

www.e-rara.ch

**Reports by the juries on the subjects in the thirty classes into which
the exhibition was divided**

London, 1852

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich

Shelf Mark: Rar 3736

Persistent Link: <https://doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-18964>

Class XXX. Report on sculpture, models, and plastic art.

www.e-rara.ch

Die Plattform e-rara.ch macht die in Schweizer Bibliotheken vorhandenen Drucke online verfügbar. Das Spektrum reicht von Büchern über Karten bis zu illustrierten Materialien – von den Anfängen des Buchdrucks bis ins 20. Jahrhundert.

e-rara.ch provides online access to rare books available in Swiss libraries. The holdings extend from books and maps to illustrated material – from the beginnings of printing to the 20th century.

e-rara.ch met en ligne des reproductions numériques d'imprimés conservés dans les bibliothèques de Suisse. L'éventail va des livres aux documents iconographiques en passant par les cartes – des débuts de l'imprimerie jusqu'au 20e siècle.

e-rara.ch mette a disposizione in rete le edizioni antiche conservate nelle biblioteche svizzere. La collezione comprende libri, carte geografiche e materiale illustrato che risalgono agli inizi della tipografia fino ad arrivare al XX secolo.

Nutzungsbedingungen Dieses Digitalisat kann kostenfrei heruntergeladen werden. Die Lizenzierungsart und die Nutzungsbedingungen sind individuell zu jedem Dokument in den Titelinformationen angegeben. Für weitere Informationen siehe auch [Link]

Terms of Use This digital copy can be downloaded free of charge. The type of licensing and the terms of use are indicated in the title information for each document individually. For further information please refer to the terms of use on [Link]

Conditions d'utilisation Ce document numérique peut être téléchargé gratuitement. Son statut juridique et ses conditions d'utilisation sont précisés dans sa notice détaillée. Pour de plus amples informations, voir [Link]

Condizioni di utilizzo Questo documento può essere scaricato gratuitamente. Il tipo di licenza e le condizioni di utilizzo sono indicate nella notizia bibliografica del singolo documento. Per ulteriori informazioni vedi anche [Link]

CLASS XXX.

REPORT ON SCULPTURE, MODELS, AND PLASTIC ART.

[The Figures after the Names (between parentheses) refer to the Exhibitors' Numbers and to the Pages in the OFFICIAL DESCRIPTIVE AND ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE.]

Jury.

- G. VON VIEBAHN, *Chairman*, Zollverein; Privy Councillor in the Department of Commerce at Berlin.
 LORD COLBORNE, *Deputy Chairman*, 19 Hill Street, Berkeley Square.
 ANTONIO PANIZZI, *Reporter* (Tuscany), British Museum; Keeper of the Printed Books at the British Museum.
 C. R. COCKERELL, R.A., Bank of England; Architect.
 J. GIBSON, R.A., 7 Tilney Street, Park Lane; Sculptor.
 LORD HOLLAND (Tuscany); Minister at the Court of Turin.
 COUNT LEON DE LABORDE, France; Member of Institute, &c.
 General GEORGE MANLEY, 19 Rutland Gate; formerly Adjutant-General in Rome.
 C. T. NEWTON, British Museum; Assistant in the Antiquarian Department of the British Museum.
 A. W. PUGIN, St. Augustine, West Cliff, Ramsgate; Architect.
 LAMBERT A. J. QUETLETT, Belgium; Secretary of the Academy of Fine Arts, and President of the Circle-Artistique, Brussels.
 RICHARD REDGRAVE, R.A., 18 Hyde Park Gate South, Kensington Gore; Artist.
 Y. D. C. SEURMONDT, Holland; late Master of the Mint at Utrecht.
 DR. C. WAAGEN, Zollverein; Director of the Museum of Fine Arts at Berlin.
 W. WYON, R.A., Her Majesty's Mint; Medallist.

THE Jury of Class XXX. assembled for the first time on Monday the 12th of May 1851. In compliance with the instructions received from the Council of Chairmen, the Jury proceeded to elect a Deputy-Chairman, to make arrangements as to the time and place of their future meetings, and to nominate Sub-Committees, who should lay before the Jury detailed reports upon the several points of inquiry specially assigned to them. Lord Colborne was elected Deputy-Chairman; and at a subsequent meeting the undersigned had the honour to be appointed Reporter.

The Sub-Committees having brought their investigations to a close with the utmost dispatch consistent with the due performance of the arduous duties entrusted to them, severally laid their reports before the Jury, who, after the most mature and anxious consideration, have agreed upon their awards now submitted to the Royal Commissioners through the Council of Chairmen. As the Jury of Class XXX. forms a group by itself, and is not part of any other group of Juries, its awards have not been submitted to any other Jury or Juries for confirmation, as would otherwise have been the case, according to the 12th Instruction from the Council of Chairmen. The Jury, however, considered it expedient to hold a special meeting as a group, and at that meeting the awards previously made were reconsidered and finally settled by the Jurors. It is therefore upon the Jury of Class XXX. alone that the whole responsibility of the awards in the Class of Fine Arts rests.

In making these awards the Jury have acted strictly in accordance with the principle laid down by the Council of Chairmen in their 15th Instruction. They have been guided solely by the merit which they have recognized in the individual works exhibited, without reference to countries, and considering the Exhibition as a whole. And in compliance with the 20th Instruction, the Jury of Class XXX. have made the proportion of the Council to the Prize Medal, a very small one. Even had this instruction not been laid down in such precise terms by the Council of Chairmen, the Jury of Class XXX. would have felt it their duty to exercise great reserve in awarding Council Medals, knowing, on the one hand, that superior excellence is but very rarely attained, particularly in such works as fell within their jurisdiction, and

being aware, on the other, that it was only "for very pre-eminent merit" that the Great Medal was intended.

It having already been explicitly stated that the Jury in making their awards were guided solely by the merit which they have recognized in the works exhibited, it might be deemed superfluous to add more on this point; there are, however, one or two facts, obvious indeed, but yet of sufficient importance to be recalled to the minds of such persons as might be led by the decisions of the Jury to draw invidious comparisons between one country and another. It is an obvious but most important fact to be borne in mind, that with respect to the principal branch of the subjects falling under Class XXX. (Sculpture), foreigners have laboured under peculiar difficulties in having had to bring over from distant parts, and at considerable expense and risk, statues in marble or bronze for the Exhibition. Again, all foreign artists have not enjoyed the same means of overcoming these difficulties. In many cases their Governments have given facilities and assistance towards this object, but, even then, this assistance and these facilities have varied in extent. The Jury could not moreover but feel and regret the absence from the list of exhibitors of the names of some of the most distinguished artists in Europe. It might be invidious to mention individuals, but it would be unjust to pass over the fact unnoticed. Among the works, however, by natives of the United Kingdom, to which Medals have been awarded, there are two deserving notice on account of their being exhibited among the Roman sculptures—a graceful acknowledgment of the advantages derived by the artists from that school on which their eminent success reflects so much credit.

