Working Papers on The Nature of Evidence:
How Well Do 'Facts' Travel?
No. 28/08

A Journey Through Times and Cultures? Ancient Greek Forms in American Nineteenth-Century Architecture: An Archaeological View

Lambert Schneider

Archäologisches Institutan
Universität Hamburg

April 2008

“The Nature of Evidence: How Well Do ‘Facts’ Travel?” is funded by

A journey through times and cultures? Ancient Greek forms in American 19th century architecture: an archaeological view

Lambe Sch eide

Abstract

The presence of classical architectural features in modern Western architecture shows that knowledge from ancient times was travelling through both space and time. Yet despite surface similarities, the architecture of revival was very different to that of antiquity. The classicistic architecture of nineteenth-century America provides a clear case. In contrast to the Roman influences that affected the founding fathers, nineteenth century American architecture borrowed instead from the Greeks. Informed less by archaeology and more by ideology, the American Greek revival saw the architectural forms divested of original meanings and invested with the ideals of post-revolutionary America. Looking at the vectors by which the revival reached American shores shows a double distortion affecting the transmission of the signal from Ancient Greece, such that what survives the great distances and times that separate the two societies is in the end a very different set of facts.

Archaeology constantly deals with so-called “facts.” Public opinion clearly associates the field with demonstrable fact. Since the object of archaeology is investigating the past by analyzing material phenomena, the discipline is expected to have something substantial to say about the “travel” – meaning in this case the □ □ ,□ □. □ – of such “facts.” The existence of ancient civilizations with their apparent immutability has generated confidence in the existence of cultural and artistic continuity, or at least of a gradual development that transmits facts through time. The numerous modern revivals of ancient forms and ideas, both in scholarship as well as in the broader context, have seemed evidence for the existence of a “cultural memory” within which

facts might comfortably travel through time.[1]

This article examines this widely-held popular assumption. I suggest that the answer to the question of what travels and how, largely depends on the interest and focus of the beholder, rather than on the phenomena beheld. Seen in this light, both Classical Revivals in art and architecture and the academic investigation of ancient Greek culture turn out to be a creative undertaking that molds and even invents the shape and meaning of the past. The material with which I will illustrate this is Greek-inspired American architecture of the 19th century, and the public response to this phenomenenon.

When the sculptures that Lord Elgin took away from the Athenian Acropolis arrived in England in 1809 and were subsequently exhibited in the British Museum [fig 01],[2] they became almost immediately world famous. In particular, the pedimental sculptures of the Parthenon, despite their fragmentary condition, rose to celebrity status. Classical Greek sculpture such as the Parthenon pedimentals was considered a symbol of freedom, an embodiment of a freer, unfettered lifestyle than was possible in most European countries at that time. Looking back into the past was linked to hopes for a better future, and therefore had utopian overtones. To the early 19th century European beholders, the Parthenon sculptures [figs. 02 & 03] represented freedom from restrictive etiquette of court dress, from wasp waist and corsett, from

---

[1] A. Assmann: □ e . e . e . □ e e □ e, □ e □ e (Munich 1999); L. Schneider: e e e e e . e □ e □ e . e e □ . In: U. Borsdorf - H. Th.

stifling ties and measured steps, but also freedom of thought and of political action.[3] Even nakedness was approved of in this case, with so-called “wet drapery” supporting the illusion of powerful, flowing movement. Casually stretching or in vigorous action the gods proudly present their bodies to the beholder. Might not all people at one time have been able to behave as such, freed from traditional restrictions? Should they not again?[4]

In a remarkable double equation, classical Greek sculpture, like architecture, was understood as a symbol of naturalness, even as a perfection of nature; and nature, in turn, as a metaphor of freedom. So it was not only the fact that one now possessed fragments of Greek sculpture of the epoch that was considered the cradle of democracy – it was the specific of these sculptures that met with an interpretation that had at that time been awakened but was soon eclipsed by other readings.

The enlightened public was well prepared to view these works in the way described here. It had been Johann Joachim Winckelmann – in a sense, the founder both of classical archaeology and of stylistic-orientated art history – who decades before had formulated the daring analogy between Classical Greek sculpture, nature, and freedom[5]:

---

[3] Forster 1996; Schneider – Höcker 2001; Schneider 2003.

