TEXTO ORIXINAL

'**All for Information**': **John Ruskin and Architectural Archaeology***

Alexandrina Buchanan
University of Liverpool

'From Romanticism to Modernism', the title of this volume of *Quintana*, implies a journey: from one world view, episteme, paradigm or simply one era to another. The subject of this essay, John Ruskin, the unclassifiable nineteenth-century writer, art critic, social commentator and educator, has been represented both as a (misleading) leader along the route, for example by Rosalind Krauss, writing of 'the modernist vocation of [Ruskin's] stare', or as an advertisement for the destination or cartographer for the voyagers.[1] We might even see, with Jennifer Bloomer, that the prose which Krauss castigates as 'prolix, endlessly digressive, a mass of description, theories that tail off into inconclusiveness, volume after volume, a flood of internal contradiction', his preference for serial publication and the nature of his production, as visual as it was textual, is confluent with the nonlinear and intensely visual narratives of the Internet, making Ruskin not merely a cartographer of modernism but of postmodernism too.[2] Yet historical journeys, whether as experienced or as represented are rarely smooth and straightforward, and between Romanticism and Modernism there are many sidetracks and byways. In this essay, I would like to explore one of the paths –a pilgrimage even– taken by Ruskin.

Our story starts with a journey: Ruskin's 1845 research trip to Italy for the second volume of his well-received book, *Modern Painters*, published two years earlier. On arriving in the Tuscan city of Lucca, however, he became conscious of a lodestone leading him in a different and unknown direction. As he wrote to his father 'What in the world am I to do in - or out of - this blessed Italy I cannot tell. I have discovered enough in an hour's ramble after mass, to keep me at work for a twelvemonth.'[3] It has been argued that it is when travelling heightens our perceptions and this was certainly the case for Ruskin. What he had discovered was San Frediano, a Romanesque church of the twelfth century, and a number of other churches of a similar date, beautiful but falling into ruin, which prompted Ruskin to one of his characteristically rambling rants against the French occupiers and Italian natives, seeing 'nothing done but evil, irremediable, self multiplying, all swallowing evil, vice and folly everywhere, idleness and inf[ideli]ty, & filth, and misery, and desecration, dissipated youth & wicked manhood & withered, sickly, hopeless old age.' He concluded 'I don't know what I shall do.'

What he did was to set to work to try to make sense of his reactions by recording such remains as he could, both in words and in images, creating in the process an archive which became the treasury from which he constructed *The Stones of Venice* (3 volumes, 1851-3). His project took eight years in total and left Ruskin exhausted and dissatisfied. In one sense, it could be seen as a digression, and its most widely discussed result, the revival of Italian Gothic as a popular style for emulation by nineteenth-century architects was one Ruskin later decried. How-

ever the project forced Ruskin to engage in different ways with concepts he had already begun to explore: notions of truth, life and labour, which would profoundly influence his future direction. At the same time, it produced new ways of working and new ways of seeing, of which the texts and drawings are the product. His drawing practice moved from the production of picturesque views for polite consumption to include rough sketches produced, as in my title, 'all for information', with an urgency about them which was entirely new.

What I would like to suggest, however, that Ruskin was not alone on this journey and that, although *sui generis*, his changing practice should be associated with new recording practices by other groups. Previous scholars have identified Ruskin's geological practice as being relevant to his architectural recording and I will offer further evidence in support of this suggestion. In addition, I would like to suggest there needs to be further evaluation of Ruskin's links with the antiquarian community, which was itself in the process of transformation in the 1840s as the principles of 'scientific archaeology' took hold. Although Ruskin is rarely considered as an 'architectural historian' it should be remembered that this label was not yet available and contemporary antiquaries were trying out various approaches in relation to the buildings of the past. Within this landscape of experiment, Ruskin's project seems less idiosyncratic - and supports recent arguments that antiquarianism can represent a form of modernity, not its opposite.[4] There are similarities between their approaches, both as products of a new awareness of the role of the observer identified by Jonathan Crary and in relation to new audiences.[5] Despite Romanticism's emphasis on the individual, that personage was almost certainly a member of an educated elite, who could draw upon a shared set of pictorial values and associations. Ruskin identified a new form of art emerging in the nineteenth century, that of the 'Modern Painters', whose landscape art, whilst heir to a long tradition, was nevertheless new and appealed to a rather different audience: the bourgeoisie. In identifying Turner as a 'genius' (as much as a print-maker as for his role as a painter) he also gave dignity to an occupation formerly associated with 'trade'.[6] Nineteenth-century theories of mind emphasized the universality of basic viewing capacity: hence the possibility of the lower orders being 'improved' through access to art. By converting visual experience into information, or universally-accessible 'facts', the new modes of representation were not merely communicating a personal visual experience but recording and disseminating data. Such data brought its objects out of the realms of the imagination and into the 'universal archive', which is associated both with the colonialist will to control - including taking control of the past - and a more democratic freedom of information. By his insistence on personal recording, rather than reliance on a jobbing draughtsman, Ruskin insisted on the importance of drawing as a means of understanding, rather than mere representation or memorialization. Both the archaeologists, and Ruskin, in different but related ways, represent what Crary has argued of Western modernity since the nineteenth century, a demand 'that individuals define and shape themselves in terms of a capacity for "paying attention", that is, for a disengagement from a broader field of attraction […] for the sake of isolating or focusing on a reduced number of stimuli.'[7]

The Picturesque

In order to chart the course of Ruskin's journey, it is necessary first to describe his starting point, both in terms of the role architectural drawing played in his life and the associated styles of representation he adopted. Since his youth, Ruskin had been taught to draw within the prevailing picturesque tradition. The Picturesque was a semi-coherent set of theories, united by an instantly recognizable visual mode: a preference for the rough over the smooth, a fascination with ruins, degradation and decay rendered visually appealing through aesthetic representation and appreciation, and the creation of landscapes artfully contrived to appear natural and timeless. The Picturesque operated iteratively: an observer within this mode actively sought views of rural and urban environments which conformed to appropriate pictorial rules and thus were 'picturesque', which were then translated into drawn and painted 'views' which confirmed these rules.

Picturesque modes of observation had been essential to the revival of Gothic as an aesthetic category worthy of appreciation. Many medieval buildings were in a state of ruin and thus became (or were made into) ornaments to the landscape; others were in a poor state of repair and thus conformed to the ideals of roughness and decay. They were rich in associations: national, political and religious, which could appeal to a wide range of ideologies. However, the Picturesque was more than simply an aesthetic: it also informed patterns of behaviour and sociability. Whereas in the eighteenth-century, the aristocrats of Europe went on a 'Grand Tour' to visit the sights of Classical Antiquity and to collect antiquities and Old Masters, in the nineteenth-century the wealthier bourgeoisie also began to travel for cultural purposes. One of the virtues of the Picturesque, for its promoters, was its accessibility (to anyone with the leisure and money to travel). However the sights they explored and the mementoes they collected were those sanctioned by the Picturesque. Again, the pattern was iterative - the Ruskins purchased

books such as Rogers's *Italy*, with its illustrations by J. M. W. Turner, and the novels of Sir Walter Scott and were thereby inspired to visit the locations described and depicted, which the young John Ruskin then recorded in picturesque sketches. These then became props to the family's social interactions: shown and shared among their friends and acquaintances.

The social aspect of the Picturesque is nowhere more apparent than in Ruskin's introduction to University life. His unusual upbringing and unorthodox education led to an otherworldliness which distanced him from his peers but it is clear that drawing was key to his acceptance –and even celebrity– at Oxford.

Henry George Liddell, the future Dean of Christ Church (Ruskin's college), reported in 1837 that 'I am going to [...] see the drawings of a very wonderful gentleman commoner here who draws wonderfully. He is a very strange fellow, always dressing in a greatcoat with a brown velvet collar, and a large neck-cloth tied over his mouth and living quite in his own way among the odd set of hunting and sporting men that gentlemen commoners usually are.'[8] Ruskin's mother, who had accompanied her son to Oxford, proudly reported to her husband how news of his artistic prowess soon spread. Ruskin was preparing for bed when there was a loud knock at his door:

The doors were opened and Mr. Liddle [Liddell] & Mr. Gassford [Gaisford, Dean of Christ Church] entered. John was glad he had wine to offer but they would not take any they had called to see sketches John says Mr. Liddle looked at them with the eye of a judge and delight of an artist and swore they were the best sketches he had ever seen John accused him of quizzing but he assured John he really thought them excellent'.[9]

Ruskin added, as a postscript, that '[Hon Stephen Fox-] Strangeways says he's coming to see some *very beautiful* sketches of mine whose fame has reached his ears, I suppose through Liddell –who was quite enthusiastic– and when I said it was the scenes which made the pictures, d——d the scenes.'[10]

We do not know which of Ruskin's early drawings attracted such admiration, although whilst Ruskin was still in London he had shown architect E.B. Lamb an 1835 drawing of Rouen Cathedral, possibly the one reproduced in *Works* (Fig. 1). This is characteristic of Ruskin's earlier manner, which he later described as 'Proutish' after topographical artist Samuel Prout, his original model. He continued to use similar compositional devices and sketching techniques whilst at Oxford, in drawings like 'Merton College Chapel' (Fig. 2). Typical features of this style are the delineation of forms by broken lines and blobs and limited use of shading, with depth provided by compositional means. It is for this reason that Ruskin suggested that it was the scenes that made the pictures, for he had carefully selected viewpoints intended to maximize the picturesque effect. In addition, there is a focus on 'little picturesque incidents', both for their visual appeal and to provide anchors to determine the relationship between different elements of the scene.[11] Ruskin picked out the same sorts of detail as Prout: sections of roof tile, brickwork visible behind peeling plaster and the furniture of doors and windows. Another typical treatment is the mouldings, depicted by lines rather than shading and having an incrusted appearance, somewhat akin to piped icing. This was a treatment he recognized as deriving from his own visual predilections, which he then represented according to conventions learned from Prout. As he explained

all carving came nearly alike to me, so only that it was rich. I cared only for "curliewurlies and whigmarleeries," and was as happy in the fifteenth century as in the tenth. Although already I had begun to draw traceries carefully, and the tabernacle work connected with them, for crockets, bosses, or decorated moldings, I used only such rude and confused lines as I had learned to imitate from Prout, and left their places blank in my sketches, to be filled up "out of my head" at home.[12]