The scope and nature of the works on which the Jury of Class XXX. were called upon to adjudicate, gave to their position and duties a special character, and must necessarily impose a peculiar line of conduct upon the Reporter.

There is no doubt, for instance, that a history, however rapid, of the rise, progress, and present state of most classes of industry represented in the Exhibition, will, in the majority of cases, form a part of, and add considerably to, the value of the several Reports, but to attempt such an historical sketch with reference to the Fine Arts must, of necessity, prove unsatisfactory and worse than

useless. The Jury believe, however, that their awards will give a just idea of the present state of the Fine Arts as shown in this Exhibition; and they here wish to express their gratification in observing the universally growing taste for objects of art, and the increasing estimation in which they are held. They have noticed with equal pleasure, that industry directed by science fosters this popular tendency. By the novel and successful adaptation of cheap materials and of economical processes to the multiplication of works of art, the best models are daily brought more and more within the reach of all classes. New and pure sources of enjoyment, hitherto the privilege of the few, are thus opened to all the members of civilized society. Again, the diffusion of good taste in the Fine Arts cannot but beneficially affect the productions of industry generally, so that what has hitherto been valued merely for its usefulness may, in many cases, be rendered an object of attraction to a cultivated eye and a refined mind.

The Jury of Class XXX. have been most anxious not to pass over any of the numerous objects in the Exhibition, which it might properly be considered to be their duty to examine. They think it unlikely that any article deserving notice should have escaped their repeated, minute, and diligent inquiries. On the other hand, this Jury have occasionally abstained from examining objects, respecting which, owing to the necessarily uncertain limits of the several classes, doubt might be entertained whether they strictly belonged to Fine Arts or not. Should the Jury of Class XXX. have been led, in some few instances, to limit their jurisdiction too much, they have the satisfaction of feeling that ample justice has been rendered to exhibitors by those Juries, to whose judgment such objects as have not been considered to belong to this Class have been finally submitted. Thus the Jury of Class XXX. have purposely abstained from judging of such metal-casts as they conceived to have been exhibited merely for the purpose of showing either the successful result of a new process, or the novel use of a particular metal. In this case they were aware that another Jury were about to take these points into their consideration, and judge of these objects as specimens of mechanical industry. In some few exceptional cases, such, for instance, as those of MESSRS. PEREZ, WEISHAUP, &c., certain objects have appeared to possess so strong a claim to be noticed in this Class, that the Jury have not hesitated to distinguish them by an award, although aware that they had been rewarded by other Juries; but whenever such instances of double awards have been made known to this Jury, the fact has been noticed in this Report.

The Jury would willingly have endeavoured to state, as directed by the 20th instruction of the Council of Chairmen, the several grounds upon which four of the Great Medals have been recommended by them; but it has been found impossible to comply with such an instruction with respect to objects of sculpture, although the Jury felt how desirable it was that such an instruction should be observed in those cases in which the elements out of which the Juries were to form their judgment, were of a more definite and more uniformly appreciable nature.

At a meeting held on the 5th of June, long before the question of individual awards came under consideration, the Jury agreed upon the following resolution:—

“That it is not desirable to assign the Council Medal to every object of art pre-eminently beautiful or excellent in its kind, whether it be executed in an inferior section of the Class or not; but that it should be rather limited to the highest works of the highest class.” This resolution, consistent with the view of the Fine Arts taken throughout by this Jury, precluded them from awarding the highest honours to any but works of art of the highest class. Their awards must not, therefore, be compared with those of other Juries guided by different principles, but must be tested only by the rules which the Jurors of Class XXX. have laid down for their own guidance. The holders of the several marks of approbation by which this Jury have distinguished merit ought to appreciate them according to the high value set upon these several marks of approbation by those who conferred them.

In forming their judgment upon works in the highest

branch of art coming within their jurisdiction, the Jury have principally looked for the embodiment of ideas, thought, feeling, and passion; not for the mere imitation of nature, however true in detail, or admirable in execution. They have looked for originality of invention, less or more happily expressed in that style which has for twenty-three centuries been the wonder of every civilized people, and the standard of excellence to which artists of the highest order have endeavoured to attain. Wherever indications of originality, chastened by a successful adaptation of this style, have been met with, the Jury have acknowledged a corresponding amount of merit; and it is this originality of conception, improved by such style, which the Jury have recognized by the honours placed at their disposal. They have endeavoured to record, in the most emphatic manner, their anxious wish that artists should study to give their ideas that form and life which spiritualizes every-day nature, and elevates the work of art to the place of a type of nature itself. The Jury of Class XXX. would point to the remains of the Parthenon as embodying the result of the great principles which they have been anxious to inculcate, and which they desire to see universally adopted. The limited number of Council Medals awarded must not, therefore, be regarded as a proof of deficiency of talent in the bulk of the works exhibited, but as evidence of the severity with which the principles adopted by the Jury have been applied.

It was agreed to recommend that Council Medals should be awarded to the following works:—

To Professor A. KISS, of Berlin, for his group cast in zinc, and bronzed by M. GEISS, representing an Amazon on horseback attacked by a Tiger. (Prussia, No. 279, p. 1065.)

To Baron MAROCHETTI, of Turin, now of London, for his colossal equestrian statue in plaster of Richard Cœur de Lion. (Outside West, No. 76, p. 118.)

To M. J. PRADIER, of Paris, Member of the Institute, for his marble statue of Phryne. (France, No. 1407, p. 1343.)

To the representatives of the late Mr. RICHARD J. WYATT, for his marble statue of Glycera. Exhibited by Captain LEYLAND. (Main Avenue East, No. 103, p. 1286.)

It was the unanimous impulse of the Jury on the awards being taken into consideration, to recommend that the same high distinction should be conferred on Mr. GIBSON (p. 846), for his marble group of a Hunter and Dog, exhibited by the Earl of YARBOROUGH. Their intention was defeated by Mr. Gibson himself, who, well knowing that should he accept the office of a Juror of Class XXX., he could no longer receive a prize from that Jury, preferred serving his brother artists to his own individual gratification, and thus disqualified himself for receiving the honour which he had so well deserved.

