would naturally make the lower half predominate over the upper, or vice versa. The Greek is a very important question.

Sculpture is an element of great power and one not to be neglected, especially in monumental buildings. But we all have such a natural fondness for sculpture in the balance of design, that there is danger of our having too much rather than too little symmetry. It is another thing to make the Greek building exactly symmetrical, the entrance being in the center and the two halves just alike, but if we treat a dwelling house in this manner we shall find that looking out on either side the changes may be well balanced without being symmetrical. A tower at one corner may balance a great window, and thus we gain in the element which we call picturesque. A picturesque design should not be a haphazard affair. You will usually find a certain balance of parts even when there is apparently great irregularity. All buildings are symmetrical and formal like Greek temples the effect is very strong and it is a remorse which we have to give way in which a proper balance between the parts is maintained, not by making the two sides duplicates but by a skillful arrangement of disparity.

Time will not permit going into many other principles of the treatment of design, but I may mention one, with which we can never attain to what is called style. By style I mean that quality in a design that gives it a peculiar character of its own. We speak of a lady's dress being stylish and we speak of another as having no style, although made of expensive materials and in an elaborate manner. Thus a building in any one of the so-called "styles" of architecture may fail to possess that peculiar and indescribable "style" that we get from a Greek building exactly symmetrical, the entrance being in the center and the two halves just alike, but if we treat a dwelling house in this manner we shall find that looking out on either side the changes may be well balanced without being symmetrical. A tower at one corner may balance a great window, and thus we gain in the element which we call picturesque. A picturesque design should not be a haphazard affair. You will usually find a certain balance of parts even when there is apparently great irregularity. All buildings are symmetrical and formal like Greek temples the effect is very strong and it is a remorse which we have to give way in which a proper balance between the parts is maintained, not by making the two sides duplicates but by a skillful arrangement of disparity.

Ornament should not be applied to a building in a promiscuous manner: it should only be applied where it will be a great ornament. It should be economical and not spoil the whole effect. Ornament should be used to emphasize the important parts of a building. The principle is to ornament one, while at the same time giving the best effect. The ornamented portions appear the richer while contrasted with plain surfaces, and plain surfaces give repose and dignity to the building which it would lack if the whole surface were ornamented.

The foregoing principles apply to all materials which may be used in the construction of a building. It now remains to consider what should be the treatment of stone. Let us enter a field where mistakes are abundant. Let us state in the first place that every building material is good in its right place. Stone and brick are good building materials, but in our climate it makes very poor windows; glass is much preferable for this purpose. Plaster is a material largely used, unused and abused. In our climate it makes a much better wall surface on the interior of a house than stone or brick. Wood is not as adaptable for exterior use as stone. Don't ever see a fine old building in the country, and for doors and interior fittings of our dwellings and for furniture, it is indispensable, for these purposes much more valuable than stone or any of the metals. Therefore the common-sense principle is to use various materials in the parts of the same building. The difficulty comes when we attempt to treat these materials in an ornamental manner. In this case the correct method is so simple and obvious that it is hard to understand why it has been as much neglected and so often abused. The principle of truth or sincerity is the one fundamental idea to be kept in mind when treating special materials. Let stone be stone, brick be brick, let plaster be plaster and wood, wood. It is not necessary that we should make public all the secrets of construction. In a well proportioned human figure the bones do not protrude through the skin, and there seems to be no reason why we should not construct the skeleton of a building in the same way. Let the walls be plastered and covered with plaster or other suitable material to give the finished form. When we recognize the plaster as a covering material there is no need to emulate, and therefore is from the same source, of course, from the same house. We have so little to look on that plaster in imitation of joints and make it appear like solid stone, then the whole thing is a lie and should be treated as such.

Galvanized iron is a very useful material, but when made into a covered surface it is not likely to be very successful, it is a little too much of the most vulgar and pretentious description. It is much better to illustrate the right and wrong use of material than in the difference between the usual treatments of galvanized iron and copper in exterior architecture. The architect who uses galvanized iron expects to paint it, and he usually paints it to imitate some other material. There is no effect that is perfectly necessary to paint it, and that it would be a waste of money to paint a material that looks better without paint. But copper if left unpainted turns a grey color and looks very metallic in tone, therefore the architect does not attempt to make it like stone and he knows that if he makes it look like copper he is imitating copper. It is a very easy thing for everyone. Therefore he ceases to use copper in places where stone or other material will be more appropriate and substitutes the iron instead. A stone building should be stone, brick or terra cotta for the main members, and then adds a gutter of copper.

