Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach’s history of architecture—the first of its kind—occupies a central place in early modern architectural literature. His Entwurff einer historischen Architectur (Outline of a History of Architecture, 1721) departed from the tradition of books on the column orders and building types as established by Sebastiano Serlio in the first half of the sixteenth century and still lingering in the early eighteenth century with theorists such as Fischer’s German colleague Leonhard Christoph Sturm. The Entwurff also broke with the Vasarian biographical tradition found throughout the eighteenth century in books by Francesco Milizia, Tommaso Temanza, and Fischer’s own contemporary and biographer, Paul Jakob Marperger.1

Fischer abandoned both of these formulas and instead adopted a series of antiquarian reconstructions of ancient monuments that outline the historical development of architecture. Yet, archaeological reconstructions of ruins were nothing new. They had been a part of architectural antiquarianism at least since Pirro Ligorio in the mid-sixteenth century. Fischer’s major innovation lies in his presentation of these reconstructions in a complete and coherent historical scheme, elaborated over four books.2 The first book begins with Solomon’s Temple, which appears as the divinely ordained origin of all monumental architecture, and continues with the seven wonders of the ancient world (Figure 1). The second book addresses Roman architecture, the third that of various non-European cultures, and the last Fischer’s own works, culminating with his Karlskirche in Vienna (Figure 2).3 A semi-independent addendum to the fourth book, seemingly somewhat extraneous to the work, illustrates a number of ancient and modern decorative vases. In all, eighty-six plates span the world history of architecture, guiding the reader from Solomon’s ancient kingdom through the contemporary Holy Roman Empire, the architectural legacy for which Fischer as imperial architect was responsible.4

Despite the obvious importance of the Entwurff, we know relatively little about its development and early history.5 Fischer’s application for imperial privilege states that he had been developing his book over the course of the previous sixteen years, placing the genesis of the work around 1705. In 1712, the architect and his regular collaborator, Carl Gustaf Heraeus, hastily compiled a manuscript version for presentation to Emperor Charles VI, who succeeded his older brother Joseph I in 1711.6 While Fischer had enjoyed close relations with Joseph and even instructed him in architecture, after Joseph’s sudden death, the positions of all court officials were in question until confirmed by the new emperor. No doubt, the presentation of the Entwurff manuscript to Charles VI was calculated to help Fischer and Heraeus retain their posts. Conceptually and structurally, the work seems to have been finished at this point, although the books each lacked some prints included in the 1721 publication, which was itself less ambitious than originally planned.7 In 1725, a second edition was published in
Figure 1  Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, Solomon’s Temple, plate 2 of Entwurff einer historischen Architectur (1721)

Figure 2  Fischer von Erlach, Karlskirche, Vienna, plate 62 of Entwurff einer historischen Architectur (1721)

Beyond this very basic outline of the Entwurf’s development lie numerous unanswered questions. Many of the prints are difficult to date with certainty; a few circulated before the release of the printed edition, but how many? The work was evidently of general interest, as the later editions demonstrate. But where else can we trace interest in the work? And whom, exactly, did Fischer hope to impress with the work once it had been presented to the emperor in 1712 and his post as imperial architect had been confirmed?

A manuscript outline of the Entwurf and related correspondence in the state archives in Stockholm provide insight into some of these problems and constitute the earliest information we have on the reception of Fischer’s book. Carl Gustaf Tessin brought this material from Vienna to Stockholm. The son of the well-known Stockholm court architect Nicodemus Tessin the Younger, Carl Gustaf traveled in Italy, France, and Germany from 1714 to 1719. Tessin the Younger hoped that his son would succeed him as royal architect, but Carl Gustaf never showed much inclination for this career path. In practice, Carl Gustaf’s travels served mostly to complete and update his father’s collections of architectural prints, texts, drawings, and other reference materials, and to establish personal contacts who would update them about artistic and cultural developments in the leading centers. These years of travel provided Carl Gustaf with a general artistic education that enabled him to become a significant collector and connoisseur and provided an international network that would later support him as an envoy in Vienna and Paris.

