distinquished this academy of science by inserting a three-tiered observatory tower at its center. Oddly, when it was almost complete the czar dismissed him. Chiaveri therefore returned to Rome with his wife, Anna Elizabeth Forman-desbach. After a tumultuous year during which his only child died and Anna aban-
doned him, Chiaveri returned north, this time to Warsaw. Here he designed a catafalque for the funeral rites of Augustus the Strong and made proposals for expanding the Royal Castle. In 1734 Chiaveri accompanied Frederick Augustus to Krakow for his coronation, and four years later the king called him to Dresden for the most important com-
mision of his career.

Caraffa carefully charts the web of contacts in Rome and Dresden that helped Chiaveri rise to prominence. Her study is populated by powerful cardinals and ambassadors, as well as the Jesuit father Ignazio Guarini, whom she sees as the driving force behind Chiaveri’s suc-
cessful candidacy for the commission. She proves equally deft at stitching together the evolution of Chiaveri’s designs from the surviving drawings, prints, and gilt tin model. Before the architect began to draw he received dictates from the court. He had to include a bell tower, outfit the nave with a royal viewing balcony, and incorporate an ambulatory on the ground floor for religious processions. This latter requirement was crucial since leading Catholic processions through the streets of Dresden was still impolitic. The royal chapel at Versailles, which had both a royal balcony and ambulatory, provided the most important model. But Caraffa also stresses the influence of Fil-
ippo Juvarra’s designs for the Sacristy of St. Peter’s and ideal church plans pro-
duced for the competitions of the concorsi dementini in Rome. In particular she sees the methods of the concorsi, which chal-
lenged architects to meet a variety of functional demands, as crucial training.

Chiaveri demonstrated this preparation by resolving all of the require-
mements for the Hofkirche with remarkable ease. He divided the principal nave into
two levels, with the lower one designated for the public and the upper one for the court and royal family. He then wrapped the lower church with an ambulatory and flanked it with two additional naves. The result was a five-aisle basilica plan easily legible on the exterior where the higher central nave seems perched like a pre-
cious box atop a broad base.

The bell tower façade was Chiaveri’s most original invention. Combining Bernini’s bell tower designs for St. Peter’s with Borromini’s curving exteriors, Chi-
averi planned an oval tower that announces the church as one approaches across the Augustus Bridge. His Roman inspiration also triumphantly heralded the Catholic character of the building, a message carried across the rest of the exterior by Lorenzo Mattielli’s statues of saints. Caraffa devotes considerable attention to the sculpture, analyzing which saints were selected and where they were positioned. She reads the ensemble as a variation on Hapsburg propaganda used for the recatholicization of Bohemia. In Prague the cult of Czech saints, such as St. John Nepomunk, helped encourage popular piety. On the roofline of the Hofkirche statues of local saints, such as Benno of Meissen, were part of a similar visual rhetoric that the king hoped would win over the populace.

Caraffa does not tell us if these efforts succeeded. She notes that in 1741 a pamphlet appeared that attacked the architecture and its message. Disparaged as Borrominian, the church was too clearly a product of a Roman architect and too openly Catholic for the anony-
mous author. History was equally unkind. Narrowly viewed as a counter-
point to the Frauenkirche, it was never considered within the wider corpus of baroque architecture. Caraffa therefore closes her book by highlighting shared characteristics with structures in Russia, Prussia, Naples, and Sicily. Most of these connections are purely stylistic. But she claims that in Naples the Hofkirche resonated on a political level. Both states were headed by rulers that had only recently assumed a royal title, and both needed to consolidate their power in visual terms. To this end they commis-
ioned buildings that communicated confidence and daring, among them a court chapel. At Caserta the king of Naples planned a chapel very similar to the ones in Versailles and Dresden. And though its architect, Luigi Vanvitelli, would have denied the debt, Caraffa highlights specific details that he took from the Hofkirche.

Caraffa’s arguments about how architecture communicated political legitimacy and religious confession could have been strengthened by better organ-
ization. Her love of detail leads her at times to sacrifice the continuity of her larger narrative. Indeed the footnotes constitute their own substantial text. But these minor criticisms do not diminish her accomplishment. Enlivened by con-
siderable learning, her study foregrounds the Hofkirche as a monument of rare religious, political, and stylistic impor-
tance for Central Europe. Like the trumpets that open Bach’s Gloria, her research rouses us to consider one of the most important cultural accomplish-
ments of Saxony’s confessional divide.

