less from others of the same class, though the individual character of each order was invariably preserved.

religious enthusiasm, each nation adhered to that of its own invention, as if conscious of having attained the desired perfection, and anxious to preserve it inviolate. The Corinthian, though Grecian in its origin, was little practised in Greece till the Macedonian conquest, when taste had begun to decline. It became, however, the favourite order of the Romans, who carried it to great perfection. With regard to what are called the Tuscan and Composite, they can be viewed in no other light than corruptions—the former of the Doric—the latter of the Ionic and Corinthian.

The next important era in the history of the art, is the modification of Grecian architecture by the Romans, from the conquest of Greece to the decline of the Empire. The brightest period of Grecian art, included the lives of Pericles and Alexander. After the death of the latter, the arts gradually declined. The Macedonian Conquest introduced much additional magnifi-

cence at the expense of the ancient simplicity and purity of taste. The Roman Conquest hastened the progress of corruption. The Romans imitated, it is true, the architecture of Greece, and employed Grecian architects for that purpose; but a sensible deviation from the style of their masters is observable in most of their works. Columns were latterly calculated more for ornament than use. They adorned the wall, or at most supported the pediment; in the Grecian, they supported the edifice, and formed the wall itself.* Amidst the splendid structures and gorgeous display of Imperial magnificence, the marks of barbarism

---

* "The Doric appears here (Rome) in very few monuments, and is so Latinised, that we lose the original order. In the Roman Temples, columns were a mere decoration, or, at most, supported the pediment alone. In the Greek, they were an integral part of the edifice, not engaged in the wall, but the wall itself. Hence arose a necessary difference in their proportions. At Rome, the Doric is about $7\frac{1}{2}$ diameters—At Athens, the greatest height of the columns is about 6—At Pestum, $4\frac{1}{2}$—At Corinth, 4."—FORSYTH's *Italy, p.* 166-7.

are sufficiently conspicuous, when compared with Grecian models. " It is only necessary to compare the Doric and Ionic of the Greeks with the Roman orders of the same name, to be struck with the decided superiority of the former, not only in the form and execution of the parts in detail, but in the chaste grandeur and symmetrical effect as a whole. In the Roman, the ornaments and mouldings are crowded and meagre; the curvilinear profiles being segments of a circle. In the Grecian, they are simple and well defined; the echinus and ovolo assuming uniformly the more varied and elegant contours of the conic sections."* The Grecian Doric in particular, displays in its contrast, variety and chaste symmetry, a striking example of architectural richness and beauty, independent in a certain degree of sculptural decoration—the moulded

---

* Edinburgh Magazine, July 1821.—*Parthenon, p. 50.*

capital, the fluted shaft—the frize naturally rich by the distribution of triglyphs—the repose of the broad and massive architrave —the whole crowned with the well proportioned cornice and mutules. Yet, it must be admitted, the Romans improved the Corinthian ; and by the successful combination of the arcade and column, laid the foundation of a new and original order—capable of great variety and magnificence, but which, being essentially different in character, ought not to be confounded with the pure Grecian style.

The third era, is its restoration by the great Italian architects,—Brunelleschi Bramante, Michel Angelo, Julio Romano, Palladio, Bernini, &c. and their followers in the other countries of Europe. In England, Inigo Jones and Sir Christopher Wren, were the most distinguished of that school. It is founded entirely on a study of the Roman remains, and necessarily retains all their defects. Like their masters too, they

did not imitate correctly, but indulged in frequent deviations, and fanciful inventions, thus removing it still farther from its original standard.* We are indebted, however, to the Italian masters, for the application of the dome to a peculiar modification of the Roman in Ecclesiastical Architecture, of which St Peter's at Rome is the finest specimen. The dome would appear to be of Eastern invention. Circular temples with cupolas, were indeed frequent in Italy, and Pausanias makes several allusions to them in Greece; but the circular temple, supported on walls, can scarcely be assimilated to the modern dome raised on high, resting on pillars or arcades, though it may have suggested the idea of its construction. The first example of the modern dome, is that

---

* The modern pedestal is but a corrupt innovation of the ancient *stylobata*. The only examples of pedestals in the Roman remains, are those of the pillars of Trajan and Antoninus, which in other respects exhibit a mixture of all the orders.

of St Sophia at Constantinople, erected by Anthemius of Tralles, and Isidore of Miletus, in 637, under the Emperor Justinian: The next, St Mark at Venice, in the 10th, which was followed by that of Pisa, by Buschetto, a Greek, in the 11th; the Duomo of Florence, by Brunelleschi, early in the 15th century;—when, at length, Bramante and Michel Angelo carried it to its height of perfection, in the unrivalled dome of the Vatican.

To the Italian architects, likewise, we owe the adaptation of the Roman architecture to modern public edifices, and to the palaces and country-seats of Princes and Nobles—splendid examples of which abound in Italy. The republican jealousy, and sumptuary laws of Greece and Rome, precluded citizens, of whatever rank or wealth, from adorning their private dwellings. Whilst magnificent public buildings, decorated with sculpture and painting, bronze and gold, multiplied on every side, their private

houses were uniformly simple and modest. A portico and pediment was a decoration reserved for the temples of the gods. The house of Augustus was as plain and unadorned as that of any other citizen of consular rank. In the decline of the Empire, when luxury and extravagance exceeded all bounds, those distinctions were soon lost. Yet there is every reason to believe, that the finest villas and private houses of the ancients, as far as regarded elegance and accommodation, have been surpassed by the noble palaces of modern Italy, and other countries of Europe.*

The term Grecian, is in general loosely

---

* " If indeed we travel to Vicenza and Verona, and view the matchless inventions of Palladio, &c. we shall be disposed, I think, to conclude that nothing was ever conceived by the wit of man, appropriate to the convenience and comfort of a residence, superior in grace and elegance to these noble palaces. The public buildings of antiquity, certainly exceed anything we have been able to raise in later ages; but their private edifices, it is probable, would look meanly by the side of an ordinary dwelling of a wealthy modern gentleman."—WILSON'S *Tour in Italy, p.* 208.

applied not only to the architecture properly so called, but to the Roman and Italian styles, and even to every modern building, however corrupt, that is not Gothic. It would, however, be of essential advantage to the progress and purity of the art, were the *three styles* already alluded to—the Grecian, Roman, and Italian, carefully distinguished from each other, *both in theory and practice.*

In recapitulating the different styles of architecture, it would be inexcusable to pass over the Gothic. Its origin has been the subject of much controversy—of many theories and learned treatises. It has been referred by different authors to the Goths, Normans, Saracens, and Persians. Yet it is more than probable it may be traced to a gradual deviation from the corrupt Roman, (or Saxon,) combined with the casual discovery and subsequent improvement of the pointed arch. It has been conjectured, that the northern nations, having been ac-

customed to assemble for the worship of their deities in woods and groves, endeavoured in their buildings to imitate the umbrageous character of the stems and spreading boughs. Sir James Hall has suggested a very ingenious variation of this theory, by supposing the Gothic arcades and roof an imitation, not of a natural grove, but of a rude building constructed entirely of wicker work. Unfortunately, however, the Gothic structures that offer themselves as peculiarly illustrative of such supposed imitations, are the latest specimens of the order, and the farthest removed from the era of its invention. But though neither of these theories be sufficient to account for its origin, it is not improbable that the similitude of avenues of trees in perspective, to buildings already erected, may have afforded hints with respect to much of the arrangement, tracery, and delicate ornament. Had the Goths been the inventors, they must have brought it either from their own coun-

try, or invented it after having established themselves in Italy and other countries of Europe.* Both suppositions appear equally improbable. Besides, there exists no proper standard for this order. Vasari says, it (the Tedesca) is so defective in systematic rules, that it may be deemed the "order of confusion and inconsistency."† It is modified by the habits, genius, and architecture of the respective countries where it is to be found. The Gothic of Florence and the north of Italy differs widely from that of the rest of Europe.‡ That of Spain

---

* Essays by Sir Christopher Wren—Warton, Bentham, Grose, Milner—particularly, Gunn's Enquiry into the Origin and Influence of Gothic Architecture.

† Vasari Vite de Pittore, T. 1. C. III. p. 128.

‡ "In Italy there are no lofty spires, or pinnacles, remarkable for their airy lightness, but square opaque towers, with round arches meeting in lines, generally standing detached from the Churches with which they are connected. It is rather singular, that no Gothic is to be found within the walls of Rome, though it prevails all over Italy. The only approximations are the *Ciboria* of the insulated altars of some of the Basilic Churches—and two pointed arches in the Convent of

exhibits features essentially distinct from the Gothic of Germany, France, and England. It has been generally classed under three styles—The Saxon and Norman—the pointed—and the Tudor or florid—of which the pointed is reckoned the purest. The Tudor, loaded with excess of ornament, and frittered into affected delicacy, betrays a meretricious taste and fantastical prettiness of detail, inconsistent with the true character of the order.

But to return to the subject of the National Monument.—We have seen that the Parthenon of Athens has been adopted as the model, by a great majority of the Contributors, that the interior is to comprehend a place of divine worship, and that an Act of Parliament has been obtained for carrying it into effect. Now, if by a place of divine worship, be meant an ordinary

---

Annunziata, refitted out of the ruins of the Forum of Nerva, by Pius V., so late as 1571."—GUNN's *Enquiry*, *p.* 164.

Church, or Chapel of Ease, where divine service is to be performed weekly, there seems some reason to apprehend, that the attempt to follow out such an arrangement may eventually prove fatal to the success of the restoration. Admitting the propriety of dedicating it to God as a National Temple, it ought assuredly to occupy a higher rank than that of a mere Parish Church or Meeting-house. Should the whole or principal part of the interior be destined for that purpose, is there no risk of its undergoing such a modification, on the plea of necessity or convenience, as may be subversive of its consistency and simplicity as a Grecian Temple? Is there no risk of galleries and boxed-up pews, of double rows of semi-circular topped windows, glaring through the columns of the peristyle—all these being the uniform accompaniments of a Modern Church? Is there no chance, too, of its being urged, as a matter of expediency or ornament, that it should be sur-

mounted by a dome, tower, or spire, as a belfry—or something compounded of all the three, not only that it may rival St Andrew's and St George's, but accomplish another most important object in the eyes of the citizens of Modern Athens—a picturesque point of view, for which they are prepared to make almost any sacrifice? If such deviations be permitted, can the edifice claim any resemblance to a Grecian Temple, far less to a restoration of its famed original? Though, for these reasons, serious doubts may be entertained with respect to the propriety of the interior being converted into a common Presbyterian Kirk, it is impossible to contemplate the slightest objection to its being consecrated to God as a National Christian Temple, like the great Churches of St Paul's, or Westminster Abbey. It would thus occupy a pre-eminent rank, both as a Metropolitan Church, where divine service might be performed on solemn occasions, and as a Pan-

theon, for the reception of sculptural monuments in honour of national achievements, and distinguished Scotsmen. Such a destination would confer the highest degree of dignity and grandeur, not incompatible with the strictest adherence to classical form, and purity of taste.

No exertion should be spared to make it, not merely an imitation, but, as nearly as possible, a true restoration—Carefully excluding everything, even in the minute details, characteristic of the Roman, Italian, or Modern styles. The subject of Sculpture will be afterwards considered. Should any difficulty occur in following the precise form and arrangement of the original architecture, care ought to be taken that the *parts so supplied* shall be purely Grecian. With respect to the two pediments and porticos, the lateral peristyles, the posticum and pronaos—their positions and relative proportions being clearly established from the remains of the edifice, no deviations or modi-

fications can with propriety be attempted. Supposing the posticum or pronaos to be adhered to, a certain latitude, on the principle already recognized, may be allowed in the disposition of the interior, the precise plan of which cannot be ascertained from the ruinous state of the original. Some are of opinion, with Mr Stuart, that it was hypoethral, and, consequently, that the cella consisted of two ranges of double columns, leaving the centre uncovered;—others, with Mr Wilkins, that, being octostyle, it must have coincided with the uniform arrangement of that species of temple.* But, whatever plan may be adopted for the interior, arches or arcades, though disposed in the most approved manner, and not encumbered with galleries, are inadmissible, being not only decidedly inferior to the colonnade in beauty and classical effect, but strictly Roman in

---

* Stuart's Athens—Wilkins' Topography of Athens.

their character, and therefore quite unsuitable to a Grecian edifice. In the celebrated Churches of St Peter's of Rome and St Paul's of London, they are less offensive, because the architecture is principally Roman and Italian. With regard to St Peter's, however, it must ever be regretted that Michel Angelo did not prefer a colonnade for the interior, the more so, as it is well known his original plan, which the jealousy of his rivals succeeded in materially frustrating, embraced a noble colonnade, and portico in front, for which the present flat and comparatively paltry façade, was afterwards substituted by Maderna. Arcades resting on columns, whether springing from the entablature or abacus of the capital, are despicable corruptions. From their facility of execution, they were early introduced at Rome, particularly the latter, which became almost universal in the reign of Justinian. They would seem, indeed, to have been one of the first steps in the progress of corrup-

tion towards the introduction of the Gothic.*

It is almost unnecessary to remark, that galleries, whether supported by arcades or columns, are equally objectionable. They are a deformity even in the Gothic, as may be observed in the modern attempts in that style, and in all cases where old Abbeys or Cathedrals have been converted into Parish Churches. In ordinary places of worship, where convenience and accommodation are primary objects, they are, of course, indispensable. In a National Monument, and that Monument a restoration of the Parthenon, such a sacrifice would be monstrous and inexcusable. Neither should windows be permitted to deform the walls of the cella. Some rare instances occur of ancient temples receiving light from windows, as the three

* In some of the best Churches of last century, they are to be found in the construction of galleries, as, for example, in St Martin's Church in the Strand, where the arches spring from the insulated entablature of the columns.

already alluded to, in the west front of the Erectheum, but they are under peculiar circumstances, and ought to be regarded rather as exceptions to the general practice. The interior might be lighted from the roof by means of flat lanterns, or cupolas, at proper intervals. Such a plan, it is true, would be quite at variance with the taste of the present day, if we might judge from the construction of our modern churches and chapels, which are uniformly provided with a double row of large round topped windows, admitting a glare of sunshine and cross-lights in all directions—affording a strong contrast to the mellow tone, and softened lights, of the Continental Churches, as well as our own Gothic structures of former days. That light sufficient for every purpose of divine service might be admitted from above, can scarcely be disputed; that it would be best calculated to display the architecture and sculpture to the greatest advantage must be equally self-evident. The disposi-

tion of light and shadow in the attelier of every artist confirms the truth of this remark. The Pantheon at Rome is illuminated by one large orb; and the Roman ladies are said to be so convinced of the favourable effect of its steady and chastened light in heightening their beauty, that they are always anxious to make their first public appearance under its classic shade. Double rows of capacious modern windows staring through the colonnade, would completely destroy the illusion of a building having any pretensions to a Grecian temple. In an architectural design, it may be possible, by keeping the windows in shadow, so to manage the effect, that the deformity shall not be observable. In the building itself, the result would be very different; for, except at a great distance, such as to preclude a proper examination, they would be obtrusively conspicuous, and form a barbarous contrast to the rest of the architecture. To insist, that windows should in every case

be rejected where a Grecian colonnade is adopted, would be absurd and impracticable. But, in a professed restoration of the purest and most splendid example of Athenian art in the age of Pericles, the exclusion seems absolutely imperative. Should they, however, be admitted, in defiance of all consistency and good taste, it would be nearly as absurd to call it a *fac simile* of the Athenian Temple, as to proclaim St Andrew's Church, (George Street, Edinburgh,) a restoration of the Pantheon of Rome, of which, indeed, it is a kind of ludicrous caricature.

Boxed-up pews, in the modern fashion, are also quite destructive of the beauty of an interior, even though the columns be raised on pedestals, like those of St Stephen's, Walbrook, by Sir Christopher Wren. A congregation, of which a great proportion are to be admitted gratis, might be more conveniently accommodated by means of light rush-bottomed chairs, or moveable

benches, which could be easily withdrawn when required. This mode of accommodation is very common in the great Churches on the Continent. None of the English Cathedrals, with the exception of a small part devoted to the cathedral-service, are blocked up with galleries or pews; nor does it occur to our brethren south of the Tweed to disfigure those fine structures, by converting them into ordinary places of worship, merely to save the expense of erecting plain buildings, equally suitable for every purpose of divine service. Why should not the National Monument of Scotland be entitled to the same privilege? If, however, the interior must be occupied as an ordinary Church, or Meeting-house, how much soever such an arrangement may compromise its dignity as a Metropolitan Church, or its destination as a National Monument, it does not necessarily follow that it must be loaded with all the usual accompaniments of a modern Chapel of Ease; nor is the weekly performance

of divine service *absolutely incompatible with architectural beauty and classic elegance.*

On the subject of Grecian architecture, the Quarterly Reviewers make the following eloquent remarks :—" When employed by its authors and inventors, the architecture of Attica is faultless. The separate members of the building have a definite relation to the whole. They are aggregated by affinity, and connected by apposition. Each one is in its destined place; no one is extrancous or superfluous; all are characterized by fitness and propriety. Grecian architecture is a composition of columns, which are intended to assemble themselves into the form of a Grecian Temple. *They seek to enter into no other combination.* Beauty and elegance result from their union. The long unvaried horizontal line of the entablature rests in stable tranquillity upon the even ranging columns below, and the conical shafts are repeated in unbroken symmetry. The edifice is perfect in itself, there-

fore it admits of no change in its plan—of no addition to its elevation. It must stand in virgin magnificence, unmated and alone. The Grecian Temple may be compared to a single crystal, and to the process of crystallization. Disturb the arrangement of the molecules of the crystal, and they will set into a mis-shapen fragment. Increase the number of their crystals, allow them to fix themselves upon each other, and their individual regularity will be lost in the amorphous mass. Thus, in the Grecian temple, the component parts have settled themselves into a shape of perfect harmony, such as is required by their integral figure ; but it is a shape that cannot be varied in its outline, nor can it be changed in its proportions. Neither does it submit to be annexed to any other. Every attempt that is made to blend the Temple with any other design, produces a lame and discordant effect. We must reject the arch, the noblest invention of architectural science. Porticos cannot be

duplicated. Doric columns cannot be raised in stories. No windows can open to the cella—No wings can be added to the right or to the left, which does not at once convince the observer, that it has no real relationship to the centre, which it obscures—No adaptation can be given which will reconcile it to utility. Plate-glass windows glaring through the intercolumniations—chimneys and chimney-pots arranged above the pediment, are just as appropriate as English nouns and verbs in a Greek hexameter."*

There is here much truth mixed up with a good deal of exaggeration and sophistry, clothed in elegant language and poetic imagery. The panegyric bestowed on the perfection and immutability of Grecian architecture would appear, from the inferences afterwards attempted to be drawn, to be conjured up only as a decent pretext for

* Quarterly Review, No. LIV. p. 311–15.

rejecting it as altogether useless and unsuitable to modern times. Grecian architecture is indeed a composition of columns; but do they "seek to assemble themselves into no other combination than that of a temple?" Were temples the only public buildings constructed by the Greeks? Vitruvius, in his treatise on Grecian architecture, describes many other combinations of columns: The Forum, with its numerous porticos, colonnades, basilicæ, curiæ—the Theatre, including its porticos and hypethral walks—the Gymnasium, or Palæstra, with its xysta, double porticos, and extensive peristyle, exhedræ, baths, &c. But even the Grecian Temple itself assumes a great diversity of form, proceeding not only from the variety produced by the respective orders and degrees of intercolumniation, but from the several distinct species of temple, differing materially from each other in size, form, arrangement, and richness of decoration; from the simple temple *in antis*, to

the prostyle, amphiprostyle, peripteral, pseudoperipteral, dipteral, hyphæthral, monopteral, &c. sufficient surely to satisfy the most insatiable appetite for variety. Besides, could we be justified in abandoning pure Grecian architecture, acknowledged to be so "faultless," "perfect," "beautiful," and "harmonious," because the arch cannot be introduced,—porticos cannot be duplicated,—columns cannot be raised into stories,—nor wings added; in short, because we cannot succeed in corrupting and vitiating it according to our own wayward fancies?