DIVISION A.—SCULPTURE AS A FINE ART.*

Section A.—1. In Metals simple, as Gold, Silver, Copper, Iron, Zinc, Lead, &c.

In this section of the works submitted to their judgment, the Jury awarded the Prize Medal to the following work, it being, however, understood that for this class of reward, when more than one article was exhibited by the same artist, the Jury might, if they thought it expedient, cumulate in their judgment the various species of merit which they recognized in the several productions.

To Messrs. C. M. WEISHAUP, Sons, of Hanau (p. 1073), for a Set of Chess-men and Board, in silver and gold, ornamented with enamel. Although aware that the merit of these articles has been acknowledged by another Jury, the Jury of Class XXX. wished to record their opinion of them as objects of art. (Prussia, No. 412.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Mr. A. VECHTE, of London (No. 97, pp. 686-690), for his designs for silver works executed by him for the exhibitors, MESSRS. HUNT and ROSKELL. Although a

* The classification of awards is according to that adopted in the “Head Juries.”

Council Medal has been awarded to the exhibitors by another Jury, the Jury of Class XXX. considered it just to record their opinion of the merits of this artist. (Class XXIII., No. 97.)

The Jury of Class XXX. have heard with great satisfaction that another Jury have suitably acknowledged the excellent workmanship of the Shield presented by His Majesty the King of Prussia to H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, on whose behalf it has been exhibited by H. R. H. PRINCE ALBERT. They think it, however, their duty to add that the several eminent artists who have contributed to the execution of the design of Director Cornelius (p. 110), deserve the special praise of the Jury of Class XXX., for the taste and skill which they have respectively displayed in this work. (Main Avenue East, No. 98.)

Section A.—2. In Metals compound, as Bronze, Electrum, &c.

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this section:—

To Mr. JOHN BELL, of London, for his Eagle Slayer, cast in bronze by the Coalbrook Dale Company. (Main Avenue West, No. 53, p. 659.)

To M. JEAN DEBAY, of Paris, for his bronze group representing the Death of the Stag. (Main Avenue East.)

To M. FRATIN, of Paris, for a group of Eagles in bronze. (France, No. 1235, p. 1236.)

To M. E. L. LEQUESNE, of Paris(?), for his bronze statue of a Dancing Faun. (Main Avenue East.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

M. — BONNASSIEUX, of Paris, for a bronze figure representing Cupid cutting his wings. (France, No. 64, p. 1174.)

M. C. CORDIER, of Paris, for his Head of a Negro in bronze. (France, No. 460, p. 1200.)

M. T. KALIDE, of Berlin, for his group in bronze of a Boy with a Swan. (Prussia, No. 285, p. 1066. Prize Medal awarded, Class XXII.)

M. P. J. MENE, of Paris, for his several Animals in bronze. (France, No. 630, p. 1208. Prize Medal awarded, Class XXII.)

M. C. MOELLER, of Berlin, for two bronze groups representing a Boy with a Newfoundland Dog, and a Girl with a Bulldog. (Prussia, No. 292, p. 1066.)

Section A.—3. In Minerals simple, as Marble, Stone, Gems, Clay, &c.

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this section:—

To Mr. E. H. BAILY, of London, for his two plaster statues of a Nymph preparing for bathing, and of a Youth resting after the Chase. (South Transept, Nos. 6 and 7, p. 847.)

To Mr. JOHN BELL, of London, for his plaster statue of Viscount Falkland, no Prize Medal was specially awarded, as he had already received one for his "Eagle Slayer," in bronze. (North Transept, No. 28, p. 847.)

To M. GIO. MARIO BENZONI, of Rome, for his statue in marble representing Gratitude. (Rome, No. 16, p. 1286.)

To M. AUGUSTE DEBAY, of Paris, for his group in marble representing Eve, with Cain and Abel asleep in her arms, and designated as the "Premier Berceau." (France, No. 45, p. 1173.)

To Professor F. DRAKE, of Berlin, for a reduced cast in plaster of part of the marble pedestal to the monument of Frederic William III. of Prussia. (Prussia, No. 273, p. 1065.)

To M. A. ETEX, of Paris, for his various works of sculpture in plaster and marble. (France, No. 1215, p. 1236.)

To Mr. J. H. FOLEY, of London, for his plaster statue of a Youth at a Stream; also for his plaster group representing Ino and Bacchus. (North Transept, No. 47, Sculpture Court, No. 19, pp. 848 and 844.)

To M. I. FRACCAROLI, of Verona, for his two statues in marble, representing Achilles wounded, and David slinging the stone. (Austria, No. 710, p. 1043.)

To M. C. A. FRAIKIN, of Schaerbeck, near Brussels, for

a plaster group of Psyche carrying off Cupid. (Belgium, No. 465, p. 1166.)

To M. A. GALLI, of Milan, for his marble statue of Susannah. (Austria, No. 711; p. 1043.)

To M. G. GEEFS, of Schaerbeck, near Brussels, for a plaster group representing a Lion in love. (Belgium, No. 466, p. 1066.)

To Mr. J. HOGAN, of London, for his reclining figure in plaster representing a Drunken Faun. (Sculpture Court, No. 14, p. 843.)

To Mr. B. JENNINGS, of London, for his marble statue of Cupid. (Sculpture Court, No. 81, p. 846.)

To M. J. A. JERICHAU, of Copenhagen, for a group in plaster representing a Hunter carrying off the Cub of a Panther. (Denmark, No. 39, p. 1359.)

To Mr. J. LAWLOR, of London, for a statue in plaster representing a Bather. (Sculpture Court, No. 22, p. 844.)

To M. A. LECHESENE, of Paris, for his two casts in plaster representing two groups of a Child protected from a Snake by a Dog. (Main Avenue East, No. 573, p. 1205.)

To Mr. LAWRENCE MACDONALD, now at Rome, for an Ionic statue in marble. (Rome, No. 18, p. 1286.)

To Mr. P. MACDOWELL, of London, for his plaster statue of Eve; also for his statues of Cupid, and of a Girl at Prayer, in marble. (South Transept, Nos. 22, 23, 24, p. 850.)

To Mr. WILLIAM C. MARSHALL, of London, for his plaster figure of Sabrina. (Sculpture Court, No. 15, p. 844.)