Tessin the Younger planned the itinerary for his son’s travels. It is frequently assumed that the father’s interest rested only in France and Italy and that a stop in Vienna was not intended. Although the Tessins considered Paris and Rome the outstanding artistic centers in Europe, they were aware of the importance of the major courts in the Holy Roman Empire, as both men had traveled through the Germanic heart of Europe in the course of their studies and knew the region well. Moreover, the father clearly encouraged his son to see and describe in detail the imperial collections and to acquire the plans of the most significant Viennese palaces as well as prints of festival architecture. A full six months before Carl Gustaf arrived in Vienna in May 1718, his father sent him the name of an old contact in the city. Later, Tessin the Younger was pleased to hear that his son met Fischer and formed a lasting friendship with Heraeus, both of whom Tessin the Younger almost certainly knew personally.

Carl Gustaf Heraeus and the Tessins

Carl Gustaf Heraeus was born in Stockholm in 1671 in a house built by Nicodemus Tessin’s father, Nicodemus Tessin the Elder. Heraeus’s father, born in Güstrow in Mecklenburg, served as court apothecary to Dowager Queen Hedwig Eleonora, who in 1680 had appointed Tessin the Younger as her court architect. Heraeus left Stockholm in 1687, but he remained in contact with the intellectual elite there and returned on occasion at least until 1698. He drifted through a number of German courts, arriving in Vienna late in 1708. In 1710 he became the inspector of the imperial antiquities and medal collections. He was evidently delighted to meet Carl Gustaf Tessin, and to judge by the regular greetings to Tessin the Younger—as well as his offer to strike a medal in the architect’s honor—Heraeus was eager to initiate more general contacts with the leading artistic family in the Stockholm court. Tessin the Younger responded with more reserve, but his comment to his son that Heraeus was “a man of merit” suggests a personal connection from their years together in Stockholm.

Heraeus and Carl Gustaf Tessin began a regular exchange of prints and drawings in the summer of 1718. Heraeus requested virtually all of the prints made after Tessin the Younger’s works and, in return, sent graphic materials by Fischer and others active in Vienna, including “Mr. Bibiena,” probably Giuseppe Galli Bibiena. Perhaps through the mediation of Heraeus, Tessin met Galli Bibiena, and he may have met many of the other artists of the imperial court as well.

Heraeus’s formal post as keeper of the emperor’s antiquities and medals was essentially an antiquarian one. He was also responsible for inventing new medals, generally with an emblem on the reverse side, and his role quickly expanded to the invention of themes for court ceremonies and even architectural projects. In this way, Heraeus came to work closely with Fischer, particularly in the development of the complex program for the Karlskirche. He was also intimately involved in the development of the Entwurf; the title page of the 1712 manuscript edition credits him, rather than Fischer, with the text.

Heraeus’s surviving letters to Carl Gustaf Tessin demonstrate Heraeus’s close relationship with Fischer. Thus, when Heraeus asked for a complete edition of Suecia antiqua et boudiera, a topography of Sweden filled with engravings of buildings by Tessin the Younger and others, he wrote that Fischer would like one as well. These prints were released publicly in 1715, although some loose sheets floated about before then, and there were several reduced pirate editions. Heraeus asked specifically for “as complete...
an edition as possible” because he already had most of the prints in an album now in the Austrian National Library in Vienna.20 He evidently cobbled this album together, including a number of extraneous prints not belonging to Suecia antiqua et hodierna. His collection was probably close to its present form soon after 1710, since the latest prints in the album date from that year. Although we can trace these prints only to Hereaus, Fischer was clearly familiar with them. He cited one of them in the Entwurff as a source for a monument comparable to Stonehenge.21

Contacts in Rome: Fischer and Tessin the Younger

Fischer and Tessin the Younger worked in Rome in the studios of Gianlorenzo Bernini and Carlo Fontana in the 1670s.22 Fischer and Tessin the Younger were roughly the same age (the former born in 1656, the latter in 1654) and studied with the mysterious drawing instructor Abraham Paris, where they may have been most likely to form an informal friendship.23 Both also had contact with the humanistic circle of Queen Christina, whose recommendations opened many doors for Tessin the Younger, including those of Bernini’s and Fontana’s studios. Christina’s importance for Fischer is less certain. His access to Bernini’s circle is usually traced through his friendship with Filippo Schor whose father, Johann Paul (Giovanni Paolo) was a regular associate of Bernini.

