L'Art Nouveau, Its Origin and Development
A. D. F. Hamlin

"ART Nouveau," or "L'Art Moderne," as it is sometimes called, is the name of a movement, not of a style. It has come into use within the past four or five years to designate a great variety of forms and developments of decorative design, which have in common little except an underlying character of protest against the traditional and the commonplace. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to frame any definition or statement of the principles, the aims, or the characteristics of this movement which would apply equally to all its productions, and among its apostles and advocates there are men whose opposition or contempt for one another's ideas is only surpassed by their common hatred of the historic styles. L'Art Nouveau is, therefore, chiefly a negative movement: a movement away from a fixed point, not toward one; and its tendencies are for the present, as in all movements of protest or secession in their early stages, divergent and separative. Whether in the process of time these divergent tendencies will again converge towards a single goal; whether the heterogeneous ideas and conceptions that now find shelter under this broad name of the New Art will blend and crystallize into harmonious form under the compulsion of some controlling force not yet manifest,—this cannot be predicted. But upon the answer to this query must depend the permanence of the movement. It must acquire and represent positive principles, it must point toward a single, recognizable goal, if it is to live. Protest unsupported by affirmative purpose is short lived. Mere negation means final extinction.

The phenomenon of protest in art is almost as old as art itself, but has manifested itself with especial frequency since the Renascence, because the Renascence was itself a triumph of protest against ecclesiasticism and mediaevalism; and it firmly established in the
human consciousness the individual right to question, to protest, and to secede. The architecture of Palmyra and Baalbec, and the eccentricities of the architecture of Constantine’s time were manifestations of the spirit of protest against the despotic domination of the old Roman imperial style. Perhaps the most brilliant of all exhibitions of this spirit was that which found expression in the decorative style of the reign of Louis XV in France. Architecture had under Louis XIV been driven into the ruts, or pressed into the mold, of ancient Roman traditions: it had become grandiose, pretentious, formal and cold. Now, there have always existed in French decorative art two contending elements, which we may perhaps identify with the Latin and the Gallic or Celtic elements in the French character and people—the one classic, formal and academic, ruled by tradition and formulæ; the other romantic and imaginative, but always guided by real or fancied logic. In the Gallo-Roman period the first dominated; in the Middle Ages the second. In the Renaissance the two were in incessant strife, which alone explains the difficulty of characterizing the styles of the different reigns previous to Louis XIV. In his time—i.e., in the second half of the 17th century—the Latin element, the formal and classical, won a brief supremacy, but the romantic Celtic taste was not extinct. In the later years of that reign and under the Regency that followed, it broke all the bonds of classic precedent and academic tradition, in everything that pertained to the interior decoration of buildings, and drove the classic element out of doors. A curious fact resulted, of which the Hôtel Soubise is a fair illustration. The column and entablature reigned without; within, a riot of unfractured invention, of broken curves, shells, scrolls, palms, network, in capricious but effective protest against the monotony of right angles, semi-circles, dentils and modillions, columns and entablatures. It was emphatically an art nouveau; but it was an art which speedily established its own formulæ, developed its own forms and principles positively and not by mere negation of precedent, and so acquired a hold upon popular taste whose strength is evidenced by its spread into Germany and Austria, and its recent revival in
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France. The Asam house in Munich, a work of the 18th century, illustrates how completely the designers of that time succeeded in throwing off the shackles of classic precedent, and in substituting for it the creations of an almost unfettered fancy. The same spirit again asserted itself in the highly personal style of the three men who, from 1828 to '48, sought to infuse into the pompous inanity of the official Roman-Beaux-Arts architecture something of the grace and charm of Greek art: I mean Duc, Duban and Labrouste. We call their work Néo-Grec: but Greek it is not in any sense or degree. It is personal and individual; not the fruit of a general movement. These men rejected all the commonly accepted formulæ of official architecture, and sought expression in a somewhat flat, dry style of design whose chief merit is less its novelty than its refinement of detail. But if it brought in no new style, it strongly affected the old, and French architecture and architects—Visconti, Lefuel, Garnier, Vaudremer—were better for its influence.