To M. RAFFAELLE MONTI, of Milan, for his marble statue of Eve after the Fall. (Austria, No. 746, p. 1044.)

To Mr. HIRAM POWERS, from the United States of America, for a statue in marble representing a Greek Slave. (No. 522, p. 1467.)

To M. J. M. RAMUS, of Paris, for his marble group representing Cephalus and Procris. (France, No. 1419, p. 1244.)

To Professor ERNST RIETSCHEL, of Dresden, for his plaster group designated as "La Pietà," representing Mary kneeling at the Dead Body of our Saviour; and for his bas-reliefs in marble. (Saxony, No. 186, p. 1113.)

To Mr. T. SHARP, of London, for his marble figure representing a Boy frightened by a Lizard. (Sculpture Court, No. 20, p. 844.)

To M. E. SIMONIS, of Brussels, for his equestrian statue of Godfrey of Bouillon, in plaster; and for other works. (Belgium, No. 464, p. 1166.)

To M. G. STRAZZA, of Milan, for his reclining figure, in marble, representing Ishmael. (Austria, No. 713, p. 1043.)

To Mr. E. THRUPP, of London, for his marble statue of a Boy catching a Butterfly; also for a marble figure representing Arethusa. (Sculpture Court, Nos. 56 and 58, p. 845.)

To M. J. TUERLINCKX, of Malines, for a statue in marble representing Giotto. (Belgium, No. 456, p. 1165.)

To the REPRESENTATIVES of the late Mr. M. L. WATSON, of London, for his marble statue of the sculptor Flaxman, exhibited by Mr. Franks; and for his two statues, likewise in marble, of the first Earl of Eldon, and of his brother Lord Stowell, exhibited by the present Earl of Eldon. (Sculpture Court, No. 60, and Main Avenue West, No. 81, p. 848.)

To M. ALBERT WOLFF, of Berlin, for his marble group of a Girl with a Lamb, representing "Innocence." (Prussia, No. 307, p. 1067.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Mr. WILLIAM BEHNES, of London, for his marble statue representing a Startled Nymph. (Sculpture Court, No. 54, p. 845.)

M. H. W. BISSEN, of Copenhagen, for his plaster statue of Orestes, and for other sculptures. (Denmark, No. 38, p. 1358.)

M. T. CLESINGER, of Besançon, for his marble figure of a Bacchante. The Jury, for reasons totally independent of the acknowledged merits of this young artist, abstained, with regret, from awarding a high mark of approbation to this work. (France, No. 419, p. 1198.)

Professor A. COSTOLI, of Florence, for a marble statue of a Dying Gladiator, exhibited by the Rev. John Sand-

ford.* The work by the same artist described under Tuscany, No. 106 of the General Catalogue, was not exhibited.

Mr. J. ENGEL, from Hungary, for his marble group representing an episode in the history of the war between the Amazons and the Argonauts. (South Transept, No. 15, p. 848.)

Mr. P. FRECCIA, of Florence, for his marble statue of Psyche. (Tuscany, No. 110, p. 1299.)

Mr. J. GEEFS, of Antwerp, for his plaster statue, "The Faithful Messenger." (Belgium, No. 451, p. 1165.)

Mr. JOSEPH JAQUET, of Schaerbeck, near Brussels, for his plaster statue representing Cupid disarmed. (Belgium, No. 461, p. 1165.)

Mr. J. LEEB, of Munich, for his marble statue of a Girl carrying a Nest of Cupids. (Bavaria, No. 89, p. 1102.)

Mr. L. MARCHESI, of Milan, for his statue in marble representing Eurydice. (Austria, No. 716, p. 1043.)

Mr. F. M. MILLER, of London, for his marble group, "The Orphans." (No. 98A, Main Avenue East, p. 850.)

Professor L. NENCINI, of Florence, for his reclining marble figure of Bacchus. (Tuscany, No. 108, p. 1298.)

M. MICHEL PASCAL, of Paris, for his model in marble of a Friar presenting the Crucifix to two Children. (France, No. 1660, p. 1256.)

Mr. A. SANGIORGIO, of Milan, for his marble bust of the poet Vincenzo Monti. (Austria, No. 722, p. 1043.)

Mr. E. B. STEPHENS, of London, for his plaster group representing a Deer-stalker and Dog. (North Transept, No. 29, p. 853.)

Mr. W. THEED, of London, for his sculptures in marble and plaster. (Sculpture Court, Nos. 13, 59, and 79, pp. 843, 845, 846.)

Mr. and Mrs. T. THORNYCROFT, of London, for their statues in plaster of the Royal Children, represented as the Seasons. (Sculpture Court, No. 34, p. 844.)

M. T. WAGNER, of Stuttgart, for a figure in marble representing Mary Magdalen. (Wurtemberg, No. 118, p. 1130.)

Mr. H. WEEKES, of London, for his marble group, representing a Sleeping Child and Dog. (South Transept, No. 21, p. 853.)

Section A.—4. *In elaborate Mineral Materials, as Glass, Porcelain, &c.*

The Jury made no award in this section.

Section A.—5. *In Woods and other Vegetable Substances.*

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this section:—

To Mr. C. GEERTS, of Louvain, for his high relief in wood, representing the Coronation of the Virgin Mary. (Belgium, No. 450, p. 1165.)

To M. J. LIÉNARD, of Paris, for his carvings in wood. (France, No. 1326, p. 1239.) The Jury were aware that the merits of M. Liénard had been acknowledged by another Jury. (Council Medal, Class XXVI.)

To Mr. W. G. ROGERS, of London, for his cradle, carved in Turkey boxwood. (No. 353, p. 842.)

To Mr. T. W. WALLIS, of Louth, for his carvings in wood. (No. 89, p. 825.)

Section A.—6. *In Animal Substances, as Ivory, Bone, Shells.*

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

M. L. BIGOTTI, of Lucca, for his bas-reliefs in ivory. (Tuscany, No. 95, p. 1298.)

M. M. HAGEN, of Munich, for his goblet of carved ivory. (Bavaria, No. 83, p. 1102.)

M. C. W. HEYL, of Darmstadt, for his goblet of carved ivory. (Hesse, No. 75, p. 1129.)

M. C. G. KLINGSEY, of Copenhagen, for his ivory jewel-casket, ornamented with bas-reliefs. (Denmark, No. 34, p. 1358.)

M. L. LAUTZ, of Paris, for his ivory carving, representing the victory of Charlemagne over the Saxons. (France, No. 295, p. 1191.)