Fischer was almost certainly associated with the Accademia di San Luca and would have met its rector, Giovanni Pietro Bellori, also a prominent member of Christina’s circle of intellectuals.24 But whether Fischer first encountered Bellori through Christina or the academy, this contact with the famous biographer and antiquarian is often considered the origin of the intellectual and historical interests that led to the Entwurff.25 More specifically, some of Bellori’s publications on various antique monuments return as models in Fischer’s work. For example, Bellori’s volume on Roman triumphal arches served as a source for a print in the second book of the Entwurff, and Bellori’s illustrated work on Trajan’s Column may be reflected in Fischer’s own reconstruction of Trajan’s Forum (Figures 3, 4).26 Fischer used similar twin columns with spiraling reliefs in the Karlskirche in Vienna and the first Schönbrunn project (Figure 5; see Figure 2). Bellori also allowed the young architect to copy a number of antique medals from his private collection, which were later incorporated in the Entwurff.27 This early interest in Bellori and his sources suggests that Fischer already contemplated some sort of antiquarian work while in Rome.

Often it is assumed that, during his Roman study, Fischer also met the German Jesuit scholar Athanasius Kircher, who died in 1680.28 Whether Fischer encountered Kircher in person or in print, the older scholar’s interests in Egyptian and Near Eastern antiquity are reflected everywhere in the Entwurff.

Bellori probably became Christina’s librarian in 1677 (rather than 1680–81, as is usually stated), just as Tessin the Younger’s first Roman visit came to an end.29 Bellori was a prominent member of her circle before he worked for her in an official capacity, however, so it is likely that Tessin the Younger knew him. In the 1670s, Tessin the Younger wrote a short, critical survey of architects working in Rome from Bramante to Bernini that shows an interest in the tradition of writing on artists’ lives.30 Bellori, who published his book of artists’ biographies in 1672, was the foremost exponent of this tradition and an obvious model for the young architect.31 The two men certainly met during Tessin the Younger’s second visit to Rome in 1687–88, when they looked at paintings and drawings together. They must also have engaged in a more general discussion of art theory and history, as the works they viewed were mostly by men already considered old masters: Michelangelo, Raphael, Giulio Romano, and Antonio da Correggio, for example.32 Both the earlier notes and the later meetings with Bellori demonstrate Tessin the Younger’s nascent interest in architectural history at the same time and in the same circles in which Fischer’s similar interest was developing.

As the son of an important court architect, Tessin the Younger arrived in Rome armed with letters of recommendation from the king of Sweden and from Christina. He was as likely to have met Bellori as Bernini during his first stay in Rome. Bernini, probably through Christina’s mediation, critiqued Tessin the Younger’s drawings and impressed his artistic views on the young man. Their acquaintance led Tessin the Younger’s biographer to assume that Bernini would have discouraged Tessin from spending time with Bellori, who held a fundamentally different view of the arts and excluded Bernini from his lives of the artists.33 Bellori’s classicism, for which French architecture would later become a practical model, served as a counter-weight to Bernini’s imagination in Tessin the Younger’s work, probably even during his first stay in Rome.34 The synthesis of these two contrasting ideals occupied Tessin the Younger for much of his career. He would later write that “combining the two [the French and Italian traditions] properly, without giving precedence to one or the other, can only be carried out with the exercising of careful judgment, effort and work; but that is how one learns and one can expect a much greater level of perfection as a result.”35
Figure 3  Fischer von Erlach, Arch of Septimius Severus, plate 40 of Entwurf einer historischen Architectur (1721)

Figure 4  Giovanni Pietro Bellori, Arch of Septimius Severus, plate 9 of Véteres arcus Augustorum (1690)
Whether or not Fischer and Tessin the Younger met during their years in Rome, Christina’s circle of intellectuals must be seen as a major shared point of reference for both architects. It also served as a starting point for their common interest in architectural antiquarianism, verging on architectural history. For Fischer, this culminated in the Entwurf. Tessin the Younger never reached this point.

Building on his 1670s survey of architects active in Rome, he wrote a series of brief biographies of architects and painters in the 1680s. Decades later, he incorporated a short survey of the history of sculpture into his treatise on interior decoration, written around 1717. This sculpture survey follows a general historical scheme from ancient Greece and Rome through the Italian Renaissance and Baroque to Louis XIV’s France; yet, his chronology frequently breaks with this plan. Overall, the historical character of Tessin the Younger’s survey is much less developed than Fischer’s Entwurf, which took its final form around the same time.