Now copper is perfectly adapted for gutters, whereas, stone and terra-cotta are very poor materials. Therefore, when we have a terra cotta cornice we can use a copper gutter we have a sensible combination, and each material being used in its proper manner the effect will be perfect. The man who uses one material to imitate another not only perpetuates a fraud which pleases no one, but he is almost certain to overlook the valuable properties of the materials he is using. The man who grins pine mosses easily color, under the impression that he is imitating oak, forgets the fact that if he varnished the pine it would be handsome. If imitating is to be done at all, it is much better to use the genuine oak at about the same price as his imitations. Instead of imitating in one material the forms only appropriate in another we should attempt to bring out in each material those forms for which it is especially adapted. If the exterior of our house is made of coarse stone our moldings must be of bold outline, but if we finish the interior in mahogany it would be absurd to use the same kind of moldings. In this way we would not only make our exteriors more beautiful but also have our interiors in harmony. Let us rather produce on the interior woodwork effects which will be impossible to reconcile with the stone. And so with each material to be adapted and in which it will have a charm of its own.
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the arranging and adjusting, harmonizing and contrasting of all these parts is the business of the whole.

When want was simpler and before construction became a science, when every building was the natural sequence of its predecessors, the architect was often an amateur, frequently of the highest intellectual and artistic order. The amateur can alone, with an expended wealth and talent on towers and domes, bridges and aqueducts, that have outlived the memory even of their other achievements. To specify the causes of their success, as contrasted with the many pitiful failures of the modern amateurs, would lead too far from our subject and for the sake of brevity we will accept the theory that the model as a means of architectural representation or vehicle of design; its value in the centuries before linear perspective was under-

stood, and its final almost total demise upon the adoption of the more intricate variety of mechanical drawing. In fact, the abandonment of the model may be said to mark the line of separation between the amateur and the professional architect. Its use today would spare the blushing novice much confusion particularly in that abstruse field of all amateurs, the staircase.

* * *

The professions of medicine and law were far advanced before the much needed and highly appreciated woman physician and lawyer appeared. Women have entered the architectural profession at a much earlier stage of its existence even before it has received legislati-

ve recognition. They met no serious opposition from either the bar or the public. Neither are they warmly welcomed. They minister to no special needs of women, and receive no special favors from them.

The great architectural societies of the country, the American In-

stitutions, and societies for art and architecture are open to all, open to all upon proof of qualification. Thank, with me, the noble hearted men whose far-seen mother and kindly nature has laid this stepping-

stone. When the American Institute of Architects was formed, every man and woman. The architectural department of the Columbia College School of Architecture, has a separate organization for men and the women. Architectural Schools, the two classes, lectures and the Williston Art School. Women have access to classes, lectures and the William S. Cleveland of London. Men and women have availed themselves of this opportunity, and one, at least, makes practical use of her training. The advantages of a large city with a rich architectural history and one which is engaged in large structural work can hardly be overstated.

The first school of Architecture in the United States established by Americans is the École des Beaux Arts in Paris. There is a prospect that this school may be open to women before long, and French papers are now canvassing the subject to that end. It must be granted that we are not as yet in France.

In Boston the School of Technology Architectural Course, partially modeled upon the Paris school, offers special advantages to pupils who have received previous office training. Two young ladies have been graduated from four and two years courses respectively, but none are now enrolling.

Cornell graduated the first university educated young woman in 1895, and since then four have completed the course that four more are now pursuing. Two of the graduates have since died.

Miss Patterson of Philadelphia, has sent me such information and many circulars concerning local art schools, none of which, however, seem to present the requisite facilities for a thorough technical education. The School of Design for Women in Indianapolis enjoys this connection because it was founded in 1847 by Mrs. Sarah Peter, to whose endeavors the Cincinnati Academy of Fine Arts is also traceable.

One Philadelphia Architectural writer that he is willing to receive women, has no desire so far as he has been able to give them separate lecture rooms, etc., but women cannot pursue archi-

tecture and the American Institute of Art cooperates in its private apartment. Co-education is a privilege as well as a necessity.

I must not forget to tell you that Philadelphia published what was probably the first number of a magazine devoted exclusively to the women's art world. From Mrs. Tuthill in 1843 to Mrs. Van Rensselaer in 1854, a greater stride has been made in the past year than in any year of the past. Another writer says that in architectural history women are his brightest pupils, but he finds the major part of the general public is inclined to subscribe to this notion. Another writer writes that a woman pupil submitted the boldest design of the year, while the most eminent was the work of a man.