[4] These were the dreams of: Johann Gottfried Herder, (Riga 1778); Gotthold Ephraim Lessing: (Berlin 1769); Gotthold Ephraim Lessing: (Berlin 1769).- Friedrich Schiller: (Leipzig 1793); Friedrich Schiller: (Leipzig 1793); Johann Wolfgang Goethe: (1795); Johann Wolfgang Goethe: (Tübingen 1798); Johann Wolfgang

Greeks. So even in this provisional and superficial first overview of the process, “travelling facts” seem to vanish almost completely. Or do they? Let us have a closer look to this.

The beholders of the late 18th and early 19th century ascribed this outstanding quality of naturalness particularly to works of the 5th and 4th centuries BC, which they called the only true Classical ones. The previous broad definition of the Classical was thus narrowed. Within antiquity it was only the *ee* that was to be awarded with the elitist honorific of “Classical.” Within this, Athenian culture of the 5th and 4th century BC was privileged most of all, with art and architecture of the period considered in the same terms as sculpture. Consequently, the corpus of ancient Greek relics were viewed as a kind of plastic art, a view which should have far reaching consequences.

This new way of looking at sculpture and at art in general .□.□ *e e* .,□ . *e* was largely based not upon the observation of objects or processes from the past but made up “at home,” created by an inner process. Winckelmann for instance – that daring prophet of the message of Greek art to modern times – was during his early years in Germany unable to see many Greek originals, and the few he physically encountered apparently made no great impression on him. He managed to write his famous and influential work of 1756, . .□ .□

the episode illustrates well the degree to which this new and sparkling classicism was not a *e* construction of an ancient past – but instead a most fascinating construction, a creative act of modelling a vague dream into a firm and detailed picture of Classical Greece, which subsequently gained physical existence both in sculptural art and architecture. From time to time, this creative act made use of archaeological observation, even minute observation, but it was never really derived from archaeological observation as it is often believed to be.

This conception of classicism incorporated social and political implications, yet was romantic from the start – unreal yet uplifting. Winckelmann and the following generations of intellectuals in Continental Europe like Johann Gottfried Herder or Wolfgang Goethe had no means of enacting or even effectively promoting democracy in their home countries, not to speak of establishing radical democratic practices as had arisen in Athens in what had been (according to Winckelmann's classification) the most classical epoch. Regarding Winckelmann himself, it was only by a royal grant for a stay in Rome that he was able to rise above his humble circumstances and escape German provincialism and mediocrity.[8] Papal patronage followed in his later years.

politicians like Count Metternich or Czar Alexander III of Russia seemed enchanted by this dream. So it was not only that the original social and political message of these revolutionary thoughts was soon discarded, but rather, from the beginning this concept of classicism never actually interfered with the even the most (as Winckelmann had it) “unnatural,” and therefore “un-Greek,” attitudes and practices.

Digging for classical remains, conserving and reconstructing ancient buildings as well as erecting new ones in the classical style in an astutely archaeological manner: all this fit perfectly well not only with democratic ideas but also with monarchic rule. Meanwhile, the Greek order – in the sense of the architectural order with all its metaphorical connotations – soon became the language of the establishment all over Europe, of stately or private authority, in milder or (more often) severe form (especially so in German speaking countries and in Greece itself).

The original meaning of the Latin word “classicus” already implied association with an upper class, but as the 19th century wore on, this more social definition acquired an added depth and severity previously absent. In particular, the Greek Doric order and also the slightly less severe and more elegant Greek Ionic order were now interpreted as physical embodiments of what Sigmund Freud would later term the “Super-Ego.” Winckelmann’s original viewing of Greek sculpture and architecture as symbolic of naturalness and freedom had given way to a new definition: a manifestation of class-conscious order, of externally enforced discipline, and of internalized self-discipline through education.[10] Classical Greek art had, in a most problematic way, become symbolic of human culture.

Classical archaeology became a tool for attaining the classicistic goal. In Greece itself, archaeological activities did not seek to disclose the ancient world as it had been, but only confirm the ideals of the so-

---

München (eds). (Munich 1988); Schneider 2001 p. 24-36.