ROBIN THOMAS
Pennsylvania State University

Thomas U. Walter: The Lectures on Architecture, 1841–1853

Thomas Ustick Walter (1804–87) is not the only major American architect who has never been favored with a mono-
ograph; one thinks of Isaiah Rogers, Wil-
son Eyre, and the elusive Bruce Price. But the absence is particularly distress-
ing in the case of Walter, the creator of Philadelphia’s Girard College and the United States Capitol dome, for his papers survive in almost their entirety. In 1982 the Athenaeum of Philadelphia acquired over five hundred architectural drawings from Walter’s descendants, along with diaries, letters, and other doc-
ments, amounting to some thirty thou-

Jhennifer Amundson, editor
although he also found time to discuss covered the whole of architectural his-
etory in architecture” (8). His lectures
delivered the public lectures that this
dressed with, and as a substitute 3 or 4
sand pages in all. But this archival cornu-
copia seems to have daunted scholars,
who to date have treated only selected
aspects of his career. One such facet is
Walter’s teaching of architectural history,
which is the subject of Jennifer Amund-
son’s handsome and well-illustrated edi-
tion of his lectures.

Walter was no academic. He was trained as a bricklayer by his father, who
superintended the building of William
Strickland’s Second Bank of the United
States (1819–24) and constructed the
mighty barrel vault of its main banking
room. Evidently taken with the young
Walter, Strickland took him in as an
apprentice (1819–21) and subsequently
as an assistant (1828–30). Walter also
attended the Drawing School that the
Franklin Institute established shortly
after its founding in 1824. There he once
again ran into Strickland, who delivered
eight lectures on the history of architec-
ture during the winter of 1824–25. This
fitful program—practical experience in
the building trades, drawing lessons, and
architectural history—constituted the
whole of Walter’s professional training.

Strickland would come to rue his
generosity when Walter bested him in
the competition to design Girard Col-
lege (1832). The construction of the vast
Greek Revival ensemble would lumber
on until 1847, establishing Walter as one
of the nation’s principal architects. But
construction faltered during 1841 (in
large part because of the collapse of the
Second Bank), and Walter devoted
much of the year to what we might call
professional development. He wrote
seven articles for the newly founded
Journal of the Franklin Institute (listed by
Amundson in a useful appendix) and also
delivered the public lectures that this
book documents.

Over six consecutive Thursday
evenings in the fall of 1841, Walter spoke
in the Franklin Institute’s public hall “to
a mixed audience of architectural stu-
dents and nonprofessionals with an inter-
est in architecture” (8). His lectures
covered the whole of architectural his-
tory, principally that of the West,
although he also found time to discuss
Chinese, Hindu, and even ancient Amer-
ican architecture. Beginning with
“Ancient Architecture,” he progressed in
historical sequence through “Greek
Architecture,” “Roman Architecture,”
“Medieval Architecture,” and “Modern
Architecture”; a concluding lecture was
entitled “Architecture Considered as a
Fine Art.” Following the convention of
the day, he read his lectures verbatim
from written manuscripts.

These surviving texts have been tran-
scribed by Amundson, who carefully notes
the minor emendations made in 1853 and
again in 1860 when Walter repeated the
lectures at the Columbian College in
Washington, D.C. (There were no other
performances, and requests in 1847 and
1866 that he repeat the series were cor-
dially declined.) What has not survived,
 alas, is the visual material that Walter pre-
pared to illustrate his lectures. Much as
John Soane had done for his lectures at
the Royal Academy a generation earlier,
Walter made large colored drawings and
placed them on an easel before the audi-
ence. By 1859 these drawings had disap-
ppeared, or so we know from Walter’s
anguished efforts to find them. By way of
compensation, Amundson provides an
inventory of those drawings he is known
to have used, and illustrates her book with
comparable images taken from books that
he owned and used.

Such lectures on the history of
architecture usually consisted of pious
recitations of platitudes, and Walter drew
heavily from his European contempo-
raries, such as James Elmes, whose
Lectures on Architecture (1823) is cited
repeatedly. But Walter was too percep-
tive a commentator—and too familiar
with the physical reality of masonry con-
struction—to echo his sources uncriti-
cally. After all, he had just built one of
the largest marble porticos in the Greek
mode since antiquity, which gave him a
healthy skepticism toward received wis-
dom. He rejected as “fanciful” Vitruvius’s
account of the origin of the classical
orders, and suggested instead that they
grew out of Egyptian prototypes (78). At
some later point, however, he reversed
himself and inserted a passage claiming
the orders were logical abstractions of
carpentry. Such emendations let us see
his evolving architectural thought,
although it is not clear how much this is
due to reading and how much to the les-
sions of his advancing practice.

