WHAT A WORK OF ART OUGHT TO BE

biggest emotional quality that is conceivable. If so, then these men are unacademic as Franz Hals was, and Velasquez and Millet; and unacademic, of course, from the point of view of the Beaux Arts and the Royal Academy.

And yet it is to these “unacademic” men (and others of their class), Childe Hassam, Lathrop, Eugene Higgins, etc., and to the sculptors who are working out on our plains and in the mountains, modeling in heroic marble and miniature bronze the restless progress, the humor, the audacity of the people and the times that are American, that America must turn for all the art that she can truly claim as her own, through which she may seek to prove her right to the immemorial prerogative of all nations.

WHAT A WORK OF ART OUGHT TO BE

“T HINGS (in a picture) must not have the appearance of being brought together by chance or for a purpose, but must have a necessary and inevitable connection. I desire that the creations which I depict should have the air of being dedicated to their situation, so that one could not imagine that they would dream of being anything else than what they are. A work of art ought to be all one piece, and the men and things in it should always be there for a reason. . . . It were better that things weakly said should not be said at all, because in the former case they are only, as it were, deflowered and spoiled. . . . Beauty does not consist so much in the things represented, as in the need one has had of expressing them; and this need it is which creates the degree of force with which one acquits oneself of the work. One may say that everything is beautiful provided the thing turns up in its own proper time and in its own place; and contrariwise, that nothing can be beautiful arriving inappropriately. . . . Let Apollo be Apollo, and Socrates Socrates. Which is the more beautiful, a straight tree or a crooked tree? Whichever is most in place. This, then, is my conclusion: The beautiful is that which is in place.”

JEAN FRANÇOIS MILLET.