It might be supposed that the Reviewers, to be consistent, would consider the application of the spire, or tower, equally incompatible with the Grecian temple, as the introduction of the arch, chimneys, and chimney-pots, or plate-glass windows glaring through the intercolumniations. By no means. In a subsequent page, we find the following passage:—"There is considerable difficulty in *combining a steeple with the Grecian or*

Roman architecture. *Wren mastered the difficulty, and produced* combinations scarcely inferior to the Gothic." This is, indeed, " disturbing," with a vengeance, the " primitive molecules of the crystal," if not making a most barbarous attack on its " virgin magnificence, unmated and alone."

The Temple of Minerva, or Parthenon, though now ruinous and mutilated, still remains the greatest ornament of the modern, as it did of the ancient Acropolis. It was built during the administration of Pericles, by Callicrates and Ictinus, under the superintendence of Phidias, on the site of a former edifice called Hecatompedon, from its being an hundred feet square. When Sir George Wheler and Spon visited it in 1676, it was comparatively in good preservation, both with respect to the architecture and sculpture. Its present state of dilapidation was chiefly caused by the bursting of a shell within the Temple, during the siege of Athens by the Venetians, in 1686, under

the command of Morosini and Koningsmark. The explosion took place in the centre of the cella, levelling to the ground a great part of the walls opposite the opisthodomus; six columns of the peristyle on the south side, eight on the north side, including five columns of the pronaos. The eastern portico suffered little, but the pediment and sculpture were much damaged. The western pediment escaped the effect of the explosion, yet most of the statues described by Wheler and Spon are no longer to be found.* Morosini attempted to remove one of the principal groups, but, whether from accident or unskilfulness, it fell, and was shattered in pieces. Lord Elgin has subsequently been more successful in such operations.

It is evident, from the description of Wheler, there were at that time in the interior of the cella, two rows of columns, one

* Stuart's Athens.

above the other, standing at a certain distance from the wall. The Greeks, after their conversion to Christianity, occupied it as a church, and covered it with a roof and cupolas, according to the fashion of the times. It was afterwards transformed by the Turks into a Mahomedan mosque. As the ancient roof was unquestionably of wood, covered with marble sculptured in imitation of tiles, it must have soon decayed. Wheler describes the state of the temple when a mosque, and confounds the modern additions made by the Greeks and Turks with the ancient remains of the edifice. Stuart and Chandler appear, without sufficient examination, to have adopted the same ideas.* Mr Stuart, as already mentioned, supposes the temple to have been an hypæthros, namely, with two ranges of columns of two stories, dividing the cella into a nave and two side-aisles, and leaving the centre uncovered. He re-

* Wilkins's Topography of Athens—Note, p. 105. Chandler's Travels in Greece, pp. 48, 49.

fers, as an authority, to the following passage of Vitruvius:—" The hypæthros has ten columns in the *pronaos* and *posticus;* in all other respects it is like the dipteros; within, it has two rows of columns, one above the other, at a distance from the wall, so that you may pass round it as in the portico of peristyles; but in the middle, it is open to the sky, without a roof; the entrance is at each end by doors in the pronaos and posticus. There is no example of this at Rome, but at Athens an octostyle, and in the Olympian Temple." Mr Wilkins has, however, satisfactorily shewn, in his Civil Architecture of Vitruvius, and his excellent discussion on the Topography of Athens, that the Parthenon is not the building to which Vitruvius alludes, in illustration of an Hypæthral Temple, from the want of an example of that kind at Rome.*

---

* Wilkins's Topography of Athens, p. 99. Ditto, Antiquities of Magna Græcia, Introd. p. 3.—Wilkins's Vitruvius, pp. 9, 10.

Should this be admitted, the principal foundation on which Stuart rests his hypothesis being removed, there remains only the authority of Wheler, which, from his ignorance of architecture, is not entitled to much consideration. Stuart thinks, the six channelled pillars alluded to by Wheler, as supporting the roof of what he calls the pronaos, were placed in the opisthodomus, and, though he confesses no remains or marks of them are to be discovered, makes no hesitation in including them in his plan of the interior. Mr Wilkins contends, with more appearance of probability, that Wheler's description applies to the six columns of the posticum, and that the expression, "supported the roof," means, that they upheld the marble ceiling over the interval between them and the western front. He observes, that "Wheler assigns the same office to the columns of the hexastyle portico, of the Erechtheum, which were still less connected with the roof of the build-

ing, than the six columns belonging to the posticum of the Parthenon. The story of the demolition of one of the columns, and the fruitless attempt to replace it, is one of general currency at Athens. It was told, with some variation, of one of the columns of Jupiter Olympius, to Dr Chandler, and repeated to me, when the building which suffered by its removal was the Poikile Stoa. It was probably told to Wheler of the posticum of the Parthenon, and introduced by him without investigating its accuracy; although, if he inserted it at the moment he was examining the building, it would have been an admission less scrutinized than many that are to be found dispersed throughout his work. The origin of the story, and of Wheler's error, seems to have been this.—The angular column of the posticum is almost wholly immured in the mass of modern masonry, raised for the purpose of supporting a minaret, when the Temple was used as a mosque. This is

the rude pile, which, as he imagines, supported the place of the angular column."*

Moreover, the particulars related in Wheler's description of the interior of the Parthenon ; viz. the canopy supported by porphyry pillars, with Corinthian chapters—the double peristyle of galleries—arches supporting columns—the semicircular form of the holy place to which light was admitted from the east, and separated from the rest by jasper columns—evince strong internal evidence that they must have been the production of a later age. Stuart has nevertheless introduced this peristyle of columns, one above the other, into his plan of the interior, as if they had formed a part of the ancient building. Mr Knight, in his Analytical Enquiry, has asserted, that the practice of placing one order above another, is not older than the theatres and amphitheatres of the Romans. But there

---

* Wilkins's Topography of Athens, pp. 108-9.

is reason to suppose, that the practice, though extremely rare, was in some cases adopted, and particularly in Hypæthral Temples. In illustration of this opinion, Lord Aberdeen refers to the mode of arrangement actually observed in the remains of the Temple of Apollo, near Phigalia, compared, by Pausanias, with the Hypæthral Temple of Minerva at Tegea.*

It may, therefore, be assumed, that the Parthenon was not hypæthral.—Neither was it decastyle, nor dipteral—nor in its general plan and details did it coincide with temples of that description. Stuart considers the circumstance of the floor next the walls being a little raised above the level, to favour such an idea; but, on the other hand, the Hypæthral Temple of Pestum has the floor in that part lower than the rest. The dimensions of the columns

---

* Earl of Aberdeen on Grecian Architecture, pp. 175-7.

ascertained from the marks of the lower range still remaining on the pavement, and corresponding with fragments lying in the cella, present, in Mr Wilkins's opinion, an insuperable objection to the internal peristyle being the remains of an hypæthros. They are only two feet two inches in diameter, and from the examples of Hypæthral Temples, in which the higher orders ranged within a certain distance of the roof, and nearly on a level with the upper members of the external order, he thinks it is impossible, by any calculations, to make a double order reach within a given distance of the proper height.* In that description of Temple at Pestum and Egina, the proportions of the external to the internal order, are nearly as three to two; those in the Parthenon, as three to one. Hence, they must have been

---

* Wilkins's Top. of Athens—Note to p. 100.—Do. likewise to p. 105.

double their present size had they formed a part of the ancient building. Stuart's Plan of the Interior, therefore, as far as regards the disposition of the columns, both of the cella and opisthodomus, would seem destitute of authority, as well as probability.*

With respect to the interior of the proposed restoration, the author would suggest, that instead of forming it into divisions corresponding to the cella and opisthodomus of the ancient Temple, it should be thrown into one large hall, lighted from the roof, decorated somewhat in the style of the Basilica, with two ranges of Grecian Doric columns supporting the ceiling, and

---

* Forsyth, when describing the Hypæthral Temple of Pestum, seems so far to enter into Mr Stuart's ideas. He says, "This (the double peristyle of the interior) corresponds with Vitruvius and the Parthenon," which, however, he qualifies with the following reflection:—"Yet surely two stories of columns, when no frize nor listet denotes an intermediate flooring, seem unnecessary and mean." Had Mr Forsyth visited Athens, it is more than probable his opinion would have coincided with that of Mr Wilkins.

subdividing the area into a nave and two side-aisles. The pronaos and posticum might be retained precisely according to Stuart's plan. Were the interior divided into two portions, like the cella and opisthodomus, it might afford more convenience and accommodation, though at the risk of impairing the architectural effect as a whole, a matter of great importance in a national structure, destined for monumental sculpture. It is well known, that the basilicæ of ancient Rome were found so convenient for divine worship, by the early Christians, that their successors built their churches nearly after the same plan; and hence the origin of the modern term basilica, as synonymous with a Church of the higher order. They who have seen the basilicæ of St Paulo fuore delle mura, and St Maria Maggiore at Rome, making the necessary allowance for their corrupt innovations, can form some idea of the beauty and magnificence of such an interior. It would combine elegance and

grandeur with classic simplicity—without presenting any serious obstacle to the performance of divine worship. The congregation might (as already suggested) be accommodated with light chairs or moveable benches, and the pulpit, instead of forming a detached and conspicuous object, might be conveniently attached to one of the columns, with a spiral stair.

But suppose the interior were divided into two portions, the larger fitted up as a modern Church, with galleries, pews, &c.—the other like a vestibule, destined for architectural decoration—would not such a heterogeneous mixture of objects and styles, of beauty and deformity, call forth the derision and disgust of every person of good taste? If the Directors are determined to transform the National Monument into an ordinary place of worship, with all its usual comforts and accompaniments; if that is really their chief object; let them at once

abandon the idea of restoring the Parthenon, and build a modern Church. They cannot attain both objects. On the contrary, were it thrown into one great unbroken nave, and two side-aisles formed by the colonnades, with a portal at each end communicating with the pronaos and posticum, it would unite the classic beauties of the hypæthros and basilica, without their defects—possess all the characteristic features of an Athenian edifice—besides being singularly well adapted for the reception of statues and sculptural monuments; one description of which might be ranged along the walls of the aisles, the other between the columns. The noble and sublime effect of such a perspective, varying at every point of view, may be more easily imagined than described. "How beautiful do columns become when they support the roof, how superior to their effect as an idle decoration, and what variety in their still

changing combinations as you pace along the aisles."*

Pilasters ought to be carefully avoided, as an ornament quite foreign to the Greeks. Modern architects are fond of introducing them in all the orders, and make them uniformly correspond with the columns in the mouldings and ornaments of their bases and capitals. This was the practice of the Romans in the Corinthian, though it seems doubtful if it extended to the other orders.† The Greeks adopted a different system. Their *antæ*, which in temples are only found as facings to the walls of the pronaos, have no correspondence with the Doric or Ionic orders, in their capitals, mouldings, and levels, but seem intentionally distinguished from them. This would appear at first a violation of symmetry and uniformity ; yet,

---

* Forsyth's Italy, p. 16.

† It is remarkable, that Vitruvius, throughout his whole work, makes no allusion whatever to pilasters.

as Mr Aiken observes, " they must have had good reasons for its adoption ; and in this instance as well as many others, probably relinquished a lesser, for the sake of gaining a greater, advantage."*

With respect to the architecture and mechanical execution of the columns, mouldings, &c. of the original, no person is so eminently qualified to afford the best information as Mr Cockerell of London, who has already been professionally employed to give the drawings and plans of the edifice. As a proof of the refined delicacy displayed in the ancient masonry, may be mentioned the circumstance of the *entasis*, or swelling of the shafts of the columns, described by Vitruvius, having been actually discovered by the same distinguished architect, to exist in those of the Parthenon and other Grecian remains, though it had

---

* Aiken's Essay on the Doric Order of Architecture, pp. 21, 22.

escaped the laborious research of Stuart, Revett, and later travellers, who supposed them to be truncated cones, diminishing gradually in their diameter from the base to the summit of the shaft.*

It has been proposed to lay out the under part of the National Monument as vaults for sepulture or dormitories ; and by their immediate sale, to realize a large fund for prosecuting the building. But supposing such dormitories could be executed without any risk of impairing the foundation, it would at all events be prudent, not to attempt disposing of them at present,

---

* Earl of Aberdeen, p. 155-7.

" It deserves to be remarked, that Stuart and Revett have omitted to notice the *entasis* or swelling in the columns of the Parthenon, the Temple of Theseus, the Propylœa, &c. when it is so very apparent not only in those structures, but in all the remaining antiquities of Greece. It may, however, be proper to state, that this circumstance has likewise escaped the observation of more recent travellers, who, from a long residence in Athens, may be presumed to have had greater facilities of ascertaining every minute circumstance relating to these splendid ruins."—ALLASIN'S *Picturesque Views of Pola*—Note to page 3d.

or entering into rash contracts, which might eventually be found difficult to fulfil. If they can be sold to advantage by anticipation, and converted into an available fund before they are begun, it is obvious they would bring a much higher price when the building was finished. Yet ought we not to hesitate as to the propriety, or even decency, of making them a subject of commercial speculation and promiscuous sale. One of the chief features of the National Monument, must be its destination as a Scottish Pantheon for the reception of sculptural monuments, in honour of distinguished Scotsmen. Now, if these dormitories be put up to the highest bidder—to every grocer and tallow-chandler who has fifty pounds to spare, would it be consistent with the dignity or character of the edifice, that vulgar ashes should repose under a pavement destined for monumental sculpture? To pretend that these vaults will be quite distinct from the National Structure,

because they are to be provided with a separate entry, is a fallacy that can deceive no one. Under the same roof, and within the same walls, they must necessarily form as essential and integral a part of the building as the upper tier of vaults reserved for names of higher renown. The glory of possessing a place in the upper cemetery will not indeed be much enhanced by such a participation. What would be thought of putting up to public sale, the vaults of St Paul's and Westminster Abbey? According to the same principle, we might expect, were the situation suitable, to see them occupied as taverns, wine and spirit cellars, porter houses, and chair-offices, as may be exemplified in most of the Chapels and Meeting-houses of Edinburgh. Nelson's Monument, on the Calton-hill, within a few yards of the site of the Parthenon, has been occupied as a kind of tavern for many years!!*

* The dormitories, consisting of 150 separate cells, are

It has been already remarked, that in all the printed circulars, and appeals to the

---

now actually advertised for public sale in all the newspapers, under the pompous title of *The Grand National Cemetery*, authorized by Act of Parliament! As an inducement to the public to come forward, the advertisement dwells on the absolute and most perfect security which it must afford against "*every attempt to disturb the dead;* and the *pious desire* which many families in Scotland must naturally feel, to have the remains of their illustrious and gallant friends and relatives reposited under the spot where *their honourable names* are to be inscribed, &c. and *their noble deeds* recorded by a grateful country!!"

This measure is at once absurd and ludicrous, and can only be viewed as a paltry expedient for raising money, which, if successful in its object, must materially injure the undertaking, as degrading to the dignity and respectability of the National Monument.

If the funds of the Royal Association do not present so flattering a result as might at one time have been anticipated, it cannot be justly imputed to a want of taste or spirit on the part of the public, but mainly to the ill-judged resolution, so early announced, and anxiously provided for in the Act of Parliament, *to convert the interior into a place of ordinary public worship.* How much soever our countrymen both at home and abroad, might be disposed to contribute towards a National Monument, it could scarcely be expected they should come forward to build a Presbyterian Church for the accommodation of the citizens of Edinburgh—(even though its exterior should put on the semblance of the Parthenon,) and still less to supply them with cheap and secure dormitories after death. One would think that the Directors, instead of endeavouring to render the undertaking as public and National as

public by the Committees and Directors, a cautious silence is observed on the subject of sculpture. Deprived of sculptural decoration, the National Monument might be a handsome Doric Temple—it could have no pretensions to be styled a restoration of the Athenian Parthenon. A body without a soul; it would be a mere model or framework, void of meaning or expression. "The arts are all connected together, but architecture and sculpture may be said to be twin sisters. The latter cannot appear to advantage without the former—nor can the former attain its highest elegance and grace without the latter."* They are not so much separate arts, as branches of the same art.

---

possible, by placing it on a grand and liberal footing, are striving to narrow its object to the local interest of Edinburgh; or, in other words, to reduce it to a mere Church-building job, to support which, they are constrained to have their pews and burying-vaults puffed in the newspapers, somewhat in the style of the patriotic wine companies of Scotland.

* Edinburgh Magazine, under the article Parthenon.—July 1821.

