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“You don’t draw well if you’re telling a lie.

- Saul Steinberg

In “The Painter of Modern Life,” an essay published in 1863 in the French newspaper, *Le Figaro*, Charles Baudelaire introduced his readers to “Monsieur G,” a poor disguise for the water-colorist and draughtsman, Constantin Guys. Baudelaire believed that he had found something quintessentially modern in this *flâneur* who “set up house in the heart of the multitude, amid the ebb and flow of movement, in the midst of the fugitive and the infinite.”¹ Guys provided the *Illustrated London News* with pen and ink sketches of his travels, including drawings of the Crimean war, which were “hastily sketched on the spot” and later engraved for printing.² Baudelaire was charmed by the annotations Guys added to his ink sketches (“my humble self” written below one figure and “2 Mars/85 The Balaklava railway reaching the Church of Kadiculi, Crimea” scrawled beneath another in the same album). It was this journalistic quality – Guys’s rooting of the self in
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² Baudelaire, 6.
a particular time and place -- that struck Baudelaire as capturing the ephemeral and contingent features of Modern life.³

More recently, the artist, Saul Steinberg, whom I quote above, offered some reflections of his own on what it means to draw from life. His comment on the difference between painting in the studio and drawing from life seems parallel to the distinction between “field” and laboratory in science. “In drawing from life,” Steinberg noted, “we are obliged to find answers to questions that so far haven’t been raised. The work you do in the studio is often an answer to questions that are already familiar.” Steinberg learned these lessons the hard way -- as an architecture student traveling through Italy. It was while drawing buildings on site that he came to see life-drawing as a peculiar challenge to the creative ego of the artist (“I am no longer the protagonist; I become a servant, a second-class character”).⁴

Architectural drawing in situ and the journalistic travel-sketches of Guys have one thing in common – they can both be traced back to the practices of antiquaries. Beginning in the fifteenth century, humanists turned to travel as an essential part of the organized study of ancient remains. The study of antiquities on site was essential to the training of Renaissance artists, but artists took their cue from the sketchbooks of peripatetic antiquaries, men like Cyriaco d’Ancona, who went as far as Greece to draw as best he could the arch of Hadrian in Athens [Fig. 1].

Composed as a travel itinerary and eye-witness account of epigraphic monuments found in Greece, Cyriaco’s commentaria gave rise to a new antiquarian genre – the topographically organized sylloge.⁵ The sylloge was a collection of epigraphic material

³ For these images, see Mayne’s edition, figs. 2-3. It didn’t hurt Baudelaire’s argument that Guys recoiled at the word “artist” and existed on the fringes of academic orthodoxy. Baudelaire did not think that drawing from nature was itself of value – it was the distillation of nature via the memory that made Guys special.


organized by location. Antiquaries who drew these inscriptions often provided a brief history of the site in which the material was found and a description of the condition of the object, whether broken or intact.

In these works, the antiquary, as both narrative guide and draughtsman, frequently remarked on his own activity as transcriber and interpreter of the ancient world. For example, in the luxury manuscript compiled by the Paduan humanist and doctor, Giovanni Marcanova, we find text and image working in tandem. Marcanova describes the condition, location, and purpose of each inscription and monument encountered in his region. At one point, the humanist casts himself as a passionate spectator overcome by the remains of the ancient past: “I do not here dare to describe or draw an image of them,” he writes, “[nonetheless] so that my trembling hand and my weak intellect may be able to treat these matters, as one unworthy of such a work, just so I will draw with my

---

There follows a pen-and-ink drawing of the sculpted human figures found on the monument [Fig. 2].

By the seventeenth century, antiquaries and naturalists alike belonged to an encyclopedic culture that valued travel and collecting. Drawing in situ remained an essential part of this enterprise, although not everyone could combine learned study with the manual skill of a draughtsman. In the published voyages to the Levant in this period, we find a new kind of organized antiquarian travel, one that was tied up with the collecting zeal of the English and French diplomatic elite. In 1674, the French ambassador to Constantinople employed several painters to accompany him on his diplomatic mission to Athens in order to draw the extant ancient sculpture and architectural monuments. Aside from some pencil sketches of the Parthenon metopes in the Bibliotheque nationale, there exists an enormous oil painting of the marquis de Nointel and his entourage greeting the consuls of France and England while surrounded by a group of local Ottoman dignitaries. In the background of the painting, the artist rendered a panoramic cityscape of Athens. The painting stretches 16 feet in length and was obviously not done ‘on the spot’ nor is it likely that Nointel and his court ever posed for it in this configuration. The picture was an ‘historical’ composition in the grand manner of French classicism and it was intended to honor the event of Nointel’s entry into Athens as a significant political moment.

Four years after Nointel’s embassy, Jacob Spon, a medical doctor and antiquary in Lyon, published his own view of Athens following his two-year voyage to the eastern Mediterranean with the English gentleman and botanist, George Wheler.

---


7 On travel as a “rite of passage” for naturalists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Paula Findlen, *Possessing Nature*, ch. 4 (“Pilgrimages of Science”), 159ff.

8 For this painting, which is now in Athens, see J.-C. Mossière, “Le voyage en Orient et le livre d’Athènes,” in *Jacob Spon: un humaniste lyonnais* (Lyon, 1993), 210. The artist is Jacques Carrey, a student of Le Brun, and allegedly the same artist who drew the only extant sketches of the intact Parthenon (i.e. prior to the attack by the Venetians in 1687).

topographical view of Athens [Fig. 3] was not meant to document a particular ‘event;’ it fused three-dimensional sketches of the prominent ancient buildings with a map of the principal hills, rivers and roads of the city. In the lower right corner, we see two figures pointing into the distance. These figures were expected staffage in antiquarian illustrations and they called attention to the human vantage point of the view itself. Spon makes sure to assign a reference number to each feature on the map and the accompanying text provided the key. Spon intended this view of Athens to convey accurate information that he had gathered himself and distilled for the sake of his home-bound readers.

Fig. 3. Jacob Spon, “View of Athens” (1679)

Relation de l’état présent de la ville d’Athènes, ancienne capitale de la Grèce (Lyon, 1674), reproduced in Mossière (1993), 216.
Spon published his *Voyage* at Lyon in 1678, and five years later, Wheler decided to publish a somewhat altered account of the same journey based on his own notes, but in the more expensive *quarto* and with more engravings.  

Like most seventeenth-century scholars, Spon knew about the ancient monuments and sites of Greece through the ancient literary sources, especially Pausanius (a travel writer himself). Spon’s description of Athens thus began with a treatise on etymology and his history of the ancient city was drawn from textual sources even as he found himself face to face with its three-dimensional reality. Words set the stage for things and Athens was already scripted.