Mr. R. C. LUCAS, of the Firs, near Winchester, for his ivory carvings. (No. 306, p. 840.)

* This object is not in the Catalogue.

DIVISION B.—WORKS IN DIE-SINKING, INTAGLIOS.

Section B.—1. *Coins, Medals, and Models of a Medallion character in any material.*

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this section:—

To M. K. FISCHER, of Berlin, for medals. (Prussia, No. 281, p. 1065.)

To Mr. L. C. WYON, of London, for his medals and medallion portraits of the Royal Children, modelled by command of Her Majesty. (No. 286, p. 838.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

M. BERNARD AFINGER, of Berlin, for his medallions. (Prussia, No. 309, p. 1067.)

M. L. J. HART, of Brussels, for his medals. (Belgium, No. 441, p. 1165.)

M. C. JEBOTTE, of Liège, for his medals. (Belgium, No. 447, p. 1165.)

M. C. PFEFFER, of Berlin, for his medals. (Prussia, No. 286, p. 1066.)

Count T. TOLSTOY, of St. Petersburg, for his medallions. (Russia, No. 328, p. 1381.)

The Jury having the honour to number Mr. W. Wyon, of London, among their members, were prevented from expressing, by their award, the opinion which they entertain of the works exhibited by this distinguished artist.

Section B.—2. *Impressions struck from Dies for Ornamental purposes.*

The Jury made no award in this section.

Section B.—3. *Gems, either in Cameo or in Intaglio, Shell Cameos.*

The Jury were of opinion that the following artist was deserving of Honourable Mention:—

M. THOMAS SAULINI, of Rome, for his shell cameos. (Rome, No. 24, pp. 1286, 1287.)

Section B.—4. *Seals, &c.*

The Jury made no award in this section.

DIVISION C.—ARCHITECTURAL DECORATIONS.

Section C.—1. *Integral, in Relief, Colour, &c.*

The Jury were of opinion that the following artist was deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Mr. N. J. COTTINGHAM, of London, for his model of a spandril for Hereford Cathedral. (Main Avenue West, No. 63, p. 852.)

Section C.—2. *Adventitious, as Stained Glass, Tapestry, &c.*

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this section:—

To M. G. BERTINI, of Milan, for a painted glass window, representing Dante and some of his ideas. (Austria, No. 737, p. 1044.)

To M. A. GÉRENTE, of Paris, for his painting on glass of the history of Samson. (France, No. 231, p. 1187.)

To Messrs. J. HARDMAN and Co., of Birmingham, for their painted glass windows. (Class XXVI., No. 532, p. 761.)

To M. S. KELLNER, of Nuremberg, for a copy in painted glass of a window by Volkamer, in St. Lawrence's Church in that city. (Bavaria, No. 86, p. 1102.)

To Messrs. MARECHAL and GUYNON, of Metz, for their painting on glass, representing St. Charles administering the Communion to the Plague-stricken. (France, No. 329, p. 1193.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

M. P. BAGATTI-VALSECHI, of Milan, for his painting on glass. (Austria, No. 616, p. 616.)

Messrs. CHANCE BROTHERS and Co., of Birmingham, for their painted window-glass. (Class XXIV., No. 60, p. 706.)

Messrs. HOLLAND and SON, of Warwick, for their life of Christ, painted on glass. (Class XXIV., No. 63, pp. 706, 707.)

Mr. J. G. HOWE, of London, for his imitation of ancient painted window-glass. (Class XXIV., No. 67, p. 707.)

M. A. LUSSON, of Paris, for his painted glass window. (France, No. 565, p. 1205.)

Mr. GEORGE MYERS, of London, for the tomb in stone of Bishop Walsh. (Class XXVI., No. 533, p. 761.) (Prize Medal, Class XXVII.)

Messrs. M. and A. O'CONNOR, of London, for their painted glass. (Class XXIV., No. 65, p. 707.)

The Jury gladly seize the opportunity which now offers itself of rendering justice to the taste displayed by their colleague, Mr. Pugin, in the arrangement of the Mediæval Court in the Exhibition. (p. 761.)

Mr. W. WAILES, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, for his painted glass for York Cathedral. (Class XXIV., No. 73, p. 707.)

To the GOVERNMENT MANUFACTORY OF GOBELIN AND BEAUVAIS TAPESTRY (No. 1367, p. 1241) the Jury award a Council Medal jointly with Class XIX.

DIVISION D.—MOZAICS AND INLAID WORKS.

Section D.—1. In Stone.

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this section:—

To the CAVALIERE BARBERI, of Rome, for a mosaic table, designed and executed by him, representing views of celebrated cities in Italy. (Rome, No. 15, p. 1286.) (Council Medal, Class XXVII.)

To Mr. G. BIANCHINI, of Florence, for his tables in pietra dura, one of them exhibited by R. S. Holford, Esq., and not entered in the Catalogue, the other entered (Tuscany, No. 113, p. 1299). The Jury were much pleased to learn that the merits of this distinguished artist, with respect to the second table, had been suitably acknowledged by another Jury. The table described under No. 111, in the same page of the Catalogue, has not been exhibited.

To M. RAFFAELLE CASTELLINI, Royal Manufactory of St. Peter's, Rome, for his copies in mosaic of a medallion portrait of Boniface II., by Bonipiani, and of the head of St. John the Baptist, by Guercino. (Rome, No. 23, p. 1286.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

M. BENEDETTO BOSCHETTI, of Rome, for two mosaic tables. (Rome, No. 17, p. 1286. Prize Medal, Class XXVII.)

M. DOMENICO MOGLIA, of Rome, for his mosaics. (Rome, No. 21, p. 1286. Honourable Mention, Class XXVII.)

The CAVALIERE LUIGI MOGLIA, of Rome, for his mosaic view of the Temples of Pæstum. (Rome, No. 20, p. 1286.) (Prize Medal, Class XXVII.)

M. ANTONIO ROCCHIGIANI, of Rome, for his mosaic view of the Temples of Pæstum. (Rome, No. 22, p. 1286.)

Section D.—2. In Tiles.

The Jury made no award in this section.

Section D.—3. In Vitrified Materials.

The Jury made no award in this section.

Section D.—4. In Wood.

The following Prize Medal was awarded in this Section:—

To MM. PEREZ and Co., of Barcelona, for an octagonal table of inlaid wood. The Jury have heard with pleasure, that the distinguished merits of this work have been suitably acknowledged by another Jury. (Spain, No. 271A, p. 1346.)