In Egypt and Greece they grew up and flourished together. In the dark ages, though corrupted and degraded, they are still found united. It would be impossible to strip the Gothic of Lombardy, and the North of Europe, of its sculpture, rude as it is, without deranging the beauty and consistency of the whole. In England sculpture is in its infancy, in Scotland scarcely in embryo. Of all the arts, architecture and sculpture, from their superior excellence and durability, have the most powerful claims on the encouragement of a great nation. What imperishable fame have not these arts, even in a state of dilapidation and decay, reflected on the nations of antiquity for a long succession of ages? Had they not remained to us, could we have formed so high an estimate of the national power and glory of Egypt, Greece, and Rome? To the remains of sculpture we are solely indebted for the revival of the fine arts, and the true principles of taste. From

them Michel Angelo and Raphael caught the spark of inspiration, which was soon to blaze forth in the sublime works of the Sestine Chapel and Vatican Chambers. Without these remains we could not have appreciated the proficiency of the Greeks in painting and design, of which we might have remained as ignorant as we now are of their music and theatrical recitation. With the exception of the paintings preserved by a kind of miracle in Herculaneum and Pompeii — the imperfect remains in the Baths of Titus—and a few others in a better state of preservation, such as the Aldobrandini Marriage, what had we to guide us in our research? We could have received little assistance from the faint and obscure allusions to art in ancient authors, not excepting the indiscriminate criticism and gossipping tales of Pliny.* The best paintings, whether in fres-

* The question of comparison between ancient and modern

co or oil, cannot retain their colouring beyond a certain lapse of time, should they

---

painting has given rise to much difference of opinion. Reasoning *a priori* and from analogy, we are entitled to suppose that the art of painting among the Greeks must have kept pace, in a great degree, with the extraordinary perfection of their sculpture. But it is going too far to assert, on the pretended authority of ancient authors, that, in the arts of colouring, and even of chiaro scuro, they had attained a proficiency equal to that of the moderns. The passages on the subject of art in classic authors, as Cicero, Pliny, Quinctilian, Plutarch, Philostratus, &c. are so vague, obscure, and inconsistent with each other, that no satisfactory information can be derived from them. All the translators of the 35th Book of Pliny; viz. Durand, Jaucourt, and Falconet, have laboured hard to discover his meaning and reconcile his contradictions, by turning and twisting the text into a variety of forced constructions, often at variance with each other. Neither do any of the ancient specimens hitherto discovered, whatever truth of ordinary light and shadow or linear perspective they may possess, authorize us to draw such a conclusion. They exhibit no knowledge of *aerial* perspective, a quality intimately connected with chiaro scuro. The painted designs on Etruscan Vases, the earliest specimens of European art, display an astonishing boldness, ease, and beauty of outline. The Aldobrandini Marriage, and some of those at Pompeii, and the Museum at Portici, have been justly admired for their simple attitudes, correct drawing, and finely cast drapery, in which they have been supposed to approach the designs of Raphael, though at the same time they cannot be regarded as fair specimens of ancient art, but, under all circumstances, rather as inferior copies by secondary artists. It is to be regretted, that none of their moveable paintings on

even escape the numberless accidents to which they are continually exposed. Yet a few revolving ages, and the most of them will no longer exist. The art of engraving, it is true, promises, in a certain degree, to remedy the defect; but still, when the original and engraving are compared together—how feeble and incorrect is, in most cases, the resemblance—how

---

wood, stone, and ivory, which must have been the most highly finished, have been preserved to modern times. Of all the different modes of painting now in use—oil, water, fresco, enamel, glass, mosaic, &c. the first alone appears to have been unknown to the ancients. It has even been conjectured, that the varnish used by Apelles and his pupils, differed little from oil painting. Indeed, an ingenious essay has lately been published, attempting to prove, that the Venetian Masters must have produced their effects nearly in a similar manner, by using dry crayons for the ground, and afterwards glazing them with oil and varnish. But it need not be matter of surprise, that the ancient modes of colouring should not have been handed down to the present times, when even the colours, oils, and manner of mixing them, adopted by the old masters of the 15th and 16th century, whether Italian, Flemish, or Dutch, have, in many respects, been entirely lost. On the whole, it would seem, that the art of chiaro scuro, properly so called, arose out of the discovery and cultivation of oil painting, of which it may be regarded as the natural result. In fresco, and distemper painting, it would be difficult, and in many cases impossible, to produce such an effect.

imperfect the expression! Every painter cannot hope, like Raphael, to find a Mark Antonio, to hand down his works to posterity. The great number of excellent artists that Scotland has produced in the other departments of art, is a proof there is no want of talent for sculpture, but of encouragement and opportunity to call it into action. That encouragement, to be effectual, must proceed from the rich and powerful; it must be public and national. It is not the modelling of a few busts for private individuals, to be stuck up in an exhibition-room, that will enable it to take root and flourish. "A taste for the fine arts is no plant of the desert that will shoot forth unheeded, and spread its blossoms where there are none to enjoy their fragrance; nor a sturdy weed that can struggle into vigour through rubbish and neglect; it is a plant whose seeds will remain inert, until called into life by culture, and will spread into luxuriance exactly in

proportion to the care taken of it."* Though sculpture embraces fewer objects than painting, those that are peculiar to it, and common to both, are the most important and difficult, viz. design, expression, grouping, and the art of draping. The sculptor has not, like the painter, the advantage of shadow, chiaro scuro, distance and foreshortening, to produce illusions and conceal deficiencies; his work being accessible from all points of view, must be finished on every side. Hence the practice of this art, requiring a more intimate knowledge of the human frame, its bones and muscles, its infinite variety of attitudes and expressions, tends directly to the improvement of art in general, by introducing a correct taste and thorough knowledge of design. "To the painter likewise, it affords peculiar facilities of studying the soft gradations—the bold and abrupt transitions of light and shadow,

* Brewster's Encyclopædia.—Art. Painting, p. 222.

so necessary for the perfection of a picture."

Before proceeding to the question of sculpture, in reference to the National Monument, it will be necessary to make a few remarks on the marbles of the Parthenon.

The east and west pediments were adorned with groups of statues of the heroic size, some of them entirely detached, emblematical of the birth of Minerva, and her contest with Neptune about naming the city of Athens. The figures were so arranged from the erect to the recumbent, as to fill the entire space of the tympanum. The metopes on the frize, were enriched with relievos, representing the combats of the Lapithæ with the Centaurs—each metope including a Centaur and Lapitha. The zophorus or frize, under the soffit of the peripterus, which went quite round the outside of the wall of the temple, uninterrupted by the insertion of triglyphs, was fitted with sculpture in basso relievo, of slight re-

lief, descriptive of the Panathenaic Procession in honour of the Goddess Minerva. Within the cella, covered with the purple peplum, stood the famous statue of Minerva, by Phidias, of ivory and gold ; according to Pliny, 24 cubits in height—the gold of which, Thucydides says, weighed 40 talents—equal to £120,000. Her position was erect—her garments reaching to her feet. Her head covered with a helmet, her breast with a Medusa's head ; she wielded in one hand a spear, in the other a victory. Acroteria are placed at the angles of the pediments, which it is probable supported vases of gilt metal. It has been likewise conjectured, that shields of the same description adorned the principal front, from the triangular holes observed in the epistylium of the eastern pediment.

We are now enabled to form a more correct estimate of those sculptures since the Elgin marbles have been brought to England. We must not, however, allow ourselves to be carried away by an excessive

and indiscriminate admiration, on the idea of their being the undoubted works of Phidias, as it is more than probable they were executed by other artists after his designs, and under his superintendence. It would appear from Pliny, that the works of Phidias were chiefly confined to metal and ivory. The few instances to the contrary recorded by Pausanias, rather tend to confirm such a supposition, notwithstanding an opinion of Visconti, founded on a forced construction of an expression of Aristotle.* He is represented by Pliny as the director and superintendent of the architects and workmen employed in its construction. The relievos both of the cella and metopes are, in the opinion of the best judges, of unequal execution, and by different artists. The sculpture of the pediments, if we may judge from the few detached statues belonging to them in the Elgin collection, the Theseus or Hercules, Ilyssus, &c. must have been executed

* Wilkins's Top. Note to p. 122.

by artists of a superior description, though it would be rash to affirm they are from the chisel of Phidias. Such a supposition is, nevertheless, no disparagement of their excellence, for even the Apollo Belvidere, Venus de Medici, Laocoon, &c. have been suspected, though perhaps unjustly, of being but good copies of former originals.*

Ancient sculpture may be classed under two descriptions, architectural and monumental, differing considerably in object and style. The latter, which was subjected to the closest inspection, exhibits the highest degree of correctness and finish. In the former, the figures being raised to a greater height, a bolder style of execution, with less finish, is observable. The object was to fill up space, and produce a richness of effect. The ancient relievo has been defined by Forsyth to be an assemblage of little statues

* It is remarkable, that of all the various repetitions of ancient statues, none of the finest are to be found, except a few of the Venus de Medici.

illustrating some event in history or mythology, and descriptive of the manners and customs of the times. " The figures," he remarks, " generally in pairs, are linked together by a certain undulatory connection, returning in alternate spaces, and balanced attitudes." Such is the arrangement of the relievos of the Parthenon, and those of most of the Grecian and Roman temples. Those on the metopes of the Doric are generally in bold relief, but when on a frize, within a peristyle, they are flattened to harmonise with the walls of the cella. With regard to the Elgin Marbles, it is remarkable, as observed by Mr Gunn, that in all of them, " whether the bold projections of the Centaurs and Lapithæ of the metopes, the larger figures of the tympanum, or the flattened reliefs of the frize,—neither figures nor draperies are rounded or softened so as to sink into the back ground, but are abruptly and angularly cut off, so as to produce a strong and deep shadow."

Imperfect from the nature of the materials, in the relations of space and perspective, the ancient relievo presumed not to encroach on the province of painting. The figures in front are as large as the houses, ships, and trees of the back ground. Whatever may be the subjects or attitudes of the figures, they are generally so disposed as to fill up the entire space, not without some sacrifice of proportion and consistency. Modern sculptors have, however, attempted to give it the effect of a picture. They introduce complicated groups, and endeavour to produce aerial as well as linear perspective, by diminishing the size and projection of the figures. It is difficult to imagine how this can be accomplished on a flat surface, without the aid of shadow or colour. Without aerial, of what avail is linear perspective? *

* The following passage from the works of Falconet, the sculptor, will sufficiently illustrate the pretensions of the modern re-

Had the sculptures of the Parthenon been sufficiently entire to admit of any reasonable

---

lievo.—" Nous qui vraisemblablement avons porté notre peinture au de la des anciens pour l'intelligence du clair obscur, de la magie de la couleur, de la grande machine, et des ressorts de la composition, n'oserions nous prendre le meme essor dans la sculpture? Bernini, Le Gros, Alegarde, Melchior Caffa, Angelo Rossi, nous ont montré qu'il appartient au gout et au genie, *d'etendre le cercle trop etroit que les anciens ont tracé dans leur bas reliefs. Ces grands artistes modernes se sont affranchis, avec succes d'une autorité qui n'est recevable qu'autant qu'elle est raisonnable.*

" Je n'introduis donc aucune nouveauté puisque, je m'appuye sur des examples qui ont un succes decidé. Apres tout, si mon opinion sur le bas-relief etoit une innovation; comme elle tendroit a une plus juste imitation des objects naturels, son utilité la rendroit necessaire.

" Je ne veux laisser aucune equivoque sur le jugement que je porte des bas-reliefs antiques. J'y trouve, ainsi que dans les belles statues, *la grande maniere dans chaque objet particuliere et la plus noble simplicité dans la composition.* Mais quelque noble que soit cette composition *elle ne tend en aucune sorte à l'illusion d'un Tableau; et le bas-relief y doit toujours pretendre puisque cette illusion n'est autre chose que l'imitation des objects naturels.*"

" Si le bas-relief est fort saillant il ne faut pas craindre que les figures du premier plan ne puissent s'accorder avec celles du fond. Le sculpteur saura mettre de l'harmonie entre les moindres saillies et les plus considerables: il ne lui faut qu' une place du gout et du genie. Mais il faut l'admettre cette harmonie; il faut l'exiger même et ne point nous elever contre elle, *parceque nous ne la trouvons pas dans les bas-reliefs antiques.*"—Œuvres de Falconet, tom. I. p. 35, 36.

hope of successful restoration, a doubt might possibly have been entertained, how far it might not have been desirable to make the attempt. The sublime effect of so perfect a union of architecture and sculpture, and the advantages necessarily accruing to the fine arts, might have more than overbalanced the anomaly of transferring the subjects of Athenian history and mythology to a Scottish National Monument. Unfortunately, however, they are so ruined and defaced, as for ever to preclude that hope. Nor is it possible, from the vague description of ancient authors, the imperfect and disputed drawings, and the conflicting opinions of travellers and antiquaries, even though elucidated by the elaborate researches of such men as Stuart and Visconti, to supply the deficiencies, or even offer a satisfactory explanation of the subjects of many of the most important groups.*

---

* For a particular account of these sculptures, see Stuart's

But, admitting the hopelessness or impropriety of such an attempt, enough remains yet entire, assisted by the Elgin marbles in the British Museum, to afford ample facility for studying the style and manner of the original.* Why not, therefore, endeavour, as already suggested, in a discussion on the same subject, to " execute a sculpture emblematical of Scottish history and achievements, approaching as nearly to the grouping style and general character of the original, as circumstances and a humbler execution will permit." It is impossible to figure a nobler subject for the display of modern genius. Such an opportunity once lost, can never be regained. It is no answer

---

Work; Visconti on the Marbles of the Parthenon; Specimens of Ancient Sculpture; Laurence on the Elgin Marbles; Wilkins's Topography of Athens. There are likewise some good remarks in Galt's Letters from the Levant, pp. 17, 18.

* The Phigalian marbles in the British Museum might likewise be consulted for the same purpose. It is much to be regretted, that the Egina Marbles have been lost to the nation through the unaccountable supineness of the Commissioners of the British Museum.

to say, with the Quarterly Reviewers, that "the dress of the horse-guards and grenadiers is ill adapted for effect in marble." That is perfectly true, "but the expression of heroism is the same in all ages of the world; and the artist must have but little invention who cannot surmount such an inconsiderable obstacle."* It is almost unnecessary to observe, that the ancients seldom adhered to the real costume of the times. Much was suppressed and altered by the sculptor, for the purpose of displaying the naked figure, and producing greater beauty and simplicity of effect. In the Roman statues, some have only a cloak (*paludamentum*) over the shoulder, or a *lorica* round the middle, leaving the rest of the body naked,—others have the upper part of the figure uncovered, and the lower wrapped in loose drapery. The Greeks were fond of exhibiting the naked figure, but

* Edinburgh Review, lxxv. p. 142.

when drapery was used, it certainly was not the national costume. Can it for a moment be imagined, that the half-naked figures of the Panathenean procession of the Parthenon represented the real dress and appearance of the people on that occasion? In the ancient equestrian statues, neither saddles, spurs, nor horse shoes, are to be found. Are we hence to infer, that such necessary appendages were unknown to antiquity? Nor is it often that the ancient relievos on vases, coins, lamps, triumphal arches, &c. represent chariot-horses with yokes or traces. Trajan's Pillar is, perhaps, the only classical monument of antiquity that gives the true costumes of the different nations sculptured on its surface.* How unreasonable, then, to assume, that modern artists are to be chained down to the precise dresses of the day, —to the exact military uniforms and appointments, according to the latest orders

* Forsyth's Italy.

from the Horse Guards! Fashions in dress soon pass away, particularly military uniforms, which have at least undergone a dozen complete changes during the last twenty years, and are at present, as every military man well knows, far from being stationary. There is nothing, surely, so incorrigibly formal and unseemly in the ancient Scottish, or modern British costumes, whether Gothic or Celtic, civil or military, that they could not be fashioned and reduced into a form approaching to classic drapery.*

---

* In spite of the Celtic mania that now prevails, the present Highland dress should be sparingly introduced; for allowing it to be the ancient Celtic garb, which is far from being clearly established, (the greater part bearing strong marks of being modern and fanciful,) it is truly absurd to call it *the ancient Scottish dress.* At a very remote period, it is possible, both Scotland and England might have been peopled chiefly by Celts, but for the last thousand years the Scots and English have been, and are, a Gothic people. Whatever fame Scotland has anciently acquired in arms, arts, and learning, must undoubtedly be attributed more to her Saxon than her Celtic population. The Highlanders, indeed, were always in a state of comparative ignorance and barbarism. They had little or no influence on the national councils, or warlike achievements of the earlier part of our history. Nay, in spite

Taking it for granted, then, that a National sculpture is to be attempted, great

---

of all that has been expended by government for more than half a century in endeavouring to improve and civilize them, by means of roads, bridges, and canals,—in spite of all the exertions and munificent encouragement of the Highland Societies of London and Edinburgh, and other Societies for Propagating the Gospel and Establishing Schools, it would appear, from a Report laid before the last General Assembly, that at the present moment a great proportion of the inhabitants of the Highlands and islands are in a state of the most abject ignorance and heathenism. The real Celtic Highlanders do not bear a much greater proportion to the present inhabitants of Scotland, than the Welch Celts do to those of England. The Celtic garb and Celtic tongue were, in truth, little known at the Court of Holyrood. It was, therefore, very bad taste in those who advised his Majesty to appear at the levee in the Highland garb, a dress none of his royal Scottish ancestors ever wore, with the exception of Prince Charles, who adopted it merely as a matter of policy. However familiar it may be to the readers of the Popular Novels, the frequenters of Freemasons' Hall, and Almack's Caledonian Balls, the London and Edinburgh Exhibitions, and Theatres, it is not to be found among the old family portraits of any Scottish nobleman or gentleman, or even Highland chieftain of the longest pedigree. It is, in short, neither more nor less than a provincial Scottish costume, and that, perhaps, none of the most ancient. As such, it is highly picturesque and martial in appearance, when worn by persons who have been accustomed to use it; but to see it paraded and caricatured by Celtic Clubs and convivial meetings in Edinburgh and London, the majority of whom are Lowlanders, is really ridiculous and disgusting. This

care will be requisite to avoid the glaring faults and mannerism of the modern, and, more especially, the English school. The English sculptors adopt the most opposite extremes. In St Paul's, for instance, we have in one corner, a naval or military hero, in complete uniform, with tight coat and breeches, full dress shoes and stockings. In another, a general officer expiring on the field of battle, stark naked, like a porter or dying gladiator. Here, a general officer in full military cos-

---

rage is carried to such a height, that even in London, the little urchins belonging to the Caledonian Asylum, the sons of Scottish soldiers, both Lowland and Celtic, are all bedizened out in the Highland dress. In Edinburgh, too, we have the Royal Archers, or Body Guard, equipped in bonnets and tartan, though the Highlanders knew just as much of archery, as they did of horsemanship. Their uniform should have been Lincoln green, like that of the Bowmen of the Border. It would be equally consistent were our yeomanry cavalry provided with tartan trews, and our militia with kilts and purses. Indeed, it is by no means surprising, that the London Cockneys, as well as hundreds of other persons in England, in other respects well informed, should suppose that all ranks in Scotland wear tartan and kilts, and that we only mount the breeches and " broad cloth," when business or pleasure induces us to visit the sister kingdom.

tume, mounted on a capering animal, more like an ox than a horse, has just received his death-wound in the midst of his staff. There, another gallant commander, in a state of colossal nudity, is in the act of being lowered into the grave by angels, who appear to totter under the weight. The taste of the present day, if we are to judge from most of the specimens in St Paul's, Guildhall, and Westminster Abbey, erected within the last twenty years, would appear to be satisfied, provided there is an imposing mass of marble worked into colossal groups of common-place allegorical figures, as Neptunes, Britannias, Victories, British lions, and so forth, however ill arranged, or worse executed. Would not rows of statues, with appropriate drapery, somewhat in the Roman style, or like that of Mr Horner by Chantrey, or even well-executed busts, be preferable to such cumbrous and unmeaning masses, which neither harmonise with each other, nor the building in which they

are placed. The relievos, too, are very indifferent, exhibiting, with a few exceptions, all the faults and peculiarities of the modern system already alluded to, with none of the taste and delicacy of execution to be found in the French and Italian schools. In those of a military character, the figures and dresses are stiff and formal, and the troops in the back-ground are seen charging the enemy with as great regularity and precision of step, as a squad of the Coldstream drilling in the Bird-Cage Walk. Monuments have lately been voted by Parliament in honour of Lords St Vincent and Duncan. Are we doomed to behold a repetition of the same Neptunes, Tridents, and British lions? Now that all those allegorical and mythological personages have been long ago banished from poetry, even school-boy themes and birth-day odes, one might hope, if they must be retained in monumental sculpture, that they would be used with at least some regard to modera-

tion and propriety. It is not intended to exclude subjects derived from Holy writ,—angels, cherubim, &c. which, when properly treated, are highly appropriate. But they should not be associated with profane mythology, a mixture of frequent occurrence in Italian churches, and even in St Peter's itself. In external architectural sculpture, where richness of decoration is a principal object, a greater latitude of allegory and mythology may be admissible.