The present movement springs from like causes with those I have sketched. It represents anew the search for novelty, the weariness with whatever is trite and commonplace. While many of its roots can be traced to England, its chief growth has been in France (or rather in Paris), with offshoots in Belgium, Germany and Austria (or rather Vienna). It is in France that the domination of academicism in architecture has been most complete and most keenly felt; and it is the vivacious, impulsive, artistic, inventive French nature that has most vigorously risen to the task of originating new things in place of the old. The spread of the movement to Belgium and Germany is no strange thing. France exercised a powerful influence over these two countries in the domain of architectural style in the Middle Ages; while in the art of both these countries there has always been an element of taste for the eccentric and outré, for what is novel and clever, to which the French innovations were sure to appeal. In England, the movement has been partly spontaneous or indigenous, springing from seeds sown by William Morris and other artistic reformers from the Pre-Raphaelites down: partly a reflection of the French ac-
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tivity. Vienna caught the fever partly from Germany, partly from Paris; and has promptly proceeded to the utmost extremes in the path in which the others have started. It has become a fad in the Austrian capital.

The history of the genesis and growth of the Art Nouveau must be sought in the magazines of art. What little I can tell you about it has been derived from the pages of the Revue des Arts Décoratifs, the Architektonische Rundschau, Deutsche Bauzei-
tung, the Studio, and other like publications. It is interesting to note the progress of the movement, at first slow and then gathering strength and speed, as one turns the pages of these magazines, from the early nineties down to the present date. Here and there in the remoter numbers, we encounter individual works, strongly personal, which express the protest against the trammels of the conventional. Later on, they became more frequent: certain artists begin to find themselves, as it were. Their style takes shape and asserts itself, attracts attention and discussion. The number of these men increases; they begin to form groups and coteries: they inaugurate propagandas and organize expositions, and the pages of the magazines are filled with their works. The move-
ment is launched: its disciples and imitators multiply, and it spreads from land to land, invades the art-schools, and manifests itself in widely diverse fields. But it is not till 1895 that the movement takes to itself a name, and is fairly recognized under the title of L’Art Nouveau. The earliest example I have discovered of the use of this term does not, however, refer to this movement or to French art at all. It occurs in a letter by V. Champier, in 1893, from Chicago to the Revue des Arts Décoratifs, in reference to the exhibit of Whiting, the silversmith, especially of his spoons. “Out-
side of this interpretation of Nature, Whiting,” he says, “shows that he has offered sacrifice to this ‘style nouveau’ derived from India, and baptized ‘Saracenic’ by its creator, Mr. Moore, one of the art directors of the Tiffany establishment.” Again, after referring to the bronze doors of the Getty Mausoleum by Louis H. Sullivan, and to Tiffany & Co.’s work, he speaks of “the impression of the very new and very personal art of the Americans.” And
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many of us remember the extraordinary enthusiasm with which our French visitors hailed the originality of conception and novelty of detail of Adler and Sullivan’s Transportation Building, and of the naturalistic decoration of the Fisheries Building at the Columbian Exposition, as evidence that a new note had been struck in this eminently western phase of architectural art.

For the earliest manifestations in Europe of the particular phase of the movement of protest in art which has developed into the Art Nouveau of to-day, we may go back to the works of such individualists and secessionists as Manet among the painters and Rodin among the sculptors: men with fervid imaginations and strong wills, impatient of the accepted formæ, the conventional standards of their time in art. Not, however, until the early nineties did the same spirit assert itself in the decorative arts. In 1891, I find in the Revue des Arts Décoratifs these expressions in an article on the extraordinary mural decorations on the exterior of the “Samaritaine” dry goods store:

“To-day an official teaching, narrow and sectarian, obliges the youth to draw his inspiration solely from Greece and Italy.”—

“Our cities are sinking into colorless commonplace”—“this fetishism of ancient formulas.”—“In Paris the manufacture of façades tends to become a pure industry.”—“Break the old molds.”—“In this path of innovation M. Toché has just made an interesting experiment which might bring about a revolution in the fashion of external decoration of buildings.”