Nonetheless, images were a very important feature of Spon and Wheler’s publications. Aside from the topographical plan of Athens above, Spon reproduced various illustrations in his *Voyage*. He drew spare outlines of ancient buildings in Athens, but he also ventured outside the world of monuments. When traveling in the river valleys near Ephesus, Spon presented two drawings of rivers that he had read about in his classical geography, but which he encountered for the first time in person: “on the summit of a hill are the remains of a tower that they call St. Paul’s Prison, from which point we discovered the marvellous deviations of Cayster, and we pulled out a pencil in order to compare them with those of the [Maeander] river, provided by the Doctor Picrelin.”

Following this passage, Spon inserted two engravings of the winding rivers abstracted from their topographical context. At another point in the narrative, Spon drew a crucifix, spied in a church just outside of Athens. The church was formerly an ancient

---

10 Wheler also added a great deal of material on botany, a subject that did not interest Spon. The works of Wheler and Spon were, in turn, used as guidebooks for Arthur Pullinger, an English merchant who explored Syria and Asia Minor while serving as a factor of the Levant Company in Aleppo from 1725-1739. The inscriptions and topographical notes found in Pullinger’s notebook are the subject of “Arthur Pullinger, an Early Traveler to Syria and Asia Minor,” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 75, no. 3 (1985), 1-80. On the antiquarian interests of English merchants, see G. Ambrose, “English Traders at Aleppo, 1658-1756,” *Economic History Review* 3 (1931), 248-267. Pullinger, in turn, became an unacknowledged source of information for Richard Pococke’s *Description of the East* (London, 1743).

11 To escape the word was not simply a matter of embracing what was in front of the eye. The move from a philological to an archaeological interpretation in the seventeenth century would have meant dispensing with the legacy of humanism as well as the power of the Church as the central institution guiding intellectual and artistic life.

temple dedicated to Ceres, yet Spon spent most of his time describing the Byzantine frescoes rather than the ancient temple. Spon drew the crucifix in order to isolate one detail that marked a curious distinction between Orthodox and Western representations of Christ. “I give here the design of one of their crucifixes,” he wrote, “you will see that they fasten Our Lord with four nails. Knowing whether there were three nails, as our painters represent them, or four, was once a considerable problem. The Greeks always do so in the latter fashion.”

In both passages, we find the same relationship between text, image, and traveler that we found in the commentaria of Cyriaco and the sylloge of Marcanova – even though the latter remained in manuscript. The images provided by Spon were abstracted from their sites and interspersed with the text in a way that underscored the narrative framework of the itinerary.

By the late seventeenth century, the empirical sciences and antiquarian investigations had become interrelated activities – and this conjunction shaped the way in which antiquaries like Spon dealt with material evidence. Spon was a medical doctor and Wheler an amateur botanist, or natural philosopher, as he called himself. They traveled with a quadrant and other instruments to take latitudes and foot measurements. When it came to the physical world, Spon and Wheler prized accurate observation. Spon, in particular, avoided rhetorical displays: “I describe things plainly and without art.” Wheler went even further by claiming that the tedium of his descriptions was a sign of its truth. Spon and Wheler sought meaning in all the material remains made by human hands, whether pagan or Christian. This eclectic and empirical sensibility encouraged greater skepticism toward the claims of both textual authorities and hearsay. “The surest

---

13 This preoccupation with the division between Greek East and Latin West is perceptible throughout Spon’s Voyage. It was more prominent in Wheler’s published Journey. Like many devout Anglicans in the seventeenth century, Wheler regarded Greece through a confessional lens. He believed that the contemporary Greeks were relevant to contemporary Englishmen, certainly more relevant than the ancients. He therefore took pains to reproduce his many conversations with Greeks, not in order to enliven his narrative, but because their opinions might confirm the natural attachment between the Church of England and Greek Orthodoxy.


thing,” Spon wrote, “is not to accept any preconceptions or common opinions if one has not examined it oneself and if one has not weighed it in the balance of reason.”

When some local nuns in Valence presented Spon with an elephant tooth which they identified as a Giant’s skeleton, he shared their fascination with the prodigious and miraculous. Yet he had to balance his skepticism with his curiosity, never an easy combination. Although Spon often questioned the traditional beliefs of the locals – that is, the beliefs “handed down” - he did not doubt automatically. At a mosque in Lampsacus at Turkey, he relates, “the peasants say that it was once a Christian church, and in fact, one can see crosses on the capitals…” Spon’s empiricism led to an appreciation for the heterogeneous, which is one of the reasons why these travel narratives are still valuable to us. As he traveled, Spon paid attention to the particular, almost as a habit of mind.

Wheler was no less curious. While on the island of Zara, along the Dalmatian coast, the English gentleman found himself staring at the venerable corpse of a local patron saint whose complexion recalled to Wheler the skin of several preserved animals he had seen in an apothecary shop back in Bologna. With no sense of incongruity, but with perhaps a touch of Anglican irreverence, he remarked on a resemblance between the dry skin of the saint and that of the dead animals, to the point of noticing that “only the skin, nerves and muscles remain and when pressed with the finger, [they] return again.” After poking the corpse of the saint, Wheler mentioned a few paintings of Tintoretto hanging in the church and then moved on to the next site.

Spon and Wheler embodied the modern antiquarian value of accuracy through autopsy and they were generally sanguine about their own ability to judge and render the material they encountered. Beginning in the early eighteenth century, however, we see a new preoccupation with the truth-value of illustrations, specifically copper-plate engravings made after on-the-spot drawings of monuments and antiquities.

---


18 George Wheler, Journey to Greece (London, 1682), 10.
Travelers who headed to the Levant in search of ancient remains began to treat their illustrations as scientific data to be presented to societies and academies back home. In 1698, Cornelis de Bruijn published his account of his travels in the Levant illustrated with his on-the-spot drawings, but when he followed up in 1711 with his *Travels into Muscovy, Persia and Parts of the East Indies*, his engravings of Persepolis came under attack. In his own defense, he responded: “...I have made it an indispensable Law unto myself, not to deviate in any respect from the Truth, merely to give an ornamental air to this Work” and he insisted that the plates he had made of the drawings were “executed with all possible justice and accuracy.”