Two late cotemporary works of statuary have attracted a good deal of public attention and criticism, the Achilles, or Ladies' Statue, in Hyde Park, by Westmacott, and the *Cenotaph* of the Princess Charlotte of Wales, by Wyatt. The latter is not yet put up, but is exhibited in the artist's house in Henrietta Street, Cavendish Square. Both have been raised by private subscription, at the cost of many thousand pounds. They afford, altogether, a remarkable and ludicrous contrast. Mr Westmacott seems to

have adopted the maxim, *Græca res est nihil velare*, for he has displayed, on a truly gigantic scale, unsophisticated nudity, leaving nothing to the imagination of his fair contributors. Mr Wyatt proceeds on an entirely opposite principle. He allows fancy to expand her wings, and take a boundless flight, having most ingeniously cast a veil, or rather thick shroud, nearly over his whole group, and contrived, out of some four or five figures, to expose to the vulgar gaze but one or two heads, and three hands! For legs or feet we should search in vain. The Achilles in the Park, when considered merely as an academy figure, or cast from the antique, is, without doubt, a fine and interesting work of art. But laying aside the want of judgment displayed in its choice and site—awkwardly placed in the most public corner of the Park—it merits the severest reprobation as a glaring example of that sort of bastard restoration, or rather senseless plagiarism, which, under the mask

of antiquity, tends to barbarism instead of improvement. An equestrian statue would have been the most appropriate monument in honour of his Grace of Wellington. Since Mr Westmacott was of a different opinion, it is to be regretted that his patronesses, the ladies of England, did not extend their generosity so far as to enable him to execute bronse casts of both of the equestrian groups of Monte Cavallo, instead of selecting one of the figures; and by the awkward expedient of clapping a buckler on his left shoulder, and supposing a sword in his right, metamorphosing him into an Achilles issuing from the bath. The two groups entire, would indeed have had a magnificent effect, placed on pedestals of a proper height, in some open and more retired situation—in front of Kensington Palace, or in the Regent's Park. Still, it might have been difficult to trace any rational connexion or analogy between the Duke of Wellington's exploits in the Peninsula, or at Waterloo,

and the equestrian statues of Castor and Pollux, any more than a naked Achilles, with a helmet on his head, issuing from the bath. If the ladies of England cannot now overthrow this mighty brazen idol, which they themselves have been the means of raising to their own shame, they should at least, for the sake of decency and national character, endeavour to get the inscription erased from its pedestal.

In the discussion already referred to, the Quarterly Reviewers, besides ridiculing the idea of executing a National Sculpture, announce their marked aversion to the practical introduction of Grecian architecture, more especially to the restoration of the Parthenon in Scotland. The only reasons attempted to be assigned are, that the Gothic, for which they entertain the most enthusiastic admiration, is, in their opinion, infinitely superior to the Grecian for English Churches; that Scotland is not Attica, nor the Calton-hill the Acropolis of Athens. In support of such powerful arguments

they give a quotation from Marmion, about "mine own romantic town," &c., not very applicable, it must be confessed, to the present state of the new city of Edinburgh—"The assertion made in the circular, that the Calton-hill is, in the opinion of those who have seen both, a finer situation for the display of the peculiar beauties of the Grecian Temple than even the Acropolis, which its able authors selected for that purpose—might be true, provided the Calton-hill stood in Attica, where the Acropolis stands, but it does not; and we have some suspicion that the circumstance makes a good deal of difference: How can the Calton-hill be a proper situation for the peculiar beauties of the Grecian Temple, so long as other beauties of so peculiar a nature are displayed around it—and well do they deserve the picturesque and glowing verses of the Minstrel of Scotland." (Here follow some lines from Marmion,) "To adapt the Parthenon to this scene, we must begin by blotting out every memorial of Scot-

tish antiquity, power, independence or piety, by which the Doric Temple is surrounded. Though the name of Walter Scott be inserted among the signatures to the circular letter, can he consent to such a sacrifice? Whilst the Abbey and Castle continue to hold their state, the Parthenon will be a perpetual and painful solecism. Justly may the people of Scotland be proud of their own romantic town, and of him whose transcendent genius has conferred upon all its historic monuments a more than classic immortality. Therefore they should seek to decorate it worthily, and nobly—obeying the yearnings of his mighty spirit, and so as to recall the memory of the ancient days of energy and independence, not by erecting a perpetual dissonance of landscape, jarring to all moral perception, and hostile to all national feeling." "The rudest cairn would be a treasure in comparison."*

---

* Quart. Rev. No. LIV.

The Reviewers must have been reduced to their last shift, when they could stoop to such empty declamation. They do not deny that the Calton-hill bears a striking general resemblance to the Acropolis—nor that the situation would be peculiarly well adapted for a Grecian Temple, *were it in Attica*—but being unfortunately in Scotland, and in the vicinity of some Gothic buildings, the result must, in their opinion, be quite the reverse.* All structures of whatever style

---

* The Edinburgh Reviewers, in contending that there is not a single Gothic structure to be seen from the Calton-hill, except the High Church, and the ruins of Holyrood Chapel, state what is not altogether correct. They seem literally to have overlooked Bridewell, the New Jail, Jailor's House, and Nelson's Monument; which, being all of a castellated Gothic, and situated on the hill itself, form decidedly the most conspicuous objects in the view. The only building on the hill of a Grecian character, is the small Temple of the Observatory, surmounted by a pitifully diminutive cupola,—and masked by high walls, as if it were deemed sacrilege to be permitted to approach too near, or even catch a glimpse of it, except at a respectable distance. It does not indeed necessarily follow, that a Grecian Temple is inadmissible, because Gothic structures happen to be in its vicinity, or within the range of its visible horizon, though it must be confessed, the National Monu-

of architecture, depend much on situation for effect, especially the Grecian Temple, from its unity and simplicity of form. The Greeks generally chose elevated and commanding eminences, and, not unfrequently, situations completely rural, and far removed from the bustle of cities. In illustration of which, besides the temples of the Acropolis, the following examples, among many others, might be enumerated :—The Temple of Minerva, on the promontory of Sunium—of Jupiter, on Mount Panhellenius, in Egina—of Apollo, on Mount Cotylus, amidst the forests of Arcadia—the temples on the rocky heights of Delphi and Eleusis—the Temple of Esculapius, near Ligurio, situated in a grove surrounded by mountains—the Doric temple on the pre-

ment would appear to greater advantage had these structures been less of a Gothic character, and still greater had they never been built at all. With respect to Nelson's Monument, in particular, there can be but one opinion—it ought to be pulled down as disgraceful to the taste of the age, and incompatible with the favourable effect of the Parthenon on its proposed site.

cipitous rocks of Segesta, the Temple of Venus, on Mount Eryx, in Sicily, besides those of Juno Lucina, Concord, Hercules, and Jupiter Olympus, on the lofty ridge of Agrigentum.—In modern times, too little attention has been paid to this important consideration. Great Britain, (and London in particular,) affords innumerable and lamentable instances of such neglect.* Could

---

* In Edinburgh, for instance, nothing can be conceived more unfortunate than the site of the New County Hall, with its handsome Grecian portico. It is buried behind the old and smoky houses of the Lawnmarket, nearly twice its height; obliquely in front rises the dark and venerable Gothic pile of St Giles' Cathedral; one flank is most awkwardly turned to the street, below the level of which it is sunk several feet—the other faces the new Courts and Libraries, with the architecture of which it has nothing in common.—The building for the Royal Society by Mr Playfair, now erecting at the north end of the Earthen Mound, cannot appear to advantage, placed in a hollow between the high masses of the Old and New Town, which must be seen overtopping it from whatever quarter it is approached. Its Grecian portico and principal front, like that of Marybone New Church, will face the north—an unfortunate exposure, which must deprive it of the sun's rays during the greater part of the year, and all the pleasing effects arising from reflected tints and picturesque display of light and shadow. The Pantheon of Rome has a portico so situated, but it is supposed to have owed its arrangement to some superstition con-

the Parthenon itself, renovated in all its glory, appear to any advantage surrounded by the mean and smoky houses of St Paul's Church-Yard, and St Mary-le-Grand,—or immersed in the filth of Bow Street, and Covent Garden Market? The site on the Calton-hill is admirably suited to the display of the Athenian Temple. Inexhaustible quarries of beautiful and durable freestone in the immediate vicinity, offer materials for its construction, equal in appearance to the finest Pentelican marble. The stone masons of Edinburgh are inferior to none in Europe; and have already proved

---

nected with its original destination. Mr Playfair's building, it is true, is provided with extensive lateral peristyles, but the pillars are placed so near the wall, that their effect will scarcely exceed that of attached columns, with windows placed between them. The great beauty and peculiar feature of Prince's Street, consists, not certainly in its architecture, but in its noble situation, great extent, and uniform and uninterrupted exposure as a terrace. Is it not to be feared the present edifice, however handsome, may derange that feature, and form a disagreeable obstruction to the view, both from the east and west approach?

themselves capable of executing the most difficult ornaments of Grecian architecture. The climate is peculiarly favourable. Pure, clear, and comparatively dry, it forms no small contrast to the smoke, soot, and damp mists, of the London atmosphere, which soon blackens, begrimes, and even rots the hardest stone—reducing all, whether marble, stone, brick, or plaster, to the same gloomy, dingy, and motley hue. The restoration will be attempted under circumstances more propitious than perhaps any other country of Europe can boast. Were a modern church adopted, a fearful chance of failure must be contemplated. In selecting the Parthenon as a model, no such risk is incurred. Provided we adhere to the original to the best of our ability, and exclude all modern innovation, a certain and glorious success must be achieved, the powerful influence of which, on the future efforts of national genius in the fine arts, it is impossible to appreciate.

What the Reviewers mean by asserting that the proposed restoration would create a "perpetual dissonance of landscape, jarring to all moral perception, and hostile to all national feeling;" and, therefore, recommending us to decorate "our own romantic town worthily and nobly — obeying the yearnings of Sir Walter Scott's mighty spirit," — it is really very difficult to guess. That celebrated person has already taken too decided a part to afford the slightest reason to suppose he has any wish to retract. Do they mean, then, that in defiance of his opinion, so openly manifested in favour of the Parthenon, we should endeavour to gather, in some shape or other, from his poems and novels, "the yearnings of his mighty spirit," for the purpose of enabling us to rear some Gothic Abbey, or castellated pile, in imitation of those of the middle ages, with tower and battlement, donjon-keep, and draw-bridge, not forgetting some convenient spot of ground in

its vicinity, where the young Advocates, Writers to the Signet, and the other spirited youth of the Caledonian capital, when tired of the theatrical exhibitions of Celtic clubs and archery, might, now that the radicals have disappeared, mount their yeomanry war steeds ; and, armed cap-a-pie, like their brave Saxon ancestors, amuse the ladies during the vacation with tilts and tournaments. It would indeed be an amusement fully as national and manly, as exposing their bleached limbs and nether parts in a fanciful Celtic garb—or equipped in a tartan dramatic costume, (which only wants the kilt to complete it,) shooting arrows at the bull's-eye of a target—a pastime which, in the southern part of the island, has of late been almost wholly abandoned to the softer sex.

The Quarterly Reviewers lavish the most unbounded encomiums on the Grecian Temple, provided it exists in Attica or Ionia. They denounce the principle of imitation

and restoration, as degrading to the original genius of modern artists. The Romans are lauded for inventing a new style, instead of imitating that of the Greeks. The Italian is preferred to the Roman, and the works of Sir Christopher Wren, who is called "the Ariosto of English architecture," are placed above those of Bramante, Michel Angelo, Palladio, and, in short, all the Italian masters. Lastly, they eulogise at great length the beauties and excellence of the Gothic, which is extolled above all the rest, (because, perhaps, it is farthest removed from the Grecian,) and is exclusively recommended as most suitable for English churches. "All things fairly considered, the Gothic style appears to be the most reasonable order for an English church. It is consecrated in its associations, and the most ordinary architect may easily learn to avoid any marked impropriety."* Wren was un-

* Quart. Rev. No. LIV. p. 316–321.

questionably a distinguished architect and engineer, a man of great talents, deeply versed in the science and learning of the times, but it may be doubted, whether, as an architect, he was not surpassed in genius and correct taste by his predecessor, Inigo Jones. Wren's churches, with the exception of St Paul's, and perhaps of St Stephen's, Walbrook, are wretched mixtures of corrupt Roman and Gothic.* We have been

* Mr Elmes, in his Life of Sir Christopher Wren, talks of St Paul's being the most splendid of modern buildings,—of its rivalling and surpassing, in purity of taste and scientific construction, St Peter's at Rome, the work of more than twenty architects, supported by the treasures of the Christian world, under the reign of twenty different popes. The circumstance of the number of architects and popes is more than once brought forward as a peculiar advantage which St Peter's enjoyed over St Paul's, while, in the opinion of every one who bestows a moment's consideration on the subject, it must be held to be quite the reverse. Had Michel Angelo, like Wren, lived to superintend the execution of his plan, for more than half a century, under the patronage of many successive sovereigns, St Peter's would have been very different from what it now is. Instead of a Latin, it would have assumed the more elegant form of a Greek cross! Instead of the present front, by the plasterer Maderna, it would have exhibited a portico and colonnade, which, in magnificence and dimensions, would have ri-

already told, indeed, " there is considerable difficulty in combining a steeple with the

---

valled any of ancient or modern times. Besides, in addition to many other imperfections caused by wilful deviation from his plan, or want of judgment in its execution, Fontana, after Michel Angelo's death, completed the dome in the short space of twenty-two months, and thus injured, in a material degree, the strength and solidity of its construction. It must be recollected, too, that though Michel Angelo was first employed by Julio II. to plan his Mausoleum, no sooner was it resolved to pull down the old church of St Peter's, and erect another in its place, than Bramante was chosen as the architect. To him succeeded Giulio de St Gallo, Giocondo, Antonio de San Gallo, Baldazar Peruzzi, &c. who carried on the building for forty years, though the plan during all that time remained unsettled. So that when Michel Angelo was at last recalled in his old age from Florence, and entrusted with its execution, he found himself reluctantly placed in a situation much less favourable than if the edifice had never been begun; without adverting to the jealousies of his rivals, and the caprices of the different popes, to which he was continually exposed during the few years that he survived. Mr Elmes proceeds to remark, that the form of St Paul's is that of the Italian Cathedral, cross like, and, *to a superficial observer, after the manner of St Peter's,* which it neither *adopts* nor *copies,* but *freely imitates,* almost even to *originality,* and, certainly, to *superiority over its Roman prototype.* This is really carrying English notions and prejudices a little too far, and is only exceeded by Sir William Chambers, who boldly declares St Martin's Church, in the Strand, a finer piece of architecture than the

Grecian or Roman architecture, and that Wren mastered the difficulty, and produced combinations scarcely inferior to the Gothic." Are we then to infer, that the excellence they admire in Wren's Grecian and Roman style, is chiefly to be attributed to

---

Parthenon of Athens. But keeping entirely out of view, on one hand, the beautiful situation of St Peter's, its fine colonnades, its fountains and obelisk,—its marbles, sculptures, bronzes, mosaics, and splendid decorations; on the other, the unfavourable site of St Paul's,—its dark, dirty, cold stone walls,—its gloomy, naked vaults, devoid of all ornament except the dusky faded paintings of the dome; confining our attention solely to their architectural designs, how infinitely superior in simplicity, elegance, and grandeur, is the Vatican Temple to the complicated masses, innumerable projections, and breaks of the English Cathedral! The dome of St Peter's is solid mason-work, consisting of two cupolas, that separate and again unite to support the Temple of the Lantern. That of St Paul's is merely false and apparent, consisting of wood, copper, &c., attached to a cone of brick-work, constructed on the ordinary principle of a glass-house. Hence the reason of the interior being so dark and compressed. St Paul's, nevertheless, is, on the whole, a fine building, equally creditable to the architect and the age in which it was produced; but it ought not to be held out as a model to the present times, still less brought into comparison with the Vatican Basilica, of which it is but a feeble and imperfect imitation.

its approximation to the principle of Gothic combination? He himself would not, most assuredly, have been much flattered by such a compliment. While they are urging the general adoption of the Gothic for English churches, we find Sir Christopher, in his Parentalia, and his friend, Mr Evelyn, taking every opportunity of reviling those structures, as "a fantastic light species of building," as "congestions of heavy, dark, melancholy, monkish piles, without any just proportion, use, or beauty;" "full of fret and lamentable imagery;" "without symmetry, regular proportion, union, and disposition." The pillars and arcades are stigmatised as "slender and mis-shapen, or, rather, bundles of staves and other incongruous props." And again, in the following passages,—"The universal and unreasonable thickness of the walls, clumsy buttresses, towers, sharp-pointed arches, doors and other apertures without proportion, nonsensical insertion of various marbles imperti-

nently placed, turrets and pinnacles thick set with monkeys and chimeras, and abundance of busy work and other incongruities, dissipate and break the angles of the sight, and so confound it, that one cannot consider with any steadiness where to begin or end; *taking off from that noble air and grandeur, bold and graceful manner, which the ancients had so well and judiciously established.*"*

To appreciate the beauty and superiority of the Grecian, we are not called upon to vilify and undervalue the Gothic. A person must, indeed, be devoid of all taste and feeling, who does not admire the best specimens of that style, independently of their venerable antiquity and historical associations. The plain and unadorned kind is, it must be confessed, extremely well adapted for country churches, or where economy must be consulted. But to imitate or presume to re-

* Parentalia, or Memoirs of the Family of the Wrens, p. 306.

store such buildings as York Minster, Lincoln, and Winchester Cathedrals, or the Chapel of King's College, Cambridge, is far beyond our reach; for had we the inclination, we possess neither the funds nor the science necessary for their completion.

The allegation, that the Romans did not adopt the Grecian architecture, appears to be without foundation. They generally employed architects and sculptors of that nation, and it is highly probable Rome owed her architectural fame and splendour, in a great measure, to the predominance of the Grecian in her temples, basilicæ, porticos, &c. The late excavations in the Piazza Trajana at Rome, now cleared to its ancient level, exhibit a variety of broken columns of great magnitude, some erect, others fallen, mutilated reliefs, statues, busts, proving beyond a doubt, that the Greek style prevailed in the Forum of Trajan, so celebrated as one of the greatest ornaments of ancient

Rome.* Apollodorus a Greek, was employed by Trajan to build his Forum, Odeum, and Gymnasium. Metellus Mardonicus raised a marble temple and portico bearing his name, which was adorned with numerous equestrian statues, the work of Lysippus. The portico was inclosed by two temples, one dedicated to Juno, the other to Apollo, both Grecian, and decorated with Grecian sculpture.† Porticos at Rome included, like the Thermæ, a variety of different buildings, as temples, libraries, schools, &c. They were very numerous, and generally colonnaded.‡ Grecian architects were not only in request at Rome, but the columns and ornaments were sometimes previously executed in Greece and trans-

---

* Wilson's Tour in Italy, Vol. II. p. 373-4.

