

THE JEFFERSONIAN COURTHOUSE IN VIRGINIA, 1810-1850

NHL THEMATIC NOMINATION PROJECT

By

Charles Brownell, Ph. D.

With the Assistance of

Craig A. Reynolds, Erika S. A. Moore,

and the Members of

Virginia Commonwealth University Graduate Seminar ARTH 789 (2003),

“The World of Jefferson and Latrobe.”

Richmond, Virginia

May 2006

OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture
 - A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia* (London, 1787)
 - B. Jefferson and the Orders
 - C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
 - D. Jefferson and Models
 - E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
 - F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
 - G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
 - H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
 - I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)
 - J. Courthouses in the Jefferson Lineage from Charlotte County to Powhatan County
- III. Conclusion

I. Introduction

"But how is a taste in this beautiful art to be formed in our countrymen, unless we avail ourselves of every occasion when public buildings are to be erected, of presenting . . . models for . . . study and imitation?"

Thomas Jefferson on the Virginia State Capitol to James Madison, 20 September

1785;

Thomas Jefferson on the Virginia State Capitol to Edmund Randolph, 20 September

1785.¹

Summary.

Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) is the first American architect of international stature. Jefferson's conception for the nation that he helped to create included a vision of civic architecture, but rarely today can we walk up to a pure manifestation of Jefferson's civic architectural thought and touch it. Many of Jefferson's designs for public buildings remained unbuilt. Others had checkered careers. Thus, it is not easy to see Jefferson's idea of a "cubic" temple at the Virginia State Capitol; it is hard to recognize his notion of a "spherical" temple at the U. S. Capitol; and most of the offspring of these two statehouses --

¹For Jefferson to Madison and Randolph, see *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Julian P. Boyd et al., 34 vols. to date (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950-), 8:534-39. I have quoted the phrasing in the Madison letter (p. 535) rather than the variant in the Randolph letter (p. 538). For the period after 16 February 1801, currently covered by the *Papers* (outside the two volumes of the *Retirement Series*, which do not apply to the present study), I have largely relied on four microform editions of the Jefferson documents (all four of which are available at the Virginia Historical Society): Jefferson, *Papers, 1606-1889*, 65 reels, microfilm (positive) made from the originals in the Thomas Jefferson Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., 1974; *Papers, 1705-1827*, 16 reels, microfilm (positive) made from the originals in the Thomas Jefferson Coolidge collection of manuscripts at the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, 1977; *Papers, 1732-1828*, 10 reels, microfilm (positive) made under the auspices of the University of Virginia Library, the National Historical Publications Commission, and the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation from originals and copies at the University of Virginia Library, 1977; and *Papers, 1761-1826*, 4 reels, microfilm (positive) made from the originals in the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, San Marino, California, 1991. Hereafter I shall cite Jefferson documents from these four sources by identifying the repository and the microfilm reel number. For helpful guides to the twelve major public collections of Jefferson documents, see Douglas W. Tanner et al., eds., *Guide to the Microfilm Edition of the Jefferson Papers of the University of Virginia, 1732-1828*, Microfilm Publications No. 9 (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Library, 1977), pp. 17-20, and the typescript guide to the Massachusetts Historical Society microfilm edition, pp. 23-25. Jefferson's outgoing letters often exist as an original and an essentially identical duplicate produced by one or another technique. As of 2006, a variety of Jefferson documents can be found by searching on the Internet.

innumerable “Temple Revival” buildings and state capitols – look far from Jeffersonian. There is, however, an outstanding case where again and again we can step up to Jeffersonian civic architecture in the flesh, as this study will show. Among courthouses, which traditionally were Virginia’s most important civic buildings, the Old Dominion preserves a cycle of buildings that ever-so-tangibly embed Jeffersonian thinking in solid masonry.²

Jefferson, great representative that he was of the Renaissance tradition of the amateur architect, taught himself how to create buildings because he had no other way of getting the art of architecture in the hinterlands of Virginia. From reading the publications of the early eighteenth-century British Palladians, he became a lifelong disciple of the sixteenth-century Italian master Andrea Palladio, although a gulf created by Palladio’s interpreters separated Jefferson from his hero. Jefferson wrote about his values, stressing two: durable brick and stone rather than wood for construction, and the Classical Orders of column for ornament. At an early point he set out to reform architecture in his native Virginia, and later he extended his attempt to his young nation. To spread his reform he relied on a powerful custom that later Americans have forgotten: in Jefferson’s time it was an old and widespread practice to make new buildings imitate standing buildings, often as a matter of contract.