[10] Marchand 1996; Schneider 1996 p.707-741; Schneider 2003 p. 148-150.

called classical period through the excavation of monumental relics. All that did not accord with these ideals was deconstructed, cleared aside, and annihilated with a terrible rigour. The few remaining skeletons of ruins of the classical period were then heavily restored to form a view fitting the ideology.[11] The Acropolis at Athens, for example, came to resemble more and more places like Munich or Berlin. Archaeologists thoroughly adjusted the physical reality of the ancient sites to their idealistic vision. They created sculptural architectonic ensembles of a kind that had never existed in antiquity [figs. 07, 08, & 09].[12]

No wonder that parallel to this at home archaeological strictness, rigorous conformance to the classical, and an almost obedient devotion supported by archaeology were the dominating principles in contemporary domestic building. In reality, these constructions were rarely real buildings in the traditional sense. Rather they functioned as plastic monuments, signifiers in stone: Walhalla's [fig. 10],[13] grave-monuments or gate-monuments (such as that in Munich by Klenze, or that of Wassili Petrovich Stassow of 1838 at St. Petersburg [fig. 11]).[14] These were not integrated into daily life but instead placed on a pedestal for veneration. Thus most of the archaeologically astute uses of the classical Doric and Ionic order no longer functioned as true architecture, but rather as symbols of a given law and of internalized order. The ensuing disintegration and destruction of historical traces happened not □ □ *e* but *e* . *e* of Classical archaeology.[15]

From the beginning, it had never been pure curiosity but devotion that led people to look back to that far-distant past. What was taken as

---

[11] Schneider 2001 p. 43-59.
[12] ibid., p.11-59.
[13] J. Traeger: *e e* ,□ „□. *e* „□ . *B* ,□. *e* □*e* □ *1* . . *e* (Regensburg 1987); Schneider 2001, p. 32-34.
[14] The gate in the center of St. Petersburg, executed in iron technique, is a free adaptation of the Propylaea on the Athenian Acropolis. It commemorated Russia's successful war against Turkey and Poland in 1834-1838. Schneider 2001 p. 34-36.
[15] Marchand 1996 p. 7-16; L. Schneider: ,□,□ □ *e*„□ ,□ *e* . In: Salvatore Settis (ed.), I Greci I: Noi e i Greci (Torino 1996) p. 707-741.

a fact of antiquity, and what was deemed to be worth incorporating into the present, was determined by contemporary interests and conceptions. The devotion to the distant past was never intended to be inclusive, but was always partial: aimed at only a small fraction both of time and of material. This dream was realised in a physical form by contemporary building activities as well as by archaeological excavation, restoration, presentation in museums, and publication. Seen in this light, classical archaeology appears as a structural complement to other endeavours within the whole bundle of undertakings of modern classicism.

In comparison to this, how does the re-use of the same classical models manifest itself in a country which for so long lacked any foundation in classical archaeology as a scholarly discipline and educational pursuit?[16] America actually offers the richest variety of Greek inspired architecture in the world, in both a quantitative and qualitative sense. American classicistic architecture is often closely associated with the idea of democracy. Hence the title of Henry-Russell Hitchcock and William Seale's book on state capitols erected in Doric, Ionic and Corinthian order: *e ,e e .*[17] And in a sense they are that [fig. 12 + 13]. Nevertheless the title is a misnomer for it suggests that Greek-inspired forms were primarily understood as an expression of democratic principles. This was not the case.

In the first place, it does not fit chronologically. Greek-inspired architecture swept across the States from New England, through the mid-west, and out into to the most remote locations. This wave started not earlier than the second decade of the 19th century[18] – more than a

---

[16] F. Yeguel: *e ,e e B ee . e e e e e , 1 -1 0* (Oxford/New York 1991); S. Dyson: *e ,e e S e . , , e , e e e S e* (1998); M. Meckler: *, , . e , e e e e B .* (2006).

[17] Hitchcock - Seale 1976; Schneider 2001 p. 32.

[18] W. Chaitkin: *e .* In: Architectural Design 49 (1979) 8/9, Profile 23,

Neither George Washington's residence, Mount Vernon (1743 and later), nor Jefferson's Monticello show anything that could be called Greek Revival. The same applies to Washington's governmental architecture during this time period. Both the White House and the Capitol[22] [fig. 14] are overwhelmingly Roman. Truly ee forms were introduced no earlier than 1818, by Charles Bulfinch. And it is only in the basement of the Capitol where you find archaic looking Doric columns copied from an early temple at Paestum which here support a cap vault [fig. 15]. However, this Greek element remains isolated within the architectural complex and isolated historically in the sense that it inspired no successors in the United States.

