I. ENGLISH ARCHAEOLOGICAL DRAWINGS OF THE XVIIIth CENTURY

The Antiquities of Athens, measured and delineated by James Stuart, F.R.S. and F.S.A., and Nicholas Revett, painters and architects: Volume the first was printed in London in 1762. The list of subscribers, headed by the King, is long and impressive, running to five large folio pages in double columns. A number of the subscribers were members of the Society of Dilettanti, to which Stuart and Revett had been themselves elected, in absentia, in 1751. The Society had not commissioned the work, and played only an indirect role in its publication. But since the acclaim that greeted its appearance directly influenced the future activities of the Dilettanti, it is not inappropriate to regard the 1762 volume as the first of the distinguished publications sponsored by or associated with the Society.

Here for the first time detailed and accurate drawings of classical monuments

1 It is a pleasure to record my warm thanks to Mr. A. N. L. Munby of King’s College, Cambridge and to Mr. D. F. Snelgrove of the British Museum for their kindness in supplying me information on various matters. Of my Athenian colleagues I wish particularly to thank Professor Homer Thompson and Miss Eurydice Demetracopoulou for their encouragement and help, and above all Miss Alison Frantz for providing me with excellent photographs.
surviving in Greece were made available to the West. The significance of this event would be hard to exaggerate, though it is perhaps even more apparent to us than to the interested public of the time, whose tastes were fashioned by long familiarity with Roman architecture. It is curious to note that Stuart himself felt obliged to insert in his Preface an elaborate *apologia* for the undertaking. He gently rebukes the great Piranesi for maintaining "that there are no remains of Antiquity which deserve our notice, either in the Cities of Greece, or in any other Places of the Levant," and alludes also to the inaccuracies in the drawings of his rival Le Roy, published a few years earlier. "Athenian" Stuart's success was immediate, but the entrenched forces of Roman classicism were not easily to be routed. As late as 1791, several years after the publication of Volume II, which includes the Parthenon and Erechtheion, Sir William Chambers (1726-1794), one of the greatest architects of his day and a royal favorite, saw fit to decry even the study of Greek monuments, with "their gouty columns, their narrow intercolumniations, their disproportionate architraves," and maintained that only Roman antiquity was worthy of emulation. His strictures were effectively rebutted by his former student, Willey Reveley, in the Preface to Volume III of the *Antiquities of Athens*, 1794, but they illustrate the depth of prejudice that still lingered.

The revolution in taste wrought by Stuart and Revett has long since received due recognition. It is fitting, however, on the two-hundredth anniversary of their original publication, to note several little-known treasures of the Gennadeion relevant to them and their immediate successors. Those who are familiar with the Library are aware of the amazing faculty John Gennadius possessed of seeking out and acquiring items of rare distinction. Many of his volumes, apart from their intrinsic value, have the added interest of being association copies, extra-illustrated copies, or examples of fine binding. His set of Stuart and Revett belongs in this select group.

The four volumes of the *Antiquities of Athens*, all in the original editions, were acquired by Gennadius for £16 in 1878 or 1879 from Heath, together with the Supplementary volume, issued in 1830, and the *Unedited Antiquities of Attica* of 1817. All six volumes are uniformly bound in Russia extra, and bear the coat of arms of the Blaney family. The binding is the work of Charles Lewis (1786-1836), the leading English binder of his day. In Volumes I-III Gennadius had a number of extra illustrations inserted. It is these that concern us, though unfortunately their provenance is unknown.

Volume I contains only an extra portrait of Stuart, dated 1789, and the frontis-

---

2 From the *Treatise of Civil Architecture*, 3rd ed., 1791, as quoted in *Antiquities of Athens*, III, p. xiii.

3 Possibly the bookseller William Heath, of New Oxford Street, whose stock was sold at Sotheby's on 26 November, 1878, or Baron John Benjamin Heath, a member of the Society of Dilettanti, who died in 1879.
piece by J. Gandy to a later edition, probably that of 1825-30. It is in Volumes II and III that we find original materials. For convenience, these and the other drawings to be discussed will be numbered successively.