We have no evidence that Fischer and Tessin the Younger remained in contact after leaving Rome, though it is hardly impossible. Tessin the Younger visited Vienna in the spring of 1688 on his way from Rome to Stockholm. Fischer seems to have divided his time between Graz and Vienna until the following fall, when he is recorded as living in Vienna. If he was in Vienna when Tessin the Younger passed through, the two men must certainly have renewed their acquaintance.

Contacts in London?: Fischer and Wren

When Fischer visited Berlin in 1704, his letter of introduction clearly stated that he was especially interested in the architectural projects then underway at the Hohenzollern court. Andreas Schlüter, then in charge of the project for the new royal palace, particularly interested Fischer, as motifs evidently reflecting Schlüter’s architectural work can be found in Fischer’s Clam-Gallas Palace in Prague and Trautson Palace in Vienna. Fischer’s Berlin visit seems also to have influenced Schlüter, whose Kameke House in Berlin (destroyed in World War II) is exceptional both in form and type for northern Germany. However, it is similar to the Viennese suburban villas popular around 1700, for which Fischer developed numerous designs. This evidence implies that Fischer not only saw the new palace and other projects...
in Berlin, but that he also probably met Schlüter and the two men may have exchanged drawings. Fischer evidently came to Berlin with drawings, for he presented Friedrich I of Brandenburg-Prussia with a design for a palace.

Fischer's sojourn in Berlin demonstrates his interest in other northern European courts, and seems not to have left a significant mark on the Entwurf. Hans Sedlmayr suggested that Fischer may have continued from Berlin to London, where a meeting with Christopher Wren could have stimulated his historical interests in a way that Berlin evidently did not.\(^40\) He received a letter of recommendation to visit England at the same time he received his travel papers for Berlin. Beyond this document though, virtually no evidence exists that Fischer did in fact extend his trip to London, and the lack of recognizably English sources in Fischer's work has been a confounding problem for Sedlmayr's proposal. The Palladian classicism of Inigo Jones might be seen as a source for the increasingly classical character of his work after 1710, but there is little justification that London provided the influence when we know that Fischer visited Venice at least twice and knew Palladio's work first hand. Fischer's possible English stay is a divisive point in the scholarship. Hans Aurenhammer accepted an English sojourn unconditionally, though he was much less certain about a possible meeting with Wren. Nikolaus Pevsner shared this view. Yet more recently, Hellmut Lorenz and Andreas Kreul have been deeply skeptical of the whole prospect.\(^41\)

Circumstantial evidence beyond the letter of recommendation supports the argument that Fischer visited England in 1704. For example, he very probably sent his son, Joseph Emanuel, to London around 1720, suggesting that he believed such a trip to be worthwhile for a young architect-engineer.\(^42\) More importantly, the overlapping interests of Fischer and Wren suggest contact. Fischer had been working on the Entwurf for sixteen years when it was published in 1721. This would put the genesis of the work around 1705, very soon after his possible trip to England. At that point, Wren had been deeply interested in the history of architecture for several decades and had written several short passages on various aspects of the subject. Wren never fully developed these notes, which were published by his heirs in 1750 as a series of fragments in the Parentalia.\(^43\) The published notes essentially combined the Vitruvian column book and architectural reconstruction traditions, though they show a broader interest in non-European architectural traditions than we find in earlier writers. No longer was Vitruvius the sole authority, for "the Orders are not only Roman and Greek, but Phoenician, Hebrew, and Assyrian."\(^44\) At least in spirit, this resonates with Fischer's first book, presenting the architecture of the "Jews, Egyptians, Syrians, Persians and Greeks."\(^45\) From other sources, we know that Wren had an even greater range of interest, encompassing Hagia Sophia and Islamic and Chinese architecture.\(^46\)

Precisely what Wren planned to do with these interests is unclear, though he may have intended to bring them together in a single, coherent treatise.\(^47\) A manuscript titled "Discourse on Architecture," probably written in the 1670s but not published in the Parentalia, may have comprised part of this statement. Here Wren's thinking extended far beyond his predecessors, for he was interested not only in the reconstruction of ancient monuments across a much broader spectrum than earlier writers, but also in their sequence and influence through time: "from the Phoenicians I derive as well the Arts as the Letters of the Graecians, though it may be, the Tyrians were Imitators of the Babylonians, and They of the Egyptians."\(^48\)