As interesting as Jefferson’s domestic designs are, Jefferson owes his international stature to his public buildings. Within this field he achieved his greatest results at the United States Capitol and the White House in Washington, but here his influence became obscured in mingling with the preferences of other men. Jefferson’s University of Virginia is his masterpiece, but it remains a unique marvel. The

² For the present author’s view of Jefferson’s place in architecture, see Charles Brownell in Brownell, Calder Loth, William M. S. Rasmussen, and Richard Guy Wilson, *The Making of Virginia Architecture* (Richmond: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 1992), esp. 46-53, 63-65, and Survey Nos. 7-12, 26-28. For the current state of study of the Virginia State Capitol, see Brownell, “Introduction to the 2002 Edition,” in Fiske Kimball, *The Capitol of Virginia: A Landmark of American Architecture*, edited by Jon Kukla, with Martha C. Vick and Sarah Shields Driggs, revised and expanded ed., with a new introduction by Charles Brownell and an essay on the Capitol model by F. Carey Howlett (Richmond: Library of Virginia, 2002). As to the argument that Jefferson was as much one of the architects of the United States Capitol as anyone who bore a formal title to that effect, see Brownell, “Thomas Jefferson’s Architectural Models and the United States Capitol,” in *A Republic for the Ages: The United States Capitol and the Political Culture of the Early Republic*, edited by Donald R. Kennon (Charlottesville: published for the United States Capitol Historical Society by the University Press of Virginia, 1999). The term *Temple Revival* is likewise my suggestion; see *Making of Virginia Architecture*, 63-67.

impact of Jefferson as a designer on American civic architecture work rested on how he put traditional room-plans inside temple-shaped bodies. He did this first at the Virginia capitol, but this building was much changed during its clumsy execution, was further flawed by a defective stucco coating on the exterior, and was not closely imitated.

Far more successfully, Jefferson united established courtroom planning and the temple body in a modest Tuscan courthouse conception with red-brick walls and stucco only on the columns. This pattern reshaped Virginia courthouses for a generation. The spread of this conception owed much to the University of Virginia buildings, where Jefferson set models for construction and the Orders, trained craftsmen, and absorbed inspiration from the second American architect of international stature, B. Henry Latrobe, the great professional, whose influence deeply affected the courthouse reform.

That reform was imperfect. For instance, Jefferson's circulation patterns were flawed, he never figured out how to integrate a bell with a temple, and his ideals for the Orders were compromised by the subjective standards that had spread from the British architect Robert Adam. Jefferson nonetheless gave Virginia a body of noble courthouse buildings fully worthy of the highest ideals of the law that is administered within them.

Method.

In June 2002, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources approached the author to undertake the present study with his graduate students because of his publications on Jefferson and his long interest in Jeffersonian courthouses. In August 2002, the Department provided a list of fifteen Jeffersonian courthouses drawn from the award-winning standard study by John O. Peters and Margaret T. Peters, *Virginia's Historic Courthouses* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995). The first major campaign of work took place with the collaboration of Virginia Commonwealth University graduate students in the spring 2003 seminar "The Architectural World of Jefferson and Latrobe" (in which Mr. and Mrs. Peters spoke). (Copies of the students' reports, cited below, are available in Special Collections and Archives, James Branch Cabell Library, Virginia Commonwealth University, as well as at the Department of Historic Resources and the Jefferson Library, the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Charlottesville, Virginia.)

The second major campaign occurred during the summer of 2003, when two of the graduate students from the spring seminar, Craig A. Reynolds (now Community Preservation Specialist, Central Regional Office Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana) and Erika S. A. Moore, held internships from the Department of Historic Resources to pursue the more difficult courthouse evidence. In the same period, Delos D. Hughes, Professor Emeritus, Department of Politics, Washington and Lee University, made his splendid collection of Virginia courthouse documentation available for copying. In November of 2003, Reynolds and Moore acquainted the public with the choicest findings of the year at "Classics and Exotics," Virginia Commonwealth University's Eleventh Annual Symposium on Architectural History and the Decorative Arts, under the co-sponsorship of the Department of Historic Resources and seven other major cultural institutions.

In pursuing the study the procedure was the classic one: to start by mastering the current state of understanding about the courthouses, and to work back systematically to the primary sources. A particular wrinkle lay in training seven graduate students to carry on the courthouse research proper, to say nothing of training other graduate students who had topics tangential to the courthouses. The most current body of written material normally was in the files of the Department of Historic Resources, while the primary sources consisted particularly of county records and the supreme primary source, the buildings themselves. It facilitated research greatly to have access to two further repositories, the Virginia Historical Society and the Library of Virginia. The results of the study would have been drastically different had it not been for the dramatic and remarkably opportune discoveries regarding Jefferson's Buckingham County Courthouse made in 2003-2004 by Professor Brian D. Bates and his students in Longwood University's Archaeology Field School, results that Dr. Bates generously made available to the courthouse project at every point. By a stroke of good fortune, late in the process of revising the present study, Delos Hughes's characteristically fastidious study of the Buckingham building reached publication late in 2004.³

³ Hughes's study appeared as "The Courthouses of Buckingham County: Jefferson and Beyond," *Arris* 15 (2004):1-25.