As yet, however, such outbreaks of individualism were sporadic. It has always seemed to me that what first gave vogue to this sort of originality was the poster-work of Chéret and Grasset and their lesser followers. Characterized as these were by brilliant imagination, masterly drawing, and admirable color-effects, borrowing suggestions from Japanese art, and from any and every source of inspiration, and always supremely decorative, they broke the supremacy of conventional standards in popular favor, and revealed the possibility of doing in decorative design something like what Wagner had achieved in music. Both Chéret and Grasset carried their ideas, so brilliantly advertised by their posters, into
the domain of industrial art, and produced in stained glass, in lava
enamel, in iron and silver, works of surprising boldness of design
and effectiveness of execution. They were accompanied and fol-
lowed by others who have since achieved distinction in those lines:
Auguste Delaherche, especially distinguished in ceramic work,
Emile Gallé of Nancy, Chaplet, and others. Thus in the Revue
for 1893 I find illustrated a carved, veneered and inlaid dresser
by Gallé, exhibited in the Secessionist or Champs de Mars Salon,
which displays a curiously eclectic combination of Louis XV lines,
rustic work, and natural forms semi-conventionalized after the
Japanese fashion.
It was, I think, in the same year that the young “Société d’Encour-
gragement à l’Art et l’Industrie” held its first competition for prizes
in industrial decorative art. The establishment of such arts-and-
crafts societies and the holding of public exhibitions and prize-
competitions (Union Centrale des Arts Décoratifs, first in 1898)
were necessary steps in the developing of any concerted or general
movement for reform in design. The subject of the competition
was a reliquary or triptych for a precious object: the first prize went
to a M. Doutreligne, a student in the National School of Art at
Roubaix. This appears to have been the first of many such exhib-
itions and competitions the fruit of and the stimulus to the pro-
gress of the new taste in Paris and in other French cities. Mean-
while, the Arts and Crafts movement had become established in
England, which both stimulated the French and German move-
ments and was reacted upon by them. In 1894 I note in my
memoranda among works exhibited in Paris in the new taste, a
music room by Karbowski, a fine wrought-iron knocker, a superb
silver tea-urn and lamp in silver, the last work of Chéret in
orfèvrerie, a fireplace front in faïence by Delaherche, and cabinet-
work by Sandrier (the same who was François Millet’s friend and
was for some years associated with Russell Sturgis in New York),
marked by refined taste and originality in designs thoroughly per-
sonal and novel. In this year also Jean Dampt first appears con-
spicuously in the pages of the Revue in articles of furniture of
great originality and elegance.
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By the year 1895 this Secessionist movement, this protest against worn-out formulae, had become so general and pervasive as to receive a name. No ceremonies attended its christening—the name simply dropped on it from a thousand pens and ten thousand lips, and naturally—for its products were works of art, and the style was new, and had become a subject of general discussion. Charles Génuy, himself a graduate of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and a winner of the Prize of Rome, discusses the movement under its now accepted name in the Revue in that year. I cannot forbear quoting from this article, entitled “La Recherche de l’Art Nouveau.” “The partisans of the new art,” he says, “affirm that our age possesses no characteristic art. They would make a tabula rasa of the past, even to denying it absolutely and striving to obliterate it from their memory.” “Individualism,” he declares, “is perhaps the most notable fact of our epoch.”

“Can the sentiment of personality, in art as elsewhere, and the conditions of originality at all costs imposed on artists, lead to the development of a true and characteristic style, . . . capable of application to all branches of art, through the pursuit of a common ideal?” He thinks the conditions unfavorable, and that “if we possess a style which we fail to recognize because too near it, it is a style whose characteristic it is to have no character.” “It must be so.” “Art expresses to-day the lack of unity, the moral disquiet common to all transitional periods, which dominate both the time and the environment.” But art must go right on; the future result may not be what we want, but whatever it is, we cannot alter the movement now.

Génuy’s prophecies, as we see, were not optimistic. Himself a seceder from beaten paths, he saw little hope of unity in the new developments. His own inclinations were toward a direct recourse to Nature, as in the mantel-piece exhibited at the Paris Exposition of 1900; for in Nature we have a universal and ever varied yet ever uniform creation of beautiful forms. Two years later he exclaims, “Soyons français! Should we not fling this cry at our artists, now that, after several years of servitude to English art and its derivatives, we are threatened by
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an invasion of Belgian art?” The English, he tells us, enjoy Nature in one way, the French in another. “The Belgians, on the other hand, have discovered—and we are listening to them—that Nature is exhausted, that she has inspired enough artists. . . . Therefore, if we wish to be ‘new,’ no more Nature—no more healthy emotions! . . . No, now in order to pretend to originality, our works must resemble nothing at all.” He cannot be sufficiently bitter in satirizing the lack of imagination or the “impotent and anaemic” imagination of these Belgian advocates of the fantastic and the outré.