Most of Ruskin's early works were uncoloured, in accordance with approved pedagogic practice. His sketch of the spire of Oxford cathedral (his college chapel) is a rare venture into paint and shows as yet little facility for its use to record age and texture (Fig. 3). Of course, colour was at that date difficult to reproduce mechanically and many of Ruskin's early sketches seem to have been produced either with an eye to publication or shaped by its norms. One of the ways in which he had learned to sketch was by copying topographical prints and the pen and ink copies of the sketches he produced on his 1835 tour were similarly bordered and labeled, and at least one view produced on his 1837 tour exists in two versions: a pencil sketch and a worked up pen and ink copy more suitable for public display.[13] Some of the 1837 sketches were reproduced in Ruskin's first published work on architecture, the incomplete 'Poetry of Architecture' essays which appeared between 1837-8 in the *Architectural Magazine*, published by John Loudon, doyen of the Picturesque. Although of interest to the development of Ruskin's architectural thought and strong evidence for the influence of the Picturesque on his architectural descriptions, there is no need to discuss these essays further here, for they show little, if any, evidence of the influence of contemporary antiquarianism. As Ruskin then defined his project: 'Our object, let it always be remembered, is not

the attainment of architectural data but the formation of taste'.[14] Instead, his technical vocabulary is derived from landscape design,[15] whilst his arguments regarding the origins of architectural forms are based on travel writing, in which buildings appear as one element of local manners and morals, often associated with the climate and landscape of the country being described. This was a common trope and Ruskin's sources have not been identi-fied, but one example of the genre, from the many others that could be cited, is William Edward Lane's *Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (1836), which included illustrations and descriptions of Egyptian houses, mosques, shops and baths.

Drawing as Data Collection

It was also whilst he was at Oxford, however, that Ruskin became more familiar with another mode of ob-servation, whose primary aim was not visually aesthetic, although its associative character could be as strong as that of the Picturesque. This was the scientific gaze, associated with the practice of drawing for gathering and analyzing data according to the ideals of inductive science.[16] Later in his life, Ruskin specifically paralleled the art he advocated with the inductive method, associated in nineteenth-century Britain with the work of Francis Bacon (1561-1626), whom he identified as 'having first opened the study of the law of material, when, formerly, men had thought only of the laws of human mind; and Turner having first opened the study of the aspect of material nature, when, before, men had thought only of the aspect of the human form.'[17]

Ruskin would already have encountered scientific modes of representation through his study of geology, a common amateur pursuit and one which was a sociable as enjoying the Picturesque. Before arriving at Oxford he had become a member of the Geological Society, where he met William Buckland, a Fellow of Christ Church and Ruskin's neighbour on Peckwater Quad. Nineteenth-century geology had been transformed by the recognition that rock formations were in themselves evidence of their date and the vicissitudes through which their constitu-ent minerals had passed. Thus the order and form of the different strata became important information, which could best be recorded through drawing. In Ruskin's mind, geological and architectural description were closely linked. Throughout his 1835 diary notebook, his descriptions of Alpine rock formations are packed with archi-tectural metaphors: buttresses, staircases, columns and pinnacles (these therefore far predate his use of similar metaphors in *Stones*). He noted that in some places 'the rocks are complete fac-similes of old stone walls' and took particular interest in the joints and cleavages, prefiguring his later focus on architectural masonry.[18] Many of his notes are illustrated with rapid diagrams showing the profiles of mountains and, in particular, details of stratigraphy. Ruskin's facility with geological representation was such that he was commissioned by Buckland to produce images for his lectures. These were nevertheless still infused with the Picturesque: Ruskin later described his lecture diagram (now lost) of the granite veins at Trewavas Head Cornwall, as including a small boat weather-ing the point in a sudden storm, in the style of Copley Fielding (one of his drawing masters, particularly celebrated for his depiction of marine scenes).[19] The sea and temporary weather conditions would have been irrelevant to the geological lesson conveyed by the image and show how Ruskin was concerned as much with the artistic and pictorial value of the scene as its informational content.

As we have seen, Ruskin's surviving drawings of architecture at Oxford were also firmly within the picturesque mode established before his arrival. However, despite the widespread approbation they received, they were not universally praised. For example, according to *Praeterita* (his autobiography), on one occasion Ruskin was drawing the spire of Oxford cathedral (probably Fig 3). On passing, his friend Henry Acland, another Christ Church student, asked Ruskin why he had drawn the cornice with only five brackets, rather than the eight actually present. Ruskin claimed he defended this decision by arguing that the clearer depiction permitted by his version 'really gave the effect of the spire better than a more literal one would'.[20] If Fig 3 is the sketch to which this anecdote relates, Ruskin's recollection was faulty, as he admitted, because he has shown seven arches, resting on eight brackets, but the principle is correct, because the actual building has nine arches resting on ten brackets. This exchange did not immediately effect a change in his drawing style but eventually 'the lesson told […] and whatever the art of my drawing might be, its arithmetic at least was trustworthy.'

Henry Acland was another of Ruskin's coterie with some limited artistic skills, which Ruskin attempted to fos-ter,[21] but he was first and foremost a scientist (he later became Professor of Medicine) and was therefore familiar with the role of drawings in conveying information. Like Ruskin later, he had been forced to interrupt his time at University through ill-health and embarked on a European tour in 1837-8, which took him to Greece. Here he received a letter from his tutor, Liddell:

Take pains, and make many (I need not add faithful) sketches of that fair land, and gladden my eyes with more representations of these spots which I have sometimes fondly dreamed to look on, but now can scarce expect to do so. Especially will you make me a correct drawing of the Temple of Nike Apteros which they have lately restored? Also, will you find out what the rock of the Acropolis is, and generally what is the nature of the soil? Lastly, the precise distances of well-known points would be a very useful thing to know.[22]

Although it is clear that Liddell wanted sketches in part for their associative value, his emphasis on fidelity and accuracy suggest that their informational value was uppermost in his mind and that he believed Acland would share this ideal. Acland's comment to Ruskin may have been intended as gentle teasing, the focus of his jibe suggests the perceived value of verisimilitude when translating observation into representation.

Antiquarianism

The second lesson came from another friend, Charles Newton, a few years Ruskin's senior. Ruskin noted that Newton, later to become a major figure in British archaeology and Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum, was 'already notable in his intense and curious way of looking into things'.[23] Newton was one of the founders of the Oxford Society for Promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture (OSPSGA) which, according to another founder member, T. W. Weare, was originally a Christ Church society, founded by himself and Newton in 1838.[24] Ruskin, by contrast, claimed the founding impetus came from 'Mr. Parker' (John Henry Parker, local publisher and bookseller) whom, along with Newton, he acknowledged as teaching him 'more accurately the study of architecture'. The 1830s and 40s saw the proliferation of local societies dedicated to archaeology, as well as to natural history and geology (sometimes in the same body), making these pursuits sociable and collaborative and revealing their growing appeal to wider audiences. The normal proceedings involved the presentation of papers by the societies' leading figures and in October 1839, Newton asked Ruskin to prepare some diagrams for a lecture he was giving to the new society on the celebrated romanesque parish church at Iffley, in the vicinity of Oxford. Although noted for his later determination to obtain accurate records of the sites on which he worked, Newton evidently adhered to the earlier practice by which antiquaries employed others to create their illustrations.

The OSPSGA was founded at the height of the Oxford (or Tractarian) Movement, a controversial Anglican reform movement campaigning to revive what were believed to be early Christian beliefs and practices via a return to medieval liturgy and beliefs widely associated with Roman Catholicism. Although many members of the Oxford Society had Tractarian sympathies, and its objectives included the promotion of the revival of Gothic, its activism was muted and its aims could be seen as antiquarian and archaeological as much as they were religious. This meant that the Evangelical Ruskin and his mother were happy to join.[25] Although Ruskin could only have attended meetings during the Society's first year, the ideas discussed were already circulating in Oxford - indeed an earlier body, the Ashmolean Society, had in 1831 received a lecture by Richard Hurrell Froude on 'Church architecture', illustrated with sketches mainly from Oxford buildings, including St Giles's Church, where Froude had spent three days 'taking measurements, tracings, mouldings and sketches'.[26] The published version reveals that Froude voiced many of the themes later explored by the OSPSGA, which were indeed the common currency of 'scientific archaeology' in the 1830s and 1840s. These included the ambition of constructing a precise stylistic table by which all buildings could be dated by their visual appearance; the identification of 'landmark' buildings in which stylistic changes were first found; and an interest in identifying the rules, or principles, of medieval architecture and how these both derived and differed from the principles of Classicism and then followed their own formal logic.[27] Froude also showed particular interest in construction processes, defining the distinction between the first and second styles of medieval architecture in terms of the substitution of cut stone for rubble masonry. The role of masonry as a dating device was of similar interest to J. H. Parker for it supported his particular concern with the transition from early to late Romanesque and then to early Gothic, an issue explored in his 1839 paper to the society on the romanesque crypt of St Peter's Church in the East compared with the chapel in the White Tower, London.[28] The lectures in the first year of the OSPSGA's existence showed similar preoccupations, with papers on Saxon and Romanesque architecture, on medieval domestic architecture and stained glass and other papers on local churches. Each of the papers shows some interest in issues of patronage as well as dating, for modern archaeologists wanted to distinguish themselves from the antiquaries of the past and take their place as essential partners in the writing of history. As Newton would later put it, in an address to the Archaeological Institute (a national body) at their meeting in Oxford in 1851: 'The first object of the Archaeologist, in studying a building, should be to ascertain its date, the race by whom, and the purpose for which it was erected. But his task does not end with this primary classification; he ought to indicate the value of Architecture as evidence for the Historian, to read and interpret the indirect record it embodies.'[29]