In 1741, the Danish Marine architect, F.L. Norden published four drawings made during his travels in Egypt (his travels were published in 1755). Norden provided the Royal Society with the engravings and reassured them of their value: “[they] were executed upon the place just as you see them. I have not since been willing so much as to finish them; much less would I have ventured to add anything by way of ornament or embellishment.” Norden also included excerpts from his journal “of what I observed on the spot, and wrote down immediately after I had taken the drawings.” Norden’s insistence on autopsy was not new, but his eagerness to guarantee the accuracy of his images may have been a consequence of linking his individual activities to the aspirations and principles of an institutional body, in this case, the Royal Society. Norden agreed with De Bruijn on one point: to ensure that a drawing was truthful meant downplaying the intervention of the artist. Norden repeatedly reminded the Society that his drawings were in service to truth. The practice of copying antiquities seemed to carry with it the burden of a moral imperative. There is certain amount of self-conscious heroizing in the

---

19 Le Brun, *Travels into Muscovy, Persia and Parts of the East Indies* (London, 1737), preface. This defense was previously published separately in 1714 in Dutch. I owe this information and citation to Jan Willem Drijvers (see [http://odur.let.rug.nl/~drijvers/research/debruijn.htm](http://odur.let.rug.nl/~drijvers/research/debruijn.htm)).

20 F.L. Norden, *Drawings of Some Ruins and Colossal Statues at Thebes in Egypt with an account of the same in a letter to the Royal Society* (London, 1741), dedicatory letter. The Royal Society welcomed reports of archaeological discoveries and antiquarian travel reports, many of which were concerned with correcting the errors and inaccuracies of previous travelers.

published excerpts of Norden’s travel journal, especially the passages in which he treats his drawings as singular achievements won in the face of adversity (“I had not finished my first drawing,” he writes, “when we were surrounded with above fifty Arabs…they grew noisy and insolent, whilst I followed my drawing as close I could”).

In 1742, Richard Pococke published his Description of the East, a work that focused on the architectural and sculptural monuments of Egypt. Pococke shared with Spon, Wheler, and Norden a concern with plain speech and factual truth. Although he initially planned to publish only the architectural plates, Pococke justified an inclusion of his travel narrative for the sake of the general reader who wanted to know something about the customs and manners of Egypt and might be inclined to skip what he called the “dry description of plans, buildings, and statues.” Pococke even apologized for not having had more accidents to relate. Pococke was less scrupulous about interfering with his images than Norden. He organized the narrative of his encounter with the monuments as if they had all been seen on a single trip down the Nile (“in their natural order”) rather than as he himself experienced them haphazardly en route. Pococke also provided conjectural reconstructions of ancient buildings, although he defended this intrusion by including double dotted lines in all the images to indicate where the speculation began, so that “everyone may see what is really in being.”

In the works of Norden and Pococke, we see an increased sophistication not only in the handling of images, but also in the evaluation of architecture itself. Spon was primarily interested in collecting inscriptions and clarifying the geography of ancient Greece. Evaluating architecture as a marker of progress in the arts or finding beautiful models for imitation was never his concern. Although aware of the Doric and Corinthian orders, George Wheler confined his assessment of architecture to a listing of measurements and dimensions (of Diocletian’s palace, he remarks, “the figure is an equilateral square, each side containing two hundred paces in length and the height that remained is above sixty feet”). These men were not after taste and they approached

22 F.L. Norden, Drawings of Some Ruins, 10.
24 Pococke, ibid, v.
architecture either as epigraphic monuments to be read or as solid masses to be measured.  

The 1750s, however, marked a watershed in illustrated architectural-antiquarian publications. In 1760, the French scholar, Jean-Jacques Barthelemy, remarked in his review of Robert Wood’s *Ruins of Palmyra*: “In the past twenty years, a new spirit has everywhere awakened the ruins of antiquity…we are finally able to see the monuments that survive…copied faithfully, and engraved with the intelligence and taste that we admire in these works.” Drawings and woodcut prints of ruins, coins, and monuments had always been an integral part of the antiquarian tradition, as we saw with Cyriaco and Marcanova in the fifteenth century, but the monumental folio engravings of Piranesi, Clériisseau, Julien-David Le Roy, Giovanni Borra, and James Stuart gave a new impetus to the visual tradition of antiquity. What distinguished these new antiquaries from the older generation was their consciously visual approach to antiquity – and architecture was the engine that pushed everything forward.

Aside from the pursuit of accuracy, these new antiquaries wanted to appeal to a polite and affluent readership. They sought an audience other than the Republic of Letters and they did so through illustrated books, lavishly produced, and devoid of the documentary trail that previous scholars had constructed. Wood, who traveled to Palmyra and Balbec in 1750, noted that “a view [of the ruins] is much more agreeable to the reader than following the traveller thro’ a tedious dry description which is often like the original in nothing else than its unconnected unintelligible disorder.” Wood was thinking here of the Roman “vedutisti,” who had already created a new vision that competed with and eventually supplanted the erudite textual work of antiquaries. Piranesi, while mining

---

25 This is not to say that they were immune to beauty, but illustrating was not their forte. In Salonica, Wheler noted that he had hoped “to take a prospect of it with my pencil, where I began to wish that I had more skill to have designed one of the most delightful places I have ever seen.” Wheler, 21.

26 Some of the best-known illustrated antiquarian works produced in this period include most of the works of Gio. Battista Piranesi, beginning with his *Alcune vedute di archi trionfali, ed. altri monumenti inalzati da Romani* (Rome, 1748), Robert Wood’s *Ruins of Balbek* (1753) and *Ruins of Palmyra* (1757), Le Roy’s *Les Ruines des les plus Beaux Monuments de la Grece* (1758), Stuart and Revett’s *Antiquities of Athens* (1762), and Clériisseau and Robert Adam’s *Ruins of the Palace of Diocletian* (1764).
the antiquarian research that preceded him, cast his studies of Rome in an aggressively visual medium that appealed to foreign buyers. After 1740, many antiquarian works coming out of the Roman milieu were published with an eye toward the cosmopolitan public, and it is possible that the attention to the visual images was, in part, a deliberate strategy in an age of competing vernaculars (much the way that today’s blockbuster films are made with pared-down scripts for a global audience).

In his review of Wood, Barthelemy noted ruefully that it was the British who had the money to subsidize such an ambitious program of travel, collecting, and publication.27 In this period, the institutions of academies and societies became instrumental in transforming the individual ad-hoc voyages of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries into collaborative enterprises with clearly-defined missions.28 A pirated edition of Robert Wood’s *Palmyra* (1757) characterized the group of men who went to Syria as a “scientific community,” an apt term given that the expedition of Robert Wood rested on the foundations of seventeenth-century antiquarian practices such as chorography, metrology, and topography. By “scientific,” however, the editor was no doubt referring to the methodical planning that went into their voyage.