During the next six years, the number of professed disciples of the new art increased rapidly. The revolt from tradition became more general, and produced many extraordinary results. In architecture a mixture of Louis XV details with incongruous and non-descript forms began to find a certain vogue. One of the most unhappy products of this tendency was the N. Y. Life Building in Paris, the work of my former atelier-mate, Goustiaux. Of this building Frantz Jourdain says: “It presents all the symptoms of the disease by which all our contemporary artists have been smitten.” “Three instruments, playing at once ‘Vive Henri IV,’ ‘Partant pour la Syrie,’ and the ‘Marseillaise,’ could not have produced a more horrible cacophony”—than this jumble of ill-assorted reminiscences of half a dozen styles clumsily travestied. The same tendency reached its highest expression in the Exposition buildings of 1900, in which there was so much that was charming in detail, mingled with so much that was extravagant and senseless. Its amazing cleverness no one can deny, and this reached its culmination in the Electric Palace, by Hénard and Alméras. The same critic characterizes the Exposition as “an orgy of staff,” “a salad of palaces.”

In this exposition there was a special pavilion of the New Art. While the Pavillon Bleu, by A. Dulong, displayed the extreme limit of eccentricity of design, L. Sortais’s “Pavillon de l’Enseignement des Lettres et des Arts” was not far inferior to it in singularity of conception, though far more rational in construction. In the Grand Palais there was an iron staircase by Louvet, which represents the new art in one of its happiest developments.
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The conspicuous names in these later developments are many; I can only name a few. Besides Grasset, Delaherche, and Gallé, Sortais and Louvet and Jean Dampt, already mentioned, there are Alex. Charpentier, Majorelle, G. de Feure, Moreau Vautier and E. Gaillard, in furniture; Henri Sauvage, famous for his decorations in the Café de Paris; Bigaux, the designer of the Salon Moderne, Moreau Vauthier, Félix Aubert, Henri Nocq, Charles Plumet.

The three last named, with Alex. Charpentier and Jean Dampt, formed an Arts and Crafts group which held its first exhibition in 1897. These were all men of marked originality, whose only formula of art was expressed in two sections, as follows:

1. The form of a work of art, destined to a given use, should always express (affirm) it and the function of the work.

2. The material employed, being by nature subject to certain rules of special manipulation, should never affect an aspect in contradiction to its own nature.

These are old and familiar maxims: the only novelty was the consistency with which they were sought to be observed. I regret having no illustrations of their works.

The mention of Jean Dampt carries us to Belgium, the land of his birth, in which the New Art easily found a congenial soil. Belgian decorative art has always been more or less riotous and unconventional. As far back as 1887 the "Fountain of the Legend of Antwerp," by Jef Lambeaux, in bronze, in the great square of that city, and later his relief of the Human Passions, displayed the talent of a man gifted with a turbulent imagination and great powers of expression. As already observed, the New Art, or as it is there called the "Libre Esthétique," ignored Nature generally, and sought in fantastic curves, that is, in the movement of lines, the secret of aesthetic expression. While it never reached in Belgium the extreme of the bizarre which has found favor in Vienna, it must be confessed that its dependence upon line and curve, and avoidance of recourse to natural forms, have led to a striving for singular effects which are not by any means always pleasing. It displays conspicuously the development of a theory
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which makes individuality and novelty the supreme tests of excellence, relegating intrinsic beauty of form to a secondary plane or denying entirely its existence. “Vigor,” “naïveté,” the “personal note,” “originality”—these are the passwords of the Free Aestheticians in Belgium. Thus Sander Pierron says: “The most naïve, the most vigorous works are those which most perfectly display the impress of that natural seal—the personality of a people or tribe—because they were executed outside of all external influence, free from every effort at imitation.” “Ibsen says, ‘the strongest man is the most isolated.’”