Wren's notes and documented interests have in common with Fischer's Entwurf Solomon's Temple, the Temple of Diana at Ephesus, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, the Pyramids at Giza, Babylon, Hagia Sophia, mosques in Constantinople, Stonehenge (described in both cases as a Roman ruin), and Chinese architecture. Some overlap is to be expected, since both used the same sources—most notably Josephus, Pliny the Younger, and Herodotus. These sources cannot account for the interest in non-Mediterranean works, however, much less their shared historical scheme, beginning with a single (divine) source in Solomon's Temple diffusing into the Greco-Roman and all other architectural traditions.\(^49\)

A generation before Fischer began thinking about the Entwurf, Wren already had brought to the study of architecture a clear historical structure that extended beyond the antiquarian interests of Bellori and Fischer's other sources. We may never be able to document absolutely that Fischer visited London and met Wren. But his curiosity about architecture and architects elsewhere in northern Europe, clearly evident in his visit to Berlin, and the striking parallels to Wren, both in content and historical vision, strongly suggest that Fischer somehow came into contact with Wren's ideas.

Contacts in Vienna: Carl Gustaf Tessin, Fischer, and Heraeus

In late spring 1718, Carl Gustaf Tessin was in Vienna accompanying "Baron Fischer and Heraeus to see those palaces and gardens in the area that merit a visit."\(^50\) The men no doubt discussed many of Fischer's own projects, and this outing suggests that Fischer shared Heraeus's eagerness to show their guest what Vienna had to offer. The city's architectural
resources reached beyond built works to the Entwurf, which was still three years from publication. Carl Gustaf Tessin evidently approached the work with care. Respecting the structure of the book, he noted at the top of the first page that “the work of Fischer is arranged in the following order,” and proceeded to list each plate and its place within the five component sections. Since it is letter-folded, we can assume that he sent the summary to his father in Stockholm. His secretary noted in his list of acquisitions an “Essai d’un Architecture historique du Baron Jean Bernhard Fischers,” with a short description. As the work was not yet published, it was perfectly natural that he gave the date of the presentation of the manuscript to Charles VI—1712.51

Tessin the Younger received the outline with great interest in summer 1718. In July, he wrote to his son, “I am not less impatient to see that beautiful work that the Baron Fischer promises to make public, but I would not know how to endure that terrible jealousy, which only detracts from its merit.”52 Tessin the Younger noted in the margins of the summary which of the prints he already had in his collection, since he, like Heraeus, had collected some sheets before the work was actually available. Tessin the Younger had only the images of the “Maison de Plaisance de l’Archeveque de Salzbourg”—Klesheim Casino near Salzburg (Figure 6)—and the first Schönbrunn project.

Tessin the Younger’s annotation of the prints already in his collection touches on problems of their origin and dating. A number of prints were intended for other projects and then used, or reused, in the Entwurf. The engravings of the Collegiate Church in Salzburg, for example, were first conceived around 1708 to document, in a set of twelve prints, Prince-Bishop Count Thun’s architectural patronage in and around the city.53 As a beneficiary of Count Thun’s support, Fischer took responsibility for the publication of the view book, preparing the drawings and contracting an engraver in Augsburg. For this he was to receive a set honorarium of sixty gulden per plate, which would cover both his own efforts in preparing the drawings and the printing costs.

Count Thun died in April 1709, and his successor had no interest in continuing the project. It was officially terminated that December with a letter acknowledging the three
finished prints of the Collegiate Church and canceling all future work. This letter seems to show that the Klesheim print cannot have been part of this project and must have been made later, perhaps with the other plates for the Entwurf. Yet, the Klesheim print’s presence in Tessin the Younger’s collection by 1718 (but after the publication of the 1712 catalog, in which no Fischer prints appear) suggests that it was made relatively early and circulated independently of the other prints, which he did not own.

The key to the problem may be that the whole project was something of a speculation for Fischer. He expected to clear two hundred gulden when the twelve plates were finished, but since he undertook the project with the payment in anticipando, there was no guarantee. If work had begun on the Klesheim plate or he had already paid the engraver when the project was cancelled in December 1709, Fischer may have absorbed the cost and circulated the print on a limited basis before reusing it in the Entwurf. The new prince-bishop of Salzburg expected him to surrender the plates for the Collegiate Church—which he evidently recovered later for use in the Entwurf; this explains the surprising fact that Tessin the Younger possessed the otherwise undocumented early impression of Klesheim but not the three of the better-known Collegiate Church.