Section D.—5. In Metal.

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this Section:—

To M. J. FALLOISE, of Liège, for various inlaid objects. (Belgium, No. 384, p. 1163.) (Prize Medal, Class XXIII.)

To M. J. ROUCOU, of Paris, for his inlaid work. (France, No. 1689, p. 1257.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Messrs. S. H. and D. GASS, of London, for a niello bracelet, designed by Mr. Maclise. (Class XXIII., No. 83, p. 683.)

The ROYAL ORDNANCE MANUFACTORY, of Toledo, for various inlaid arms. (Spain, No. 266, p. 1346.)

M. E. ZULOAGA, of Eibar, for his inlaid ornaments on pistols and other arms. (Spain, No. 264A, p. 1346.) (Prize Medal, Class XXIII.)

DIVISION E.—ENAMELS.

Section E.—1. On Metals.

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this Section:—

To M. — BONNET (of Paris?), for the head of St. John, in enamel. (France, 1369, p. 1241.)

To Mr. W. ESSEX, of London, for his enamel paintings. (No. 241, pp. 435, 436, Class XXX.)

To M. — HAMON, of Paris, for an enamelled casket. (No. 1369, p. 1241.)

To Madame PAULINE LAURENT, of Paris, for her three enamels in copper, two after Raphael, and one representing Venus. (France, No. 1369, p. 1241.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Mr. W. C. BELL, of London, for his enamel painting of the "Ecce Homo," after Correggio. (No. 249, p. 836, Class XXX.)

Mr. H. P. BONE, of London, for his enamel paintings on gold. (No. 238, p. 835, Class XXX.)

Mr. J. HASLEM, of London, for his enamel paintings on gold. (No. 237, p. 835, Class XXX.)

Section E.—2. On China.

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this Section:—

To M. ANTOINE BÉRANGER, of Paris, for his portrait of Prince Albert, life-size, painted on china, after Winterhalter. (Main Avenue East, No. 97, p. 109.) Also for a Head, painted by him on china, after Rubens. (France, No. 1369, p. 1241.)

To M. H. BUCKER, of Dresden, for his paintings on china. (Saxony, No. 176, p. 1112.)

To M. J. DIETERLE, of Paris, for the general good taste displayed in the painting of china in the Manufactory of Sèvres, of which he is co-director. (France, No. 1369, p. 1241.)

To Mme. A. DUCLUZEAU (of Paris?), for her portrait of Her Majesty, life-size, painted on china, after Winterhalter. (Main Avenue East, No. 96, p. 109.) Also for her painting of a Holy Family, on china. (France, No. 1369, p. 1241.)

To M. JACOBBER, of Paris, for his paintings of flowers on china, after Van Huysum. (France, No. 271, p. 1189.)

To Mme. JACOTOR, of Paris, for the Head of Raphael, painted by her on china. (France, No. 1369, p. 1241.)

To M. N. KORNILOFF, of St. Petersburg, for a landscape after Berghem, on china; executed at the Imperial China Manufactory, St. Petersburg. (Russia, No. 318, p. 1376.)

To M. — SCHILT, of Paris, for his painting on a china vase. (France, No. 1369, p. 1241.)

To M. O. WUSTLICH, of Bamberg, for his portrait of Charles IX. on china. Exhibited by Mr. Schmidt. (Bavaria, No. 92, p. 1102.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Mr. — BRADLEY, of Stoke-upon-Trent, for his painting of Ducks on china, exhibited by Mr. COPELAND. (Class XXV., No. 2, p. 711.)

Mr. S. CHESTERS, of London, for his specimen of painting on china, after Murillo. (No. 246, p. 836.)

MM. ECKELMANN and WÜSTLAH, for their portraits of the Queen with the Prince of Wales, and of Prince Albert, painted on china from miniatures after Thorburn. (Main Avenue West, No. 140, p. 109.)

MM. F. E. HENNEBERG and Co., of Gotha, for their paintings on china. (Prussia, No. 772, p. 1093.)

M. MARIETTE DE CHASSAGNE, for a painting on china

after Horace Vernet, exhibited by M. Boyer, of Paris. (France, No. 1554, p. 1251.)

M. — NIGG, for a Flower-piece and Holy Family, on china, from the Imperial China Manufactory at Vienna. (Austria, No. 615, p. 1038.)

Mme. TURGAN, of Paris, for her painting on china. (France, No. 1504A., p. 1248.)

Mr. G. WALTHER, of Dresden, for his paintings on china. (Saxony, No. 177, p. 1112.)

Section E.—3. On Glass.

The Jury made no award in this Section.

DIVISION F.

MATERIALS AND PROCESSES APPLICABLE TO THE FINE ARTS GENERALLY, INCLUDING FINE-ART PRINTING, PRINTING IN COLOUR, &c.

Section F.—1. Encaustic Painting and Fresco.

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this Section:—

To M. J. DEVERS, of Paris, for a Holy Family in enamel paste, painted on lava. (France, No. 818, p. 1219.)

To M. J. N. VON FUCHS, of Munich, for his specimen of a stereo-chromic method of producing indestructible paintings on walls, exhibited by Mr. Muhr. (Bavaria, No. 91, p. 1102.)

Section F.—2. Ornamental Printing, Chromo-Typography, Gold-illuminated Typography, Typography combined or uncombined with Embossing.

The following Prize Medal was awarded in this Section:—

To M. G. SILBERMANN, of Strasburg, for his chromo-typography. (France, No. 374, p. 1194.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artist was deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Mr. J. HARRIS, of London, for his imitations of ancient typography. (No. 244, p. 836.)

Section F.—3. Lithography (Black), Chromo-Lithography, Gold-illuminated Lithography, Lithography combined or uncombined with Embossing.

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this Section:—

To Messrs. DAY and SON, of London, for their specimens of tinted lithography and chromo-lithography. (Fine Arts Court, No. 80, p. 825.)

To Messrs. M. and N. HANHART, of London, for their chromo-lithography in graduated tints. (Fine Arts Court, No. 64, p. 823.)

To Messrs. HULLMANDEL and WALTON, of London, for their drawings on stone with the stump, and for their lithotints. (Fine Arts Court, No. 71, p. 824.)

To the IMPERIAL PRINTING OFFICE OF VIENNA, for the "Paradisus Vindobonensis" in chromo-lithography. (Austria, No. 362, pp. 1025-1028.)

To Mr. OWEN JONES, of London, for his chromo-lithography. (Fine Arts Court, No. 54, p. 823.)