Victor Horta may be taken as the most noted of the Belgian architects of the new school. The house erected by him for the Baron von L. on the Rue Palmerston, is a fair sample of the product of his theories. It is a design in charpente apparente, an effort to design, as our theorists put it, “truthfully,” or constructively. To us it seems thin and poor, destitute of elegance or domesticity. By contrast the Condict building in New York, which is quite as truthfully designed and as logical, is a vastly more interesting building, not for its size, but for its general design and detail. Yet it was never put forth as a specimen of the New Art. It simply shows that Mr. Sullivan, whose design was as personal and as novel as M. Horta’s, and more elegant, has been doing “new art” in America for years without making any fuss about it. A window by Horta in the Hôtel Communal at Uccle, is far more successful, because more imaginative and more appropriate. Of Horta’s work Pierron says, in the same article quoted above from the Revue: “The influence of the curved line in decorative art, iron work and furniture, has had in Belgium a tremendous vogue; but what is in M. Horta’s work careful and studied, becomes in other works awkward and merely fanciful.” In the industrial arts and in minor sculpture Philippe Wolfers is the leading spirit. A sculptor can hardly help turning to nature for inspiration: his vases in crystal and silver are good illustrations of the decorative resource and fertility of invention which he has displayed in an extraordinary variety of works in jewelry and minor sculpture. In Germany, Darmstadt appears to be the center of greatest activ
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ity of the new school. Here there exists a colony of artists who have designed and furnished their own houses. Profs. J. M. Olbrich and Peter Behrens are the leaders among them, and Olbrich’s house, illustrates the style, so far as there is anything that can be called a definite style in their work. Of Olbrich’s work the Studio (Nov. 11, 1901) says that it is marked by “plenitude of ideas and fancies;” that “he utilizes an artistic idea to its last shreds,” and that herein lies the chief fault in his manner, which, in another place, seems to “lack repose.” The furniture in this colony, all strikingly novel, seems to the comfort-loving American singularly ungraceful, stiff and uncomfortable. There is, as it seems to me, a notable lack of ease and domesticity in the interiors of these houses; its place is taken by an affectation of naïveté and originality which is tiresome in the end. I cannot help comparing with it a simple American house at Lake Forest, Ill., by H. Van D. Shaw, likewise built for its designer. It is equally straightforward, but less ostentatious and affected, and inclines one to query whether we do not here already possess, as the result of a natural process of evolution, responding to national conditions, what is being sought for with much blowing of trumpets and hard labor in the Old World. And what shall we say of the resting room in the New Art exhibition at Dresden, by Prof. Gussmann? Can it be called charming, or is it merely eccentric? I think we turn with pleasure from it to such quiet and unostentatious work as the New Theater at Meran by Martin Dülfer, and to the interesting iron-work of the new elevated railway in Berlin, a model for American engineers to study, with its admirable structural lines and its sane and elegant combinations of cast and wrought iron details. Even more elegant, and thoroughly charming, is a tomb by Eisenlohr and Weigle, in the Pragfriedhof at Stuttgart. Until quite recently the Arts and Crafts movement progressed but slowly in Germany. German critics complained of the German neglect of the common and minor objects of daily use. Furniture was, and it still is to a considerable extent, pretentiously Renascence in style or affectedly Old German. But the votaries of the “Arts and Crafts” are steadily and rapidly increas-
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ing, both in numbers and in influence, and there are, besides the Darmstadt professors, many men like Bruno Paul and Robert Macco, whose work in furniture, ceramics, jewelry, metal-work and textile design bears the impress of originality and imagination.

Vienna is German except where it is Magyar, and Vienna is a city of fashions and fads. To what extent the blending of Magyar exuberance with German love of the fantastic accounts for the eccentricities of the New Art in Vienna I do not pretend to say. But it is certain that the movement has been carried by the Viennese Secessionists to the furthest limits of singularity and extravagance. The tortuous line and the absolute rejection of everything that could by the extremest stretch of language be called classic or traditional, have here produced results so extraordinary that one is tempted to ask what has been gained by the process? If novelty alone is the aim of art, these Austrian secessionists have mastered the secret of art, and if singularity is a merit, these are works of remarkable excellence. But if beauty, grace, harmony and repose and the charm of refinement are wanted, these are not the works in which to look for them.

In marked contrast to these strange conceptions, the works of Otto Wagner display always the influence of a highly-trained taste, rarely or never at fault, and always controlled by a well-balanced judgment, thoroughly disciplined by years of practice in the use of classic forms.