The other print that Tessin the Younger owned was of Schönbrunn Palace near Vienna. The finished Entwurf contains two views of the palace. One is quite close to what was built (generally called Schönbrunn II; Figure 7), and the other is a massive complex much closer to an ideal project than any that conceivably could have been built (Schönbrunn I; see Figure 5). The text in the plate of Schönbrunn I describes it as the “Premier projet que l’auteur a formé pour placer la Vénérable Impériale sur la hauteur de Schönbrun”; this inscription has long led scholars to assume a date before 1701, when Fischer sent prints of Schönbrunn to Salzburg, Graz, Berlin, and elsewhere. However, it has recently been shown that the plate of Schönbrunn I was made later, as the engraver, Johann Adam Delsenbach, was not yet fifteen years old in 1701 and first came to Vienna in 1710. The image is not included in the 1712 manuscript, and there is in fact no record of it before its appearance in the 1721 edition of the Entwurf. We now know that it was finished and integrated into the project by 1718, when Carl Gustaf Tessin included both Schönbrunn prints in his summary list of the contents, but it is uncertain whether Schönbrunn I circulated widely enough before then that Tessin the Younger could have acquired it. The problem is complicated by the inscription in the plate of Schönbrunn I.
Schönbrunn II, which does not specify that it is the second project for the palace. It is thus possible that Tessin the Younger owned an impression of Schönbrunn II but believed that it was Schönbrunn I when he annotated the summary made by his son.

The Entwurf Arrives in Stockholm

Early in 1720, still well over a year before the official publication, Heraeus sent an advance copy of the complete Entwurf to Carl Gustaf Tessin, who was now back in Stockholm. Recalling their meeting in Vienna nearly two years earlier, Heraeus noted that Carl Gustaf Tessin was already familiar with the work, which was almost unchanged from the outline he had made in Vienna. He sent it with a request that nothing be said about the matter to the imperial embassy in Stockholm, which, he explained opaquely, could cause diplomatic difficulties. Most importantly, he remarked specifically that, with the exception of a few prints, among them the second Schönbrunn project, no one had yet seen the work.60

The letter opens with a curious and awkwardly self-conscious paragraph in which Heraeus appears to confess that his correspondence was as much about establishing contact with Tessin the Younger as about friendship with Carl Gustaf Tessin. It is a theme that runs more subtly through all of the letters, where we find postscripts such as “you would do me a particular favor in giving my very humble regards to his Excellence, Monseigneur your father, who . . . gives honor to Sweden” that reflect the enormous influence and reputation of the architect in both cultural and political affairs.59 Now, in March 1720, Heraeus wrote:

One would not know how to be more sensitive than I to the goodness that you have wished for me, and to that politeness that appears in everything you do. . . . You have come at the interest of Monseigneur your father. It is true that I am not the first foreigner to praise the graces of that lord, and to recognize the grandeur of his sentiments both in his smaller actions and in the works he leaves to posterity. With all of this . . . [is] my very humble recognition of my obligation to you, and to the generosity of His Excellence [Tessin the Younger].60

It seems that the Entwurf, like the various other textual and graphic materials sent from Vienna, was probably intended more specifically for Tessin the Younger than for his son. This is entirely consistent with the context in which Carl Gustaf Tessin had first met Heraeus and Fischer: as his father’s representative responsible for updating his contacts and collections. Nonetheless, aside from the emperor and, presumably, a few close friends and collaborators, Tessin the Younger and Carl Gustaf Tessin were the first to see the Entwurf einer historischen Architektur.

The Tessins were well known as ravenous collectors of books and graphic materials related to the arts. Collecting was Carl Gustaf Tessin’s main task during his travel years in the 1710s. Yet, this episode is different from the general collection of source materials from book sellers and drawings dealers. It more specifically deals with whom Heraeus and, at least by consent, Fischer wanted to see Fischer’s work. Moreover, Fischer may have been more proactive in this exchange of materials than is immediately evident, for one of the remarkable aspects of this correspondence is that neither Carl Gustaf Tessin nor Heraeus leaves any hint that the Entwurf was a collaborative effort. Contrary to the attribution of the text to Heraeus in the 1712 manuscript, by 1718 both always referred to the book as the work of Fischer alone.