It was rather the new self-confidence of the next two generations, fuelled by Andrew Jackson's victory over the British troops in 1812, a

---

168-195; Meyer Reinhold.- B. Köster: e . e e B e S (München 1990); J. S. Curl: e e ee (Woodstock/New York 1991); Höcker 1997. Most of these architectures in the USA were not designed by professional architects but rather by e - e e (Minard Lafever calls them e e). Written records are rare. The following literature mainly stems from or deals with renowned and literally well documented architects: Asher Benjamin: e e (New York 1833, reprint [= T e e B e 5] New York 1972); Asher Benjamin: e Se e , ed. by A. Embury II (New York 1917); J. M. Bryan (ed.): e , e (Washington DC 1989).- A. Jackson Downing, e e e e (1850; reprint New York 1969); A. Jackson Downing: e . e . e e e , , ed. by Jaquetta M. Haley (New York 1988); H. M. Pierce Gallagher: e . e e e 1 1-1 (New York 1935); Minard Lafever, e e B e e (New York 1852); Minard Lafever: eB e e e e , e e e e e e e (New York 1839); Minard Lafever: e e , , e e e e e e e ... (New York 1856): R. H. Newton: & . ee e e 1 12-1 0 (New York 1952); A. Peck: e , e e 1 03-1 2 (New York 1992); A. Scully jr.: e , e . ee e e S . (Baton Rouge LA 1973); G. Waddell – R. W. Liscombe: . e & (Easley SC 1981); H.H. Reed: e e S e e e e (Washington DC 2005).

[22] 1793-1863 (the Doric columns in the room under the Old Senate). Architects: William Thornton, B.H. Latrobe, Charles Bulfinch, Robert Mills, T.U. Walter. See: Hamlin 1942 pl. VI left..- G. Brown: e e S e (1980); W. C. Allen: e e S e , e e , , (2005): H. H. Reed – A. Day: e e S e . e e e (2005); D. Frydman: e e e e . e e S e B . 1 2 1 (2007).

new pride following years of depression that was visualized by this fashion. So it was not so much “temples of democracy” as it was an expression of the new economic prosperity and the new trend toward conspicuous consumption. [fig. 16]

It is revealing that it was not so much the old founding families who followed this fashion, but rather the young entrepreneurs. I think, this is one explanation for the fact that - while you find some examples of Greek revival in places like Boston - there are by far more and more impressive examples found further west: in Troy[23] [fig. 17] or Geneva[24] [fig. 18] (both Upstate NY), for instance, so in newly developed areas at that time.

This new class of entrepreneurs were focused on the present and the future. They neither saw in Classical Greece a democratic model, nor did they in any way reverentially look back to a distant past. For them, Greek forms were something akin to a garment suitable for their social status and new-found wealth. A telling example of this attitude is Whale Oil Row[25] at New London, CT, aligned by houses with truly

built that speak against a tight linking of democracy to these Greek-inspired forms. It is also the contemporary assessment of the phenomenon that points to another direction, and (as we will soon see) the buildings themselves.

Some of the buildings, especially the earliest ones look, at first sight, very much like those you would find in England and Continental Europe: close copies of ancient classical architecture. For instance, William Strickland's remake of the Parthenon of 1819-24 at Philadelphia[27] [figs. 21 & 22]. Even these very strict copies, however, were seen in a different light by contemporary beholders [fig. 23]: light not only in a metaphorical sense, but also in its literal meaning. Listen to Philip Hone's assessment of this building on February 14, 1838, a typical entrepreneur of the time, politician and amateur in the field of architecture and the arts:

> The portico of this glorious edifice, the sight of which always repays me for coming to Philadelphia, appeared more beautiful to me this evening than usual, from the effect of the gas-light. Each of the fluted columns had a jet of light from the inner side so placed as not to be seen from the street, but casting a strong light upon the front of the building, the softness of which, with its flickering from the wind, produced an effect strikingly beautiful[28].

Hone's view is a contemporary one, but these lights still exist and give "physical" proof to his impression. The basic concept of Greek temple building is totally inverted by this. Whereas the massive walls of the cella of ancient Greek temples appeared as something compact and dark behind the shining columns, here the cella shines like a jewel, behind the darker fence of the columns. The columns still appear important, but more dominant is the actual building itself, which after all in this case was "The Second Bank of the United States," so not an empty monument but a building intended for actual use.