Gustave Geffroy, a French writer in the Revue in 1900 (?), attributes to English influence in large measure the artistic reform in France. "To England," he says, "we were in part—let us frankly admit it—indebted for the salutary revolution whose excellent effects we are now experiencing." It is perhaps true that the artistic industries of Lewis and of William Morris were the first organized protest of our own times against the bondage of tradition in decorative and industrial art, and that out of them grew that general and healthy reaction which in recent years has found fuller expression in the Arts and Crafts movement and all allied activities. In England the New Art has only to a slight degree invaded
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architecture. The Horniman Free Museum at Forest Hill, London, built by C. Harrison Townsend, to display the art treasures collected by F. J. Horniman, Esq., M. P., represents the quiet and conservative way in which the principles of the New Art are applied to buildings in England. For the most part the New Art propaganda in England has been carried on, so far as I can ascertain, by the schools of industrial and decorative art, the Arts and Crafts Societies, and the art magazines like the Studio. It appears to have been more popular, more widely pervasive in England than anywhere else, but by the same token, perhaps by reason of its greater spontaneity, less freakish and extreme. We might cite C. F. A. Voysey and C. H. Townsend among the architects, and F. Anning Bell, Derwent Wood, G. M. Ellwood and Frank Brangwyn among the craftsmen, as conspicuous leaders in the movement. But every provincial art school is a center and focus of its activity, and from Leeds and Sheffield, Liverpool, Manchester and Glasgow are turned out every month thousands of clever designs in which flowers and figures and the inevitable "New Art curve" are blended in doilies, book covers, title pages, book-plates and what-not. Every exhibition of Arts and Crafts leagues shows the personal and independent note, as well as the mannerisms of the new movement: in works not always intensely interesting, sometimes imitative of Belgian and French eccentricities, but rarely compelling notice by extreme singularity. On the whole, it can hardly be denied that the New Art has in a quiet way more deeply affected the popular taste in England than anywhere else in Europe, because more sane and moderate, and that it has done much to attract the attention and to stimulate the zeal of European art reformers.

If we were to sum up briefly the tendencies and achievements of the New Art movement in Europe, I think it would be fair to say that it has been least successful in architecture, and that in this art its best works have been those which are the most conservative. Curiously enough, these are to be found chiefly in England and Austria. In France, the devotion to "logique" at all costs, even if at the cost of beauty, has led the adherents of the Art Nouveau into
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extraordinary atrocities. The Castel Béranger by Hector Guimard, a professor in the National School of Decorative Arts at Paris, is a jumble of incoherent motives without grace or harmony. It reminds us of certain atrocities in Philadelphia which the Architectural Record has been wont to illustrate and castigate as “Architectural Aberrations.” If this is the matured fruit in architecture of the Art Nouveau, heaven defend our country from the sowing of that seed here! No, the successes of the movement have been rather in the field of what we call industrial design, and they have been successful in proportion as the element of fancy or caprice has been admissible. Interior architectural decoration demands subjection to structural lines and a certain repose and harmony which suffer when caprice is unrestrained. Furniture is more amenable to varied and individual treatment: still more so utensils, tableware, orfèvrerie and jewelry. It is in furniture and cabinet work that the new art has asserted itself most aggressively, because in these its personal caprices are most conspicuous by reason of their conflict with tradition, and yet not offensive as they are apt to appear in the more severely limited field of architecture. Thus in the doorway by Bigaux, from the Salle Moderne at the Exposition of 1900, the loop which encloses the doorway and the V-shaped wainscot panels are pure caprice; directly violating the demands of structural form and of repose, and yet in a certain sense amusing, and rendered elegant by the fineness of the accompanying detail. The same is true of a buffet by E. Gaillard, another Parisian. It is Japanese, Louis Quinze and New Art curvilinear, all in one—personal, capricious, eccentric, and obviously impossible to harmonize with any room or architecture or decoration less eccentric and tortuous than itself. And yet a certain elegance of finish and grace of detail appear through all the fantastic movement and restlessness of this design. In all this work there seem to be two conflicting tendencies: one toward Nature, toward floral and animal forms, as the true source of inspiration; the other toward pure fancy expressing itself in restless movement and fantastic curves. The careful study of the nature of the material, and regard for its special physical qualities
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in manipulating it, receive more attention in England, under the Arts and Crafts influence, than in France or Germany, except in the handling of architectural iron-work.

I cannot close without calling attention anew to the fact that what is in Europe a new propaganda, with a name, organs, adherents and apostles, has in fact and substance long existed in the United States.

What will be the future of the movement? No one can tell. So far as it responds to a true undercurrent of public taste, to a real demand of the multitude, its effects must be lasting. At present, it is largely personal, an art of individuals and coteries.