(1) Inserted at the beginning of Volume II is a delicately executed ink sketch of the Olympieion (Pl. 119, a), measuring approximately 75 x 34 cm. The view is taken from the S. E. corner of the temple, looking toward the Acropolis, with the Hill of the Muses, crowned by the Philopappos monument, at the extreme left. At the foot of the Acropolis, framed between the three western columns of the Olympieion and the Arch of Hadrian, a group of houses in the Plaka can be seen. There is no indication as to the identity of the artist or the date, but a statement by Willey Reveley, in his description of William Pars' view of the Olympieion (see No. 3 below) gives us at least a terminus post quem. He notes (Vol. III, p. 15) that "the column remaining in the Western front, when Messrs. Stuart and Revett were there the first time, had been thrown down in the interval by the Waiwode, to make lime of the marble. If it had remained, its situation would be behind the three columns which stand detached from the larger groupe." By the same token our drawing must be later than 1753, when Stuart and Revett left Athens, and may be as early as 1765-1766, the date of Pars' visit. Parenthetically, I may note here that the Gennadeion does possess a small (21.5 x 16 cm.) water color drawing (Pl. 119, b), by W. Purser, which shows the western column still standing. While not without a certain charm, the drawing is of interest chiefly as an archaeological record. Who Purser was or when he visited Athens I have not yet been able to determine. Mr. A. N. L. Munby kindly informs me that a William Purser was active in London from 1805 to 1834 as an architect and also as an architectural and landscape painter, but it seems unlikely that he could have been in Athens before 1765. If he is indeed the artist of our drawing, he perhaps worked it up from some earlier sketch or engraving, though I know of none that shows the temple from this angle. The inaccuracies in the background view (note especially the absence of the Hill of the Muses) may in any case rule out the likelihood that the drawing was done on the scene or from autopsy.

4 Revett had no part in the publication of these volumes, having parted company with Stuart some years earlier. Volume II was nearly ready for publication when Stuart died in February, 1788. Stuart's widow, Elizabeth, assisted by William Newton, completed the editorial work and the volume appeared later that year or in 1789, though dated 1787. Part of the cost of publication was borne by the Society of Dilettanti. Volume III, which appeared in 1794, was edited by Willey Reveley.

6 The best representation I have found is that of Stuart and Revett's rival, J. D. Le Roy, in Les ruines des plus beaux monumens de la Grèce, Paris, 1758. The column can also be seen, through the Arch of Hadrian, in an engraving of Stuart's own sketch, in Antiquités of Athens, Vol. III, Chap. III, Plate I, and its position is shown on the plan, Plate II, as also on the plan published earlier, in Vol. II, Chap. I, Plate XXXI. A still earlier, but less detailed, plan was given by Richard Pococke, A Description of the East, Vol. II, Part II, London, 1745, Plate LXXXIII, opposite p. 166.
(2) Facing Plate I of Chapter II in Volume II, the view of the Erechtheion from the N. E., a lively water color drawing (Pl. 120, a), measuring 53.5 x 35.5 cm., has been tipped in. Gennadius evidently believed it to be the original from which the engraving was made, despite a number of slight but significant differences. Actually, the immediate model for the engraving is in the British Museum, where it was deposited by the Society of Dilettanti in about 1800 together with other drawings by Pars belonging to the Society. It is about the same size as ours, and Laurence Binyon, in the Catalogue of Drawings by British Artists in the British Museum, describes it as “Water colours, unfinished.” What then of the Gennadeion drawing?

Without actual confrontation of the two drawings it would be difficult to claim with absolute assurance that both are by the same artist. It is not, however, strange or even unlikely that Pars should have made two renderings of the same scene. We know from records of the Society that in 1769, the year Antiquities of Ionia, Volume I was published, payment of £42 was made “To Mr. Pars for finishing and making new drawings colouring &c.” Evidently some of the sketches brought back by the Ionian Expedition had to be re-worked or re-drawn before they could be engraved. In what sense the British Museum drawing is “unfinished” is not apparent from the reproduction I have seen, but it may be in the coloring, which would be of less importance to the engraver. It is possible, therefore, that our drawing is the Athenian original, and the one in the British Museum a later version prepared for the use of the engraver. One point of comparison may be thought to support this suggestion. The prominent rubble wall at the left of the picture is carefully rendered in the engraving (Pl. 120, b), as in its immediate model, while in our drawing the set-back at the extreme left of the wall is only casually suggested, the character of the wall itself is barely indicated, and attention is focussed entirely on the ancient architectural fragments embedded in it, which are drawn with great precision. To an artist working on the site, this might well have seemed the one feature in the wall worth recording.