† Stuart's Preface to Vol. I. p. iv. Vell. Pat. B. I. c. xi.

‡ The late excavation by Lucian Bonaparte on the site of the villa of Mæcenas at Tivoli, proves that there was but one order of columns in the Grecian manner, and not two, as formerly conjectured.

ported to Italy. Adrian raised a Lyceum in imitation of the Greeks—a Prytaneum, Pæcile, and Academia, after the model of those at Athens. In the preface to the third volume of Stuart's work, the author remarks, that " the Doric Portico or Agora at Athens, is another instance that the Athenian manner was not difficult to trace in the age of Augustus, and *probably the characteristic manner of the Greeks was not departed from but by slow degrees.*" Vitruvius, himself a Roman, illustrates *his precepts from Grecian examples*, and is supposed, according to the most probable opinion, to have formed his system from preceding treatises by Grecian architects.* In the hands of the Romans, it is true, it never reached its native perfection. But at the period of the conquest of Greece, a sensible decline had taken place in Grecian art, which was accelerated in the course of time

* Wilkins's Vitruvius, p. 34.

by the inferior taste and imperfect science of their conquerors, aided by that rage for novelty and originality, so fatal to the permanence of excellence in works of art. The Roman architecture, therefore, though in many respects corrupt, must have been in its origin and early stages essentially Grecian. If the Doric and Ionic lost much of their beauty and simplicity, the Corinthian in their practice rose to its highest perfection. Subsequently, indeed, they had the merit of successfully uniting the Grecian column and entablature with the arch and vault, derived from their Tuscan ancestors —thus producing a new and original combination, well suited to the wants of a great nation, and worthy the grandeur and magnificence of the masters of the world. Yet, can it be supposed their efforts would have been crowned with success, had they not previously, and for a length of time, practised a close imitation of the Grecian ?

We are warranted, therefore, in conclu-

ding, that the Romans adopted and imitated as nearly as their circumstances and inferior skill would admit, the architecture of Greece. We do not indeed learn they actually restored any of the most celebrated Grecian temples. The reason is obvious. Greece and her colonies, more especially Sicily, and that portion of Italy denominated Magna Græcia, formed a central and prominent part of the empire, equally accessible to a Roman as Ireland or Scotland is now to an Englishman. In such circumstances, restoration would have been superfluous. Moreover, those fine structures were then in a perfect state of preservation; nor did there appear the most distant chance of their destruction either by conquest or spoliation. The Italian architects were, in some degree, in the same situation in reference to the Roman remains in their immediate vicinity. " It is quite true, that the Romans did not copy the Grecian temples; and that the modern Italians have

not thought of attempting a restoration of the Colyseum or the Pantheon. But it is to be recollected the originals were within their reach, and had already exercised their salutary influence on the public taste. The ancient Romans had only to go to Pestum, Agrigentum, or Syracuse, to behold the purest Grecian temples; and their warlike youth, in the course of the military expeditions to which all citizens were liable, had perpetually in their eastern dominions the Grecian edifices placed before their eyes."*

It may be admitted to a certain extent, that as a model, the restoration of the Parthenon "will teach nothing to the architectural student which he cannot learn from the accurate drawings by which he is presented by his contemporaries."† Yet, of what avail is such knowledge, if it is never to be reduced to practice, but reserved for the portfolios and libraries of amateurs

* Edinburgh Review, No. LXXV. p. 137.
† Quarterly Review No. LIV.

and professional men? It would be just as consistent as a certain philosopher, who was so great an admirer of swimming, that he actually procured a person to give him instructions in the theory of the art, while sprawling on the table of his own study, though he had previously resolved never to practise it in water, an element to which he happened to have a mortal antipathy. When the architecture of a country is so mixed and corrupt as that of Great Britain, the only chance of improving the public taste, is to retrace our steps—to restore in whole, or in part, some of the most admired monuments of antiquity, as landmarks to guide us in our future progress. The eye soon gets accustomed to deformity in works of art. It is only by comparison that we are able to appreciate the difference, and wean ourselves from the effects of habit and prejudice. The most splendid drawings and engravings, the most correct models, fail in making a forcible impression

on the mind, or conveying a just idea of their originals. "Engravings, it has been justly observed, never become an object of interest, till the originals have been seen." The works of Stuart, Rivett, Chandler, and Le Roi, first laid open the treasures of Grecian art. Before that period, the remains of Greece were almost as completely lost to the world, as if they had been buried under the lavas of Etna or Vesuvius. They are now more or less in a state of dilapidation and decay—those of Attica in particular, which it is to be feared the present sanguinary and protracted struggle between the Greeks and their brutal oppressors, will visit with additional destruction, if not in many cases with total annihilation. Admitting the alarm to be groundless—placed at the distance of some thousand miles beyond seas and continents, among a semi-barbarous people—they must always be inaccessible but to a few favoured and adventurous travellers. Architectural works, such as

those of Stuart and Le Roi, &c. on the Grecian—Palladio, Piranesi, &c. on the Roman remains are much too expensive and scarce, ever to get into general circulation. They are not to be found in the best subscription and circulating libraries—and rarely indeed in the collections of private gentlemen. But supposing they were as accessible as books of an ordinary description, can we place implicit confidence in the truth and correctness of their designs? It will scarcely be disputed, for example, that those of Piranesi and Le Roi, however picturesque and beautiful as works of art, are notorious for their glaring inaccuracy and embellishment, and can therefore be of little practical use to the architectural student. Stuart's work, and a few others, are perhaps honourable exceptions. Yet a late professional traveller, whose accuracy cannot be questioned, imputes a good deal of error and general imperfection to the mea-

surements and designs in that work.* Stuart and Rivett's oversight in detecting the *entasis* of the columns has been already remarked.

It would appear likewise that magnitude, an essential ingredient in the sublime, is absolutely necessary to display architecture

---

* "Having submitted these observations, which seemed to be essential in publishing a work so immediately after that of Stuart on the same subject, it may be necessary to add, that I have laboured principally to supply what I conceive to be its defect: *His views of most of the buildings by no means convey adequate ideas* of their taste, simplicity, and elegance. This remark extends, in a great measure, to all the views from the pencil of Stuart, *but particularly to those of the Acropolis of Athens, which are extremely imperfect.* It is matter of surprise, that the almost exclusive merit of having measured and drawn the antiquities of Athens, &c., should have been attributed to that gentleman, when in fact so small a share of this valuable work was the result of his personal labour and experience. It will appear, in referring to the original materials, that Rivett measured and delineated the principal parts, if not the whole of the architectural subjects, while Pars contributed several of the views, and the more considerable proportion of the sculpture contained in the second and third volumes. Some of the plates also were added by Reveley; thus leaving little more than the editorship to Stuart, who, it must be acknowledged, deserves no common praise for his very careful and judicious arrangement."—*Pref. p. 3. Allason's Antiquities of Pola.*

to advantage. Mr Burke, in his Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful, remarks, that, "To the sublime in building, greatness of dimension seems requisite; for on a few parts, and those small, the imagination cannot rise to any degree of infinity. No *greatness in the manner* can effectually compensate for the *want of proper dimensions*." Hence one reason why models or epitomes of buildings, however correct, fail in producing the same impression on the mind of the beholder. Another, perhaps, is the absence of that brilliant play of light and shadow, and diversified effect of perspective, owing to the object not being seen at the proper angle of vision, and under the natural breadth of shade. All travellers are struck with a certain indescribable emotion of wonder and sublimity, on beholding the Pyramids of Egypt, independently of their peculiarity of form, or the interest excited by their remote antiquity: Let the most correct models be exhibited, and they will

be viewed with cold indifference. This remark is equally applicable to the simplicity and severe grandeur of the Grecian Doric Temple, of which no specimen worthy the name is to be found in modern Europe. In England, there are a few late examples of meagre detached porticos, such as that of Covent-Garden Theatre, Bow Street, (the most favourable,) the small brick and plaster chapel in the Regent's Park—and several others of a similar kind erected within a few years, in different parts of the kingdom. English architects, indeed, seem to think this order best adapted to the petty decoration of the porches of town-mansions and shop-fronts. Pestum and Doric pillars, of dwarfish dimensions, may be observed attached to almost every second house or shop in Waterloo Place and Regent Street, from Pall-Mall to Oxford Street, while the portico of the new church in the same line, which afforded at least a better opportunity for their display, is a sort of corrupt Roman Doric.

One of the most formidable objections, in the opinion of the Quarterly Reviewers, to the introduction of the pure Grecian, is the necessity of excluding the arch. The beauty, science, and utility of the arch, when properly applied in the Roman, Italian, and Gothic styles, or when regarded as a branch of engineering in bridges, aqueducts, &c. cannot be disputed.* Yet in an order where it is not required—where it would not only be superfluous, but a deformity, it is surely carrying the partiality for it a ridiculous length, to abandon the most perfect architecture the world ever beheld—the parent source from which all later systems have

---

* " Bridges excepted, in which alone modern architecture is greater than the ancient, (and in none more than those of England,) where *arches are justified by necessity, I do not consider the adoption of them as conferring either beauty or stability to architecture.* The classic Temples of ancient Greece, *those wonders of human ability,* so completely arrest and absorb the mental powers of the spectator, that no scope is left for the allurements of the imagination, *nor the intrusion of the idea that they might have been improved by the admission of the arch.*"—Gunn, *on Gothic Architecture, p.* 186-7.

sprung; because, forsooth, we cannot indulge our predilection for Gothic combination of arcades. In the fine arts, science and utility, it must be recollected, do not always involve grace and beauty. The moderns have perhaps excelled in the two former—the ancients, unquestionably, in the latter. But, are arches or arcades, in any form or combination, comparable to the pillared architecture of Greece? Does the restoration of a few examples of the original and standard order in its purity, necessarily corrupt and exclude the others? or, would it not rather tend to fix and improve them? On the subject of the arch, the Earl of Aberdeen, in his late Treatise on Grecian Architecture,* makes the following just reflections:—"We cannot wonder that a discovery so powerfully recommended by its character of utility, convenience, and cheapness, should, when once known, have

* P. 210-11.

been speedily adopted throughout the civilized world. How far these advantages may have contributed to the employment of the arch to situations *in which it was ill-suited, and indeed inapplicable, it is not necessary to inquire. We may doubt whether a very material addition has been made to the ornamental architecture of the Greeks by its construction. Few will deny, that its abuse has perpetuated a greater corruption of style, and a more truly vitiated taste, than would probably have been witnessed had it never existed.*"

After exhausting every possible argument against the introduction of the Grecian and restoration of the Parthenon, the Reviewers " beg leave to state distinctly, that their objections are mainly gathered from the most competent judges in their behalf:"—That " they have hardly ventured to make any remark which has not been sanctioned in substance by the sculptors, architects, and dilettanti, of the southern

Metropolis." In short, they confidently assert, that " they are the faithful organ of the general sentiment ;" and, that the best-informed artists and lovers of art in England, oppose themselves to the scheme, because they are fairly convinced that it will powerfully impede the progress and cultivation of original design." They seem to regard the Earl of Aberdeen as one of their conclave, and rather triumphantly quote a passage from his work in illustration of their doctrine. It is to be regretted, indeed, his Lordship should have expressed any opinion that could afford a colouring of support to such a system of narrow-minded bigotry and exclusion, diametrically opposed to the scope and principles of his excellent Essay. His Lordship recommends an imitation of the Grecian—not *with the servile hand of a copyist, or with a strict adherence to the details of the edifice,* but with a due regard to the changes of customs and manners—to the difference of

climate and condition of modern society.* The Quarterly Reviewers, on the other hand, supported by their professional and dilettanti friends, being of opinion that the pure Grecian is unfit for modern times, and unwilling that its perfections should be impaired by corrupt innovations, are determined to reject it altogether. Both agree in extolling its unrivalled perfection. The Reviewers, with more appearance of consistency, abandon what they do not choose to corrupt. His Lordship, after exciting our admiration and enthusiasm by his classical descriptions and critical disquisitions, most provokingly and unaccountably concludes, by advising modern architects—not to restore or imitate correctly—but "to strive to possess themselves of the spirit and genius with which the originals were planned

* Lord Aberdeen's Treatise, pp. 216-17,—likewise, Edinburgh Review, No. LXXV. p. 144, where the fallacy of this reasoning is exposed.

and directed ;" or, in other words, to open a wide door to every kind of corruption and vitious innovation.

But it might be asked, what right the Reviewers, architects, sculptors, and dilettanti of the southern Metropolis, have "to oppose themselves" to the execution of a scheme in the northern Capital, with which they have no concern, in which they have not been consulted, and for which, it is presumed, they do not mean to contribute. Can we really imagine these gentlemen take so deep an interest in the success of our National Monument ? Are they not rather actuated on the present occasion by a slight ebullition of pettish jealousy, lest its successful accomplishment should eclipse the architectural glory of the southern Metropolis, —not excepting the Athenian St Pancras, with its double Pandrosium and Tower of the Winds, or the boasted façades of Regent Street !

How the restoration of the Parthenon in

Scotland should powerfully impede the progress of art and original design, "is a paradox not a little incomprehensible." Let us suppose a case, that the Greeks were to succeed in finally throwing off the yoke of their Turkish oppressors, and in raising themselves once more into a free and independent nation—an event by no means improbable — would the Reviewers and their friends "oppose themselves" to the modern Athenians restoring their ancient Parthenon, because it would impede the progress of art and original design? Would they recommend them to adopt some plan of Sir Christopher Wren's?—or the Gothic?—or perhaps attempt a new style, better suited to modern customs and manners?

Mr Elmes, in his Life of Sir Christopher Wren, takes an opportunity of vindicating the doctrine laid down by the Reviewers and the Earl of Aberdeen, relative to the subject of restoration and close imitation, which he

stigmatizes as "plagiarism and downright theft,* without even enough of that inge-

---

* In the following passage, on the same subject, one would suspect he had in his eye St Pancras, and its Tower of the Winds: "It consists in imparting, as it were, such portions of a foreign or ancient style, as appears suited to the purposes of its importers, and perverting them to their own use; *not as their authors would have done in their time, but forcibly torturing an ancient art to modern uses.* Such as these are mean copiers, trading importers, common borrowers."

With respect to the contempt entertained by Mr Elmes and his professional friends, for restoration, and their admiration of the efforts of original invention, it might be sufficient to refer to a passage from Seward's Anecdotes, (Vol. II.) quoted in his own works. "Many of the buildings which have remained to us from the ancients, are universally allowed to be perfect models of the art of architecture. In spite of the rewards offered by sovereigns, and of that innate desire of man to do something more and better than his predecessors have done, every attempt to add another order of architecture to the five long since transmitted to us from the Greeks, has been vain and fruitless, and has, in general, effected nothing but a variation in the Corinthian order. The art of building being an art, of which the constituent parts are utility and beauty, must have soon arrived at its point of perfection. We have but little left to do but to arrange and compare. What has the rage of inventing in architecture produced in our times? May-poles, instead of columns, capitals of no order, and adjuncts and decorations, so whimsical, so minute, so split into small parts, tortured into grotesque forms, that, as Lord Bacon observes of plots in gardens, you may see as good sights often in tarts."

nuity to conceal it, which among the Lacedemonians procured a pardon for a thief." He does not, indeed, make a direct allusion to the restoration of the Parthenon in Scotland; but from his eulogiums on the article in the Quarterly Review, the application is sufficiently obvious. He is at the same time a little out of humour with the epithet, "Ariosto of English architecture," bestowed on Wren by the Reviewers, and contends rather quaintly, that Borromini or Bernini has a better claim to that distinction! while Sir Christopher ought to be compared to Tasso or Virgil. (Note to p. 32-4.)

When Stuart's Athens first began to direct the attention of the public to Grecian architecture, Sir William Chambers indulged himself in a virulent attack on it, in his Treatise on the Decorative Part of Civil Architecture. He is of opinion it should be entirely excluded from the study of the modern architectural student. He recom-

mends him to "travel, as necessary to acquire superiority in his profession." "*Books*," he says, "*cannot avail, descriptions and drawings, and prints, are but weak substitutes for realities.* Since the Grecian structures, even in the time of Pericles or Alexander, do not deserve great notice, either for dimension, grandeur of style, rich fancy, or elegant taste, it follows that our knowledge ought not to be collected from them, but some purer or more abundant source, which, in whatever relates to the art, can be no other than the Roman antiquities yet remaining in Italy."* In short, to give a true specimen of his knowledge and taste, he asserts, (as already mentioned,) "that the famous Parthenon," as he calls it in derision, "is inferior, both in size and beauty of architecture, to St Martin's Church in the Strand!" If it be difficult, even on the plea of ignorance and prejudice, to find an ex-

* Sir William Chambers' Treatise on the Decorative Part of Civil Architecture.

cuse for such illiberal dogmatism, what shall we say at this time of day in palliation of the opinions so deliberately avowed by the Reviewers and their professional and dilettanti supporters? Can the latter be members of that society of dilettanti, to whose zeal and exertions architecture and sculpture have been so much indebted?

The general scope of reasoning employed in the Quarterly Review, if it prove anything, proves too much. For if no nation be entitled to adopt the arts and architecture of another that may happen to differ from it in climate and manners, or precede it in the career of improvement; if each country must be confined to that precise species of art that shall be defined to be national or indigenous, there would be an end at once to every kind of amelioration and improvement. When a proposition involves an absurd conclusion, it does not require a regular demonstration to shew its fallacy. The same arguments might be di-

rected against all arts and all systems of architecture whatever, ancient and modern, not excepting even St Paul's Cathedral, the style of which has most assuredly no pretensions to be English or national. If, in Scotland, we are driven to the expedient of raising a cairn,* let our southern neighbours keep us in countenance, by battering down St Paul's. Nay, it will be no easy matter to prove the Gothic of English growth, the French and Normans having prior claims to it. If we are to believe their oracle, Sir Christopher Wren, it is of Arabic or Saracenic origin, which would only transfer them to the other horn of the dilemma.†

---

* Quarterly Review, No. LIV.