The labors in the seminar produced a rich group of analytical ideas and a generous body of documentation. The course made one unwelcome conclusion plain, however: it was not possible to study all fifteen courthouses – distributed as they are around a large state -- in the necessary scholarly depth. The buildings for nomination were therefore pared to the most essential three, the courthouses of Charlotte, Lunenburg, and Goochland Counties. The wisdom of this reduction became incontrovertible during the summer of 2003, when scrutiny of two of these three buildings quite unexpectedly overturned the existing scholarship. Flying in the face of learned opinion, Craig Reynolds demonstrated, on the one hand, that the interior of Jefferson's Charlotte County Courthouse is not original, and that, on the other hand, much of the interior of the Lunenburg County Courthouse on the first floor does date from the period of construction. Judiciously, then, in connection with nominating the Charlotte, Lunenburg, and Goochland "temples of justice," the present report summarizes the lines of interpretation that took shape in 2003 and concludes by applying those ideas to a survey of the Jeffersonian courthouse in Virginia.

Acknowledgments. Brian D. Bates, Ph. D., Director, Longwood Archaeology Field School, Longwood University, Farmville; Ann C. de Witt, Graphics Coordinator, Virginia Historical Society; Delos D. Hughes, Ph. D., Professor Emeritus, Department of Politics, Washington and Lee University; David A. McLeod, M. D., Richmond; John O. Peters and Margaret T. Peters, Richmond; Craig A. Reynolds, Community Preservation Specialist, Central Regional Office, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana; and the present and former staff of the Department of Historic Resources, particularly Robert A. Carter, Ph. D., Bryan Clark Green, Ph. D., and Calder Loth.

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

Jefferson wanted to reform Virginia architecture. In his book *Notes on the State of Virginia* (London, 1787), he spelled out what he thought was wrong, and to that we shall come in a moment. It is harder to establish what he thought was right. Jefferson wrote little about architecture, and the researcher has to compile Jefferson's values from countless stray remarks among his vast written remains. Still, one can sketch out the pattern.

It seems probable that, like his Italian Renaissance hero Andrea Palladio and Palladio's British followers, Jefferson thought that he was practicing the one, true architecture that the Greeks and Romans (the "Ancients" or "Antients") had founded on the unchanging Laws of Nature (fig. 1). It also seems probable that, like many of his contemporaries, Jefferson believed that the "Moderns," the architects from the renewal of antiquity in the Renaissance onward, had not equaled the Ancients' achievements (Fig. 2). There was one exception to this exclusivity: for Jefferson, Palladio's handling of the Orders of column was the best in history (Fig. 3). Very likely, Jefferson had worked out a hierarchy of building types. At the top, it seems, were the greatest public buildings, the statehouses, which Jefferson wanted to make models of the purest Ancient forms, the "cubic" and "spherical" forms of the temple (Fig. 4). On the next level down stood the magistrate's house (Figs. 5-6), for which Jefferson favored the ideal geometry set by one of the greatest Modern buildings, Palladio's Villa Rotonda. Still further down came the private house, where Jefferson permitted great latitude.⁴

Jefferson referred to Palladio's treatise as his architectural "Bible." This statement is profoundly revealing for Jefferson's architecture, as grows clearer with each passing year. There is, however, a deceptive wrinkle in this allegiance. As Frank H. Sommer III has pointed out, Jefferson took as authoritative a version of Palladio's treatise that was wildly impure. Jefferson depended on three eighteenth-century editions of Palladio that Giacomo Leoni had published as *The Architecture of A.*

⁴See Brownell in *Making of Virginia Architecture*, 46-53, for more detail on the issues discussed in the foregoing paragraph. For a sample of the evidence that Jefferson saw Palladio's Orders as the finest in history, see below, Section II.

Palladio; In Four Books (1715-20, 1721, and 1742). These editions suffered from an unreliable text and, vastly more important, from plates that Leoni had pervasively altered to serve as advertisements for his own practice. One of Jefferson's greatest architectural feats was to bring a purified Palladianism out of so questionable a source. Even so, Jefferson never guessed that, when he thought that he was using the Orders of Palladio, he was really using Palladio's Orders as arrogantly reworked by Leoni.⁵

⁵Jefferson's reference to Palladio's architectural treatise as "the Bible" appears in the report that Colonel Isaac A. Coles wrote to General John Hartwell Cocke (23 February 1816) on Coles's conference with Jefferson concerning architecture; see Cocke Papers, No. 640 etc., Box 21, in the Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia Library. Sommer, the former Head of Library at the H. F. du Pont Winterthur Museum, published his analysis in a seminal essay, "Thomas Jefferson's First Plan for a Virginia Building," in *Papers on American Art*, edited by John C. Milley, 87-112 (Maple Shade, New Jersey: Edinburgh Press, for the Friends of Independence National Historical Park, 1976). My debt to Sommer, an inspiring teacher, will be evident to anyone who reads "Jefferson's First Plan," and I am proud to acknowledge my debt. The basic discussion of Leoni's editions of Palladio is Eileen Harris, assisted by Nicholas Savage, *British Architectural Books and Writers, 1556-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 355-59, which does not, however, begin to suggest how profoundly Leoni altered Palladio's illustrations.