To support its remit, the Society became an avid collector of prints, drawings and casts. Its surviving archive, sadly depleted, reveals the wide range of styles found in contemporary antiquarian representations. Many of the original records were created by the members themselves, showing how architectural recording had become a polite pursuit, although the society also retained an engraver and a modeler, echoing earlier practice by the Society of Antiquaries of London. The highlight of the collection was a corpus of drawings produced by Thomas Rickman, author of *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of Architecture* (1817), which popularized the standard division of English medieval architecture into the 'Norman', Early', Decorated' and 'Perpendicular' English styles, and widely considered 'the father of modern architecture in the scientific sense'.[30] Rickman's drawings, in both style and substance, were entirely different from those of the contemporary Picturesque (Fig. 4). He was self-taught, only acquiring the rudiments of perspective long after he had started sketching, and had no interest in capturing the effects of age, of light and shade or the surrounding landscape in his records.[31] The drawings in his publications are delineated with delicate ink lines, ruled or drawn with compasses if necessary. The marks of age are effaced and buildings appear as crisply carved as when new, with masonry joints shown only as evidence of building material, not as textural motif. His records also dissected buildings into individual features (such as doors, windows and mouldings), which he then classified by style. It is clear that when Rickman visited a building, he viewed it not as a picturesque whole but as a museum of specimens which needed to be abstracted from their actual location in order to be positioned within a chronological framework, from which they could then instruct other 'discriminating' viewers. Similarly diagrammatic modes were used by other antiquaries admired by the OSPSGA, such as William Whewell and Robert Willis, who were both made honorary members on the Society's creation. It is probable, therefore, that this was the mode of representation Newton had in mind when he asked Ruskin to produce lecture diagrams for his paper, delivered on 29 October 1839.[32] As Ruskin records the incident, Newton requested 'that I would draw a Norman door for him, on which he was going to read a paper to the Architectural Society. When I got to work on it, he had to point out to me that my black dots and Proutesque breaks were no manner of use to him, and that I must be content to draw steady lines in their exact place and proportion. I fulfilled his directions with more difficulty than I had expected - and produced the first architectural drawing of any value I ever had made in my life.'[33]

Both the anecdotes, and Ruskin's assessment of the influence of the OSPSGA members, identify a new, more literal, or accurate, manner of translating architecture onto paper. The lessons learned at Oxford, however, were destined for a long germination in terms of Ruskin's practice. At the time he felt 'the accuracy was irksome to me; - the result I thought cold and commonplace'.[34] Nevertheless, he would accept the importance of accuracy as an ideal, albeit not carried out to antiquarian standards. Thus when poor health forced him to abandon his formal education and he embarked with his parents on another European tour, commenced in September 1840, the sketches he produced were still 'partly in imitation of Prout, partly of David Roberts' (another picturesque artist and printmaker).[35] Although he admitted his difficulties in trying to capture the effects he so admired in the work of Turner, he nevertheless came to regard the drawings as having some 'historical interest in their accuracy of representation'.[36] Moreover, Ruskin was no longer happy to accept Prout's views as accurate records - he recorded in his diary that he intended on his return to compare his interpretation of one of the capitals of the Doge's Palace with Prout's view of the building 'though I fear he won't bear it.'[37]

Truth

It is not the aim of this article to offer detailed analysis of Ruskin's notions of truth. Nevertheless, it is necessary to untangle the different strands of thinking that wove the cable to which he clung, because it was against this moral quality that all his 'arguments of the eye' were tested. At the same time, an appeal to 'truth' was a rhetorical device, for until Whistler argued (against Ruskin) that art should have its own sphere, separate from that of morality, few nineteenth-century readers or viewers were likely to reject the value of 'truthfulness'.

At the heart of Ruskin's concept of Truth was its characteristic as an essential attribute of God. To be truthful was therefore to represent God. Even though he had religious doubts throughout his life, and eventually turned his back on the Evangelical God of his upbringing, he continued to view nature as 'Creation', the manifestation of a coherent design, either divine in origin or the product of its own laws and integrity.[38] Like the authors of the 1830s 'Bridgewater Treatises', commissioned to demonstrate the 'Power, Wisdom, and Goodness of God, as manifested in the Creation', Ruskin wanted to see no difference between 'scientific' and 'theological' ways of viewing and interpreting the world. It is therefore not surprising to find, at the very start of the diary of his 1849 research trip, a series of quotations from the Bible, all relating to the theme of 'Truth'.[39] At the same time, Ruskin's

notion of truth was Platonic: it was an idea, not a thing and could only be grasped intellectually, emotionally and spiritually, not directly through the eyes.

The belief that Nature was the visible creation of God and therefore embodied Truth, however, puts art in a potentially problematic position: it is not Nature, but its representation, and the representation may not be a true one, and could even be a lie. What constituted a 'true' representation was therefore a vital issue that Ruskin would explore throughout his life.

Ruskin's training in the Picturesque exposed him to a number of concepts. Firstly, picturesque sketchers were encouraged to draw in front of the object of their attention. Various pieces of equipment, including the Claude glass, the *camera obscura* and the *camera lucida*, were devised to capture exact outlines of any scene identified as inherently picturesque. If not inherently picturesque, a scene could be 'improved', either through changing details of what was represented (for example, by representing a ruin as more ruinous and ivy-clad) or through the artist's skills of mark-making or coloration, thus rendering a repellent subject aesthetically beautiful. The tension between beauty lying in the choice of subject or in its mode of representation underpins the debate between Ruskin and Liddell already mentioned. In that exchange, Ruskin argued for the primacy of subject but this may have been a sign of false modesty, for he too was known to 'improve' scenes. One of the illustrations in the 'Poetry of Architecture' was intended to represent an English dwelling in its landscape (Fig. 6) as both evidence and visual reinforcement of his argument about their connectedness. He illustrated a real building, Coniston Old Hall, but any observer by Coniston Water could verify Ruskin's later claim that he exaggerated the height of the background hills in order to enable the building to be represented within its Lake District setting, rather than as it would literally have appeared via a *camera lucida*.[40] This argument introduces another facet to Ruskin's concept of truthful representation: that it should be truthful to what is signified, rather than to how the signifier might be shown through the conventional rules of representation, such as perspective.

The distinction between signifier and signified was the basis for Ruskin's defence of his drawing of the Christ Church spire. In the same letter already quoted, he suggested that 'the mere conveying of a certain quantity of technical knowledge respecting any given scene can never be the object of art. Its aim is not to tell me how many bricks there are in a wall, nor how many posts in a fence, but to convey as much as possible the general emotions arising out of the real scene into the spectator's mind.'[41] By this argument, Ruskin's art was aiming to communicate the affect of the scene, rather than the details of the scene itself. 'You will soon emancipate yourself from any idea that artists' sketches are to be mere camera-lucidas, mere transcripts of mechanism and measurement'.[42] This was an argument to which Ruskin adhered throughout his life, which in his latter years supported the production of views every bit as 'impressionistic' in appearance as the work of Whistler or Monet. However during the early years of the 1840s, he developed a new attitude towards the relationship between truth and visual accuracy. The outcome of this change of opinion is conveyed in a letter to Acland of 1845, in which he critiques *Modern Painters* I: 'Finally, my distinction between things as they are and ought to be is rascally - things *are* as they ought to be. (If my drawing master had but told me this, I should have been a good artist by this time, but the fellow talked about improving nature, and be d—d to him.)'[43]

Ruskin's refutation of Aristotle's poetic theory can be related to a series of mystical experiences which he related in *Praeterita*. The most famous, said to have occurred when sketching an aspen tree at Fontainebleau in June 1842, is told as follows: "Languidly, but not idly, I began to draw it; and as I drew […] the beautiful lines insisted on being traced […] With wonder increasing every instant, I saw that they 'composed' themselves, by finer laws than any known of men. At last, the tree was there, and everything that I had thought before about trees, nowhere."[44] The veracity of this account has been questioned,[45] but it is clear that during these years Ruskin developed an enhanced attentiveness to natural forms and a belief that these forms in themselves could communicate truths to the watchful observer.

The basic argument of *Modern Painters* I, written soon after this epiphany, is that its hero, J. M. W. Turner, was peculiarly attuned to the inner laws by which the aspen's branches had composed themselves in Ruskin's own drawing. These were scientific laws, true of all natural objects, and therefore rather than attending to the incidental pleasures of the Picturesque, Ruskin advocated that young artists should study science sufficiently to be able to represent the 'truths' of natural forms in their work. The experienced artist, such as Turner, however, might go beyond the truths known to science and represent truths as yet unknown. Only by humbly attending to external form could the artist access inner meaning: a 'conception of drawing as both a scientific records and an act of worship which had nothing to do with "picture-making".'[46]

Modern Painters I offers evidence for Ruskin's views on truth in relation to architectural draughtsmanship as they changed between the appearance of the first and third editions (1843 and 1846 respectively), the period within which I argue for a change in his attitude. Whilst the general outline of his principles relating to 'Truth' remained the same, the chapter in which he discussed their application was greatly expanded, both to include more artists and to include more situations in which truth could be displayed, including architectural sketching. In the first edition, architectural representation is discussed in two sections. The first is Ruskin's celebrated comparison between Canaletto, Prout, Stanfield and Turner in their recording of Venice.[47] According to his analysis, Canaletto fails to record either the architecture or the atmosphere of Venice; Prout records the spirit, but his architecture is inaccurate, and in Stanfield's work 'all is perfection and fidelity' as to the architecture, but 'all is drawn hard and sharp, there is nothing to hope for or find, nothing to dream or discover'. In Turner, alone, was there both atmosphere and architecture, the latter indistinctly but not through a lack of concern for accuracy but rather as a record of the experience of distant vision. The second section in which architecture is discussed comes almost as an afterthought following the sections dealing with the truths of the skies, the earth, water and vegetation. Architecture did not merit its own section because Ruskin felt it was impossible to err grossly in the depiction of architectural form and the general observer would have sufficient knowledge to assess the truth of a representation.[48] The general truths of architecture 'are at the fingers' ends of every engineer's apprentice' (notwithstanding his own difficulties in capturing them!). What was unique to the artist was the representation of architecture's shadows.