† Wren's ideas were so confused and contradictory on the subject of the Gothic, that he ascribes the buildings of St Cross and Winchester Cathedral, to the Saxons, before the Conquest, while he denies them the use of glass for windows; yet he attributes the invention of tracery work "to the necessity of disposing the mullions for the better fixing in of glass," which he refers to the end of the thirteenth century. He traces the invention of the pointed style to the Saracens in the seventh and eighth centuries, though he quotes Mr Evelyn in support of his theory, who asserts that "this fantastic light species of

When we take into consideration the wealth, learning, and science of the British empire, the rapid improvements in some departments of the arts, and the laborious study and research bestowed on the theory and history of all of them, it is surprising how little good architecture is to be found in the British metropolis. With the exception of a few buildings, like St Paul's Cathedral, the Banqueting-House at Whitehall, St Paul's, Covent Garden,* the Monument, the Bridges, Greenwich Hospital, and some others of less note, what is there in the shape of a public edifice of the higher class, worthy a moment's consideration in an architectural point of view?† The

---

building" was introduced by the Goths and Vandals of the North, when they subverted the Western Empire two centuries later.—*Rev. Mr Milner's Letter to Mr Taylor, pp.* 14, 15, *and Note.*

* This church, by Inigo Jones, conveys a general idea of the ancient temple *in antis;* yet it must be recollected, that the rules laid down by Vitruvius for the Tuscan, refer to *its being constructed chiefly of wood.*

† Sir James Mackintosh, in a debate last session of Parliament, on the subject of the British Museum, makes the fol-

Mansion-House, Custom-House, Bank of England, East-India House, Somerset-House, Carlton Palace, Admiralty, Horse Guards, Drury-Lane Theatre, the Opera-House, the late addition to Westminster-Hall and the Houses of Parliament, the Penitentiary at Millbank—are such struc-

---

lowing remarks on the architecture of the English capital:—"London, though the greatest city, is *the least ornamental metropolis in Europe.* For almost a century this city was without any ornamental architectural additions. *The late effort of improvement, of which he wished to speak without any disparagement, partook more of the neatness of individual taste than of general grandeur:* This was perhaps owing to inadequate encouragement; and upon that subject he begged to deny that the fine *arts flourished under private patronage.....* As to improvement of architecture in the capital, there were three great causes to retard it; the first, the distance of materials; the second, the taste of the higher classes for a country life; the third, the taste of the middle classes for comfort, rather than display. The first was unavoidable; the second difficult to surmount; the third not to be removed."

The *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent on all stone and slate carried by sea from one port to another, only repealed last session, might have been stated as an additional obstacle to the improvement of architecture in the metropolis. It seemed not only calculated to force the inhabitants of London to use nothing but brick and tile for building, but acted as a direct discouragement to the architecture, as well as agriculture, of the kingdom at large.

tures to be held out as models for the study of the professional student, or standards for regulating the public taste? As to ecclesiastical architecture, almost all the churches that are not Gothic, including nearly the whole of Sir Christopher Wren's, are of a mixed and vitiated style. Even his biographer and panegyrist, Mr Elmes, with the exception of St Paul's, and a few others, merely praises them for the economy, solidity, and scientific ingenuity of their construction. St Martin's Church in the Strand, and St George's, Hanover Square, are in better taste, and highly respectable, according to the taste of the times in which they were built. The late structures of Marybone* and St Pancras, on which such enor-

* "In the design of this church (Mary-bone) the Roman style of order is mixed with some Italian peculiarities, and the whole combined with reference to Grecian taste; in fact, it appears to have been the endeavour of the architect to unite in this building, intended to form a dignified whole, whatever might be usefully adapted from the various ages and countries of systematized architecture; and under the circumstances of the alteration that took place, by which the building was increased from a chapel to an edifice of superior magnitude and

mous sums have been expended, are, with much higher pretensions, entitled to little preference ; nor are they more of a Grecian character. The Reviewers tell us, indeed, that no church should be without a lofty steeple, because "the heaven-directed spire has a sacred dignity which should never be sacrificed, except under the pressure of the most imposing necessity;" yet they confess there is considerable difficulty in combining a steeple with the Grecian or Roman architecture, though they allege Wren mastered that difficulty! In another passage they inform us, that "the Grecian or Roman stee-

---

character, it was a difficult task to unite the parts in such a way that the combination should be complete: this is not quite so perfect as could be wished, but perhaps is more so than might have been expected. *In building a Christian church, the architect, from long established custom, is obliged to contend with a difficulty arising from the absurd practice of appending a steeple to it. The steeple formed no part of the Greek or Roman Temple,* the prevailing lines of which are horizontal; but that of the steeple is a vertical one, which, however suited to its early and original style of architecture, and to the latter forms of the Gothic character, in which such lines prevail, *is most inauspicious to the design of a Grecian edifice."—Repository of Arts, Literature, &c. for October,* 1816, pp. 191-2.

ple appears worst and ugliest when, as at St Martin's-in-the-Fields, it is seen riding athwart a Corinthian portico, to which it does not bear the slightest affinity, and best when, according to the favourite practice of Palladio, it stands by the side of the edifice as a campanile, or bell-tower." Yet what is a Grecian or Roman steeple? Had it any existence among the Greeks and Romans? If worst and ugliest when riding athwart a Corinthian portico, and best when detached from the building altogether, how came Wren to master the difficulty? In ordinary churches, though decorated with pediments and porticos, it may not be possible to dispense with towers or spires, because they are useful as belfries, and ornamental to a city when viewed at a distance. But then such buildings, whatever may be the style of their component parts, must forfeit all title to be called *Grecian or Roman:* Let them rather be classed under the *Modern Ecclesiastic style.*—In spite of the practice of Sir

Christopher Wren, the recommendation of Sir William Chambers, and the authority of the Quarterly Reviewers, spires, towers, or belfries, of any form, are incompatible with a structure having the smallest pretension to be a restoration or imitation of an ancient Temple. The prevailing lines of the Grecian and Roman architecture are horizontal, those of the steeple verticle, and consequently at variance with the leading line of the entablature above the columns. If the architect attempt to assimilate the spire to the laws of Grecian architecture, which is so often done in the present day, the transverse lines of the different entablatures, cornices, imposts, &c. destroy its lineal harmony, and produce nothing but confusion Neither can the dome be applied to the pure Grecian, though its successful combination with the Roman by the great Italian architects, must now be regarded as classic authority. In Italy, during the middle ages, square towers, often detached, and

sometimes adhering to the buildings to which they belonged, were in frequent use. Spires were less common, and of later date. In England, high towers and cross aisles were first introduced in the time of Alfred, or somewhat later. The Saxon churches were generally of an oblong square form, semicircular at the east end, like the Roman basilica. Towers formed at first a part of the building, and rose little higher than the roof, being intended as lanterns for the admission of light; but the general use of bells is supposed to have suggested the expedient of raising their height. Spires were subsequently constructed on those towers, such as that of Salisbury, and many other examples.

The modern Grecian or Roman spire, as it is called, is therefore a monster in architecture, unknown to the ancients. That which approaches the shape of a rounded tower or elongated dome, is less offensive when combined with the Roman, though

much inferior to the grandeur and fine proportions of the Italian dome. The real tapering Gothic steeple, springing from a square tower, without any adventitious ornament, has a fine effect when united to a Gothic pile.

In addition to the new Churches and Theatres, the extensive range of Waterloo Place and Regent Street has afforded a wide field for architectural display. It is certainly a great improvement, and, as far as regards a spacious street, handsome shops, and facility of communication, is not to be surpassed by any city of Europe. The first impression on viewing the long and varied lines of pillars, pediments, cupolas—of projections and decorations, in endless succession of perspective, is that of surprise and magnificence. To those, however, who possess any knowledge of the art, a more particular examination must be followed by disgust and regret, at the bad taste and gratuitous affectation that predominate in the

greater part of the line. Grecian and Roman beauties are literally " clustered by Goths." Excepting the colonnade of the quadrant, which is chaste and handsome, and one or two of the façades, particularly the division between Conduit and Old Burlington Street, which are rich and elegant, considered as *mere architectural elevations*, could we get over the incongruity of their being associated with shops, overtopped by mean attics, and countless rows of chimneys—there is scarcely a corrupt deviation, or capricious combination in the modern application of the art, that may not be detected in this street; viz. massy porticos, and pediments, colonnades and circular temples hoisted on high—pediments overtopped by pediments—innumerable projections and recesses, stuck with unmeaning columns—windows glaring under the colonnades, through them and above them—of every possible form—round-topped, semicircular, venetian, oval, round, square—

heavy balustrades, surmounted by rows of half-concealed mean attics and roofs—the whole liberally interspersed with Caryatides and Persians, Doric, Pestum, Egyptian, eastern, and nondescript pillars, with various petty and fantastic ornaments and accessories, all mixed up and confounded together. They are built on a short lease. There is scarcely a stone employed in their construction. All is thin brick walls, covered with plaster, retained together by beams of wood, and supported chiefly by iron pipes. A building, as the Quarterly Reviewers well observe, which "we know to be constructed of Canada deals and cast-iron pipes, daubed with lithick paint and patent mastic, *will never please us as much as if it was raised of free-stone.*"

The new-buildings fronting the Regent's Park, which the Edinburgh Reviewers think chaste and elegant examples of the application of Grecian architecture, are liable in some respects to the same objections as those

of Regent Street; though less offensive, because they are not shop-buildings. The pediments and colonnades of the centres and wings, are heavy and disproportionate, and forced into awkward arrangements, from the necessity of subdividing them into separate dwelling-houses. The little Grecian Chapel, with its Doric portico, is most pitiful. It is easy to produce an imposing appearance of confused magnificence by means of projecting pediments and colonnades, but difficult to apply them in a chaste and correct manner in buildings of that description. The crescent at the north end of Portland Place, with its basement of coupled columns, is, however, simple and elegant. The private houses of the Greeks and Romans were plain and modest, while their public buildings shone with unrivalled splendour. We seem to adopt a system altogether the reverse. Our private houses and shop-buildings mimic, in mock majesty, the style and decoration of palaces, while

our public edifices, comparatively plain and meagre, are calculated only for convenience and accommodation. It has been said of the English, that their hospitals are like palaces, and their palaces like hospitals. It has likewise been justly observed, by Mr Galt,* that their churches are like theatres, and their theatres like churches.† Private houses in streets and rows may be handsomé and elegant, though plain and chaste. The style of decoration for such buildings, whether there is one order with a basement, as is now generally adopted, or two after the manner of the banqueting-house at Whitehall,‡ should never ex-

---

* Mr Galt's Letters from the Levant.

† The Doric among the Greeks and Romans was reserved almost exclusively for Temples. In England, the Theatres are generally Doric, and the Churches Ionic or Corinthian.

‡ Among the great number of new buildings that are projected and in progress in Edinburgh, elevations somewhat in the style of the Banqueting-house at Whitehall, with a flat-roof and balustrade, would be a good variety. The breaks above the columns might be avoided, and the orders and arrangement rendered in other respects more simple.

tend beyond attached columns, and pilasters with a balustrade and flat-roof. The town mansions (detached) and country-seats of the higher ranks, are of course exceptions: They admit of the highest decoration, particularly the latter, which exhibit, perhaps, some of the finest specimens of the art in the island.*

The modern architecture of Scotland, as far as regards public buildings, partakes of the same general character as that of England. Private houses of every description are, however, much more substantial and

---

* It is curious to observe, while streets and rows of houses are rising every year in clusters round London and Edinburgh, Cheltenham, Leamington, and all the watering-places—the state of the country, and the habits of modern society, are such, as not only to force a large proportion of the landed proprietors to abandon their seats, resort to towns and watering-places, or retire to the Continent, but some actually to pull them down, and many to let or sell them to those who cannot afford to keep them in repair. Wanstead House is a melancholy example of the former; Prior Park, near Bath, of the latter.—It is not impossible that Fonthill Abbey may one day share the same fate.

durable, owing to the abundance of free-stone and slate—and the system of building leases being unknown. Edinburgh is justly celebrated for its beauty and fine situation ; yet, it must be confessed, the older part of the New Town has very little to boast of in point of architectural taste. The high sloping roofs, and huge garret-windows, projecting from them without parapets or balustrades, are a great deformity, while the monotonous regularity of the elevations, uninterrupted by balconies, verandas, French blinds, or anything that the eye can rest upon, conveys an impression of meagre sameness, and naked insipidity. Prince's Street, the cross streets, and St Andrew Square, are now much improved by being partially converted into shops, hotels, &c. Indeed, the more this part of the town is cut up the better ; and it would even be desirable, that an additional story, regularly executed, with a flat-roof, like some already built in Prince's Street and St An-

drew Square, were added to the whole of the northern quarter of the New Town—which is horribly disfigured by those projecting windows on the roofs. Charlotte Square, Heriot-row, Abercromby Place, and the buildings northward, how handsome soever in other respects, shew too great a height of roof. Our architects would do well in this particular, to imitate the plan of the houses of London and Bath, the roofs of which are comparatively low, and generally masked by a parapet or balustrade. The inequality of ground on which the New Town is placed, precludes, it is true, the possibility of entirely concealing the roofs—but a balustrade of a moderate height would go far to remedy the defect; and would, at all events, have the desired effect, when viewed from the opposite side of the broadest street in the city. In the new buildings now erecting on Coates, Hillside, and the Earl of Moray's grounds, parapets, and an improved roof, are beginning to be introduced. The ele-

vation of that range fronting the west end of Queen Street, is particularly simple and elegant, and may well vie with any in the neighbourhood of the Regent's Park.*

There is little variety in the Ecclesiastical architecture of Scotland. The modern Presbyterian Church is generally distinguished by a spire or steeple, ornamented in the usual manner with pillars, pilasters, &c.—a scanty colonnade and portico, having no connexion whatever with the rest of the building—a double row of round-headed windows—and a high-pointed roof, at variance with the angle and level of the pediment. The portico is sometimes wanting, in which case the steeple is either attached to the gable, or placed on the top of it. Those recently built, differ little in charac-

---

* It has one fault, however, in common with many others of the present day.—The order is neither Tuscan, nor Doric, but a sort of meagre substitute, with an attic base, divested of the distinguishing marks of either. If economy be the object, it is but a poor saving on buildings of that description.

ter from the English modern Church, though towers or belfries, like St Pancras and Marybone, have not yet been introduced—for it is impossible to dignify with that name the miserable attempts in that style, exemplified in the two new Chapels of Ease, at Stockbridge and Hopepark. The greatest effort of modern church-building, is St George's, Charlotte Square. It is built on a different and more imposing plan. It is surmounted by a high and capacious dome, springing awkwardly, and, it is believed, not very securely, from a square foundation. The dome is not visible from any part of the interior. Instead of a pediment and portico in front, there is a large recess or opening provided with four columns, without a regular entablature—a favourite resource among Scottish architects, as may be observed in many public buildings in Edinburgh and its vicinity.* The

* Viz. The Old Bank—The New Buildings connected with

general effect is heavy and inelegant. The interior, with its concave ceiling, in imitation of a cupola, and flattened arcades, clumsily ornamented, and loaded with galleries, is equally ponderous, bearing a strong resemblance to an overgrown cellar. Yet, it is but justice to say, a better taste is rapidly gaining ground in Scotland, which, it is to be hoped, will soon extend to Ecclesiastical structures. The Regent's Bridge, with all its defects, is a fine range of building, and is disfigured by few of the corruptions and peculiarities so conspicuous in the street of the same name in London.* The New

---

the Courts of Law—The Regent's Bridge—The Custom-House, Episcopal Chapel, Leith, &c.

* The most obvious defects, besides the practice of sinking the columns in a nich already alluded to, are the diversity of the different levels of the corresponding parts of the respective ranges, and the unusual number and crowded state of the windows, detracting considerably from the effect of the elevation. The two narrow projecting pediments on the corners—and their awkwardly tall Ionic columns, are, it must be confessed, as contemptible as anything to be found in Regent Street. They have likewise been made to project about 13 feet beyond the

College of Edinburgh, altered and new-modelled by Mr Playfair, from the plans of Adams, promises, as a specimen of the Roman and Italian manner, to rival the best designs of Palladio and Inigo Jones.

In no country was architecture in former times more encouraged or better practised, according to the taste of the age, than in Scotland, whether we look to her Cathedrals, churches, and religious houses, reduced to premature ruin by the barbarous

---

former houses, the consequence of which is, that the head of Leith Street, the greatest thoroughfare in Edinburgh, has been narrowed to such a degree as to cause much inconvenience, if not danger, to the public. The appropriate elevation and spacious sweep of the buildings leading from Leith Walk into the new street at Hillside, form a striking contrast in every respect. An extraordinary clamour was some time ago raised against the New Buildings, North Bridge, merely because they were supposed to mask the Gothic towers of the Jailor's House on the Calton-hill. But in that case, the Town-Council and feuars, instead of encroaching, gave an additional breadth of 12 feet to the Bridge—which of itself was conferring a great benefit on the public. Yet, the same people who were so outrageous against these buildings, unquestionably the handsomest shop-range in the city—and a very great improvement when compared with old St Ann Street, never dreamt of resisting an unjustifiable encroachment, and irremediable nuisance, that was rising up under their very noses.

zeal of John Knox, and the early reformers, —to the splendid remains of her Royal Palaces, which have suffered so much from the shameful neglect of their keepers, and the culpable apathy of Government ;* or to the baronial and castellated residences of her nobility and gentry, some of which still remain to attest their former magnificence.† The arts of carving in stone and wood, necessarily associated with the introduction

---

* Since his Majesty's visit to Scotland, a liberal grant has been made for the repair and restoration of Holyrood Palace and Chapel.

† In addition to Holyrood, the Kings of Scotland possessed the Royal Palaces of Linlithgow, Falkirk, Stirling, Scone, and Dunfermline, which, for beauty and magnificence, were inferior to none in Europe—besides others that formed occasional residences, as Lochmaben, Dunstaffnage, Dunoon, Carrick, Castle of Rothsey, &c. To those who have seen the fine ruins of Linlithgow Palace, the opinion pronounced by Mary of Guise, James the Fifth's second Queen,—" That it was equal to any of the Royal Palaces of France," will not appear much exaggerated. Of the noblemen's seats, Winton House, and Castle Seaton, belonging to Lord Seaton—no traces of which now remain, are celebrated by contemporary writers, not only for their architecture, but the singular beauty of their grounds and gardens.—See BLACKWOOD'S *Magazine*, Vol. II. *under the article, Stirling Heads.*—PINKERTON, Vol. II. *Late Expedition in Scotland in* 1544.—DALZEL'S *Fragments.*

and continuance of Gothic architecture, seem also to have arrived at great perfection. The Stuarts, with all their faults, were munificent patrons of architecture and the fine arts. But the convulsions and dissensions, both civil and religious, that so long agitated the kingdom, not only arrested the progress of the arts, but plunged the country into a state of stupor, distraction, and poverty, from which she did not begin to emerge till the middle of the 18th century. Within the last 40 years, however, she has made unprecedented advances in every department of industry and wealth, connected with national prosperity. The progress in the fine arts has been equally conspicuous. In architecture more especially, the spirit of enterprize and improvement is, at the present moment, stronger than ever, and only requires to be united and properly directed, to produce the most successful results.