(3) Much the same argument applies to the water color drawing (Pl. 121, a) inserted in Volume III, opposite Plate I of Chapter II, the general view of the Acropolis and the Olympieion as seen from the Ionic temple on the Ilissos. Again the artist was Pars, and the British Museum possesses the presumed original, though Binyon’s catalogue notes that “the sky and the l. foreground are unfinished,” and that it was engraved “with additions.” Both water colors are approximately the same

---

6 The engraving does not correspond to the description given in the text, p. 19, a fact explained in the Introduction, pp. iii-iv. Stuart’s papers having been left in considerable confusion on his death, the intended view could not be found, and the editors substituted for it a drawing made by William Pars in 1765/66, borrowed from the Society of Dilettanti.

7 It is reproduced as Plate LI, 2 in J. M. Paton and others, The Erechtheum, Cambridge, Mass., 1927.

size, ours measuring 60.4 x 40.5 cm., and are considerably larger than the engraving. I have not seen the British Museum version, but that in the Gennadeion differs in a number of details from the engraving: the scene extends further to the left, beyond the Hill of the Muses; the circuit wall of the Olympieion is lacking in detail; above all, the Theater of Herodes Atticus in the distance appears as a solid mass, without the fenestration that is clearly depicted in the engraving. Once again, therefore, what we have may be the artist’s original drawing, executed in Athens.

Other drawings of the period are found in volumes I and II of the *Antiquities of Ionia*, acquired separately by Gennadius in 1878 and 1879.

In 1764, inspired by the success of Stuart and Revett’s first volume, the Society of Dilettanti resolved to send out an expedition to Asia Minor, consisting of Richard Chandler, Nicolas Revett, and William Pars. Chandler, who was already noted for his publication of the Arundel marbles at Oxford, was put in charge of the expedition and “was appointed to execute the Classical part of the Plan.” “The Province of Architecture” was assigned to Revett, while the “Choice of a proper Person for taking Views, and copying Bass Reliefs, fell upon Mr. Pars, a young Painter of promising Talents.” The expedition set sail June 9, 1764, and returned to England November 2, 1766, after spending the first year at Smyrna, the second at Athens. The first volume of their work appeared, with commendable speed, in 1769.

The Gennadius copy of this volume is on large paper and has a number of inserts. In 1779 Sir Joshua Reynolds had painted two group portraits of members of the Society, from which engravings were made in 1821. A fine copy of the portrait of Sir William Hamilton showing an open volume of his *Antiquities* to a group of colleagues has been bound in as a frontispiece; it is on India paper, one of 100 such copies printed. An extra, and variant, title-page has also been inserted, and at the end of the volume there has been added Chapter IV, on the Temple at Jackly, near Mylasa, which was published separately in 1784, and which is lacking in many copies.

(4) More important, however, is the original water color inserted before Plate II of Chapter III. Like the engraving that follows it, this is a view of the temple of Apollo at Didyma. But whereas the engraving shows the temple as seen from near the N. E. corner, our water color was drawn from the S. side, near the S. W. corner. The British Museum catalogue lists a similar view, by Pars, of almost identical size (ours is 47 x 29.5 cm.), and says that it was engraved by Byrne as Plate 2* of this chapter. No such plate exists in the two copies of the volume that I have seen, nor is it

---

* The four architectural plates for this chapter were engraved by James Newton, at a cost of £27/6/0, Pars’ view of the temple by W. Byrne, at a cost of £73/10/0. These payments, made in 1784, are wrongly assigned by Cust and Colvin, *op. cit.*, p. 249* to the expenditures incurred on Volume II. Strangely enough, though they record, on p. 103, the decision to prepare the material on Jackly for publication, they omit any mention of its actual appearance.
mentioned in the text. Since copies of the engraving may be uncommon, it seems worth while to publish a photograph of our drawing (Pl. 122).

Our copy of Volume II of the *Antiquities of Ionia*, publication of which was delayed until 1797, is the most richly extra-illustrated of all the volumes under review. It once belonged to Charles R. Cockerell, and contains a large number of his own archaeological sketches, which however fall outside the chronological limits of our present survey. What concerns us here are four water color drawings corresponding to originals by Pars, and three, possibly four, designs that can be assigned to Revett. The “Pars” drawings are as follows:

(5) Corresponding to Plate II, “Temple of Jupiter Panellenius in Aegina.” (46 x 27 cm.)

(6) Corresponding to Plate XV, “Temple of Jupiter Nemaeus, between Argos and Corinth.” (46 x 26.5 cm.)