---

[27] Hamlin 1942 pl. XX and p. 77; Kennedy 1989 p. 114-115, 194-195; Tournikiotis 1994 p. 213; Schneider 2001 p. 29-32; Schneider 2003 p. 158-161.
[28] Quoted by Hamlin 1942 p. 78 n. 19.

This radical inversion of an otherwise minutely copied ancient model is not an isolated case. Similar lighting is reported of the Old Custom House at Erie, PA[29] (1839, now Erie Art Museum), and still to be seen at Bethel United Methodist Church at Charleston, SC[30] (1852-53) [fig. 24 – regarding the front elevation, an otherwise astute copy of the Athena and Hephaistos temple, the so called Theseion at the Agora of Athens]. Also once a noble bank – even with living quarters to house

completely new: into buildings which seem to wear Greek orders like clothing. The core building never hides behind the columns. The attitude we found reflected by the artificial lighting is also reflected in the buildings themselves.

This, of course, is not just a question of aesthetics. It is the vital functions of the buildings, their uses in life that were proudly shown to a public: proudly in respect to any beholder and proudly in respect to the ancient models. Like jewels, the inner cores of the buildings glow behind rows of Greek columns. It is not just this view from the outside-in that is important and underscores the proud display of function, but also the view from the inside-out. The beholder looks through the ancient columns to the present beyond.

For a villa of around 1850 at Eutaw, AL[33] [fig. 27], copies of the Ionic columns of the classical little 5th century temple near the Ilissos river at Athens were employed to "clad" the core-building and to support not only the roof but also a surrounding balcony, attached in a most un-classical manner directly to the shafts of the columns. The roof again is crowned by a little belvedere which imitates the main structure on a smaller scale. No less impressive is Neill-Cochran-House at Austin, TX[34] [fig. 28], erected during the same years. Again, the columns of the Ilissos Temple, as drawn by Stuart and Revett and reprinted in various 19th century American books on architecture, are here used as models, and once more the rows of beautiful large windows on both storeys behind the classical ionic order are to be noticed. The columns of the Ilissos Temple were often used as models, and so it was at the 1843 Wilcox-Cutts House in Orwell, VT[35] [fig. 29]. But this time, the columns are five in number – gently abandoning classical rules of Ionic order in favour of attaining a colonnade that does not obscure the view from the large windows behind.

---

[33] Kennedy 1989 p. 241; Schneider 2003 p. 162-163.
[34] Smith 1981 vol. 3, p. 635-636; Kennedy 1989 p. 242; Schneider 2003 p. 164.
[35] Pierson 1976 p. 449; Kennedy 1989 p. 35; Schneider 2003 p. 162.

A similar care for the building itself and pride on what is going on inside is shown in public architecture. Nashville's Tennessee State Capitol[36] of 1845-59 [fig. 30], designed by William Strickland – the architect of the Second Bank of the US, seen above – presents an enlarged version of the main front of the Erechtheion on the Acropolis with its characteristic capitals but now with 8 instead of 6 columns [fig. 31], and once more there appear blinking rows of windows behind the colonnade. On top of the roof – above a dome not visible from the exterior – is placed a minute copy of Lysicrates Monument at Athens (again taken from Stuart and Revett's book).

The same inverted use of the classical Erechtheion is found in many buildings of the time, as for instance in Madewood Plantation House[37] near Napoleonville, LA, erected in 1846-48 [fig. 32] and Avery Downer House[38] at Granville, OH, erected in 1842 and designed by Minard Lafever. Even in cases like Judge Robert Wilson House[39] of 1843 at Ann Arbor, MI [fig. 33], where the classical order was accurately copied in toto, the same fundamental inversion of the classical concept is to be noticed. All the more so when the classical models were changed in form and proportion: the front of the Erechtheion on the Acropolis, for instance, reappearing at Clifton Place,[40] Mount Pleasant, TE [fig. 34], erected in 1839. That the builders and architects of the ante-bellum-time were not afraid to frivolously install five (!) columns when otherwise copying their model quite accurately, is due to the same new and distinctly American approach to the Classical, such as at the 1840 Fitch-Gorham-Brooks House[41] in Marshall, MI [fig. 35].