Architecture remained without its own section in the 1846 edition, but the passage above was toned down, with the focus placed on perspective rather than the details of architectural form - clearly Ruskin was now more aware of the skills required to represent these.[49] In the expanded earlier section, his 1845 experiences are more clearly apparent and that he was thinking of them when writing is clear from his reference to the church of San Michele, Lucca. He now had new standards by which to castigate Canaletto: no longer were the artist's panoramas contrasted with Ruskin's own delightful memories of the Grand Canal but with the Daguerreotypes of the depicted buildings he had recently acquired.[50] There is also a new urgency to his call for accuracy - the perilous condition of the buildings of Venice demanded that they be accurately recorded rather than invented. Having now had more experience of architectural sketching, Ruskin suggested that not all architectural details should be drawn, either for reasons of visibility or for amount of detail. It was therefore acceptable to describe the building in a form of shorthand, since all good architecture and all good ornament consists of a 'system of parts', an 'anatomy' from which a thoughtful observer could select the salient points.[51] Ruskin's concept of a 'system' of architecture will be discussed below. He described what he had in mind as 'an abstract, more or less philosophical, made of its general heads'.[52] Such systems were devised by several antiquarians and as we shall see, Ruskin used forms of abbreviation and coding when he came to record the buildings of Venice in 1849-50.[53]

1845: Lucca to Venice

As already suggested, 1845 marked the date when Ruskin's practices of architectural observation began to change. It was the first trip he had undertaken without his parents, so he was no longer bound by his father's 'fastidious taste'. When he reached Lucca in May, his eyes were opened by a series of buildings which confounded his previous views on architectural beauty, so much so that he began to record his observations in new notebook.[54] These notes are complemented by at least two surviving sketches and together reveal Ruskin trying to make sense of his reactions. Looking back on his time in Lucca, Ruskin wrote 'Absolutely for the first time I now saw what mediaeval builders were, and what they meant. I took the simplest of all facades for analysis, that of Santa Maria Foris-Portam, and thereon literally *began* the study of architecture.'[55] As he later identified, he was beginning to develop new ways of understanding buildings, as well as new goals for representation. Indeed he claimed that up until 1845, 'all architecture […] had depended with me for its delight on being partly in decay. I revered the sentiment of its age, and I was accustomed to look for the signs of age in the mouldering of its traceries, and in the interstices deepening between the stones of its masonry', the very features emphasized in Fig. 2.[56] The drawing of San Michele (Fig. 6), however, show less of his former focus on open joints and more on how the individual blocks fitted together, evidence of an obvious fascination with architectural construction. Despite suggesting that in 1845 he did not know how to paint (perhaps referring to his rather tentative use of colour), the main faults of his 1845 sketches were that he was working 'not for the sake of the drawing, but to get accurate knowledge of some point of the building'.[57]

After Lucca, Ruskin travelled to Pisa, then Florence, Parma and Macugnana. He had no need to draw the Duomo at Pisa for he had a print to which he could refer and which he corrected in ink;[58] he did, however, draw

Alexandrina Buchanan

a palace on the Lungo L'Arno.[59] His comments on the Campo Santo suggest he was already aware of a new level of archaeological attention - having described it as 'a beautiful example of a mingling of two styles', he noted 'it is not until the attention is especially directed to it, that one discovered the fitting of the Gothic work like a window frame into the simple original arches of Giovanni Pisano.'[60] In Florence he made brief notes on Santa Croce and Sta Maria Novella, largely as an introduction to his discussion of their artworks.[61] On leaving Florence, the notes cease.

In Baveno he met up with his former drawing master, J.D. Harding and they made their way to Venice, sketching as they went (Fig. 7). On meeting up with Harding, Ruskin began to reflect on how far his sketching had diverged from its former course, for whilst Harding produced pretty and well-balanced pictures which were 'desirable things to have […] pleasant things to show', Ruskin now considered his own sketches 'a written note of certain facts, […] put down in the rudest & clearest way as many as possible.'[62] Despite the differences Ruskin identified between his own sketches and Harding's, one page in the latter's sketchbook does suggest that the two men were discussing architecture and its representation. Amongst the scenes of trees, boats and townscapes which fill his sketchbooks are some atypical details of a palace at Vicenza, supplemented by some explanatory notes (Fig. 7). Nevertheless, the small size of the details, their continued adoption of an oblique angle and their apparent finish but lack of detail remain distinct from Ruskin's new approach.

Harding's sketches reveal his visual delight in the decaying and overgrown state of some of the buildings they passed. When they reached Venice, Ruskin found that many of the palaces he had previously enjoyed sketching were either in ruin or were undergoing major work which was resulting in the loss of the ancient stonework Ruskin so loved. The sorts of scenes he encountered are captured in a rough sketch in his 'grey notebook'.[63] He therefore embarked upon a frenzied campaign of recording. Cook and Wedderburn's catalogue of Ruskin's drawings before their dispersal records drawings of the Palazzo Ducale, the Palazzo Foscari, the Ca' d'Oro, and the Casa Loredan, as well as San Marco, all of which can be dated to 1845 and of which a few examples survive.[64] It is clear that through this project he started to develop the systematic process of recording he would use in 1849-5.

Regarding the Ca' Foscari, Ruskin wrote to his father that he and Harding were trying to document it together. Sadly, none of Harding's drawings seems to have survived. Ruskin described his method to his father - he 'started small', recording the mouldings and capitals and then began a sketch that Harding claimed would 'frighten the Daguerreotype into fits'.[65] In his grey notebook, we find some of these small details, as well as notes and measurements.[66] He also made 'large studies of the most interesting parts, leaving the rest to sketch in lightly'. This description may refer to details of windows now in the Victorian and Albert Museum and King's College, Cambridge labeled 4 and 5 respectively, showing that there must once have been at least three further such drawings.[67] His need for exactitude caused Ruskin much anguish: 'it is no use to me unless I have it right out & know all about it', which extended to picking and sketching the very weeds growing on the palazzo facade.[68] The following week he had started at the Ca' d'Oro, where the stonemasons and plasterers were already at work. A fortnight later he reported that he had all the mouldings and measurements of the Ca' Foscari but was having difficulties getting a general view. The drawing he had started with such hopes whilst working with Harding had been abandoned as too time-consuming and he was at a loss to know how best to proceed. 'To ta[ke t]he outline is what has been done a thousand times - the bea[uty] of it is in the cracks & the stains, and to draw these out is impossible and I am in despair.'[69] He believed previous artists had also failed and he wanted to achieve something new, but felt unprepared for the task. His despair was alleviated, however, by the purchase and commissioning of some daguerreotypes, a recording mechanism he had already seen but whose value became more evident as his time in Venice drew to a close.[70]

In terms of Ruskin's oeuvre, the main innovations in his sketching practice are the frontal treatment of building facades, the preponderance of details rather than attempting to capture a single view of the whole building, and the recording of measurements and moulding profiles. He commented to his father that he was 'never satisfied now with my architectural sketches unless I have measures & details, and I don't know how architects get these, but I find it not so easy a thing to measure columns especially, and the rate of bulge bothers me to death.'[71] A number of measurements - which as Hewison has noted, are in Italian *bracchia*, rather than English feet and inches, are on the Ashmolean sketch but there are many more in his notebook.[72] These records are typical of professional architectural practices, with which Ruskin was evidently familiar and to which he turned in his new work of architectural analysis. They can be related to prints aimed at both architectural and antiquarian markets such as the lithographs produced by Harding for Auguste Pugin's *Gothic Ornament*s (1831), which show a similar focus

on details. Nevertheless, his practices remain distinct from these norms. In particular, his use of coloured washes is more evocative than their use in 'tinted drawings' by artists such as the Bucklers. Ruskin had long been keen to capture the exactitudes of coloration (see, for example, his use of the cyanometer to record the colour of the skies seen on his 1835 trip and his interest in the colour of the Rhine) and this was more important to him than ensuring all parts of his image were fully coloured. This gives the sketches a fragmentary character, reinforced by their uneven level of detail, which recalls the imagery of memory more than vision. Whilst the preliminary sketches of topographical artists often added colour only as far as required for information (as in Turner's "Ruined Abbey at Haddington" 1794[73]), or added textual notes for further detail (for example Fig. 8), Ruskin's rather give the sense of being a record of his very process of observation and recording what captured his eye. His need for speed was almost certainly another factor in the looser style he used in the Ca' Foscari sketches and the incomplete character of the sketch of the Ca' d'Oro facade (RF 1590). At the same time, he was also interested in securing the exact effects of shadows on the architecture: as Stephen Kite has noted, shadows were for Ruskin as important to the phenomenology of architecture as moulding profiles.[74] It is clear where Ruskin's priorities lay: he suggested to his father that he should hire a German draughtsman to draw the outlines of the capitals of San Marco 'with severe, true lines' (i.e. the style typical of 'scientific' antiquarian recording), which he would then complete with details of the light and shade.[75] Several of his sketches are even annotated with the time of day at which the shadows were recorded.[76]