Wood’s companions were John Bouverie and Richard Dawkins (both wealthy Oxford graduates). Giovanni Borra, a court architect to King Charles Emmanuel III, was hired as the architectural draughtsman and view-painter. These men were accompanied by seven servants, making a total traveling party of eleven. Wood, secretary to a wealthy Grand Tourist, was a classical scholar in search of correspondences between ancient literature and the “classical ground.” He had already been to Greece, Syria, and Egypt in 1742 and 1743. Bouverie’s interests were limited to the artistic monuments primarily as examples of taste, which he compared with what he had seen back in Rome (he died en

27 Even to purchase, let alone subsidize the making of these folio publications of architectural monuments, was a costly investment. These works were highly-prized and expensive commodities - the price of Piranesi’s *Antichità Romane* was roughly equivalent to the monthly wages of a Roman artisan.

28 In the case of draughtsmanship, the academies had already set up certain practices that lent themselves to architectural-antiquarian expeditions. The *pensionnaires* at the French academy in Rome, for example, were obligated to send back drawings (*envois*) of architecture to Paris – one set of drawings had to portray the monument in their found state with no embellishment and the other offered an imaginative reconstruction.
route in 1750). James Dawkins (who funded the trip and the ensuing publications from his West Indies fortune) made his own observations of flora and fauna (an interest probably picked up when he was at Oxford), but Dawkins also hoped to use to trip to write his own history of the architectural orders in Greece.29

The main value of this work, as Barthelemy noted, lay in the engravings. For this reason, Borra’s sketchbooks of plans, architectural details, and “views” were considered essential to their enterprise - for their exactitude in correcting previous accounts and for their ability to convey the art of the buildings. Wood especially valued Borra’s architectural skill, especially his reconstructions of the ancient theater buildings, the knowledge of which, he wrote, was “greatly helped by [Borra’s] fancy without solid authority from the ruins.”30 As patron, Dawkins wrote up the ‘official’ narrative of the journey (which filled 6 quarto volumes – never published); this official account was compiled from the diaries of the four men. Borra was not considered an “author” of the work and Dawkins’s diary makes it clear that the images were the property of the planners; he refers to them as “our view, plan and measures.”31 In fact, Dawkins owned the drawings of Borra (having paid him a set fee as well as room and board), and so he was the one to prepare the plates for the final publication.32 Even though Borra was in service to these men, his expert opinions about the architecture are quoted throughout the official record.

This division of labor is important not only as a precedent for the expedition of James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, but also in connection to other eighteenth-century expeditions, both antiquarian and scientific. The hiring of a draughtsman to accompany naturalists or antiquaries was a regular practice in the eighteenth century – and although


30 C. A. Hutton, 119. The plans had to be precise, but conjectural reconstruction based on fragments found around the ruins was a perfectly legitimate practice.


32 C. A. Hutton, 102-103.
the images were composed separately from the narratives, the artists were intended to be in service to the collaborative endeavor. The correspondence between the artistic views and the official account was not always achievable, however.  

Wood’s party evidently moved through the various sites with Wheler, Pococke, and other travel-books in hand. They consistently note down corrections along the way. In fact, correction seems to constitute the primary purpose of these visits. They note that “the river has changed its course since Wheler was there” and they express regret at the irrevocable errors of another previous traveler: “tis pity that part [of the decree of Teos] escaped so accurate an author, it now lyes in a mangl’d condition just enough to prove it the same.” For these men, travel was about confirmation, not discovery – the journey was an act of deliberate repetition in which they could check to see if identical conditions prevailed. Wood and company even camped out in the same building in Ephesus as had Pococke ten years earlier, and thus they were able to correct his identification of it as an ancient warehouse. In tracing the same steps, looking for the same antiquities as previous travelers, they revealed themselves as Grand Tourists at heart, complete with the usual judgments (“I firmly believe that if St. Sophia was in Rome that no traveler except a German would enter it”). Unlike earlier antiquaries, Grand Tour travelers made formal and calculated choices about what to describe and represent long before they embarked.

33 See Paolo Antonio Paoli’s Antichita di Pozzuoli, Cuma e Baja (1768), a collaboration between Giovanni Battista Natali and Gabriel Riciardelli, who supplied images of buildings and general views of southern Italy, and Thomas Rajola, an architect hired to design orthographic illustrations. The Dilettanti-funded voyage of Richard Chandler to the Ionian islands, brought along Revett for technical drawings, and the view-painter, William Pars, and resulted in The Antiquities of Ionia (1769;1797). This was followed by the travels (again, to southern Italy) of the abbe de Saint-Non, Dominique-Vivant Denon, and Fragonard in 1759-1760, which generated Saint-Non’s Voyage pittoresque ou Description des Royaumes de Naples et de Sicile (1782). The use of artists for these antiquarian-architectural expeditions should be compared with the same practice in scientific explorations, particularly the voyages around the world funded by the Royal Society and led by the wealthy botanist, Joseph Banks, and Captain Cook in the 1760s and ending with the famed Napoleonic expedition to Egypt, headed by Vivant Denon, who never got much credit for his contribution to Saint-Non’s expedition.

34 C. A. Hutton, 113-115.


36 C. A. Hutton, 111.
By singling out one particular monument over another, one interpretation over another, they demonstrated their taste and judgment to buyers and patrons back home. James Stuart and Nicholas Revett shared this Grand Tourist experience with the Wood party, and like the Wood party, their four-year excursion to Greece was a project first conceived in Rome. In fact, the Stuart-Revett expedition to Greece was forged among a group of young artists on a walking trip from Rome to Naples in 1748. James Stuart, a painter, Gavin Hamilton, a Scottish cicerone and picture-dealer, and Nicholas Revett, an architectural draughtsman who had also studied painting in Rome, joined up with Matthew Brettingham, an architect. Rome at mid-century was a cosmopolitan hub for struggling artists, not least because it was host to several foreign academies as well as thousands of aristocratic visitors with money to spare. Painters in Rome did not live under the shadow of academic regulation as they did in Paris – they were free agents in a city filled with collectors. Moreover, the experience of making a living in Rome while surrounded by ancient ruins created an esprit de corps among young draughtsmen and architects housed along the via del Corso. During the 1740s, landscape painters (many of whom were pensionnaires at the French academy) and architects in search of ruins to draw embarked on sketching expeditions in the countryside of Lazio.