It has been asserted, that architecture is

not an imitation of nature, and that consequently its forms being conventional, do not admit of abstract perfection, but are susceptible of as many *varieties of perfection* as of destination. Were this principle admitted, it must extend to the individual forms and proportions of the respective orders, as well as to their combinations. Why then stoop to borrow at all from the Greeks and Romans? Why not strike at once into bold and original invention, and give birth to a new *conventional* architecture, a new order of columns, entablature, mouldings—new forms and combinations of arches, according *to the yearnings of modern genius and fancy*—that shall at once supersede all grovelling imitation of the ancients, and found an unequivocal and legitimate claim to originality? But should the pretensions of those champions of an original architecture, not soar quite so high—should they be unable, as is most probable, to emancipate themselves altogether from the esta-

blished elementary forms of antiquity, round which their imaginations continue to linger —let them not be ashamed to imitate and restore the works of their masters, before they attempt new styles, and original combinations.

It is unreasonable to infer, that those who are desirous of restoring the Parthenon as the National Monument of Scotland, are so bigotted in their exclusive admiration of the Grecian, as to imagine it could be generally applied to all kinds of public edifices—though it certainly remains to be satisfactorily proved, that it could not be successfully adopted in many structures of a simple character, and with a slight modification (such as not to injure its character) in much of the pillared and ornamental architecture of modern times. Nay, after restoring some of the best specimens of the Grecian, why not proceed to a few select examples of the Roman—preparatory to a study and imitation of the most celebrated

Italian masters?—Even the Gothic should not be neglected, the plain and unadorned style being, in many cases, well adapted to country churches. In short, a system of select restoration and imitation of the different kinds of architecture, beginning with the Grecian as the original standard, would offer the best means of ensuring the purity of each; and, by establishing a school of practice for professional men, afford the most effectual preparation for new combinations and original designs.

It has been alleged as a reason for withholding the sculpture, that, to a spectator, placed at a certain distance, it would be invisible. This argument might have some weight, were the National Monument erected merely to answer the purpose of a picturesque object, to be seen from certain remote points of view, like a mimic temple or ruin, in the pleasure-grounds of a park. The station best calculated for displaying its architectural beauty, will be on the Calton-

hill itself, so near as to embrace the whole structure and its details—receive the full impression of its magnitude—and by successively changing the points of view—enjoy the varied perspective of the pediments, peristyles, and porticos. This will be precisely the range within which the external sculpture, combined with the architecture, will be viewed to the greatest advantage. United to the majestic elegance and severe grandeur of the Grecian Doric, it will impart a richness and finished grace enchanting to every beholder. No distant view, however picturesque, could compensate so great a sacrifice. Admitting the presumption of attempting a restoration of the ancient statuary, it is surely not beyond the reach of modern art to compose and execute a National Sculpture, that shall resemble, at least in general effect, the appearance of the original. Should marble be found too expensive, the best free-stone would answer extremely well, both for the larger

figures of the tympanum, and the relievos of the metopes, and frizes. It would necessarily correspond in appearance and duration with the ornaments and masonry of the rest of the edifice; and since it is impossible to construct the whole of marble, like the ancient temple, what more can be desired? Mr Alison, in his Essay on Taste, remarks, that the mere consideration of fitness is insufficient to account for the pleasure which is generally derived from the established orders of architecture—that it arises from different causes than from their proportions—and that when the proportions only are considered, the pleasure generally felt is *not greater* than what is experienced on perceiving in any great work *the proper relation of means to an end. The proportions of the orders are, in his opinion, distinct subjects of beauty, from the ornaments with which they are embellished, from the magnificence with which they are executed, from the purposes of elegance they are intended to serve,*

or the scenes of grandeur they are destined to adorn—and though we are accustomed to observe them in such scenes, and with such additions, and are disposed to feel the effect of these accidental associations, he thinks we are seldom willing to examine what are the causes of the complex emotion we feel, and readily attribute the *whole pleasure we enjoy exclusively to the architecture itself.* He concludes with the following remarks, which are peculiarly applicable to the present subject:—"It will be found, I believe, that the real beauty of such proportions is, in fact, not greater than that which we feel in many cases where we perceive means properly adapted to an end; and that the admiration we feel from the prospect of the orders of antiquity, is necessarily to be ascribed to *other causes* besides these proportions. The common people, undoubtedly, feel a very inferior emotion of beauty from such objects, to that which is felt by men of liberal education, because

they have none of those associations which modern education so early connects with them. The man of letters feels also a weaker emotion than that which is felt by the connoisseur or the architect, because he has none of the associations which belong to the art, and never considers them in relation to the genius, or skill, or invention which they display. *Deprive these orders, in the same manner, of their customary ornaments, and leave only the great and governing proportions; or, change only in the slightest degree their forms, without altering these proportions, and their beauty will be in a great measure destroyed. Preserve, on the other hand, the whole of the orders, but diminish in a great degree their scale;* and *though they will still be beautiful,* yet their beauty will be *infinitely inferior* to that which they have upon their usual scale of magnificence. It is possible, in the form of a *candlestick or some other trifling utensil,* to imitate with accuracy any of the orders. It

is possible, in many of the common articles of furniture, *to imitate some of the greatest models of this art;* but who does not know that their beauty in such an employment, would be lost? *Yet still their proportions are the same, if their proportions are the sole cause of their beauty.*"

Even allowing that Mr Alison is disposed to ascribe rather too small a share of the emotion of pleasure we enjoy in contemplating a work of architecture to the mere proportions of the order, it will scarcely be denied, that his theory and analysis are founded in truth and experience, and that any attempt to reduce the scale of the edifice, alter its plan, or withhold its sculptural decoration, must be attended with imminent risk of failure. Taking it for granted, that no alteration will be made either on the scale or plan of the original Temple, let us not trust too implicitly to *the effect of the bare architectural proportions of the order, however correct, divested of its legiti-*

mate ornament. The Doric, indeed, from its triglyphs, fluted columns, and massive richness, is, perhaps, less dependent on sculpture than the other orders; and we know that most of the ancient, and some of the later examples, had no such decoration. Had the present undertaking, therefore, been merely an ordinary public building, in imitation of a Doric Temple, the sculpture might have been relinquished without much risk; but where it is a National Monument, aiming at the highest perfection of the art—professing to restore the Athenian Parthenon—and assuming its very name, the circumstances of the case are materially changed. Though the beauty and symmetry of the Doric architecture on its full scale, must always command admiration, yet when we recollect the object and pretensions of the structure, and the associations so intimately connected with it, a bitter feeling of disappointment and regret would be the inevitable result. In vain

would the eye wander over the pediments, metopes, and frizes, in search of their proper attributes, it would meet nothing but the flat and naked mason-work of a dead wall. The soul and character of the building would thus be irretrievably lost. In short, none of the requisites—not even the usual and apparently trivial accompaniments, should be omitted, that can, in any degree, contribute to insure its successful accomplishment—nor, for instance, does there appear any good reason why the gilt metallic vases and shields, which formerly adorned the pediments of the ancient Parthenon, should not be replaced on the Scottish Restoration.

If want of funds be pleaded as an excuse for abandoning the sculpture, why should we despair of additional contributions coming in during the progress of the work? Suppose even the worst, that there may be a deficiency of funds—the sculpture might, at all events, be retained as a part of the plan,

though at the risk of remaining for a time incomplete. The deficiency will assuredly be supplied by the taste and generosity of the next generation. We ought to calculate not so much on the amount of the funds already realized, as what may be anticipated from the patriotism and spirit of the nation, were the undertaking really begun with taste and vigour. Better far that it should remain incomplete for half a century—nay, that it should never be begun, than finished within a short period on a reduced and imperfect plan, with the funds already collected. What are a few years in the eyes of posterity? A century did not suffice for raising St Peter's.—The Duomo of Milan, the richest and most magnificent (though not the purest) Gothic of Europe, second only to the Vatican Basilica in size and splendour, received the contributions and united labours of seven centuries, till the enterprizing genius of Napoleon nearly completed it at an enormous expense.

The unrivalled mausoleum of the Medici at Florence, has remained almost three hundred years in its present imperfect state —yet it is not the less celebrated, nor is it possible to withhold our admiration of the aspiring genius and grandeur of those princely merchants, who projected such a monument amidst their other great and splendid works.

Public expectation is naturally high and sanguine, after the warm professions and eloquent appeals that have been made to the public, and circulated through all corners of the Empire, in behalf of the National Monument. Let not the Directors deceive themselves; any compromise or half measure, must end in certain and disgraceful failure.* A heavy responsibility attaches to

---

* It will afford no small subject of triumph to the Quarterly Reviewers and their professional friends, to learn that the boasted Parthenon of Scotland, is at last to dwindle into a Presbyterian Kirk. Besides, will Mr Cockerell condescend to take charge of an undertaking from which he can derive neither honour nor credit?

the Committee of Management. It remains perhaps with them to decide, whether, by yielding to the contracted views, bad taste, and interested suggestions of a few local subscribers, they are so to alter and modify the plan, that it shall incur universal contempt —turn out " a poor, meagre, and miserable imitation of the Parthenon," remaining a monument of eternal disgrace to themselves, and never-ceasing regret to their country ; or whether, by adhering to a correct and and classical restoration of its great original, they are to raise an edifice not unworthy of being consecrated to God as a National Christian Temple—that shall reflect honour on themselves and the Empire—shed an extraordinary lustre over the Scottish Capital—and by exhibiting a splendid example of fine taste to posterity, elicit the admiration of the present and every succeeding age.

EQUESTRIAN STATUE

OF

HIS MAJESTY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to a considerable amount have been collected for erecting an Equestrian Statue of his Majesty George IV. in Edinburgh. It is unquestionably the most elegant and appropriate mark of respect that can be paid by a free and loyal people to their Constitutional Sovereign, in commemoration of the Royal Visit, of which it will remain a splendid and lasting testimonial. It will likewise have a powerful effect in rousing a taste for sculptural decoration, the want of which is much felt in the northern Metropolis. There are several situations well adapted for an equestrian statue—the

middle of George's Street—the centre of Charlotte Square—opposite the Register Office, or even in front of Holyrood Palace. But the best and most classical site would be in front of the Parthenon on the Calton-hill. Far removed from the smoke and bustle of the city, it would there appear to the greatest possible advantage, in the midst of highly picturesque scenery, and associated with architecture of the noblest character. Besides, when we consider the particular interest his Majesty has taken in the National Monument, the foundation of which has been laid under his own immediate patronage, such a destination must appear, in every respect, the most proper and honourable. Moreover, it would powerfully conduce to the splendour and success of both undertakings. It would be strictly in unison with the taste and arrangement of the Athenian Acropolis, where two equestrian statues, the ruins of the pedestals of which still remain, anciently adorned the front of

the Propylæa on the brow of the hill, in the immediate vicinity of the Parthenon. One of the pedestals still bears an inscription in honour of Agrippa.*

---

* There is a report in circulation, that it is to be placed on the northern battery of the Castle, the point from which his Majesty enjoyed the view of the City, and the surrounding scenery. It is to be hoped this measure will never be carried into execution. An equestrian statue on such a situation, would be exposed without the least shelter, to the unmitigated fury of the wind and the tempest—it would be shaken to its very centre by every discharge of the great guns —it could be seen to no advantage from any point within the Castle—nor could it be recognized to be a statue at all from Prince's Street without the aid of a telescope. The Pitt Club of Scotland, have already voted out of their funds a monument in honour of William Pitt; yet sculpture owes nothing to him, for he was never known, in the course of his public or private life, to afford the least encouragement to it or any of the fine arts. It is said, a certain learned Lord has proposed that the statue shall be erected on the top of the new building for the Royal Society, at the north end of the Mound, for the purpose, no doubt, of protecting it from the insults that might be offered to it by the Whigs and Radicals of this City.—The Whig Club, it is natural to suppose, will lose no time in following so good an example—and will forthwith proceed to vote, if not out of their funds, at least out of their pockets, a monument to Charles Fox, perhaps in the shape of Antonine's Pillar. Nay, there are a set of malignant spirits in this our modern Athens, who presume to affect independence, and even refuse to bow themselves down before either of those political Idols. Now, it is not impossible, in this monument-voting

The Statue, it is presumed, will be executed in bronze. Chantrey is, of course, to be the sculptor. Without the slightest intention of calling in question his acknowledged talents and genius as an artist, when it is recollected how many of the modern equestrian statues have turned out failures, it is not unreasonable to entertain some apprehensions of the result of a first attempt in so difficult a department of the art, in which he can have had little or no experience. As the best means of insuring success, and conferring much additional interest, the author would suggest, that the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius of the Ca-

---

age, that it may occur to such persons to erect a statue to Mr Joseph Hume, in which event they will not fail, as a most necessary precaution, to pitch it at an altitude far beyond the reach of all placemen, pensioners, and expectants, whether Tories or Whigs.

Seriously, however, it is much to be regretted, that the Equestrian Statue of his Majesty, and all the sculptural Monuments lately voted in Scotland—to Lords Melville, Hopetoun, Mr Pitt, Lord Erskine, John Knox, Burns, James Watt, &c. should not be reserved for the decoration of the Scottish Parthenon. They would thus acquire a lustre and renown which no other destination could bestow.

pitol, should be selected as the model,—That the horse should be cast precisely from the same mould—and that the figure of his Majesty, in the same attitude and drapery, should be substituted for that of the Roman Emperor.

Few of the equestrian statues of antiquity have been preserved to modern times. The most celebrated, are the Corinthian and Venetian Horses—those of the Balbi, discovered in Herculaneum, the two groups of Monte Cavallo—and that of Marcus Aurelius. They have incurred, indeed, the severe censure of many modern artists and critics. Mr Falconet the French sculptor, has, for instance, devoted nearly a whole volume of his works to demonstrate, that his equestrian statue of Peter the Great, at St Petersburgh, is infinitely superior to that of Marcus Aurelius, the horse of which he characterizes as false and unnatural in his actions —heavy and inelegant in his proportions, though he seems disposed to allow some

merit to the figure and attitude of the Emperor. But unfortunately for Mr Falconet, posterity has not confirmed this judgment; for while Marcus Aurelius still rides triumphant on the Capitol, attracting universal admiration, his statue of Peter the Great has long ago been consigned to oblivion, as a work scarcely above mediocrity. Allowing that the ancient equestrian statues, particularly the groups of Monte Cavallo, and the Corinthian horses, are not correct imitations of nature, or equal in excellence to the other *chefs-d'œuvres* of the art—the Apollo, Venus, &c. it will scarcely be denied, that they are distinguished by a life and energy, by a fine taste and dignity —in short, by a stamp of genius sufficient to redeem a multitude of faults. Those qualities are more especially applicable to the statue of Marcus Aurelius, which may boast among its numberless admirers, of Michel Angelo, (by whom it was placed on its present proud situation,) Pietro de Car-

tona, Bernini, Winckelmann, Addison,—names of no small authority in works of art.* It has been alleged, that the carcass of the animal is too large, and resembles an ox more than a horse. The body is without doubt large and full, but not more so than it ought to be, were it placed at a proper distance from the eye, which its present site will not admit of. The head, neck, and limbs, are finely formed; and, on the whole, after repeatedly viewing it, the author cannot help being of the same opinion as a late tourist, who remarks—"We should not certainly wish a Roman Emperor mounted for official show and ceremony on a *race horse*, however beautiful of its kind, but we should *wish to see him on the back of just such a charger as he here bestrides*, full of spirit and majesty, and bearing with impatience the slow-

* Even the leaden equestrian statue of Charles II. in Parliament Square, possesses a certain air of grandeur and dignity, proceeding entirely from its general resemblance to that of Marcus Aurelius.

ness of a pompous procession. His limbs are fine, his carcass full and close, his shoulders strong and fleet, his neck fleshy and curved, his ears pointed, quite the *aures micantes* of Virgil; his head small in proportion to his body, and his hind quarters broad and firm. But I had almost forgotten the Emperor on his back, by which I have paid him a compliment, for *he sits so well that he seems a part of his horse. The head is noble—the drapery well cast—the arm admirably placed, and the legs disposed with the science of a riding-master.* He is well down on his seat, his body thrown back, but easy, and rather giving to the position of his right arm; the thighs adhere closely, and follow the bend of the horse's body, and the legs, from the knee to the foot, fall with ease and elegance, and hang free for use. The man who designed this statue *knew what a good horse was, and how to ride it well.*"*

---

* Wilson's Tour in Italy.

The statue of Marcus Aurelius is the more interesting, from being the only remaining equestrian statue of the many that adorned ancient Rome. It is reported to have owed its preservation to Totila, King of the Goths, who was so struck with its beauty, that he ordered it to be spared.

Should the Calton-hill be so fortunate as to obtain this new accession of ornament and dignity, in addition to the splendour of the Parthenon and its own beautiful and commanding situation, it might, without presumption, claim some slight resemblance, in character and association of objects, to the Athenian Acropolis, and the Roman Campidoglio.

THE END.

RESTORATION OF THE PARTHENON.

[From the Scots Magazine, February 1820.]

To the Right Honourable the Lord Advocate of Scotland, Convener of the Committee on the National Monument.

My Lord,

I take the liberty of addressing your Lordship on a subject which occupies, at this moment, a considerable share of public attention; and I do so in the full confidence that, when the improvement or embellishment of this city, or, indeed, when the public interest in any respect is concerned, I shall have a most attentive auditor in your Lordship. I am further induced to place your Lordship's name at the head of this letter, in consequence of a belief, which I trust is well founded, that your Lordship is disposed to think favourably of the plan recently brought before the public, I mean that of restoring the Temple of Minerva, commonly called the Parthenon, as the National Monument of Scotland. Your Lordship's support on this occasion, is considered of much value by all persons of taste and public spirit in Edinburgh, in consequence of the experience which they have had of the judgment, the activity, and disinterestedness which have marked so many successful measures in which your Lordship has been engaged.

So much has already been written upon this subject, that it seems superfluous to enter again into a minute consideration of it; but I beg your Lordship's attention to some points upon which the public seem not to be quite agreed, although the question has been very much narrowed by the frequent consideration it has met with during the last twelve months. The delay also which has arisen in the choice of a model and a situation has been productive of advantage, by allowing people time to reflect and to inquire into the merits of an undertaking so foreign to their ordinary thoughts. The effect seems to be, that, with a few exceptions, only one opinion prevails as to the objects, and very nearly a universal opinion as to the plan and position, of the National Monument.

These objects are, to commemorate the glories of the late arduous and honourable war, by some trophy calculated duly to minister to so splendid a retrospect; and which shall tend, by its magnitude and prominence, to keep alive that ardent, generous, and invigorating sentiment of national honour, to the influence of which we owe all our prosperity; whether that consist of military triumphs, of civil liberty, or of domestic security and peace: and it ought to be such that, by its symmetry and beauty, our national taste may be improved, and thence our national manners still further dignified and refined. These are lofty objects, even when considered with reference to ourselves: but every true lover of his country, whatever be his station or his party, must desire to transmit such ennobling sentiments to his posterity; and though history will certainly dwell with due energy upon the great events of our

day, it is beyond its powers to inspire, or, at least, to impress permanently that chivalrous and enthusiastic feeling of patriotism which a great, and beautiful, and conspicuous national monument is alone capable of producing.