Ruskin's understanding of architecture may also be gauged from his notes. As he wrote: 'The Architecture of Lucca is peculiarly interesting from unity of system, the same manner prevailing in all of its churches, more or less, the only marked difference being between those built before and after the cathedral of Pisa…'.[77] It is possible that his interest in the Italian Romanesque and its chronology was sharpened by the OSPSGA's particular interest in Romanesque and its transition into Gothic, although it is clear that the initial appeal was more visceral: he wrote to his father of the 'glorious dark arches & columns' of San Frediano which he tried to capture in his sketch (now in the Manchester Art Gallery) and it is only later that he reflected on their difference in structural terms from the 'pierced lace-work' of late Gothic tracery he had previously admired.[78] His use of the word 'system' likewise reveals connections with contemporary archaeology: it was a concept common to scientific antiquarianism and demonstrates that Ruskin was starting to view the elements of architecture as interconnected, whereas in 'The Poetry of Architecture' he had suggested that the woodland scenery of England demanded 'irregularity of system in the architecture of man.'[79] The system to which he was now referring was that of style rather than aesthetic or structural principles. He also endeavoured to describe the details of what he saw, using language which was apparently unfamiliar: 'All the arches of San Michele spring (I mean where I use this word technically that they are wider in their mouldings at the top than at the sides, thus [diagram] but they do not reenter, i.e. do not bend in above the capital thus [diagram], as is the case with the cathedral portico.'[80] This description is of particular interest because it can be linked Fig. 6. As well as depicting the two upper tiers of arcading on the south side of the facade, Ruskin provided details of the ground storey arcade, according to the description already quoted, with archivolts whose inner and outer edges were not parallel, creating arch orders of two different shapes. This suggests that he was sufficiently aware of the norms of medieval architecture to recognize an interesting deviation. In his notes he contrasted San Michele's arches with those of Sta Maria Forisportam which were pure semi-circles: 'perhaps a distinction between the Lombard style & the Pisan' - San Michele being later identified as a perfect example of the Pisan manner.[81]

Ruskin's identification of a 'Lombard' style was probably adopted from Palgrave's *Handbook for Travellers in North Italy* which he had taken with him, but his otherwise unorthodox terminology (neither 'spring' nor 'reenter' are used according to conventional practice) makes it difficult to situate Ruskin's antiquarian knowledge and there is no evidence of any specialist reading. The most significant contemporary study of Italian Gothic was Robert Willis's *Remarks on the Architecture of the Middle Ages, Especially of Italy* (1835), in which Lucchese architecture received the following mention: 'The arches […] of the cathedral of Lucca are segmental, and decorated with retiring faces, forming compound archways of three orders' (there is no description of those of San Michele, but those of the cathedral are similar in form). He noted also what Ruskin would call their 'spring', describing them as 'not concentric', adding 'In this departure from concentricity, we have the first step towards making the arches / of different forms'. According to Willis's evolutionary narrative, this would be the first step towards what he (and later, Ruskin) called foliation, which in turn led to the development of tracery. In contrasting the descriptions by Ruskin and Willis, we can see that although Ruskin was starting to observe details, as opposed to picturesque wholes, his understanding was limited to style and he could not relate his observations to an aesthetic system.

1846-8: Learning about Gothic

Picturesque viewing practices involved time and motion in that they depended on the movement of the viewer through space and the sudden 'surprise' when a picturesque scene revealed itself; these experiences were translated into sketches through the conventions of oblique views, partial occlusion, dramatic lighting and transitory weather conditions. They could also depend on associations with historical figures and events, or simply meditations on the passing of time inspired by the signs of age and decay. Through scientific archaeology, Ruskin also learned a historicist mode of viewing, whereby a building could be presented within a different chronological framework, giving it a status as a historical monument rather than a building experienced in the here and now.

Ruskin's initial interest in Italian architecture had been piqued by the buildings themselves: both through their contrast with his preconceived ideals and through the perceived risk to their very survival. His programme of recording quickly improved his architectural observation and by November 1845 he was surprised to note how much more he was now seeing in familiar buildings.[82] However he felt that he had 'advanced only in knowledge of individual character, provincial feeling, and details of construction or execution. Of what was primarily right and ultimately best, there was never more doubt'.[83] Other than his OSPSGA experiences, his knowledge of the archaeological approach to architecture consisted of little more than half-digested summaries in works such as Laing's *Notes of a Traveller*, from which he quoted the long-established notion that Gothic was the architecture of verticality, aspiration and faith, whilst Greek was the architecture of horizontality, endurance and philosophy.[84] His 1846 reading would not be systematic, but the commonplace book sometimes described as volume 6 of his diary (RF MS 05C) includes notes taken from Joseph Woods's *Letters of An Architect* (1828),[85] Francis Price's *Account of Salisbury Cathedral* (1753), or a work which quoted from this,[86] and Willis's *Remarks*, whilst the 1846 'Small notebook' includes reflections on Pugin's *True Principles*, which he had evident read in some detail despite later protests to the contrary.[87] By 1848 he had also read Whewell's *Architectural Notes on German Churches* (1842 edn), to inform his trip to Normandy that year.[88] These books provided him with some context for his research, both in the form of dates for buildings and ways of interpreting buildings with which he could engage. Whilst Woods was useful for dates, Ruskin was dismissive of his aesthetic judgments, which harked back to a previous era. Willis, however, was useful for both dates and ideas and it was largely through engagement with *Remarks* that Ruskin's understanding of medieval architecture developed from a personal encounter with the physical remains to an understanding based on their construction and preservation, rather than simply their role as picturesque adornments or associative signifiers.

One of the earliest clues that Ruskin had read *Remarks* and had started to use its ideas to inform his thinking comes on 26 April 1846.[89] By then he had returned to Europe and was in the Alpine city of Chambéry. The cathedral, originally erected as a Franciscan convent in the fifteenth century, was subjected to Ruskin's scrutiny and evaluated in language which could only have derived from Willis. He described the main entrance on the west front as having a 'line of trefoiled foliation' (meaning an order of mouldings forming a series of cusps with sub-cusps), with none of the orders of mouldings having capitals marking the division between vertical and arched element, which he described as 'continuous imposts'. He then suggested that their configuration 'could not have been thought of but when the spirit of Gothic defied its letter and laws'. The disapproval of late Gothic forms was shared by most contemporary antiquaries but it was the antiquarian project to identify the laws of Gothic, along with Willis's vocabulary that enabled Ruskin to put his censure into appropriate terms.

Through his use of Willis, Ruskin learned to understand architectural form as the result of a dynamic interplay of forces, both structural and visual. His meditations on form were evidently prompted by Willis, who condemned the structural polychromy of Italian Gothic 'a practice more destructive of architectural grandeur can scarcely be conceived'.[90] In his commonplace book, on 22 December 1847, Ruskin started to reflect on this passage:

Of Stripes and their value. Read the note at page 12 of Willis. Consider why he is mistaken. Compare this coloured stripe with the brick or stone courses, as at the Treasury [sketch of alternating joints] Consider the appearance of stripes in steps. On ship sides [sketch on facing page]. In bold quaint draperies. Giotto in Sta Croce. Veronese. Patterns &c. Stripes on shells & [?zones]. On zebra. Rare in flowers and why?

The following year, after studying the forms of shells in the British Museum, he expanded this point:

Now I think that form, properly so called, may be considered as a function or exponent either of growth or of force, inherent or impressed; and that one of the steps to admiring it or understanding it must be a comprehension of the laws of formation and of the forces to be resisted; that all forms are thus either indicative of lines of energy, I or pressure, or motion, variously impressed or resisted, and are therefore exquisitely abstract and precise.

Variegation, on the contrary, is the arbitrary presence or absence of colouring matter and the beauty is more in the colour than in the outline. Hence stains, blotchiness, cloudiness, &c. in marble, on skins and so on, and their beauty of irregularity…

This separation of decoration from construction, proposed by Willis, enabled Ruskin to focus on the former without denying the significance of the latter. This led him to distinguish the wall as a constructional feature from the decorative 'wall-veil', a distinction whose value for architects such as Louis Sullivan may readily be identified.

Many years later, when denying the influence of Pugin on his thought, Ruskin associated this new concern for how structural and decorative elements interacted directly to his reading of *Remarks*:

You have, perhaps, thought that pure early English architecture depended for its charm on visibility of construction [one of Pugin's 'true principles']. It depends for its charm altogether on the abstract harmony of groups of cylinders, having no real *relation to construction whatsover, and a theoretical relation so subtle that none of us had seen it till Professor Willis worked it out for us.*[91]

Besides identifying the laws of Gothic, Willis's other aim was to add to antiquarian understanding of the chronology and geography of medieval architectural styles through investigation of Italy. Based on the chronological framework - the 'stylistic table' formalized by Thomas Rickman in 1817 - Willis sought to identify buildings in which elements of transition could be seen and then to investigate whether the transitions were the result of emulation of buildings elsewhere or developed as an inventive response to local requirements. This was a project adopted by the OSPSGA, but as we have seen, it was not at the forefront of Ruskin's 1845 studies and seems first to have informed his investigations in 1846. Thus in his analysis of the Colleone Chapel in Verona, visited on 10 May 1846, he identified the porch as 'an intermediate step between the Lombard and Italian Gothic', having Gryphons supporting the columns, which Ruskin associated with Lombard work, and a foiled arch above.[92] Also in Verona he not only showed an interest in trying to characterize the city's architecture in relation to that of Venice (as he had done in relation to Lucchese/Pisan architecture in 1845) but also to identify peculiar features of Italian Gothic and link them to the structural aesthetics promulgated by Whewell, Froude and Willis.[93] At the Duomo he paid particular attention to the relationship between the shafts (which he called divisions of moulding) of the main piers and the vaulting shafts and arcade mouldings. Although he did not approve of the intermediary capital which 'reminds one of the crumpled ornamental paper about a leg bone of mutton', he noted to himself that this relationship between the different elements was an important illustration 'of the value of unity, and of clear lines of decorative design.'[94]

Later in April 1846, we can see that Ruskin had begun to create a stylistic table for Italian Gothic, for when he moved on to Venice, he found a house behind his hotel which seemed to exhibit the first stage of the transition from a 'foiled' to a 'foliated' arch order (although not yet adopting these Willis-derived terms).[95] Here he was evidently using the techniques of formal analysis, promoted by his OSPSGA friends, to try to make sense of the visual differences he saw between buildings in Venice, in order to link their chronologies to the histories of Italy he had also begun to consume. We can already, in 1846, see a new confidence in dating buildings by style, for example he questioned that San Zeno in Verona could be as late as the date of 1000 assigned by Palgrave in *Murray's Guide*.[96] According to modern standards, Ruskin's dates were generally too early - even when using archive evidence he shared the common mistake of early antiquaries of wanting buildings to date from the earliest records of their construction rather than later rebuildings; however the principle, that he was learning to trust his eyes rather than his reading, holds true.