The total number of women graduates from the various schools of the country can hardly exceed a dozen, and most of these seem to have renounced ambition with the attainment of a degree, but there are among them a few brilliant and energetic women for whom the future holds great possibilities.

There are also a few women drafting in various offices through the country. They have never been considered in the number, and the brothers are in distinct unison in familiarizing themselves with the practical questions involved in the highest work. The majority of women students, however, graduate but the next decade will doubtless give us a few thoroughly efficient architects from their number.

So much for the past and the present. If in what I say of the future your personal prejudices are offended, pray remember that you have no right to indulge in them.

The objects of the business woman are quite distinct from those of the professional architect. Her aims are conservative rather than aggressive; her strength lies in adaptability, not in reform, and her desire is to conciliate rather than to dominate a whole.

The future of woman in the architectural profession is what she herself seems fit to make of it. She has often proposed that she become exclusively a dwelling house architect. First she would like to see in the suggestion. A specialist should begin so from intrinsic fitness, not from extrinsic influence. Furthermore, the dwelling is the best pottering and worst-paid work an architect ever does. He always dreads it, not, so much because of its lowly position, as because he usually deals with a woman, but because he must strive to gratify the conflicting desires of an entire household, who dig up every hatchet for his benefit and never orders a single thing on his account. He must spend his time usually deal with a woman, but because he must strive to gratify the conflicting desires of an entire household, who dig up every hatchet for his benefit and never orders a single thing on his account. He must spend his time

In response to questions concerning the Women's Fair Building Mrs. Beebe said: "Such a building is沙龙, "those little affairs of a separate Women's Board Exhibit, etc., expresses a sense of inferiority that business women are far from inferior. She declares that a woman architect, and the chief of construction has issued a circular inviting competition, notwithstanding the fact that competition is an evil against which the entire profession has strives for years, and the now nearly vanished; it is unfortunate that it should be revived in its most objectionable form, and the occasion, by women, and for women.

"The building will cost about $600,000, and the prize offered to the successful competitor is $1,000. This is all that can be secured.

That is, she renders 'personal artistic service,' and also prepares her drawings for competition. It is a regular rate for full professional service. The extremely equitable arrangement made with the committee. It is also true that the ladies are to be paid a little for her personal artistic service for $10,000, all his drawings to be made at the expense of the commission. The total sum to be expended for the ten principal buildings in the neighborhood of $5,000,000, making an average of $500,000 each. Each architect receives $500 for his drawings, for which she renders about one-third his full professional service.

The appropriation for remuneration to the architect of the Women's Building is about three-tenths of the average rate per square foot, and because appointed architects for similar service. It is an unfortunate fact that we have not established just now, and may take years to live down its effects."

Notes from Foreign Exchanges.

Professor Stier, of Hanover, has recently collected the statistics of all the competitions of Germany since 1858, the results of which he is shortly to inflict upon the public in book form. La Semaine des Constructeurs, for December 5, gives, however, some interesting points and the cream of all those investigations in a short form.

The 238 competitions that occurred brought out 1,324 designs, which were awarded 235 prizes, of a total value of $425,900. Prof.

Stier has been able to find the actual practical results in only 214 of the competitions. In 1909 of these 214 the first prize was awarded to one of the competitors, while in 31 others, the second or third prices were given. The buildings erected.

To establish from time to time competitions and to encourage in every way the construction and sanitation of cheap homes.

This society publishes a bulletin in which there is an interesting description of some tenements recently erected at Paris. The Philanthropic Society built in 1890, on rue Jeanne d'Arc, a building approximately 70 feet front and 35 feet deep, containing three stores on the ground floor and five apartments of two and three rooms each on each of seven stories. The building is of thirty-two tenants. The price of rent per annum of each tenement is at the astonishing average sum of at 847 4/54, or at the rate of less than one cent per super-

This is a wonderful result and if all cities in the United States would follow this example. It is probable that the building of over $50,000, there is a net income of $925 per cent, upon the investment, which is shown by a very large profit or loss schedule.

And yet all these tenements are arranged in the most satisfactory manner from a sanitary and architectural point of view. The stairway is broad and well lighted and every room has outside light. Most of the tenements have their own water-closet, also with light from the outside. Others of the oldest character have their light from narrow windows and ventilation, both at Paris and in the provinces, which promise to be equally successful, both in a financial and sanitary point of view.
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