Perhaps for this reason, James Stuart’s career is still a bit of a mystery, particularly the origins of his architectural interests, since he had no formal training. He started out as an apprentice to Louis Goupy, a luxury fan-painter, but once he joined up with the British colony of artists and wealthy patrons while in Rome, he never returned to this craft. Although fan-painting did not rank in the hierarchy of painting established by academies, intricate landscape images were a frequent subject for luxury fans and they

37 Lesley Lawrence, “Stuart and Revett: their Literary and Architectural Careers,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute, Vol. 2, No. 2 (October, 1938), 128-146. Stuart, Revett, and Hamilton were living under the same roof at this time. Brettingham and Hamilton eventually backed out of the project, leaving only Stuart and Revett.


were desirable collectibles among Grand Tourists.\footnote{See the images of tourist fans in Andrew Wilton and Maria Bignamini, eds. *Grand Tour: The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth-Century* (London: Tate Gallery Publishing, 1996).} At some point, Stuart managed to learn Latin at the Jesuit College of the Propaganda. He evidently completed a crash course in humanist learning, which couldn’t have been too difficult in Rome, a city used to supplying fast educations to English gentlemen. The historical erudition supplied in the text of the *Antiquities of Athens* was the result of a belated, albeit intensive study. By going to Rome and mingling with artists and patrons alike, Stuart managed to catapult himself into a higher social position than he could have achieved if he had stayed in England.

The walking tour of antiquities in southern Italy led Stuart and Revett to imagine doing the same in Greece in order to provide a much-needed architectural specimen book along the lines of Degodetz’s *Edifices Antiques de Rome* (1682), but Stuart also wanted to provide a faithful record of ancient monuments *in situ*. The original goal – conceived in 1748 - was to “illustrate the history of architecture by delineations from the antiquities of Athens.”\footnote{Stuart and Revett (1762), dedicatory letter to the King. The original proposal (1748) was reproduced in the first volume, the only volume that appeared in Stuart’s lifetime, but Stuart did not comment on the way in which the paintings and drawings, done on site between 1750 and 1753, had been re-conceived to fit the aims of the published work.} Stuart and Revett seemed to have in mind an ambitious project to “improve taste” through a collection of architectural forms. By “delineating” the architectural monuments of Greece, Stuart wrote, they hoped to expand “the system of ancient examples” beyond what was already known in Rome.\footnote{Stuart and Revett (1762), Preface, i.} The reference to collecting “examples” and adding to the “stock” of known forms (common parlance among eighteenth-century architects) ensured that the images would constitute the principal value of their publication.

In his 1753 publication, *The Ruins of Palmyra*, Robert Wood referred to Stuart and Revett as “English painters.” This vocation proved critical to the way in which text and image functioned in *The Antiquities of Athens*. In the preface, Stuart claimed that
artists alone could convey the necessary information about Greece and its ancient monuments:

[Travellers] have all of them been too little conversant with painting, sculpture and architecture, to give us tolerable ideas of what they saw. The books, therefore, are not of such utility, nor such entertainment to the public, as a person acquainted with the practice of these arts might have rendered them. For the best verbal descriptions cannot be supposed to convey so adequate an idea of the magnificence and elegance of buildings. The fine form, expression, or proportion of sculptures, the beauty and variety of a country or the exact scene of any celebrated action, as may be formed from drawings made on the spot with diligence and fidelity by the hand of an artist.43

Stuart’s manifesto for artists as the rightful interpreters of the ancient world sought to displace the erudite travels of earlier antiquaries. In effect, he was fighting a battle on two fronts, against picturesque inventions and tourist capricci, on the one hand, and against an exclusively philological approach to physical remains and topographical sites, on the other. Stuart composed the narrative, which provided an account of their itinerary as well as a commentary on the images. He also painted all the topographical views. This twofold role (author and painter) allowed Stuart full control over the relationship between text and image – although, as we will see, the original paintings did not always support the final text.

For the rest of the paper, I wish to focus on Stuart’s topographical views. The “views” were panoramic images that showed ancient buildings and monuments rooted in the landscape of Athens and its countryside and they set the stage for Revett’s almost surgical treatment of cross-sections, elevations, and architectural details that make up the bulk of the work. Although Revett’s specimen engravings of the architecture owed much to Antoine Desgodetz’s pioneering images of Roman buildings published in 1682, the images by James Stuart were unique in the history of antiquarian illustration. They marked the coming together of several strands in eighteenth-century culture: aristocratic portraiture, antiquarian travel narratives, plein-air drawing, and the Grand Tour veduta.

In Stuart’s own words, the views “faithfully [exhibit] the present appearance of [each] particular building and the circumjacent country.” He also insisted that the views were “all finished on the spot,” to ensure total accuracy: “I have taken none of those

43 Stuart and Revett (1762), Preface, v, n. [a].
liberties with which painters are apt to indulge themselves from a desire of rendering their representations of places more agreeable to the eye... Not an object is here embellished by strokes of fancy nor is the situation of any one of them changed... the figures that are introduced in these views are drawn from nature.”

Stuart’s preoccupation with accuracy links him back to the world of Norden and Pococke, but in this context, the insistence on autopsy was intended as an attack on his rival, Julien-David Le Roy. 45

Yet the views were not intended originally as weapons. Here is the General View of Athens, the first view of the first volume [Fig. 4]. Stuart’s view is framed by a grid of letters through which the reader could orient himself with respect to the city of Athens and the surrounding mountains, but unlike Spon’s earlier image, the reference letters are outside the frame of the image. Stuart thus preserves the topographical features that we see in Spon’s illustration [see above Fig. 3], but he demotes them in favor of a painterly composition. One year before Stuart published this image, the Italian antiquary, Ridolfino Venuti, made a case for erasing any didactic reference numbers in the engravings he used for his Collection of Beautiful Views in Italy, a work aimed at Grand Tourists and artists traveling to Italy. Venuti explained the new rules: “when several places are joined together in the same plate,” he wrote, “they are distinguished by a greater or lesser number of birds in the air, while they are marked by numbers only in the accompanying

44 Stuart and Revett (1762), Preface, viii. Stuart makes one exception with the position of a fountain in volume I.

45 This was an artistic debate unanticipated in 1748, but which came to dominate Stuart’s narrative. Julien-David Le Roy, a French competitor living in Rome at the same time, had set off for Greece in the spring of 1754 just as Stuart and Revett were on their way back to England from Smyrna. Le Roy wanted to compare ancient architecture with the known Roman structures as part of an artistic paragone and he managed to publish his engravings first. In his 1762 volume, Stuart made sure to claim priority for this idea. See Stuart and Revett (1762), Preface, vi-vii. See also Robin Middleton’s introduction to Le Roy’s Ruins of the Most Beautiful Monuments of Greece, trans. David Britt (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2004). Bruce Redford also focuses on the controversy with Le Roy and identifies several overlapping conflicts coming together in this publication (scientific aims vs. anti-scientific, Britain vs. the continent, picturesque vs. truthful). See “The Measure of Ruins: Dilettanti in the Levant, 1750-1770, in Harvard Library Bulletin, vol. 13, no. 1 (2002), 5-36.
explanation. This was done because numbers in the plates are unpleasant and ugly."\textsuperscript{46} The naturalistic detail of birds was thus a disguised documentary reference. The new aesthetics governing engravings in the eighteenth century was parallel to the aesthetics of the page, which was swept clean of footnote citations and dense quotations. Although Venuti did not say so, the reference numbers also distracted from the authenticity of the view, that is, from the illusion that the viewer was seeing the landscape rather than looking at a map.