Mouldings and Mud

By 1849, therefore, Ruskin had developed a new understanding of architectural form and had already started to think about the narrative structure and arguments of the *Stones of Venice* before he returned to the city in November for further research, continued in winter 1850-1.[97] This was what he later remembered as 'so much hard, dry, mechanical toil',[98] metaphors often applied by contemporaries to antiquarianism, personified by the character 'Dryasdust', used as a metacharacter by Sir Walter Scott to present historical information which literary convention considered too dull or factual for inclusion in polite novels.

The 'mechanical' nature of Ruskin's project lay in his efforts to be methodical, both in his practices of recording and relating his observations to the system he started to outline as he made his way through France in 1849.[99] Here we find the identification of 'Gothic families' consisting of three lines of descent: 'Surface Gothic' (which included 'Giotto' as one of its varieties), 'Central Gothic' (consisting of 'Pure Decorated' and 'Venetian') and 'Lin-

ear Gothic' ('Flamboyant' and 'Perpendicular'), a system which he illustrated in volume II of *Stones*.[100] Of the three families, he found 'Giotto Gothic' the noblest 'where fully developed in the South', culminating in the cathedral of Monza; 'Central' was the noblest ever reached in the North, whilst the 'Linear' represented the essential and culminating Northern character. His was a tripartite system, as had been proposed by Rickman and Whewell, drawing on Ruskin's understanding of the linearity of what Willis had termed the 'After-Gothics' (explored by Ruskin during his time in Switzerland in 1846 and in Normandy in 1848) and implicitly rejecting Willis's denial that Italy had produced a true school of Gothic.

To add detail to this genealogy, Hewison and Kite have shown how, in November 1849, Ruskin succeeded in devising a progression of forms which seemed to match his understanding of both stylistic and chronological development. This was represented as a sequence of arch forms, numbered as separate 'orders'. His next task thereafter was to seek out the earliest examples of each form and to trace the transition from one style to the next. The nature of transition (another word common to both architecture and geology) was a problem that faced all architectural historians and Ruskin found it no easier to deal with than others. In reflecting on the issue, Ruskin resorted to visual metaphors: styles could change 'like one Colour into another', or styles could coexist, which he represented in his notes as a stepped tier of overlapping horizontals.[101] Willis had registered the chromatic analogy as a process of 'melting', which undermined the model of a table of distinctive styles: like Ruskin, his proposed solution was to study the stylistic development of each architectural member separately, but other than some unpublished notes and lectures, this was not a course he eventually pursued.[102]

For Ruskin, however, membrological study became an essential structuring device for his research. Following his stylistic classifications, in Notebook M2, he went on to a discussion of the different elements of a building: walls, roofs, doors and windows and the proper function of each, thoughts which would contribute to the 'Six Divisions of Architecture' enumerated in the *Stones of Venice*, volume 1. This discussion continues for twenty eight pages and must have been in progress for some days (although p.14 was certainly completed by the time Ruskin reached Monza on 1 November 1849, for a note made in that city in Book M refers to a passage in M2). It is in these notes that we find a classification of capitals into different groups, each with an associated letter, according to a system based on whether the bell is convex or concave in curvature. Later, he classified arches into 'Flat', 'True' and 'High', each sub-divided according to whether the arch was round or pointed. Although the notes make some reference to actual examples, his system was largely theoretical, rather than being based on the 'actual history of buildings', to quote a division made by Whewell.[103]

Whewell had characterized the archaeological research required to connect theory with observable data as requiring time and learning. This was what Ruskin began on arrival in Milan, making drawings and rough notes on site (in Notebook N), which he wrote up in the evening, with fuller descriptions in Notebook M, adding cross references to the relevant page in Notebook N. His sketches and notes initially used pencil, with some later inked in and given coloured washes, with the inked notes sometimes forming fuller descriptions (similar to those found in M) and sometimes being queries or reminders to himself to gather more data. At Verona, he started to supplement Notebook N with initial drawings and measurements made on the spot on plain sheets of paper (now known as the 'worksheets' e. g. Fig. 9). These were given a running sequence of numbers, 1-195, and were occasionally dated. All the known worksheets seem to date from the 1849-50 trip. These were also used as the basis for Ruskin's evening notes, and cross-referenced. The worksheets therefore represent a chronological account of the project, although they no longer form a complete series. In Ruskin's own lifetime he cannibalized them for illustrations for his publications and on his death they were dispersed.[104]

Soon afterwards, Ruskin started to undertake thematic research, recorded in notebooks with titles such as 'Housebook', 'Doorbook', 'Palace book', 'Gothic book', 'St M[ark] book', 'Verona book' and 'Bit book'.[105] The first Housebook, recording the buildings along the Grand Canal must postdate 23 November, the date when he finally worked out a typology for the different styles of Venetian Gothic. The different orders on which his system was based are drawn on the front endpaper of the Housebook and its numerical coding is used as shorthand throughout. In addition, the endpaper includes typologies for mouldings, according to their function (capitals, bases etc), with associated codes. There are no cross references to worksheets and therefore it is possible that, despite his use of ink, these notes were made in the field. Here we see a new system of recording, for prior to Ruskin's notes the pages had been marked up in a second hand (identified as that of his wife, Effie) with a recording schema: 1 = door; 2 = water level; 3 = Angle; 4 = windows 1st story; 5 = 2nd story and 6 = 3rd story. A similar schema was used for the 'Door book', started in December: each door was given a running number, after which were recorded the house number (according to the sequence used in the Housebook), the type (according to a taxonomy drawn

up on the front endpaper, which corresponded to the his basic stylistic classification: Byzantine; Transitional; Gothic, and Renaissance), masonry (diagrams of and notes on whether the mouldings included foliage), archivolt breadth (measurement, not always completed), and archivolt section, jamb section, and pilaster head (coded according to the taxonomies on the front endpapers, which represented a modification of those used in the Housebook). Use of such recording schemes was common practice amongst archaeologists and may have given Ruskin the notion, but these are dissimilar to any Ruskin would have encountered and must have been devised by himself. However we soon find that Ruskin's natural verbosity and concern for detail overcame the limitations of the schema and in some cases notes fill several pages beyond what was originally intended. Although some of these notes include architectural criticism: 'rich in feeling but bluntly cut', 'Very glorious - perfectly fine & simple', none of the notes expands into the metaphorical language so typical of the final publication, suggesting that this was adopted both as a means of communication and a rhetorical device to support his interpretation, rather than being an integral aspect of his primary visual experience.[106]

Although polite sociability underpinned both the Picturesque and archaeological movements, Ruskin's project was very personal. Although he had collaborated with Harding in 1845, this had revealed the discrepancy between their approaches. The most marked characteristic of Ruskin's new drawings from the perspective of his father, still rooted in more traditional modes, was their fragmentary character. As he wrote of Ruskin's sketches to his friend W. H. Harrison from Venice in 1846,

It is gathered in scraps hardly wrought, for he is drawing perpetually, but no drawing such as in former days you or I might compliment in the usual way by saying it deserved a frame; but fragments of everything from a Cupola to a Cart-wheel, but in such bits that it is the common eye a mass of Hieroglyphics - all true - truth itself but Truth in mosaic.[107]

No longer conforming to the demands of the 'common eye' (or, rather the eye of the cultivated connoisseur), from 1849 Ruskin worked only with his manservant and gondolier. His wife Effie recorded how far from polite norms his research had become as he descended dusty from climbing over building sites, his scribbled notes incomprehensible to anyone but himself. Whilst the eighteenth-century antiquary had ordered the taking of 'views', which were recorded according to polite norms, Ruskin's research demanded personal physical contact with the buildings themselves and direct observational learning through drawing.

