alſo conſiſts of three parts, that is, three times the length of the noſe; but the head is not four times the length of the noſe, as ſome writers have aſſerted. From the place where the hair begins to the crown of the head are only three-fourths of the length of the noſe, or that part is to the noſe as 9 to 12.

It is probable that the Grecian, as well as Egyptian artiſts, have determined the great and ſmall proportions by fixed rules; that they have eſtabliſhed a poſitive meaſure for the dimenſions of length, breadth, and cir­cumference. This ſuppoſition alone can enable us to account for the great conformity which we meet with in ancient ſtatues. Winkelman thinks that the foot was the meaſure which the ancients uſed in all their great dimenſions, and that it was by the length of it that they regulated the meaſure of their figures, by giving to them ſix times that length. This in fact is the length which Vitruvius aſſigns, *Pes vero altitudinis cor­poris ſextae,* 1. 3. cap. 1. That celebrated antiquary thinks the foot is a more determinate meaſure than the head or the face, the parts from which modern painters and ſculptors too often take their proportions. This proportion of the foot to the body, which has ap­peared ſtrange and incomprehenſible to the learned Huetius, and has been entirely rejected by Perrault, is however founded upon experience. After meaſuring with great care a vaſt number of figures, Winkelman found this proportion obſerved not only in Egyptian ſtatues, but alſo in thoſe of Greece. This fact may be determined by an inſpection of thoſe ſtatues the feet of which are perfect. One may be fully convinced of it by examining ſome divine figures, in which the artiſts have made ſome parts beyond their natural di­menſions. In the Apollo Belvidere, which is a little more than ſeven heads high, the foot is three Roman inches longer than the head. The head of the Venus de Medicis is very ſmall, and the height of the ſtatue is ſeven heads and a half: the foot is three inches and a half longer than the head, or preciſely the ſixth part of the length of the whole ſtatue.

Practice of Sculpture.

We have been thus minute in our account of the Grecian ſculpture, becauſe it is the opinion of the ableſt critics that modern artiſts have been more or leſs emi­nent as they have ſtudied with the greater or leſs atten­tion the models left us by that ingenious people: Winkelman goes ſo far as to contend that the muſt finiſhed works of the Grecian matters ought to be ſtudied in preference even to the works of nature. This ap­pears to be paradoxical; but the reaſon aſſigned by the Abbe for his opinion is, that the faireſt lines of beauty are more eaſily diſcovered, and make a more ſtriking and powerful impreſſion, by their reunion in theſe ſublime copies, than when they are ſcattered far and wide in the original. Allowing, therefore, the ſtudy of na­ture the high degree of merit it ſo juſtly claims, it muſt nevertheleſs be granted, that it leads to true beauty by **a** much more tedious, laborious, and difficult path, than the ſtudy of the *antique,* which preſents immediately to the artiſt’s view the object of his reſearches, and com­bines in a clear and ſtrong point of light the various rays of beauty that are diſperſed through the wide do­main of nature.

As ſoon as the artiſt has laid this excellent founda­

tion, acquired an intimate degree of familiarity with the beauties of the Grecian ſtatues, and formed his taſte after the admirable models they exhibit, he may then proceed with advantage and aſſurance to the imitation of nature. The ideas he has already formed of the per­fection of nature, by obſerving her diſperſed beauties combined and collected in the compoſitions of the ancient artiſts, will enable him to acquire with facility, and to employ with advantage, the detached and partial ideas of beauty which will be exhibited to his view in a ſurvey of nature in her actual ſtate. When he diſcovers theſe partial beauties, he will be capable of combining them with thoſe perfect forms of beauty with which he is already acquainted. In a word, by having always preſent to his mind the noble models already mention­ed, he will be in ſome meaſure his own oracle, and will draw rules from his own mind.

There are, however, two ways of imitating nature. In the one a ſingle object occupies the artiſt, who en­deavours to repreſent it with preciſion and truth; in the other, certain lines and features are taken from a variety of objects, and combined and blended into one regular whole. All kinds of copies belong to the firſt kind of imitation; and productions of this kind muſt be executed neceſſarily in the Dutch manner, that is to ſay, with high finiſhing, and little or no invention. But the ſecond kind of imitation leads directly to the inveſtigation and diſcovery of true beauty, of that beauty whoſe idea is connate with the human mind, and is only to be found there in its higheſt perfection. This is the kind of imitation in which the Greeks excelled, and in which men of genius excite the young artiſts to ex­cel after their example, *viz.* by ſtudying nature as they did.

After having ſtudied in the productions of the Gre­cian maſters their choice and expreſſion of ſelect na­ture, their ſublime and graceful contours, their noble draperies, together with that ſedate grandeur and ad­mirable ſimplicity that conſtitute their chief merit, the curious artiſts will do well to ſtudy the manual and me­chanical part of their operations, as this is abſolutely neceſſary to the ſucceſsful imitation of their excellent manner.

It is certain that the ancients almoſt always formed their firſt models in wax: to this modern artiſts have ſubſtituted clay, or ſome ſuch compoſition: they prefer clay before wax in the carnations, on account of the yielding nature of the latter, and its flicking in ſome meaſure to every thing it touches. We muſt not, how­ever, imagine from hence that the method of forming models of wet clay was either unknown or neglected among the Greeks; on the contrary, it was in Greece that models of this kind were invented. Their author was Dibutades of Sicyon; and it is well known that Arceſilas, the friend of Lucullus, obtained a higher de­gree of reputation by his clay models than by all his other productions. Indeed, if clay could be made to preſerve its original moiſture, it would undoubtedly be the fitteſt ſubſtance for the models of the ſculptor; but when it is placed either in the fire or left to dry im­perceptibly in the air, its ſolid parts grow more com­pact, and the figure loſing thus a part of its dimenſions, is neceſſarily reduced to a ſmaller volume. This dimi­nution would be of no conſequence did it equally affect the whole figure, ſo as to preſerve its proportions en-