It may be that Heraeus in part acted on behalf of Fischer, much as Carl Gustaf Tessin represented his father, perhaps because Heraeus and Carl Gustaf Tessin were closer in age and seem to have gotten on well, even aside from their official duties. This association would also explain Heraeus’s request for detailed information from Tessin the Younger on Drottningholm Palace outside of Stockholm and other projects. Heraeus already had a series of views of this and other palaces in his incomplete album of plates from Suecia antiqua, so he probably now wished for measurements and even measured drawings. This was the sort of information that would be of more use to an architect and may ultimately have been requested by Fischer.61 The desire to send a copy of the Entwurf to the Tessins—as well as the willingness to risk difficulties with the imperial embassy—thus may have rested primarily with Fischer. The correspondence suggests something about whom Fischer considered his peers and is a useful antidote to the common perception that the leading architects in northern Europe were bound together primarily by their interest in Roman and Parisian sources.

The Afterlife of the Entwurf

Tessin the Younger’s initial enthusiasm for Fischer’s book did not fade over the following years, and he took a more active interest in it than in many of his other reference materials. Although the Entwurf was filed under “ancient monuments,” one of the major organizational categories of his library and graphic collections, Tessin the Younger did not think of it simply as a source of architectural reconstructions.62 This would have destroyed the integrity of Fischer’s
work and betrayed a complete misunderstanding of his achievement. Tessin the Younger turned to the Entwurff in 1724 in conjunction with a commission from Peter the Great for a church in St. Petersburg (Figure 8). Peter requested the project in a letter to the architect dated 2 December 1724, and Tessin the Younger was able to convey finished drawings for the church before the czar’s death on 8 February 1725 by sending a virtual copy of his unbuilt project for a sepulchral church in Stockholm.

Along with the drawings, Tessin the Younger included an extended explanation of the project that takes the form of a history of architecture. It begins with a description of Solomon’s Temple and then presents the seven wonders of the ancient world, discussing not only the buildings but also the antiquarian sources through which they were known. Tessin the Younger’s outline differs from Fischer’s Entwurff on a number of points. He omits non-European architecture, for instance, and he takes up contemporary monuments in Rome, Paris, and London that are curiously absent from Fischer’s work. As far as we know, Tessin the Younger included no prints or drawings with the text except for his own project for Peter. Yet the overall scheme is the same as the Viennese architect’s, particularly in its culmination in his own ecclesiastical project for the czar, which replaces Fischer’s Karlskirche as the pinnacle of northern European architectural development. The implication was that Tessin the Younger’s church was Peter’s chance for an eternal spot in the unfolding history of architecture. The architect wrote, “thus may your imperial majesty bring no greater immortal name to the future than through such a great church, as you are inclined to build to God’s glory.”

Peter may not have seen Tessin the Younger’s proposal since he died soon after making his request. Charles VI may have been flattered by the suggestion that the Holy Roman Empire was the successor of the various earlier empires outlined in Fischer’s book, but it is unlikely that he gave much thought to the work after the formal presentation of the manuscript in 1712. Early interest in the Entwurff seems rather to have been concentrated among practicing architects. Balthasar Neumann, who visited Vienna in 1718 and several times thereafter, owned a rare first edition of the work. Some drawings by Giuseppe Galli Bibiena, active in the imperial capital in these years, have reconstructions of ancient monuments very similar to Fischer’s. The Piedmontese Bernardo Antonio Vittone seems to have encountered the book for the first time during his studies in Rome in 1731–33; during this period, he evidently made numerous copies of individual monuments from the Entwurff. Decades later, he used some of the monuments as exempla in his Istruzioni diverse concernenti l’officio dell’architetto civile (1766) and recombined many of the monuments freely in his Istruzioni elementari per iniziare dei giovani allo studio dell’architettura civile (1760; Figure 9). A modified version of Fischer’s reconstruction of Hadrian’s mausoleum, now set on a three-story base, stands in the background, while a battered interpretation of Fischer’s pyramid of King Sotis at Heliopolis appears prominently in the foreground (Figure 10). Vittone was closely associated with Filippo Juvarra, who may have found stimulation for his monument-strewn landscapes in the Entwurff very soon after its publication in 1721.