Less apparent from the surviving notes, but an equally important part of the research was his study both of published sources and (via the offices of local scholar Rawdon Brown) in the Venetian archives.[108] This also shows that Ruskin followed contemporary antiquarian method in trying to bring together 'external' (historical) and 'internal' (archaeological) evidence in order to create self-evident historical 'facts'. As well as providing methods, antiquarianism may also offered suggestions for the wider aims which would underpin *The Stones of Venice*. Whilst in Florence, in 1845, Ruskin observed the contrast between the Lucchese and the Florentines in their attitude towards historic buildings. As he wrote to his father: 'All that remains at Lucca is genuine - it is ruined, but you can trace through all what it has been [...] - you know that those are the very stones that were laid by the hands of the 10th century.' In Florence, on the other hand, monuments such as Giotto's Campanile were in a perpetual state of restoration, until nothing of Giotto remained and it became a mere copy, with no power of addressing the feelings.[109] His views on the matter were echoed by a piece he had read in the *Quarterly Review* on some works on medieval architecture, including Gally Knight's *Ecclesiastical Architecture of Italy*. Although Ruskin later disputed the reviewer's claims as to the accuracy of its illustrations, he wrote to his mother that the piece described his 'antiquarian feelings to the very letter' in its statement of the value of all architectural remains as historical evidence. As the review put it, to the antiquary (a label Ruskin willingly claimed), 'Every structure becomes the living evidence of the knowledge, the manners, the opinions, and the feelings of mankind [...] The edifices which nations raise are inseparably associated with the deeds which the nations perform.'[110]

Such statements, commonly uttered by contemporary antiquaries but rarely worked through in practice, offer a clear parallel to Ruskin's project. For example, his analysis of arches would eventually lead to the chapters in *The Stones of Venice* wherein, in volume 1, he described the construction of an arch (and established it as a metaphor and signifier of human morality, enabling its historical development to be read in relation to the society of the day) and, in volume 2, provided an account of its formal development, from the Byzantine round arch to the Gothic pointed and then to the foiled and foliated forms. This chronology was based on the one provided by Willis in *Remarks* and followed Willis's model of the history of Italian architecture as a struggle between a debased Classicism and the Northern Gothic. Ruskin claimed that this conflict was both most keenly experienced and most fully resolved in Venice. Whilst early Gothic structures in the city could be compared to a prisoner 'entangled

Alexandrina Buchanan

among the enemy's forces, and maintaining their ground till their friends came up to sustain them',[111] the Palazzo Ducale would represent the resolution of this struggle, viewed in historical, racial/geological and formal terms:

Opposite in their character and mission, alike in their magnificence of energy, they came from the North and from the South, the glacier torrent and the lava stream: they met and contended over the wreck of the Roman Empire; and the very centre of the struggle, the point of pause of both, the dead water of the opposite eddies, charged with embayed fragments of the Roman wreck, is Venice.

The Ducal palace of Venice contains the three elements in exactly equal proportions – The Roman, the Lombard, and Arab. It is the central building of the world.[112]

Here we can see how Ruskin transformed his archaeological model from something primarily (though never exclusively) formal to an intensely dramatic and metaphorical account. However in doing so, he moved his text far beyond the conventions of architectural history as they were beginning to be established. As Hewison and others have shown, Ruskin's work contained moral and political messages which were becoming increasingly alienated from the 'scientific' ideals of contemporary antiquarianism and his work was not even reviewed by the *Archaeological Journal* nor the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, the customary organs of the embryonic discipline. At a time when the study of architecture could be deeply controversial, archaeologists such as Willis wanted to avoid the taint of 'party' or 'enthusiasm', instead claiming the neutral rhetoric of science. Not that this is likely to have caused Ruskin any concern - he had neither the ambition nor the intention to become an archaeologist nor to direct his contribution to a particular audience.

If the *Stones of Venice* did not conform to archaeological norms, for Ruskin's father - who was the financial underwriter for both research and publication - its aims remained too dry 'and not very interesting to English architects even'. Whilst considering the *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, in which morality overrode antiquarian detail, to be 'a magnificent Book', he was concerned that *The Stones* contained too much technical information: 'a vast deal of plain matter of fact & very minute details', which were unnecessary and unappealing for one such as himself 'a mere general Reader seeking Delight & Entertainment'.[113] The struggle between his father's continued fidelity, not simply to the Picturesque but to the gratification of his 'fastidious taste & feelings' and Ruskin's newfound commitment to factual evidence can readily be traced in the modifications Ruskin made to his manuscript.[114] Writing was nearly as intense a process as the research and eventually his attitude to his work became jaded. In 1851 he wrote to Acland, 'I am going to give up drawing, as you told me I should'[115] and a few years later he recalled to his American friend, Charles Eliot Norton that by the time he had finished 'Venice presented itself to me merely as so many 'mouldings', and I had few associations with any building but those of more or less pain and puzzle and provocation', the puzzlement stemming from 'window-sills which wouldn't agree with the doorsteps, or back of house which wouldn't agree with front…'. However all was not lost: 'I have got all the right feelings back, now, however; and hope to write a word or two about Venice yet, when I have the mouldings well out of my head - and the Mud'.[116]

Conclusion

Ruskin's journeys to the Continent between 1845 and 1853 led him away from the Picturesque into modes of viewing and recording more associated with the production of knowledge ('science' in nineteenth-century terminology) than sensibility. His research helped Ruskin to cultivate an 'expert eye', which set him apart from his peers, not merely by the sensitivity to beauty he had long cultivated, but by his capacity for attention to detail and his skill in visual analysis. However the methods cultivated by Ruskin were not purely visual: they required an iterative interaction between eye, hand and mind. What he saw had to be translated into drawing; what he drew could become data for comparative analysis, reflection and interpretation. His changing understanding then affected what he subsequently saw and recorded. And at every stage of this cycle, external information, from his reading and viewing of the products of other architectural researchers affected what he saw, how he recorded and how he interpreted. There is neither start nor end point to this cycle, with each stage potentially happening simultaneously, although some points of disjuncture can be identified, such as in Lucca in 1845, when Ruskin became aware that what he was seeing did not accord with his previous understanding; in Como in 1846 and Normandy in 1848, when Ruskin's reading began to affect what features he singled out as worthy of more detailed observation and how he described and interpreted what he saw, and in Venice in November 1849, when the interplay between viewing and reflection on both texts and buildings enabled him to devise a new system by which his observations could be classified and a narrative created.

Alexandrina Buchanan

For those seeking the antecedents of Modernist visual practices, Ruskin's wanderings through Venice can seem anticipatory of the detached vision of the *flaneur*, whilst his interest in the fragmentary appears preminiscent of Walter Benjamin's collecting of potentially redemptive remnants of history and his metaphors of flows and eddies prefigure modernist spatial values. At the same time, Ruskin's attention to systems, by which this understanding of Venice was reached and justified, attend to a different modernist value, that of scientific objectivity. Yet he is not simply a writer on the cusp of modernity, for the systematic viewing cultivated by Ruskin also had results which were far from dispassionate and led Ruskin in a very different direction. For example, it was only through the gathering of hundreds of examples that Ruskin was able to claim that some arch mouldings must have been ordered 'in the gross', a system of mass production he came to decry.[117] Thus the use of 'mechanical methods' enabled him to offer a critique of their products. Recognizing what he saw as signs of 'life' and enjoyment by medieval builders politicized his viewing, moving it away from the disinterested eye of the Picturesque into something more passionate and engaged, laying the foundations for his future commitment to artisan education. Indeed, when reflecting on his changing practice, Ruskin predicted many of the recent criticisms made of the Picturesque for its false objectivity and 'hardness'.[118] Thus whilst his language was often acquisitive and he collected mouldings and even physical fragments much as an imperialist ethnographer might collect shrunken heads, it is too simplistic to see his sketching practices as symptomatic of a will to control masquerading as a quest for knowledge. Rather, Christopher Newall has described one of the purposes of Ruskin's drawing as being 'to abase himself through the self-chastisement of painstaking delineation.'[119] His sketching practices were no longer a performance of gentility but a sacred responsibility, intended to convert monuments of private wealth into a common inheritance which, once they were able to 'see properly', all might be able to understand and enjoy.

NOTES

* The author would like to thank Stephen Kite; Stephen Wildman and the staft al the Ruskin Library; the archivists and curators at the other repositories used and in particular Rocío Sánchez Ameijeiras for her painstaking and elegant translation.

[1] R. Krauss, *The Optical Unconscious (*Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), p. 2; M. Swenarton, *Artisans and Architects: The Ruskinian Tradition in Architectural Thought* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989); G. Davenport, "The House that Jack Built", *Salmagundi*, 43 (1979). pp. 140-55.

[2] J. Bloomer, "Ruskin *Redux*", *Assemblage*, 32 (1997), pp. 8-11.

[3] H. I. Shapiro (ed.), *Ruskin in Italy. Letters to his Parents 1845* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972), p. 51.

[4] See in particular R. Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London and New York: Hambledon, 2004).

[5] J. Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992).

[6] For the social relationship between antiquaries and their artists, see N. Heringman, S*ciences of Antiquity. Romantic Antiquarianism, Natural History and Knowledge Work* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

[7] J. Crary, *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle and modern Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001), p. 1.

[8] E.T. Cook, *The Life of John Ruskin*, 2 vols (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 1911), 1, p. 55.

[9] V. A. Burd (ed.), *The Ruskin family Letters: the correspondence of John James Ruskin, his wife, and their son, John, 1801-1843,* 2 vols., Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973, I, p. 433.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 434.

[11] J. Ruskin, *Notes by Mr. Ruskin on Samuel Prout and William Hunt: illustrated by a loan collection of drawings exhibited at The Fine Art Society's Galleries, 148 New Bond Street, 1879-80* (London, 1879) *p.*46.

[12] Ruskin, *Praeterita*, *Works*, 35, pp. 622-3. It is suggested that the word "carved" is a typographic error which should read, as here, "cared".

[13] 'Fisher Street, Carlisle', Ruskin Library, Lancaster University (henceforth RF), RF 1194 and (pencil version), Harvard Art Museums/Fogg Museum, Bequest of Mrs. Alfred Mansfield Brooks, 1970.90. I am grateful to Stephen Wildman for drawing this sketch to my attention.

[14] J. Ruskin, 'The Poetry of Architecture', *Works*, 1, p. 29.

[15] J. D. Hunt, 'Ruskin: The Design of Nature and the Transcription of its Manuscript', *Assemblage*, 32 (1997), pp. 12-21 (p.18).

[16] M. Rudwick, 'The Emergence of a Visual Language for Geological Science, 1760-1840', *History of Science*, 14:3 (1976), pp. 149-95.