---

[36] Hitchcock – Seale 1976 p. 119; P. L. Hudson – S.L. Ballard: The Smithsonian Guide to Historic America. The Carolinas and the Appalachian States (New York 1989) p.314-315; Schneider 2001 p. 27; Schneider 2003 p. 165.
[37] Bayou Lafourche, 2 miles south of Napoleonville. Architect: Henry Howard. Smith 1981 vol. II p. 313-314; Kennedy 1989 p. 185.
[38] Kennedy 1989 p. 323.
[39] ibid. p. 235; Schneider 2003 p. 162-163, 166.
[40] Kennedy 1989 p. 50.
[41] ibid., p. 48.

Exactly the same features are to be found in the American use of the Doric order. Respective examples are a house designed by Elias Carter in Central Massachusetts[42]

again with doors, windows and a balcony directly attached to the pillars, a concept similarly applied to temple-type houses too. The most lavish specimens of this Pillar Order derived from the Thrasyllos Monument show A.L. Davis's studies for various projects:[51] the huge Astor Hotel in New York [fig. 40] of c. 1830 or the New York Commercial Exchange, projected in 1862.

It is again Philip Hone, who has left us a vivid portrayal of the aesthetic and practical functioning of this peculiar type of classical adaptation. In his diary of September 1, 1835,[52] he writes about such a building:

> We had last night at the pavilion a farewell hop in the dining room, at which the girls enjoyed themselves very much. At eleven o'clock, I retired to my room, lighted a cigar, and seated myself at the front window. The view was unspeakably grand. The broad red moon ...threw a solemn light over the unruffled face of the ocean, and the lofty pillars of the noble ... building, breaking the silver streams of light into dark gloomy shadows, gave the edifice the appearance of some relic of classic antiquity.

This it did not quite do, but "some relic" is quite to the point.

The attitude toward classical models expressed in this architecture and its evaluations sometimes included connoisseurship

Another phenomena, in its own way quite convincing, is a kind of grafting of different pieces onto others, resulting in a new creature – and one which might even have enchanted the ancient Greeks were they not so constrained by traditional building doctrines: Minard Lafever's leaf-capital [fig. 41], which was very popular especially in the Southern States, is one such example. His publication of 1839,[54] in which he presented this creation, has the telling title: "The Beauties of Modern Architecture...". He proceeded as if following instructions in a cook book: take from Stuart-Revett the lower half of the Corinthian capital of Lysicrates Monument at Athens[55] with all its characteristic leaves and blossoms [fig. 42], then without hesitation add the upper half of a capital from another monument, the "Tower of the Winds,"[56] found in the same neighbourhood in Athens and also published by Stuart and Revett[57] [fig. 43]. This second element however was not strictly copied but infused with life, its leaves becoming more juicy and plant-like.

Playfully dealing with historical models, these variations were compatible with other newly created capital forms such as the American Tobacco- and the American Corn-Order[58]. In accordance, Lafever explained his capital in the following words[59]: "This is a design composed of antique specimens, and reduced to accurate proportions; with a view to render it acceptable in many places, instead of the standard orders. ...In many situations this design will be preferable to

---

279.

[54] *eB e . e e e . e , e e e , e e* (New York [3]1839). Lafever's anti-Roman and pro-Greek attitude is well documented by his statements in this book as well as in *e e B . e e* (New York 1852).

[55] J. Stuart – N. Revett: *e . e e* , vol. I (London 1762) chapter IV pl. VI.

[56] Horologium of Andronikos: J. Travlos*B , e . v. e e* (Tübingen 1971) p.281-288.

[57] J. Stuart – N. Revett: *e . e e* , vol. I (London 1762) chapter III pl. VII.

[58] Pierson 1976 p. 403.