Fig. 4. James Stuart, “General View of Athens,” \textit{Antiquities of Athens, vol. I, ch. 1, pl. 1}

What is not immediately obvious, however, is that Stuart’s image manages to combine an artistic portrait with a topographical illustration. In order to see this, the viewer had to become a reader. In his explanation of this plate, Stuart writes, “the figure represents Hassán Agà, the \textit{vaiwode} of Athens, accompanied by the principal Turks of the city and by their servants. He delighted in archery, and desired to be thus represented in this view.” In deference to his Ottoman host, Stuart added in the text that “[the vaiwode’s] greatest random shot was 175 English feet.”\textsuperscript{47} As with the \textit{historia} painting of

\textsuperscript{46} Ridolfino Venuti, \textit{Collection of Beautiful Views in Italy} (London, 1762), originally published as \textit{Raccolta di alcune belle vedute d’Italia} (Rome, 1761).

\textsuperscript{47} Stuart and Revett, \textit{Antiquities of Athens} (London, 1762), Vol. I, preface, x. The original painting of this view is lost. The engraving was done by James Basire.
the Nointel embassy in 1674, this image offered a portrait of a specific individual (in this case, the Ottoman governor). Yet Stuart’s portrait of the vaiwode was inserted within the veduta. Stuart thus found a way - through images - to acknowledge the social and cultural aspects of modern Greece and to fulfill his obligations toward his hosts. A pictorial genre commonly used by architectural draftsmen to convey information about the topographical situation of a particular building became a social document of travel in Stuart’s hands.

Stuart offers another picture of the vaiwode on a hunting party in his view of the Ionic Temple on the river Ilissus [Fig. 5]. The original painting [not included] allowed Stuart to show off his skills as a water-colorist, by conveying the subtle gradations between the underlying ancient marble and the “barbarous additions” made when the structure was converted to a Christian church.  

Fig. 5. James Stuart, Ionic Temple at Ilissus, vol. I, Ch. 2, Plate II

There was yet another reason for including this image in the final publication. Stuart wanted to challenge Le Roy on a point of fact using the “view” as his evidence. Le Roy

48 Stuart and Revett (1762), Chapter II, 7. The gouache admirably does what cork models achieved in this same period.
had referred to the same Ionic temple as located in the background of one of his own views, but Le Roy dismissed the building as (in his own words) “of so little consequence that [he] judged it superfluous to give a large view of it.” Stuart jumped on this claim (having himself given a view of it) and he insisted that Le Roy had merely followed Spon and Wheler’s description of another building, which was “½ mile to the left of any object he has represented in his View, and of consequence, must be considerably out of his picture.”49 He further suggested that Le Roy “in reality has seen neither” of the buildings he described. Stuart’s attack on Le Roy, ably discussed by both Middleton and Redford, was a debate about the status of the topographical view.50

The Octogon Tower of Andronicus Cyrrheses [Fig. 6], otherwise known as the Tower of the Winds allows Stuart to situate himself as painter and to offer precise information not only about the topographical context for these ancient monuments, but their social context as well:

… [The view is] taken from a window in the house of the Mudeerees Effendi. Over the doorway of this building and on each side of it are evident traces of the entablature and pediment which formerly adorned it…The Turk with the long hair, whose back is turned to the Spectator, is the Sheih Mustapha; chief of those dervishes who perform the circular dance in the Tower of the Winds; on the top of which, in a cavity to be described at Plate VI, he has by way of ornament, placed a large wooden model of his turban.

Stuart identifies the Acropolis in the background and he describes the women as representing a Christian matron with two marriageable daughters and a servant (hence generic figures). He ends the explanation of the view by zeroing in on a detail that links the ancient Acropolis to the Ottoman Turks: “In the white wall which is immediately behind these figures, may be observed a darkish horizontal line from which some herbs or weeds are growing: the darkness of that line and the growth of the weeds is occasioned by leakage from the water-pipes which are inserted in that part of the wall; by these pipes

49 Stuart and Revett (1762), Chapter II, 11.

50 What is striking here is the use of images as sufficient evidence. Piranesi recognized that a controversy between architects could only be settled through a battle of images. See especially the way Piranesi selected certain engravings from Le Roy’s volume and inserted them into his own prints in Della magnificenza ed architettura de’ romani (Rome, 1761). On this famous quarrel over Greek and Roman architecture, see R. Wittkower, JWI (1938).
the brackish stream whose sources are at the foot of the acropolis, is conveyed toward the principal Moschea.”

Fig. 6. View of the Octogan Tower of Andronicus Cyrrheses (SD 145/3, RIBA)

I want to offer some samples of Revett’s drawings of this same structure in order to convey the sequencing of illustrations in this work. Stuart and Revett’s book is organized so that the eye can zoom in from the general topographical view to the abstract architectural details. First, the viewer confronts the engraved copy of the view of the Tower of the Winds, followed by the elevation of the Tower, and concluding with an exclusively sculptural image of one of the three external moldings visible in the first two images.  