By the end of the 1730s, interest in the Entwurff had spread even farther. Nicholas Hawksmoor and James Gibbs each owned a copy of either the German or English edition. Gibbs in particular used some reconstructions as models for his own projects. His Boycott Pavilion at Stowe and a project from 1740 for the Turner Mausoleum at Kirkleatham reflect various Fischer prints. Turner Mausoleum, for example, clearly appropriates Fischer’s image of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus.
The Morgan Library in New York holds two early sheets of notes and sketches after the *Entwurff* made by Giovanni Battista Piranesi, probably from the beginning of the 1740s (Figure 11). Piranesi went through Fischer’s book systematically, beginning at the top of the page and working from left to right as he copied whichever prints captured his fantasy.70 We can easily make out the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, the temples at Ephesus and Nineveh, pyramids at Thebes and Heliopolis (see Figures 10, 11), as well as other ancient monuments and, from the end of the work, vases. As Piranesi sketched the images in the order in which Fischer presented them, they reflect the book’s structure. Yet, this appears to have been of little concern to him. Piranesi had a sharp historical mind and contributed to the eighteenth-century debate on the primacy of Greek or Roman art, but these sheets of sketches have been interpreted as early influences in his development of the architectural fantasy, for which he drew on Fischer, Kircher, and others.71 With the exception of a large copy of the second project for Schönbrunn, all of the sketches are after Fischer’s reconstructions of ancient monuments and vases. Of the latter, Piranesi copied only those that were presented as antiquities, not those invented by Fischer. Like his peers, Piranesi showed no interest in the internal coherence or the comprehensive scope—geographical or chronological—of the book.

**Conclusion**

Architectural reconstructions had to some extent always been the domain of practicing architects. This was true from the sixteenth century, with Pirro Ligorio, Andrea Palladio, and Juan Bautista Villalpando—all recognized by Fischer in the preface of the *Entwurff*—as outstanding early examples of the tradition. If one of Fischer’s early inspirations for the *Entwurff* was in fact Wren, the idea for a broad history of architecture would also have been conceived in part within the context of a discussion between architects. Even as the project took on a grander cast, with a formal presentation to the emperor and a claim to a learned universal history, the evidence from the 1720s on suggests that architects were the primary audience of the *Entwurff*, even if they frequently had to borrow the book from the libraries of aristocrats.72

In the preface, Fischer wrote that he intended to offer examples of all sorts of architecture for the interested amateur and to provide new ideas and inventions for practitioners. He did not seek primarily to instruct intellectuals, although he no doubt hoped to attract a more educated audience as well. Nearly all of the architects who picked up the book treated it like any other collection of prints, drawing from it at will but showing no particular interest in the historical structure that made it so different from what had come before it.
Tessin the Younger approached the work very differently from his contemporaries. Most evidence of the *Entwurff's* reception and influence is graphic. Tessin the Younger’s explanation of his project for Peter the Great, which constitutes the only insight we have into his reflections on Fischer’s work, is entirely textual. This fact seems significant. Like Fischer (and Wren), Tessin the Younger was an architect-aristocrat, appreciative of both the humanistic and the purely inventive aspects of the book in a way not seen with the other architects who used it. Not until the second half of the eighteenth century do we find another practicing architect, Friedrich August Krubsacius in Dresden, grasping Fischer’s historical scheme and reworking it for his own purposes.

Carl Gustaf Tessin’s visit to Vienna in 1718 seems to have made Fischer and Tessin the Younger reflect on conversations concerning the history of art and architecture.
that took place in Rome nearly half a century earlier. At the ends of their lives, each recalled their shared intellectual interests. This explains Tessin the Younger’s particular impatience to see the Entwurff as well as his treatment of the book in a manner very different from the other literature and graphic material in his collections. His ability to comprehend the totality of the work may well be the reason that Fischer and Heraeus in Vienna were so eager to see the work reach him in Stockholm.

Notes
Part of this material was presented at the College Art Association meeting in Boston (February, 2006) and in Einsiedeln, Switzerland (July, 2006). I offer special thanks to Dr. Friedrich Polleröd, Vienna, for reading and commenting on the text, as well as to the anonymous readers for their insightful comments. My thanks also extend to the American-Scandinavian Foundation for supporting my archival work in Stockholm and to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation for funding the subsequent research and writing.
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