(7) Corresponding to Plate XXXIII, “Ruins near the Lake of Myüs, or Baffi.” (47.5 x 29.5 cm.)

(8) Corresponding to Plate XLVIII, “Stadium at Laodicea” (Pl. 123). Signed, “I. T. Serres, 1781.” (48 x 30.5 cm.)

Originals of all of these except No. 5 also exist in the British Museum, and correspond closely in size and description to ours. The problem of attribution, however, is complicated by the fact that our No. 8 is signed, but not by Pars! Moreover, Nos. 5-8, together with No. 4, differ somewhat in feeling from Nos. 2 and 3. Nos. 2 and 3 give the impression of being rapid sketches, while these are highly finished drawings, with great attention to details, however insignificant. On the other hand, Nos. 3-7, together with No. 9 (see below), are uniformly mounted, and pencilled numbers on most of them indicate or at least suggest that they were once part of a single series, and came from the same source. No. 8, however, the Serres drawing, is on different paper, is mounted differently, was added later to the volume, apparently after 1895, and except for its stylistic resemblance to Nos. 4-7, seems to be in a class by itself.

John Thomas Serres, born in December, 1759, was the son of Dominic Serres, a member of the Royal Academy from its foundation in 1768. At the age of twenty, in 1780, young Serres made his own debut at the Royal Academy with two water colors and an oil painting; and in 1793 he succeeded his father as marine painter to

---

10 Nos. 10-11, though unmounted, must belong to this same series because of their relation to No. 9. See below.

11 The volume was included in the sale at Sotheby's of a portion of Gennadius' library in 1895, but was fortunately repurchased at once from the bookseller who bought it. The sale catalogue mentions only three "of the original drawings for the work in colours." Evidently the Serres drawing had not at that time been inserted in the volume.
the king. Apparently nothing in the published accounts of his life connects him with the Pars drawings, yet our No. 8 shows that in 1781, the year after he first came to public attention, he did in fact execute a fine water color after an original by Pars, which, though lighter in feeling, differs only in very slight details from the engraving of the same scene made at some later date (before 1797) by James Newton. The occasion for this we do not know, but it is easy to see how it may have come about. Serres was a friend and neighbor of Paul Sandby, and Sandby in turn was a friend of Pars, some of whose Greek drawings he had rendered in aquatint. Whether the young and promising artist made this copy merely as an exercise, or was commissioned by Pars to do some of the work of preparing finished drawings suitable for the engraver must remain an open question.

It must also remain an open question whether Serres had any hand in the other "finished" drawings in this group, Nos. 4-7, or if these are entirely Pars' own work. Nor can we be sure, except for No. 2, which of the duplicate drawings served as actual models for the engravers. Only autopsy comparison with the drawings in England might provide the answers.

(9) (10) (11) Three pieces can safely be ascribed to Nicholas Revett, the architect of the Ionian Expedition. These are architectural designs, labelled respectively 1, 2, and 3 "of the Great Theatre at Laodicea." In general they correspond to Plates XLIX, L, LI, though the engraver has rearranged some of the materials. The finest of these is the second (our Pl. 121, b, corresponding to Plate L, Fig. 1), which because of the shading is far more effective than the engraving.

(12) Presumably also the work of Revett (it cannot in any case be by Cockerell, who failed to reach Laodicea \(^1\)) is a restored elevation of the Theater, in water colors, measuring 94.5 x 55 cm. (Pl. 124, a). We know also, as stated in the text (Vol. III, p. 32), that the place was so overgrown "that not a spot could be found where a view of it might be taken either satisfactory or picturesque; for which reason it was thought proper to decline it." Perhaps this architectural design was intended as a substitute, but was not published as being largely imaginary.

The remaining drawings in this volume are apparently all by Cockerell, and will be discussed in a later note in this series.