Likewise, one can never know how
slavishly nineteenth-century orators
declared their texts. Walter seemed will-
ing to extemporize on occasion, to judge
by the odd parenthetical aside to himself,
as in his account of the Egyptian style:
“The Prisons at Newark and at Trenton in
New Jersey, and the Female Apartment
of the Philad Prison, are likewise in this
style, and are all stone structures. (Remark
on the errors of the present day in refer-
ence to this style)” (45).

But just what, exactly, were those
“errors of the present day”? One was the
top-heavy dome that Charles Bulfinch
(whose name he tactfully omits) placed
atop the United States Capitol. Walter
contrasts its “ponderosity and ineleg-
ance” with the “lower and more grace-
ful curve” envisioned by Benjamin
Henry Latrobe, the mentor of Strickland
and an architect whom he praises fre-
quently throughout his lectures (188).
Paradoxically, Walter would come to
crown the Capitol with an even mightier
dome (1851–65), but here he gauged its
height to correspond to his lateral exten-
sions. Such an aesthetic appeal to the
judgment of the eye is rare in the lec-
tures, which tend to convey a certain
scholarly pedantry and not the questing
openness of a practicing artist. Thus
Walter repeatedly cites exempli-
ary specimens of the orders, such as John
Not-
man’s gatehouse at Laurel Hill
Cemetery: “the only correct Roman
Doric specimen on a large scale in the
neighborhood of Philadelphia” (113).

Walter is most fascinating in his
occasional comments on contemporary
architecture, as when he describes the
effect of the Greek Revival craze on
Philadelphia’s builders. Here we get a
vivid sense of his living experience as a
teensage housewright:

The heavy Roman eaves were wholly dis-
pensed with, and as a substitute 3 or 4
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courses of brick were slightly projected from the face of the wall and gravely called a cornice; . . . facias, or projections extending across the façade to indicate the several stories were considered so outré that people had them cut out of the fronts even of old houses; and the everlasting round headed doors, were universally adopted, at the expense of the most obvious principles of good taste; thus presenting a façade without the slightest projection except what was made in some instances by thin window sills, and the tasteless apology for a cornice at the top (190).

In almost every respect, this volume is scrupulously and intelligently edited, with a thoughtful introduction and useful marginal notes. I could find only one error of fact: the Unitarian Church in the Greek Doric mode, where Rev. William Henry Furness preached, was designed not by Walter but Strickland (89). But there is one most unfortunate omission: Amundsen does not cite Jeffrey A. Cohen’s “Building a Discipline: Early Institutional Settings for Architectural Education in Philadelphia, 1804–1890,” which has much to say about the role of the Franklin Institute in architectural education.1 Cohen points out that Walter taught at “that Institution for two successive seasons” (154), the first of which began in late 1840, preceding by a full year his course on architectural history. In that first season he spoke not as a historian but as a practicing architect, with some intellectual substance? The architects of antebellum Philadelphia consisted almost exclusively of carpenter-builders who after an improvised program of guided reading and drawing instruction declared themselves to be architects. Some of them, such as John Notman and Samuel Sloan, achieved national prominence; one wonders if they were among Walter’s audience.

How important were Walter’s lectures? They seem to have produced at least one architect of note: John McArthur Jr. A classical revivalist of genuine conviction, McArthur was the designer of Philadelphia’s City Hall, a building that owed much to the counsel of Walter, who served from 1874 to 1887 as McArthur’s chief assistant. That these two men could work together so long and so harmoniously, and in a hierarchy that inverted their original relationship, could scarcely have been possible had they not shared a similar conception of architecture, both formal and philosophical.

In the end, Walter’s model of architectural history was politely conventional, assuming implicitly that Athenian classicism was “the full perfection of art” (73). It posed no challenge to the existing order, as did the theory of contemporaries such as Heinrich Hübsch or A. W. N. Pugin. Perhaps this accounts for the relative neglect of Walter in American architectural history, which has always been more curious about rule breakers than rule givers.

Michael J. Lewis
Williams College

Notes
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Vienna was among the few cities on the eve of World War I that could boast of having three full generations of modern architects. The first generation had a sole representative—Otto Wagner, born in 1841, who had almost single-handedly crafted the basis for the new aesthetic in the early 1890s. The second generation, more numerous, was comprised of those who had been born three decades later, in the years around 1870. Its leaders—Leopold Bauer, Josef Hoffmann, Adolf Loos, and Joseph Maria Olbrich—had all been reared elsewhere, in the provinces.