51 Stuart and Revett (1762), Chapter II, 17.

52 Stuart and Revett (1762), 22. Note that the turban is gone in the elevation drawing (in its place, Revett has inserted the “Triton and conical marble” found in Vitruvius’s description).
Stuart’s attention to the social and political world of modern Athens is conveyed in another view – that of a monument found straddling the streets of Athens [Fig. 8]. Stuart argued that this gate was once part of an Agora, and not a temple, as Spon suggested. In explaining the image, Stuart pointed out the mosque minaret, which can be
seen through the intercolumniation, as well as the Christian church on the right, obscured by the shade, “now deserted and in a ruinous condition,” he writes, since the Turkish government discourages rebuilding. While a social and religious engagement with the Christian East was not important to these visitors, Stuart still managed to call attention to the disparities between the Muslim and Christian places of worship. However, his main interest here was in acknowledging the kindness of the French consul:

The gate out of which a Greek servant is coming with a fusil in his hand belongs to the house in which M. Estienne Leonson, the French consul, lives: who is here introduced sitting between two gentlemen, one a Turk, and the other a Greek, for the sake of exhibiting the different habits of this country. The fountain, on the foreground of the view, was rebuilt at the expense of the French consul, and on it are inscribed E.L. the initial letters of his name…And altho characters of persons are by no means the subject of this book, yet to pass in silence the disinterested hospitality with which this gentleman receives all strangers would argue a want of sensibility…

[Fig. 8. View of the Gate with Doric Portico (SD 145/2, RIBA)]

This is the only occasion where Stuart admits to departing from reality. He informs his reader that the fountain has been turned somewhat from its original position so that the viewer can see it. The figures of the Greek and Turk illuminated by the sunlight fulfill a different function here than the portrait of the consul Leonson. These are generic figures

\[53\] Stuart and Revett (1762), Ch. I,
placed there in order to exhibit the local costume of the inhabitants, but Stuart is careful to distinguish the specific individuals from the picturesque staffage.

The genre of the “view” allowed for meaningful juxtapositions, which were clearly stage-managed. In his view of the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates [not shown], Stuart depicts a Capuchin monk seated under a thatched awning in his garden and contemplating a skull on the table; the *memento mori* suggests that we are dealing here with an allegorical motif supplied by Stuart. He doesn’t introduce the monk as a specific individual the way he did the *vaiwode* and the consul. Referring to this engraving, Stuart writes, “The figure represents the French capuchin sitting in his garden.”54 The Choragic monument – seen in the background -- had been preserved because it was literally built into the library of the French Capuchin monastery. Stuart’s attention to the contemporary physical contexts for ancient monuments seems to generate a contemplative reflection in which past and present are grasped as spatial categories, adjacent to each other, and yet dissonant. Stuart did not engage with this missionary world in the same way as Spon and Wheler, but he knew that the juxtaposition of the Christian and pagan elements would make an agreeable view.55

What is most striking about Stuart’s topographical views is the way that they serve as documents of Stuart’s and Revett’s very presence in Greece. The gouache view of the Arch of the Sergeii [Fig. 9], taken during Stuart and Revett’s tour of Dalmatia,

54 Stuart and Revett (1762), Chapter IV, 31

55 Stuart eventually returned home and designed a miniature choragic monument as a garden decoration as well as a Tower of the Winds for a country estate in Shugborough. (for photographs of these buildings, see David Watkin, *Athenian Stuart* (London, 1982) and Lesley Lawrence, 22 and 2). In the *Antiquities of Athens*, Stuart went to great pains in order to ascertain the origin and function of these ancient monuments. This historical contextualization was often lost on those who paid attention to the architectural plates as “specimens” of architectural taste. Although Stuart insisted that the Choragic monument celebrated a specific event and individual in ancient Athens, he was the first to de-contextualize the monument when he went home. By the late nineteenth century, everywhere one turned in the English-speaking world, there was a choragic monument of Lysicrates. It was a kind of Zelig structure, showing up as a lighthouse in Maine, a Civil War memorial in Connecticut, a botanical garden ornament in Australia, and on top of the Merchant Exchange in Philadelphia. This unmooring of the monument was obviously a consequence of the priority given to the images.
shows (albeit faintly) the two men measuring the arch as a herd of cattle passes underneath and a group of singers gathers to the left, standing upon an illuminated green pasture.

Fig. 9. Arch of the Sergeii, Pola [SD 146/8]

Although Stuart never remarks on the natural landscape in his views, his images employ features consistent with *plein-air* landscape painting, a practice gaining momentum in Rome in this same period. The dramatic cloud formations, the use of light and dark, and most importantly, the inclusion of figures in desultory motion imparted a sense of contingency consistent with contemporary landscape *études* (of course, the original

---

56 Writing about *plein-air* drawing began with De Piles in 1708, who encouraged the marking of seasonal changes and cloud formation as memory-aids for later use in the studio where such paintings were completed. Theoretical writing about the sketch as valuable in itself began in the 1730s with Caylus’s *Lecture on Drawing* (1732). On this history, see Paul Rea Radisch, “Eighteenth-Century Plein-Air Painting and the Sketches of Pierre Henri de Valenciennes,” *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 64, No. 1 (March 1982), 98-104. William Pars, who provided paintings for the Chandler expedition in 1764-1766, was an early victim of *plein-air* drawing. He returned to Rome and went on several sketching expeditions with Thomas Jones in the 1770s only to die of hypothermia in 1782.
gouache paintings evoke this better than the engravings). This painterly attentiveness to the temporal dimension matches the antiquarian concern with journalistic documentation. For example, Giovanni Borra’s sketchbook is filled with pencil vedute made on the spot and annotated with precise dates. One coastal view is inscribed with the words “Scyda 10 feb,” a view of a harbor with “tiro li 16 feb, 1751,” and a view of mountains reads “Malvola alli 7 Marzo verso mezzo giorno.” The dates were important because Borra had to keep track of when and where he was, but by the late eighteenth century, many artists believed that all landscape sketches should manifest the precise hour in which it was drawn (even if this meant returning at the same time the next day).

Before the eighteenth century, the narrative detail of travel took place in the text itself. The need to document one’s own individual (as opposed to generic) experience was characteristic of the aristocratic Grand Tour, which often ended with a flattering portrait before a choice monument in Rome. The production of tourist vedute (itself originating in theatre design) aimed at a similar illusion of being there, although these views of monuments were less individualizing than Grand Tour portraits. Here is Stuart’s view of the Temple of Minerva Polias on the Acropolis [Fig. 10]. Stuart uses the view to comment on the Ottomans’ suspicions of his and Revett’s activities, which they quite sensibly took for treasure hunting, but Stuart also took the opportunity to fix this image in time.

The Turkish gentleman smoking a long pipe is the Disdar-Aga. He leans on the shoulder of his son-in-law, Ibrahim-Aga, and is looking at our laborers who are digging to discover the base…under the Caryatids…the two Turks in the Pandrosium were placed there by him to watch our proceedings and give him an account of our discoveries. The little girl leading a lamb, and attended by a Negro slave, is the daughter of Ibrahim-Aga. The lamb was fatted to be eaten at the Feast of Beiram, which was not far off at the time this view was taken.”