One final archaeological drawing in the Gennadeion collection, the work of Willey Reveley, noted above as the editor of Volume III of Antiquities of Athens, calls for mention. In 1785-1787 Reveley, as architect and draftsman, accompanied Sir Richard Worsley, a member of the Society of Dilettanti, on his tour of Greece and the Levant. Worsley acquired and brought back to England a large collection of classical antiquities, and in 1794 published privately two large and handsome volumes entitled Museum

Worsleyanum,\(^{13}\) illustrating both his collection and the scenes of his travels. A number of the “views” were engraved after sketches made by Reveley. The piece in the possession of the Gennadeion, however, is an architectural plan:

(13) “Plan of the Portico at Smyrna, commonly called the School of Homer” (Pl. 124, b). The plan, measuring 91 x 50 cm., is reproduced on a small scale, and lacking some details, in Museum Worsleyanum, Volume II, facing page 99 (see also the view opposite page 97). Since Reveley’s notes supplement the information given in the publication, they are worth transcribing:

In this plan the parts tinted red\(^{14}\) are what now remain, & the dimensions here written were all taken on the spot. The parts tinted yellow are what is wanting, & are entirely imaginary. This Portico was evidently an arcade as appears by the base of one of the piers visible at A: it is drawn out by the large scale at B. Each of these piers consists of a single block of marble (called at Rome Porta Santa) forming on the outside a demicolumn & within a pilaster: the base is of white marble. C is a white marble pedestal supposed to have supported the statue of Homer. The inhabitants of Smyrna say it stood in a large niche at the East end of the portico (probably at D) within the memory of some people, it is now not far off but the niche is entirely destroyed, no remains of any part being now visible except those tinted red. E is a cornice of white marble now on the site which is at present a Turkish byring [sic] ground. F is a street or way dividing the byring Ground into two parts: the level of this way is about even with the bottom of the plinth of the base, but the ground on each side is about 5 feet higher: the walls GGGGGG are modern. H is the apophyges of the column on its base by the large scale. I is a small part of the ancient wall of the portico now to be seen in the Cellar of a Turkish house. Willey Reveley Arch Mens: & Delin:

It is unfortunate that we do not have the pedigree of any of these drawings, which might help to answer some unresolved questions. Only the two signed pieces, No. 8 by Serres and No. 13 by Reveley, are completely in the clear, though we should like to know the circumstances in which Serres made his copy of Pars’ original. There is little doubt that Nos. 9-11 are the work of Revett, and he is the most likely candidate for No. 12. No. 1 might have been done either by Revett or by Pars, or even, possibly, by some later visitor. The remaining six drawings, Nos. 2-7, corresponding to known works by Pars, are presumably by his hand, and two of them (Nos. 2-3) are probably his original Athenian sketches. It is only the Serres copy, which is so similar in style to Nos. 4-7, that raises a lingering doubt that they too may be copies by Serres, though the difference in paper and in provenance argues against this.

Be that as it may, the collection provides an interesting and valuable sampling of eighteenth-century archaeological drawing. In one way or another, all thirteen

\(^{13}\) The Gennadeion set is a presentation copy from the author to Lord Nelson, who in turn gave it to Lady Hamilton. At her sale at Christie’s in 1809 it brought £52/10/0. Gennadius acquired it in 1906 for £51.

\(^{14}\) Namely, the N. E. corner pier with the two adjacent piers on the E. side and one adjacent on the N. side; the seven westernmost piers on the N. side, excluding that of the N. W. corner; on the W. side, the third pier from the N. W. corner; and a small part of the outer wall at the N. W. corner.
pieces document the activities of the Society of Dilettanti and the interest in archaeology stimulated by the pioneer publication, just two hundred years ago, of Stuart and Revett. It is fitting to recall here that a century and a half later John Gennadius was himself elected to membership in that distinguished Society.

Addendum. Professor G. E. Blackman of Oxford University, a Pars enthusiast, has examined our Nos. 1-8, and kindly informs me that not only the six water colors presumed to be by Pars (Nos. 2-7) but also the unattributed ink sketch of the Olympieion (No. 1) all show the “broken-line” technique that is characteristic of Pars’ work. On the other hand, the piece signed by Serres (No. 8), though it derives from an original by Pars, does not share this stylistic peculiarity but is drawn with a firm line. This clarification is most welcome, and we can now with reasonable assurance claim Nos. 1-7 for Pars, whatever may be the relation of five of the water colors (Nos. 2-4, 6, 7) to their counterparts in the British Museum.

The Gennadius Library

Francis R. Walton
a. The Olympieion. Ink Sketch.

b. The Olympieion. Water Color by W. Purser.
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b. Architectural Drawing by Nicholas Revett.
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The Temple of Apollo at Didyma. Water Color.
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a. The Theater at Laodicea. Plan and Elevation by Nicholas Revett.

b. Plan of the "School of Homer" at Smyrna by Willey Reveley.
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