To M. R. J. LEMERCIER, of Paris, for his lithography and chromo-lithography. (France, Nos. 587 and 588, pp. 1205, 1206.)

To MM. WINKELMANN and SONS, of Berlin, for their coloured lithography. (Prussia, No. 306, p. 1067.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

The fac-similes of ancient MSS. and illuminations by Comte AUGUSTE DE BASTARD, of Paris, have been duly appreciated by the Jury. As it appears, however, that the most important parts of the several objects exhibited are finished by the hand, the Jury abstained from a more special inquiry into their merits. (France, No. 1717, p. 1258.)

Mr. G. BAXTER, of London, for his printing in colours. (No. 115, p. 828.)

M. F. DREGER, of Moscow, for his chromo-lithography. (Russia, No. 362, p. 1383.)

Mr. T. UNDERWOOD, of Birmingham, for a new process of lithography. (Fine Arts Court, No. 77, p. 825.)

Section F.—4. Zincography, or other modes of Printing.

The following Prize Medal was awarded in this Section:—

To Mr. R. APPEL, of London, for his anastatic printing. (No. 274, p. 838.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artist was deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Mr. J. HANFSTAENGEL, of Munich, for his galvanography. (Bavaria, No. 85, p. 1102.)

To the processes applicable to the Fine Arts generally, belong those employed by the next three Exhibitors, whose claims the Jury of Class XXX. have acknowledged in the following manner:—

Prize Medals were awarded—

To Mr. B. CHEVERTON, of London, for his process of reducing sculpture by machinery, as exemplified in the Theseus. (No. 194, p. 832.)

To M. A. COLLAS, of Paris, for his process of reducing sculpture by machinery, as exemplified in the Gates of the Battistero at Florence, and other works. (France, No. 1709, p. 1258.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artist was deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Mr. B. E. DUPPA, of London, for specimens of a new process of executing fine-art designs on detached tiles; the design being burnt in on the separate pieces, and then put together. Exhibited by Messrs. H. MINTON and Co. (Class XXVII., No. 51, p. 767.)

DIVISION G.—MODELS.

Section G.—1. In Architecture.

The Jury having been directed to include architectural models in the range of their inquiries, were naturally led to reflect upon, and then to feel it a most agreeable duty to acknowledge publicly, the merit of the Building in which they met. The originality of the construction, and the rapidity with which it has been carried to completion would, in comparatively recent times, have induced popular enthusiasm to ascribe to fairy agency the power of overcoming obstacles hitherto considered to be insurmountable by human ingenuity. The noble simplicity of the whole edifice, the striking grandeur of its proportions, the novel and ingenious application of the materials of which it is constructed, and the admirable adaptation of all its parts to their multifarious purposes, gave to the person who conceived it, as well as to those who, with so much zeal and success, carried out the constructor's design, a right to the highest award in the power of the Jury to recommend. The Jury had, therefore, the honour to propose that a Council Medal be awarded to Mr. JOSEPH PAXTON, and a similar Medal to Messrs. FOX and HENDERSON. And although the Jury had already rendered justice to the claims of Mr. OWEN JONES, by awarding him a Prize Medal for his chromo-lithography, they felt it to be their duty to record here their opinion of the advantages resulting to the Building from the simple and tasteful style of decoration which Mr. Owen Jones has so skilfully suggested and so successfully applied.

The following Prize Medals were awarded in this section:—

To Mr. J. C. BOESCHE, of Magdeburg, for his models of Magdeburg Cathedral and of the Nuremberg Fountain, executed in limewood. To this artist the Jury have also made a money award of 30*l.* sterling. (Prussia, No. 785, p. 1094.)

To Mr. JABEZ JAMES, of London, for his model in various materials of the Britannia Suspension Bridge. (Class VII., No. 106, p. 321. Prize Medal, Class VII.)

To Mr. S. SALTER, of London, for his model executed in card of St. Nicholas' Church, now being rebuilt at Hamburg. (Class VII., No. 221, p. 331.)

The Jury were of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Mr. J. H. CASSEBOHM, of Oldenburg, for his model of

* Since the Award Book was closed, it has been ascertained that the two entries No. 257 and 258 refer to the same person.

Heidelberg Castle, carved in cork. (Oldenburg, No. 1, p. 1135.)

Mr. S. CUNDY, of London, for his restoration of the Monument of Philippa of Hainault, in English alabaster, from drawings by Mr. G. C. Scott. (Main Avenue West, No. 60, p. 848. Prize Medal, Class XXVII.)

Mr. T. DUNHILL, of London, for his model in plaster, and other materials, of a Metropolitan Cattle Market, with abattoirs, &c. (Class VII., No. 90, p. 318.)

M. J. LEMAN, of Berne, for his model of the Nuremberg Fountain, carved in wood. (Switzerland, No. 258, p. 1283.)*

M. J. LEMAN, of Zürich, for his model of the Cathedral of Strasburg, executed in card. (Switzerland, No. 257, p. 1282. Prize Medal, Class VII.)*

Mr. W. STUART, of Plymouth, for a model of the Plymouth Breakwater, executed in limestone. (Class VII., No. 28, pp. 311, 312.)

Section G. 2.—In Topography.

The following Prize Medal was awarded in this section:—

To Mr. JOHN GRANTHAM, Secretary of the Liverpool Local Committee, for a model of the Docks and commercial portion of the Town of Liverpool, in various materials. (Main Avenue West, No. 95, p. 851.)

Section G. 3.—In Anatomy.

The Jury of Class XXX. abstained from examining models in Anatomy, as such objects were transferred to another Class. (Minute of May 26th, 1851.)

DESIGNS.

The various designs for decoration, tapestry, embroidery, mixed fabrics, &c., not having been submitted to the examination of any other Jury, the Jury of Class XXX. appointed a Committee of their own body, which, together with members of Juries of other Classes, were instructed by the Royal Commissioners to report on the articles thus overlooked. This mixed Committee having reported accordingly, the Jury of Class XXX. proceeded to award the following Prize Medals:—

To MM. BERRUS BROTHERS, of Paris, for their general ability in designs for shawls. The Jury wished, however, to guard themselves from being supposed to approve of the introduction of landscapes in such designs, as exhibited in frames Nos. 1 and 2. (France, No. 55, p. 1174.)

To M. J. CHEBEAUX, of Paris, for his cotton and calico prints, apart from their taste. (France, No. 1146, p. 1233.)