Stuart thus presents this view as a record of a precise moment, to the point of indicating a particular date in the Muslim calendar. He even cast himself in the image more directly,

57 Borra, Sketchbook, Wood 17 (f.5, f.7, and f.17), Institute of Classical Studies.
58 Radisich (1982), 99.
59 Stuart and Revett (1787), 17. This work was published posthumously with a preface by Elizabeth Stuart. Stuart’s polemic against Le Roy ceases in these posthumous volumes, although Stuart’s narrative takes into account Chandler’s expedition published by the Dilettanti in 1774.
as the man drawing with a pencil in the lower right-hand corner, although he uncharacteristically omits to mention this in the text. Many landscape painters in Rome depicted themselves or their companions in the act of drawing, especially Hubert Robert, but few intended to communicate an actual person captured in time and space.

![Image of Temple of Minerva Polias](image)

Fig. 10. Temple of Minerva Polias, Vol. 2, Chapter II, Plate II.
If we turn to the original painting that Stuart made of this monument, however, we find that the figure drawing in the same position is not Stuart, but Revett [see the figure on the right below]. We know this man is Revett because Stuart depicted him in another view, the Theater of Bacchus.

In explicating his view of the Theater of Bacchus [Fig. 11], Stuart writes: “just over the Cyprus tree is the monument of Philopappus…the foreground is a recess or little grotto…whence this view was taken. In this place, I have endeavored to represent my companion Mr. Revett, who from hence did, with great patience and accuracy, mark all of the masonry in front of the scene.” 60 Revett is here shown holding a feathered stylus and a notebook. In the engraved copy of the view of Minerva Polias, Stuart is holding a pencil and flat paper. The discrepancy between the original gouache painting and the engraving may be due to a falling out between the two (Stuart took control of the project when they returned to England) or it may have been an independent decision by the editors, since the engraving come from the posthumous volume put together by Stuart’s wife, Elizabeth in 1787.

60 Stuart and Revett (1787), 24.
Fig. 11. Theater of Bacchus [SD 145/9]
The Monument of Philopappus [Fig. 12], visible from the Theater of Bacchus, provides one the strangest views of the entire work. Here, I think we are seeing the antiquarian habit of self-inscription combined with the portraiture of Grand Tourism. Here, Stuart has captured the meeting between himself and Revett, dressed in local costume, and Robert Wood and James Dawkins, shown in British clothes. “On the foreground,” Stuart writes, “Mr. Revett and myself are introduced with our friends James Dawkins and Mr. Robert Wood; the last of whom is occupied in copying the inscription on the pilaster. Our janizary is making coffee, which we drank here…” The use of the views to document the expedition is unmistakable here.

Since Robert Wood had traveled to the Aegean in 1750 with James Dawkins, this must have occurred on their return trip in 1751 (Wood also mentions their encounter in his Palmyra volume). In the engraving, Revett actually turns toward the viewer and grins, as if to say, ‘here I am in front of an ancient monument in Greece.’ The oddly photographic quality underscores the documentary intent of the image, which owed a great deal to the practice of having one’s portrait taken in front of a choice monument while on the Grand
Tour. Many English aristocrats posed for painters in front of monuments and statues back in Rome, but these were staged studio portraits and there was little sense that they documented a specific moment in time. However, British Grand Tourists did consider these portraits as evidence that they had gone to Rome. I offer two of these below for comparison:

**Henry Somerset, 3rd Duke of Beaufort, ca. 1735; Wilton and Bignamini, The Grand Tour, 1996, [cat. 11]**

Stuart and Revett were more accustomed to painting Grand Tourists than acting like them, which is why the *plein-air* pose in front of the monument is so delightful. If we turn to the original painting, however, we discover that the figure of Robert Wood, described in the text as “occupied in copying the inscription on the pilaster,” is missing, as are the goats, one shepherd, a dog, and the janissary making their coffee. Dawkins was an important gentleman to include because he made it possible for Stuart to complete the expedition and prepare for the second volume of his work: “…it would not have been in our power to continue a sufficient time at Athens for the completion of our work, had it not been for the liberality of Mr. Dawkins.” But why is Wood missing? The addition of Wood in the engraved copy had to be done with Stuart’s knowledge.

Despite Stuart’s own insistence on the accuracy of his views and his painstaking admissions in the text when anything had been shifted for the sake of the viewer, these discrepancies are possible evidence that the transfer of gouache painting to engraving

---

61 Stuart and Revett (1787), vol. II, Preface, vi. Dawkins apparently provided housing for both Stuart and Revett when they returned to England in 1755. See Lawrence, 130.
involved many opportunities for rethinking the social and personal function of the views. I have suggested that Stuart’s images have roots in the older antiquarian tradition, but that they also take cues from the more recent artistic practice of *plein-air* drawing. Peter Galassi has suggested that landscape painters created “[a] syntax … devoted to the singular and contingent rather than the universal and stable” and that this was also “the syntax of photography.”

I am not so sure that we should ascribe this photographic impulse solely to images of the natural world. The visual tradition of antiquarianism and the Grand Tour travel of the eighteenth century may have played a role too. After all, when Baudelaire wanted to praise the ephemeral character of modern life, he turned away from Nature to the work of a draughtsman and journalist who had sketched on-the-spot drawings of the Crimean war and Parisian society.

I want to end with a view *[Fig. 14]* taken in Salonica of a monument that is now gone. As with the Choragic monument in the Capuchin monastery, Stuart often needed to intrude on private land in order to gain his views of the monuments. Here, Stuart presents a view of the Incantadas. This is another image in which Stuart acknowledged hospitality on the ground:

> [It is] the Incantada in the courtyard of a Jew merchant on whose premises it stands. The figures represent an interview between consul Paradise and the Jew. The consul had, with great good nature, insisted on attending us to the Jew’s house, the more effectually and readily to obtain permission for us to measure and design whatever we might find there…and…to dig where we thought proper. The Jew received us at the door of his courtyard; he was attended by a boy with coffee, which, with great respect he immediately offered to the consul; his wife, from a kind of gallery, gently reprehended her husband for a breach of decorum, by offering his coffee before he had desired the consul to sit down…an old woman who was spinning approached us with a greater appearance of confidence.

Stuart describes the image as an actual event seen from his own perspective – *the old woman is approaching us* -- and yet he also places himself as a figure within the composition. “The figures seen at a little distance,” he concludes, “are Mr. Revett and myself with my excellent friend, young Mr. Paradise, *then* about ten years old…” It is remarkable that the social and religious distinctions within modern Greece – the way in which Muslims, Christians and Jews lived side by side with the ancient ruins -- emerges

---

only in these views, which Stuart employed to record his and Revett’s activities as well as to acknowledge those very real individuals who were rooted in time and place.

Fig. 14. “The Incantadas,” vol. III, ch. 9.