[59] *eB e . e e e . e , e e e , e e* (New York 1839) p.102.

those generally in use.” And, as a comment on his Erechtheion-capital variation shown in the same book[60], he wrote: “This example has

England, since the beginning of this new style, looks markedly different. Normally complete temple-fronts were applied as facades of mansions and churches in an appropriate archaeological manner. So these English examples, even with their variety and relative freedom, remain rather severe looking in comparison to their American counterparts. Almost all English architecture of that time not only looks very Greek in general but – at least, seen from the front – come in the disguise of temples. And, what is most important, the basic concept of ancient Greek temple building above described remains largely untouched in these cases. Telling examples are Henry Holland's Scin

representations was not so much to transmit precise data, but rather to fire the public with general enthusiasm for ancient Greek architecture. They sufficed for motivating classicistic building ambitions at home only as long as "true" quotations were not asked for. So they widely lack any accuracy of drawing concerning the proportions of the buildings and almost totally lack metrical information by measurements – if given at all, the user of the book could never be sure if the suggested precision was true or only designed to give the reproduction an air of accuracy. Furthermore, in these publications reality and fantasy is often mixed and interwoven in such a way that anyone who had not seen the originals could by no means separate the two: extant parts of architecture and uncertain reconstruction are rarely discernable; even different buildings were frequently mixed into one, or coherent building structures split into separate "independent" architectural units. A prominent example of this kind of transfer is Julien David Le Roy's *e e e e e* of 1758, which was widely distributed in France and Italy and came out only a year later also in London [see fig. 49].

Le Roy's publication is known to have circulated also in the United States[66] but was soon superimposed by James Stuart and Nicholas Revett's ambitious publication [see fig. 50],[67] which by the quantity of the monuments taken into account and even more so by the quality of precise data via drawing and measurements was a step into a new dimension of transporting ancient Greek architectural forms through time and space. Stuart and Revett's three volumes were significantly more expensive than the various editions of Le Roy's work, but they did find their way to American architects – as is documented by their libraries, and the extant buildings themselves. In the end, Stuart and Revett's publication influenced American building far more thoroughly than any other work. This applies not only to the rather accurate copies of Greek architecture (as, for instance, Strickland's Second Bank of the United States, dealt with above), but also to the majority of free variations on

[66] Höcker 1997. The degree to which this fact is granted impact on American architecture goes along with the general evaluation on French influence on the American Greek revival. To my knowledge, this was rather minimal, aside from Thomas Jefferson's rather "Roman-based" introduction of ancient architectural design into American building. For this aspect, see Schneider 2003.

[67] J. Stuart & N. Revett: *e e e e e e e e e*. 3 vols. (London 1762-1794).

Ancient Greece had never been seen as symbols of nature or of

done to them on their long and unsafe travel. When we refer to a voyager, we admit that the person at the end of a journey is not exactly the same as that at the beginning, but still somewhat the same. The same must apply to travelling “facts.” Within the frame of my case study, they do seem to exist. They have by no means totally changed their appearance during their journey. They do not, however, form something like a coherent “tradition.” Rather, are they to be considered as elements of a “memoria”: a contemporary set of paradigmatic models created by drawing back on selected past entities, whether existent in antiquity or not.

Bibliography

Crook, J. M. *e ee e - e B e (London, 1995).

Forster, K. W. *e e e e . In: I greci 1.1. Noi e i Greci (Salvatore Settis, ed.) (Torino, 1996) pp. 707-742.

Frazer Smith, J. *e . *e e e e e e (New York, 1941).

Hamlin, T. *e ee e e S e , The Art Bulletin 1942 pp. 244-258.

Höcker, Ch. “Greek Revival.” *e e.e 14/2 (2000) pp. 249-253; 244-258.

Hammet, R.W. *e e e e S e (New York, 1976).

Hitchcock, H. R. & W. Seale.

Pierson, W. H., Jr. *e B e e . e - S e* (Garden City, NY, 1976).

Potts, B. *e e e* (New Orleans, 1988).

Schneider, L. “Das archäologische Denkmal in der Gegenwart., In: Die Antike in der europäischen Gegenwart” in W. Ludwig, ed., *S e - e e e 1 2* (Göttingen, 1993) pp. 31-42; 171-178.

Schneider, L. “Das Pathos der Dinge. Vom archäologischen Blick in Wissenschaft und Kunst.” in B. Jussen (ed.), *e e e* Hamburg 1ku(M.ccaj-ku(M.ccaj-2nen I). Eiol)5.4(oauf Am0.0k, Lgnne)9.d Wschen

Sutton, R. K. *e e e e e e 1 00-1 0* (Niwot, CO, 1992).

Tournikiotis, P. *e e e* (Athens 1994).

Trowbridge, B.Ch. *e e* (New Haven, CT, 1923).

C. Winterer: *e e ee e e*