It is of importance, therefore, to consider what is the fittest model to be adopted, since the occasion is obviously of too great moment to admit of experiment, especially as we have by no means unlimited funds: and we are naturally led to take the advice of those who are allowed, on all hands, to be the best qualified, by their studies and pursuits, to give a practically correct and safe opinion. The authorities which, on this occasion, are entitled to the greatest attention, are, men of high reputation as artists, accomplished classical travellers, and all those who, without being either artists or travellers, have given much of their time and attention to such subjects. And it happens most satisfactorily to be the case, that all the artists who have been consulted upon this point; the travellers who have visited both Athens and Edinburgh; and many gentlemen whom this interesting topic has stimulated to reflection and inquiry, are of opinion, that no model, of which we have any knowledge, is so well calculated as the Parthenon, for the National Monument; and that the Calton Hill is not only as well fitted for its reception as the Acropolis was for the Temple of Minerva; but that the situation, of which we have here the command, actually possesses some striking advantages in size, figure, and situation, over the position on which the original temple has stood, the wonder and admiration of all ages. *

In support of these assertions, it will probably be deemed satisfactory to quote the opinion of a gentleman whose reputation in this city stands deservedly high; and whose authority is of importance in this discussion, since he is well known as an artist, a traveller, and an amateur.

"Is it too much, then," says this animated writer, after expatiating on the beauties of his own romantic town,—"is it too much, then, to expect that a fac-simile, or a restoration of the Temple of Minerva, may yet crown the Calton Hill, as a monument, to proclaim to distant ages, not only the military glory, but the pure taste which distinguishes our country in the present? Is it too much to expect, that an enlightened patronage may call up genius, kindred to that of ancient times, and may direct our native talents to efforts similar to those which gave splendour to the age of Pericles? Such an example of perfection would purify the general taste of the country in all subsequent undertakings, and do more to ennoble the age than all the trophies of victory." *

Dr Clarke observes, when speaking of Edinburgh, that, in order to render the resemblance between it and Athens complete, nothing is wanting but a temple of great dimensions on the Calton Hill.

The authority of our best architects is in favour of the expediency of this restoration, in preference to any experimental building; an opinion which does no less honour to their taste than to their liberality, since this plan is the least expensive that could be chosen.

That the present is a fit moment for making this great addition to the beauty and importance of the capital, will be very apparent, when it is recollected that the public taste is not taken, as it were, by surprise, but has been invited to come forth, and to develope itself by regular, though not slow, degrees. The time is not very distant when the most wealthy and fashionable inhabitants of this town were content to reside in *wynds* or alleys, which their servants would now disdain to lodge in. A taste for higher comforts having sprung up, the New Town rose to gratify it;

* It is by no means the opinion of the supporters of the present plan, that Nelson's Monument should be removed, the effect of that monument, with all its faults, being certainly very fine. There is ample room for the Parthenon a little to the northward and eastward of Nelson's Monument, on a spot overlooking Prince's Street, towards which one end of the Temple would be directed.

* Travels in Italy, Greece, and the Ionian Islands. By H. W. Williams, Esq. Edinburgh, 1820. Vol. II. p. 419.

this indulgence naturally begot still farther refinements: and the new churches and chapels were soon erected to the great advantage and ornament of this singular city. It was next considered, that, to such a magnificent town, the back of the Canongate was but a despicable approach, and the Regent's Bridge and the Calton Road were formed as if by magic. Then followed works of pure taste; the Observatory, the County Hall, the new designs for the College; in short, since the public taste expanded, in proportion as it had worthy objects to exert itself upon, we may infer that, if we take advantage of the liberal spirit which now prevails, and secure in the centre of the city an exact restoration of the most perfect model of art which the world has ever seen, we shall furnish our country with the means of extending the national taste beyond any assignable limits. We are therefore, it appears, just arrived at that happy moment when we can appreciate such a building as the Parthenon; a building which, to use the words of Mr Dodwell, "is the most unrivalled triumph of sculpture and architecture that the world ever saw. The delight," he adds, "which it inspires on a superficial view, is heightened in proportion as it is attentively surveyed. If we admire the whole of the glorious fabric, that admiration will be augmented by a minute examination of all the ramified details." * It has the further and important advantages of being constructed on the most durable principles; or, as Mr Dodwell says, "contrived for eternity." Plutarch remarks, "That the structures of Pericles are the more admirable as being completed in so short a time, they yet had such a lasting beauty; for as they had when new the venerable aspect of antiquity, so now they are old, they have the freshness of a modern work: they seem to be preserved from the injuries of time by a kind of vital principle, which produces a vigour that cannot be impaired, and a bloom that will never fade."†

It is not necessary to detain your Lordship with any observations upon the advantages which may be looked for at the present moment from a judicious cultivation of our local pride in these matters; because the fact of our consequence, our wealth, and our useful population, having increased with the improvements and embellishments of Edinburgh, is generally felt and admitted. It is also evident, that our manners have been improved, and that learning, refinement, and intelligence of every kind in Scotland have been most wonderfully advanced by the recent augmentation and improvements of the capital.

Many people are not aware of the facilities which we possess for undertaking such a work as is proposed. In the first place, it is not generally known, that the freestone of Edinburgh is considered, by judges fully qualified to decide upon such a question, as being quite as good for a great building as the marble of Mount Pentelicus, of which the original Temple of Minerva is built. This stone, of which we have such an unbounded command, though not absolutely white, is of as fine a colour as the Athenian marble, after it has been exposed to the air; it is equally hard; it works as well under the chisel; and is held to be at least as durable. To these advantages we may add that of the quarries being close at hand, actually open, and at this instant wrought by experienced workmen, who can produce with certainty blocks or shafts of any required dimensions. It is further the opinion of practical men, that our masons and stone-cutters have acquired a neatness and precision of chiselling, which give promise of success in the imitation of any sculpture whatsoever. *

In the next place, it is known that there are, in this country, plans, drawings, and measurements of the Parthenon, made with the utmost care upon the spot by the celebrated Mr Cockerell, by Mr Basevi, and by Mr Saunders.

---

* Dodwell's Travels, Vol. I. page 321.

† MS. of Plutarch, in the King's Library at Paris, quoted by Mr Dodwell, Vol. I. page 328.

* Why, indeed, should we despair of producing in this country, by due encouragement, workmen equal to those sculptors who executed, with such exquisite finish, the tracery of our Gothic cathedrals?

The most important point, however, is the choice of an architect; and here we must allow no consideration whatsoever to interfere with the freest competition; for, if we employ an architect who does not possess, in a considerable degree, the genius and taste of the ancient artists, and who has nothing but mechanical power of execution to recommend him, we may be certain that this great restoration can never be accomplished so as to become an honour to this age and country.

But, although it were too much to expect that the occasion should all at once call into being a British Phidias, yet it were a most unworthy determination to stop short because we are doubtful of commanding the highest degree of excellence, or to take it for granted that this great and free country, which has produced such statesmen, and warriors, and poets, and philosophers, and great artists in every other department, should be incapable, upon due encouragement, of sending forth an architect not less worthy of the age in which we live.

At all events, the Committee are bound in justice, not only to the subscribers, but to the whole country, not to trifle with the national reputation in this matter, but to encourage, by every means in their power, the fairest competition; to circulate invitations, not only to architects, but to men of genius of all descriptions, to come before the Committee, in order to substantiate their claims to the great honour of restoring the Parthenon.

If this be done in an honest spirit, as we feel confident, from the known characters of the leaders in this national undertaking, it will be done; if all jobbing and favour be excluded; if a sufficient time be given; and if able, upright, and public-spirited judges be appointed by the Committee to investigate the claims of candidates, and to distinguish between the mere mechanical copyist and the man of genius; we feel assured that this appeal to the country will not be made in vain.

Such, then, being the fitness of the occasion for raising a National Monument; the advantages of situation for placing it; the model from which to copy it; and the materials wherewith to construct it; and such the expectations of procuring a fit architect; there does really appear no solid objection to its being immediately adopted by the Committee, except the want of funds for so great an undertaking.

But a moment's consideration will serve to show, that this very objection is, in fact, one of the strongest arguments in favour of the immediate and unqualified adoption of the Parthenon as the model, and the Calton Hill as the situation, of the National Monument. Even the lowness of the subscription is an indubitable and striking symptom of the justness of the public taste; for there is no man, whatever be his politics, or whatever his patriotism, who ought to subscribe so freely, when doubtful of the uses to which his money is to be appropriated, as he would do when he has a distinct assurance that it would certainly be devoted to an object countenanced by persons of taste, knowledge, and public spirit, under the direction of an architect of genius and talents. This is not only obvious *a priori*, but is strictly consonant to the fact in the present case, as all who have heard the subject discussed in company will admit. We hear in every quarter people asking, "What is to be the plan of the National Monument?" "Who is to be employed to build it?" Some lamenting that they have subscribed before the plan was fixed; others declaring that they will not subscribe at all unless the Parthenon be adopted, and unless every possible competition be allowed before appointing an architect; and many more promising to double, treble, and even some very eminent individuals have been heard to declare, that they will quadruple the amount of their subscription whenever these important points are finally settled. It is exceedingly important that such feelings should not be allowed to subside, without due advantage being taken of them; and the Committee may rest assured, that, if they allow the moment to pass, they can never hope to restore the valuable tone which now prevails amongst all classes and parties, and which only wants a little well-directed impulse to give it the irresistible momentum, that never fails to accompany the exercise of right public opinion in this country. The same reasoning will apply to our settlements

abroad, particularly in India, where there is not only wealth, but a very pure taste for Grecian architecture, and where, as I can testify, from having resided some time in that country, the motives just adverted to may be expected to act most powerfully.

At all events, the experiment is well worth trying; and if, in the end, the funds shall not prove sufficient, we shall not be in a worse predicament than we are at present. But of this there is little fear, because the Parthenon is considered by skilful practical men to be the least expensive form which could be selected; and it is thought, that, for thirty or forty thousand pounds, the whole temple might be restored in the manner proposed; and that, for ten thousand more, suitable sculpture might also be added. It is evident that, with this sum, it would be hopeless to aim at distinction in any other known style of architecture.

And here one reflection occurs, which it is right that every lover of his country and of the arts should attend to, namely, that, if the present project fails, there is no hope left that it will ever afterwards succeed in this country. No such opportunity as the present can ever arise again in our day; and it is in Edinburgh alone that this great edifice can be restored; because in this city, and in no other, all the requisite advantages are to be found. In the first place, it is in the capital alone that a National Monument ought to be placed; in the next, Edinburgh is adapted most wonderfully, by its picturesque physical situation, as well as by its eminent moral rank in the scale of cities, for the reception of a great Classical Temple; and, lastly, it commands exclusively an unlimited supply of the finest possible materials.

Were the Temple of Minerva, indeed, entire, there might be some doubt whether it would be right to attempt such an imitation as is proposed; but, alas! the original is fast disappearing, and in a few years will be totally lost to the world. This arises, as is well known, not at all from the nature of the structure itself, which is of a character to promise unlimited duration, but entirely from local circumstances; so that to restore, and to perpetuate in this country, and in a perfect manner, an edifice which has contributed probably more than all the other buildings in the world, to the refinement of taste, were of itself an object worthy of any age or country.

If, then, as is most earnestly to be hoped, the Committee shall lose no time in publishing to the world that they have decided upon adopting the model proposed, and inviting subscriptions on that understanding, it is material that they should attend to the following points, without a due recollection of which, they must not hope to see the subscriptions in the smallest degree augmented.

It ought to be distinctly stated to the public, not only that the Parthenon is to be adopted as a model for the National Monument on the Calton Hill, but that *it is not to be a church.* This assurance is altogether essential to the success of the proposed measure, as will be apparent to every one who recollects, that the objects of this building are to record and commemorate deeds of military renown, —to foster and rouse the national pride; to keep alive that lofty and daring spirit, which has for its object the advancement of national glory, the resistance of foreign enemies, and, in short, the encouragement of every patriotic and energetic feeling which the recent war called into such useful action; and without the operation of which we should probably have become a province of France.

Now, although there is nothing in these patriotic feelings incompatible with our religion, there is not a little inconsistency, in selecting a place devoted to such objects, as a house of worship. Such an appropriation would be destructive of those objects, and the National Monument of Scotland would soon merge in the Calton Church of Edinburgh: Whatever, indeed, tends to alter its original purpose would infallibly lessen, and eventually obliterate, its effect; and we should soon cease to regard this monument in the spirit which it ought to be estimated, were we to make it a place of daily or weekly resort, not with a view of reflecting on the national objects for which it was raised, but to carry our thoughts to considerations of an infinitely higher and more sacred character, and which have no connection whatsoever with the monument in question.

It is no answer to this to observe, that, in comparison with these exalted reflections, the objects of a National Monument are absolutely as nothing; —it is on this very account that we wish to keep these feelings separate; to prevent the certain destruction of the one, without the chance of advancing the other.

But there is still another objection, which, in justice to a large proportion of the public, cannot be surmounted.

If a Church be determined on, to what persuasion is it to be appropriated? On what principle can it be maintained that it should be of the Church of Scotland? Are the Episcopalians not fully entitled to participate in all the advantages of the National Monument? Have not all other persuasions a similar claim? They have all contributed their share to the glories which this Monument is intended to record; and there ought certainly to be nothing done upon this occasion to imply that there is, or has been, any shade of difference in national spirit. In point of fact, there is no such distinction; it were a libel on the country to suppose it possible; and it would be a wanton and profitless insult to propose a measure which should virtually take for granted so humiliating and unworthy an aspersion!

As a matter of policy, too, this idea (if it ever was seriously entertained) must be speedily abandoned. The numerous and wealthy members of the Church of England here, though possessed, as we know, of the highest public spirit, and the most praiseworthy zeal and liberality in every thing that relates to the embellishment of Edinburgh, cannot be expected to subscribe to a Scotch church. The same will apply, but with still greater force, to all other persuasions.

But, while we deprecate the idea of devoting the National Monument to that part of our religious observance which consists in periodical service, we would by all means recommend that the spot should be consecrated, and that it should be devoted to sacred purposes alone.

The want of a fit receptacle for tombs or cenotaphs, or, indeed, any kind of memorial in honour of eminent men, has long been felt in this country, and never more than at the present moment.

Where, for example, it may be asked, where are the monuments that commemorate the services of Duncan, of Abercromby, of Moore? Where those which tell us of the discoveries of Napier, or Gregory, or Maclaurin, or that are to record the celebrity of our lamented contemporary Playfair? And why is the memory of such writers as Smith, Robertson, Ferguson, or of such poets as Thomson, Home, and Burns, and of numberless others dear and honourable to Scotland, and which, in any other country, would have been consecrated by superb monuments, thus entirely neglected in a land where nationality is so deeply cherished?

England, to her infinite advantage, has Westminster Abbey, and St Paul's, but we in Scotland have absolutely no spot on which to raise a monument to any of the distinguished philosophers, statesmen, or warriors of Scotland, who have so greatly contributed to bring our country to its present degree of knowledge, security, and glory. In every point of view this is a most important national desideratum, and it is impossible not to see how admirably it would be supplied by devoting the National Monument exclusively to this sacred object; an object which, it may be remarked, could not be accomplished, were the Monument to be a Scotch Church, because the usages of this persuasion forbid all such appropriations.

The value of such a public receptacle for monuments in sustaining the national character is so well understood, that it is needless to dwell upon it here; but it may not, perhaps, have occurred to every one how directly it would contribute to the improvement of taste, by the encouragement it would instantly give to sculpture; for, independently of the numerous monuments which public respect, pride, and gratitude, would be happy to raise to departed learning, valour, and talents, many families would be stimulated by such an opportunity, to erect monuments to relatives who may have fallen in the service of their country. Let those who have lost friends in battle recollect how consolitary is public sympathy and respect, and how dreary and comfortless is the idea that so much worth and valour are to be forgotten, or to be recalled only to the recollection of some vil-

lage congregation, by an obscure and frail memorial in a country churchyard; and let them contrast with this the enthusiastic pride they would feel in knowing, that the glory which their family had achieved was not to pass away, but was to be publicly acknowledged, and publicly recorded, in a splendid and conspicuous monument, raised for this purpose by their exulting country! We may be sure that there is no person insensible to these valuable emotions; our country would be low indeed were it otherwise, it being clearly essential to a free country that such feelings should exist; since, where there is no ambition to be venerated after death, there is no such thing as devotion to the public service when alive. There will be, and ought to be, a vast variety in the kind and degree of sentiment which will prompt us to raise such monuments, but the result must be the same in all—the security, the glory, the happiness of the country.

I shall trouble your Lordship and the public with only one other consideration.

It has often been asked, If such be really the advantages of the Grecian architecture above that which is the growth of this country, why have we not imported it before now? The answer to which is, that we were, until very lately, almost entirely ignorant of the existence of the fine buildings of Greece, or, to speak more correctly, we were ignorant of their extraordinary beauty, and of their effect in forming the taste and chastising the judgment in all matters connected with the science of architecture. The descriptions of a few old travellers failed altogether to strike our imagination; but, in process of time, as the facilities of travelling increased, these splendid monuments of ancient art became the objects of more frequent and careful examination, and numerous travellers returned to spread in this country, by their writings and drawings, as far as such means could do, the enlightened spirit which they had but just acquired themselves. The first effect of this was, to send abroad eminent artists and men of science of all descriptions. The next was, to induce many enterprising and public-spirited individuals to send to this country such detached fragments of those glorious edifices as were capable of transportation. The effect on the public taste which arose out of these causes has been prodigious.

But, while every one allows the importance of these researches and these collections, in a national point of view, it does not appear to have been so generally felt, that a much greater advantage would arise from transferring to this country, not alone a few mutilated fragments of the sculpture which has ornamented a temple, but the whole, or rather a *fac-simile* of the whole temple itself.

The reason of this appears to be, that, to understand to any useful purpose the merits of Grecian architecture, it must be *seen*. The effect, indeed, produced on the mind by the *sight* of Doric temples is most extraordinary, and not easily described. It imparts, in fact, a new sense, and without the aid of this the mind is not fitted to receive those ideas in which a right apprehension of the subject consists. There is no man of sense and education who has examined a temple of the pure Doric style without being strongly affected, or without being conscious of having thereby acquired an unexpected accession of correct taste, and sound judgment on architectural subjects. The impression left is never to be erased, and it has, moreover, the power of giving birth to and of cherishing a new class of perceptions, which are of use in improving the understanding not only when it is employed upon works of art, but when the objects of its consideration are in any way connected with the elegancies and refinements of society.

It is this strong impression of the magical effect, which the presence of such a temple as the Parthenon can alone produce, that urges the advocates of the present plan to recommend its adoption so earnestly. They feel persuaded that, to place the Temple of Minerva before the eyes, not of one or two travellers, but of the whole public, is the most certain means of cultivating our national taste and happiness at home, and, consequently, the power and importance of our country among other nations. Nothing short of this, it is greatly to be apprehended, can produce that ardent and valuable enthusiasm which, unhappily for so good a cause, has found, upon this occasion, such feeble and inadequate expression.

A Traveller.