To M. C. E. CLERGET, of Paris, for his designs generally, and his exhibited works in ornament. (France, No. 799, p. 1219.)

To M. A. COUDER, of Paris, for his Shawl Designs, and for his skillful execution of his Designs generally, apart from their taste. (France, No. 1566, p. 1251.)

To the GOVERNMENT HEAD SCHOOL OF DESIGN, established in London. (Fine Arts Court, No. 10, p. 821.)

The mixed Sub-Committee examined the Designs intended for Manufactures, exhibited by this School, directed by Messrs. J. R. Herbert, R. Redgrave, and H. J. Townsend; the female department being superintended by Mrs. M'lan. The Sub-Committee reported that in these designs they had observed a purity of taste, a propriety and chasteness of invention, and a well-understood adaptation of style for the several objects, which do great credit to the directors and to their scholars. The Sub-Committee, therefore (Mr. Redgrave, one of its members and a Juror of Class XXX. having withdrawn), felt it to be their duty to propose to this Jury that a Prize Medal should be awarded to the Institution. They moreover recommended that Honourable Mention should be made of three of the pupils, and that six other pupils, viz., S. ASHWORTH (No. 87, Class XVIII., p. 558), FLORENCE COLLINS (No. 86, Class XVIII., p. 558), J. S. CUTHBERT (No. 10, Class XXX., p. 821), A. TOWN (No. 10, Class XXX., p.

821), J. KYD (No. 10, Class XXX., p. 821), and J. RAWLINGS (No. 10, Class XXX., p. 821), should be mentioned with much approbation. The Jury of Class XXX., after due inquiry and mature deliberation, approved unanimously of these suggestions, and adopted the whole of these recommendations. The names of the three pupils to whom an Honourable Mention has been awarded will be severally found in their proper place.

To M. E. LAROCHE, of Paris, for his Manufacture of Designs. (France, No. 291, p. 1190.)

To LUKE LIMNER (Mr. Leighton), for a variety of Designs. (Class XVII., No. 24, p. 538.)

To Mr. DIGBY WYATT, of London, for good taste generally in his Designs. (Fine Arts Court, No. 30, p. 822.)

The Jury were, moreover, of opinion that the following artists were deserving of Honourable Mention:—

Mr. W. ALDRIDGE, a pupil of the Government Head School of Design, for his Designs. (Fine Arts Court, No. 10, p. 821.)

M. C. BRAUN, of Paris, for his Designs for Calico Prints. (France, No. 72, p. 1175.)

Mr. JOHN CARTER, of Crayford in Kent, for his Designs unapplied. (P. 821.)

M. F. DIDIER, of Paris, for his Designs for Shawls. (France, No. 820, p. 1219.)

M. N. A. GALIMARD, of Paris, for his Designs for Painted Glass. (France, No. 228, p. 1187.)

M. GRUENTHAL, of Berlin, for his Patterns for Berlin Wool. (Prussia, No. 166, p. 1057.)

Mr. J. K. HARVEY, of London, for his Designs for Carpets. (Class XIX., No. 197, p. 567.)

Mr. B. HEALD (Class XIX., No. 269), of the Government School of Design at Nottingham, for his Lace Designs. (Prize Medal, Class XIX., p. 570.)

Mr. EDWIN IRELAND, a pupil of the Government Head School of Design, for his Designs. (Fine Arts Court, No. 10, p. 821.)

Mr. J. H. MÉREAUX, of Paris, for his Designs for Lace Manufacturers. (France, No. 631. Prize Medal, Class XIX., p. 1208.)

M. MEYNIER, of Paris, for his Designs for Shawls. (France, No. 638, p. 1208.)

MM. NAZE and Co., of Paris, for their Designs for Cotton Prints. (France, No. 625, p. 1207.)

M. E. PICARD, of Rouen, for his Designs for Woollen, Cotton, and other Printing. (France, No. 347, p. 1194.)

Mr. C. P. SLOCOMBE, a pupil of the Government Head School of Design, for his Designs. (Fine Arts Court, No. 10, p. 821.)

Mr. G. TRUEFIT, of London, for his Design of a wrought-iron canopied Tomb. (Fine Arts Court, No. 75, p. 824.)

*The Jury of Class XXX., having brought their labours to a conclusion, cannot refrain from expressing their hope that steps may be taken for rendering the Great Exhibition as useful after it has ceased to be, as it has proved gratifying and instructive in the course of its short existence. It is the wish to see these hopes realized, that impels the Jury, even at the risk of overstepping the strict limits of their functions, to submit, with great deference, their views on this point to the Royal Commissioners.

The foundation of a permanent industrial Museum in the heart of the metropolis of trade and industry, seems to the Jury the logical and practical consequence of this Exhibition. It is in the "Crystal Palace" that the great truth has been impressed upon us, that art and taste are henceforth to be considered as elements of industry and trade, of scarcely less importance than the most powerful machinery. It seems also natural that this Museum should in the first instance consist of the objects to which the several Juries have called public attention as happy types and models for imitation. While such a Museum, on the one hand, would be a lasting depository of industry and of the arts; it would, on the other, serve as the best and easiest standard of comparison by which human ingenuity might mark its progress, on the opening, ten years hence, of a new Great Exhibition;—it would serve alike as a guide and as a beacon.

* Since the Award Book was closed, it has been ascertained that the two entries, Nos. 257 and 258, refer to the same person.

Thus the Great Exhibition of 1851, which already stands out so prominently in the past, would bear fruitful and lasting consequences for the future, and would acquire an additional claim to a grateful record in the annals of mankind.

The Greeks, our masters in the nobler arts, did not trust to the historian and the poet alone for the record of their achievements, but committed to the greatest artists the task of immortalizing their military triumphs. The Great Exhibition deserves to be celebrated as the triumph of industry and invention over commercial routine and international jealousies. Whether the "Crystal Palace" shall be removed or not, posterity will look for some

mark of gratitude to the illustrious Prince to whom the present generation owe the realization of a gigantic thought; a thought which may have floated in the minds of others, but which received consistency and was brought to maturity by his energy and perseverance.

The Jury of Class XXX., therefore, hope that on the site of the Exhibition Building a statue will be erected to Prince Albert. On its base should be recorded the share which statesmen and others have borne in bringing such an undertaking to completion. The Fine Arts would thus be called upon to perpetuate the memory of the Great Exhibition, to the attractions of which they have so variously and so powerfully contributed.

A. PANIZZI, REPORTER.

London, September 1851.