[17] J. Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, III, *Works*, 5, p. 353.

[18] J. Evans and J. H. Whitehouse, *The Diaries of John Ruskin*, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 1, p.39.

[19] Ruskin, *Works*, 35, p. 198.

[20] *Ibid.,* p. 611.

[21] See letter from Ruskin c.1840 giving him advice on shading and making colours: *Works*, 36, pp. 19-21.

22 H. L. Thompson, *Henry George Liddell D. D., A Memoir* (New York: Henry Holt, 1899), p. 46.

23 Ruskin, *Works*, 35, p. 198.

24 W. A. Pantin, 'The Oxford Architectural and Historical Society, 1839-1939)', *Oxoniensia*, 4 (1939), pp. 174-94 (pp. 174–5).

25 D. Prout, '"The Oxford Society for Promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture" and "The Oxford Architectural Society", 1839–1860', *Oxoniensia*, 54 (1989), pp. 379–91; G. Chitty, 'John Ruskin, Oxford and the Architectural Society, 1837–1840', *Oxoniensia*, 65 (2000), pp. 111–31.

26 .R. H. Froude, "Church Architecture", in J. H. Newman, J. Keble and T. Mozley (eds), *The Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*, 2 vols (Derby: J. G. and F. Rivington, 1838), 2, pp. 333-74. The quotation is from T. Mozley, *Reminiscences, chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement*, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green and Co.,1882), 1, p. 216.

27 A. Buchanan, *Robert Willis and the Foundation of Architectural History,* Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2013, pp.71-114.

28 J.H. Parker, 'Notes on the Crypt of St Peter's Church in the East compared with the Chapel in the White Tower, London', Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Dep c.591.

29 C. Newton, 'On the Study of Archaeology', *Archaeological Journal*, 8 (1851), pp.1-26 (p. 20).

30 'Report of the Annual Summer Meeting of the Leicestershire Architectural and Archaeological Society, 1865', *Associated Architectural Societies Reports and Papers*, 8 (1865-6), p. lviii.

31 See for example his 'Drawings of Churches', 1802-12, British Library, Add. MS 37803.

32 *The Rules and Proceedings of the Oxford Society for Promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture* (Oxford, 1840), proceedings for 29 October 1839.

33 Ruskin, *Works*, 35, pp. 611-12.

34 *Ibid*.

35 Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, II, *Works*, 4, p. 343.

36 Ibid.

37 Ruskin, *Diaries*, 1, p.189.

38 Hunt, 'Ruskin: The Design of Nature'; C. S. Finley, *Nature's Covenant: Figures of Landscape in Ruskin* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992).

39 RF Notebook M, ff. 1-2.

40 J. Ruskin, *Letters addressed to a college friend during the years 1840-1845* (New York and London: Macmillan and George Allen, 1894), pp .40-2.

41 *Ibid*., p. 38.

42 *Ibid*., p. 42.

43 Ruskin, 'Letters', *Works,* 36, pp. 58-60 (p. 60).

44 Ruskin, *Works*, 35, p. 314.

45 C. Wilmer, 'Back to nature: Ruskin's aspen and an art in the service of the given', *Times Literary Supplement* (1 December 1995), 3-4.

46 N. Penny, *Ruskin's Drawings* (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1997), p. 26.

47 J. Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, 5 vols (London, 1843-60) 1 (1843), pp. 92-6.

48 Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, 1st edn., 1, pp. 400-401.

49 Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, 3rd edn, 1, pp. 403-4.

50 *Ibid*., 1, pp. 109-110.

51 *Ibid*., 1, p.105.

52 *Ibid*.

53 For Whewell's system in the edition used by Ruskin, see his *Architectural Notes on German Churches,* 3rd edn (Cambridge and London: J. and J. J. Deighton and J. H. Parker, 1842), pp. 116-26; for Willis, see Buchanan, *Robert Willis*, pp. 129-30; for the system used by Henry Dryden and advertised to the OSPSGA in 1841, see Bodleian Library, MS Dep c.591.

54 RF MS 05B.

55 Ruskin, *Works*, 35, p. 350.

56 *Ibid*.

57 J. Ruskin, *The Ruskin Art Collection at Oxford, Catalogues, Notes and Instructions*, *Works*, 21, p.175.

58 RF MS 05B, f. 10.

59 RF MS 05B, ff. 14-17, detail of window on f. 15v.

60 RF MS 05B, f. 20.

61 RF MS 05B, f. 85 and f. 132.

62 Shapiro, *Letters*, p. 189.

63 RF MS 05A, f. 19v.

64 E.T. Cook and A. Wedderburn, 'Catalogue of Ruskin's Drawings', in *Works*, 38, pp. 293-301.

65 Shapiro, *Letters*, pp. 205-6. This was probably drawing number 1, see below (now apparently lost).

66 RF MS 05A, f. 16v and loose sheet after f. 18, identified as reating to the Ca' Foscari in RF, MS 05C, f. 47.

67 Their subjects can be identified from RF MS 05C, ff. 46v-47.

68 Shapiro, *Letters*, p. 207.

69 *Ibid*., p. 139.

70 *Ibid*., p. 220.

71 *Ibid*., p. 85.

72 R. Hewison, *Ruskin on Venice* (New Have and London, Yale University Press, 2009), p. 94.

73 Presented by Ruskin to the Ruskin Drawing School in 1875, now in the Ashmolean, WA.RS.ED.102.

74 S. Kite, *Building Ruskin's Italy. Watching Architecture* (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012).

75 Shapiro, *Letters,* p. 204.

76 An 1846 example is RF MS 05B, f. 16. He noted the importance of aspect in relation to the effect of mouldings in *Modern Painters*, 3rd edn., 1, p. 104.

77 RF MS 05B, f. 1.

78 Ruskin *Modern Painters*, 2, *Works*, 4, Epilogue.

79 Ruskin, *Works*, 1, p. 110.

80 RF MS 05B, f. 4v. It is interesting to note that Ruskin must have been already aware of the forms of the arches at Pisa, although this is not noted until f.10.

81 RF MS 05B, f. 4.

82 Shapiro, *Letters*, p. 236.

83 *Ibid*.

84 *Ibid*., p. 206.

85 RF MS 05C, f. 43v and ff. 51-62.

86 RF MS 05C, ff. 113-114, 117-26.

87 Ruskin Museum, Coniston (CONRM), 1990.381, p. 151.

88 RF MS 06, f. 46 and f. 248.

89 RF MS 05C, f. 8.

90 R. Willis, *Remarks on the Architecture of the Middle Ages, especially*

Alexandrina Buchanan

of Italy (Cambridge: Deighton, 1835), p. 12.

91 Ruskin, "Aralecta Pentelici", *Works,* 20, p. 21.

92 RF MS 05C, f. 15.

93 RF MS 05C, ff. 15-16.

94 RF MS 05C, f. 16.

95 CONRM, Sketchbook 4, 1846: 1990.381, pp. 33-4.

96 RF MS 05C, f. 19.

97 Hewison, *Ruskin on Venice*, pp. 149-75 and Kite, *Building*.

98 J. L. Bradley and I. Ousby, *The Correspondence of John Ruskin and Charles Eliot Norton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 37.

99 Notebook N, RF 1996 P1619, facing f.1, written up in Yale University, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS Vault Section 14 Drawer 2 Box 4 (used in digitised version cited above), ff. 1-3 (from back).

100 *Ruskin Works*, 10, pl. 12.

101 Hewison, *Ruskin on Venice*, p. 181.

102 Buchanan, *Robert Willis*, pp. 113-14.

103 Whewell, *Architectural Notes* (1842), p. XII.

104 The majority are now in the Ruskin Library at Lancaster, some others survive elsewhere.

105 These have been digitised by the Ruskin Library and collated with the other sources: http://www.lancaster. ac.uk/users/ruskinlib/eSoV/ <accessed 23 July 2014>.

106 For Ruskin's use of metaphor, see A. Hultzsch, *Architecture, Travellers and Writers. Constructing Histories of Perception 1640-1950*, Legenda Studies in Comparative Literature 26 (London: MHRA and Maney, 2014), pp. 129-52.

107 Quoted in *Works*, 8, p. XXIII.

108 Hewison, *Ruskin on Venice*, pp. 154-62.

109 Shapiro, *Letters*, p. 119.

110 *Quarterly Review*, 75 (1845), pp. 334-403 (p. 339).

111 Ruskin, *Works,* 8, p. 248.

112 Ruskin, *Works*, 9, p. 38.

113 Letter from John James Ruskin to John Ruskin, 6-7 January, 1852, quoted in R. Hewison, 'Notes on the Construction of *The Stones of Venice*', in R. Rhodes and D.I. Janik, *Studies in Ruskin. Essays in Honor of Van Akin Burd* (Athens, OH, 1982), pp. 131-52 (p. 142).

114 Hewison 'Notes' and *idem*, *Ruskin and Venice*, pp. 177-205.

115 Ruskin, *Works*, 36, pp.114-15.

116 Letter from John Ruskin to C.E. Norton, May 1857, in J. L. Bradley and I. Ousby (eds.), *The Correspondence of John Ruskin and Charles Eliot Norton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 35-6.

117 Ruskin, *Works*, 9, p.172.

118 For example, A. Bermingham, *Landscape and Ideology: The English Rustic Tradition, 1740-1860* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989) and R. Sha, 'The Power of the English Nineteenth-Century Visual and Verbal Sketch: Appropriation, Discipline, Mastery', *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* (2002), 21:1, pp. 73-100;

119 C. Newall, 'Ruskin and the Art of Drawing', in H. Welchel (ed.), *John Ruskin and the Victoran Eye* (New York: Harry N. Abrams and the Phoenix Art Museum, 1993), pp. 81-115 (p. 81).