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia* (London, 1787)

It is fairly common knowledge that Thomas Jefferson wished to reform the architecture of the Old Dominion. It is uncommon knowledge that Jefferson spelled out exactly what he found wrong with Virginia's buildings in his only book, the *Notes on the State of Virginia*. As the present section will show in detail, Jefferson concerned himself chiefly with *only two charges*: Virginians did not adorn public buildings with the Orders, and they did not construct private buildings from enduring materials. Among people who do not read what Jefferson wrote, a nonsense-legendry has grown up to the effect that, as a reformer, Jefferson wished to return to the origins of architecture, to revive the architecture of Republican Rome for the new American republic, to apply the innovations of the French architectural avant-garde of the late eighteenth century in his own nation, to create an American style, or to do all of the preceding in one mighty swoop. All of these supposed goals are the fantasies concocted during the second half of the twentieth century. Rather, in the *Notes* Jefferson identified his leading goals, to promote the use of the Orders and – the topic on which he laid special emphasis – to promote construction of brick and stone rather than more perishable wood. If we review what he wrote in the *Notes*, we shall see that his loyalty to the Orders belonged to a larger devotion to architectural principle, and that he mentioned an enduring aesthetic of his, a love of the “light and airy.” But we shall be brought back again and again to the two major issues of the Orders and masonry construction, which are definitive for understanding the Jeffersonian courthouse.⁶

In the *Notes* Jefferson's discussion of Virginia architecture seems disorderly but it does fall roughly into three sections: private buildings, public buildings, and private buildings once more. Jefferson opened by stating the masonry theme: “the private buildings are very rarely constructed of

⁶The authoritative edition of the *Notes on the State of Virginia* is that edited with an introduction and notes by William Peden (1955); I have used the reprint ed., New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1972.

stone or brick; much the greatest proportion being of scantling [small pieces of lumber] and boards.” His next sentence – “it is impossible to devise things more ugly, uncomfortable, and happily more perishable” – looks more widely. Here Jefferson may have had in mind a section of the only ancient treatise on architecture to survive, the treatise by Vitruvius, a Roman architect of the 1st century B. C. In a celebrated passage, Vitruvius set up a tripod of architectural values: attractiveness, utility, and soundness. After his three-pronged condemnation, Jefferson commented neutrally that “two or three plans” governed “most of the houses” before he reverted to perishable construction of logs or frame (more expensive than logs but less effective at temperature control).⁷

Jefferson next veered off into diet before turning to his second major topic, public buildings. Now he considered four Williamsburg structures, “the only public buildings worthy mention.” He began with the second Williamsburg Capitol (1751-53; Fig. 7), “the most pleasing piece of architecture we have,” which Jefferson called “light and airy,” a phrase that probably referred only to the two-tiered Palladian portico. Apropos of the Capitol Jefferson evaluated nothing but the Orders. That is, he did not even mention the plan, even though, in 1785, well before he made the revisions for the definitive text of the *Notes* (1787), he had copied that very plan for his Richmond Capitol. Rather, Jefferson criticized the Orders of the Williamsburg Capitol portico in detail. The gist of his remarks was that the lower, Doric Order was “tolerably just in its proportions and ornaments,” whereas the upper, Ionic Order was highly disproportionate with detailing “not proper to the order.” No doubt Jefferson had already set about correcting this portico with the pair that he devised as part of his museum of the Orders at the first Monticello (fig. 8). His corrections extended to masonry construction for Monticello columns. The

⁷For the *tripos* of *venustas*, *utilitas*, and *firmitas* see Vitruvius 1.3.2. The translation of the terms above comes from *Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture*, translated by Ingrid D. Rowland, with commentary and illustrations by Thomas Noble Howe, and additional commentary by Rowland and Michael J. Dewar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 26. Richard Charles Cote suggested the possible connection between the *tripos* and Jefferson’s “ugly, uncomfortable, and ... perishable” in “The Architectural Workmen of Thomas Jefferson in Virginia,” 2 vols. (Ph. D. dissertation, Boston University, 1986), 5-6.

Williamsburg Capitol columns were wood, described by Latrobe just a little later (1796) as “twisted and forced out of their places in all directions” and apparently “perfectly rotten.”⁸

Jefferson’s second example was the Governor’s Palace (fig. 9, lower right). Jefferson found this Late Stuart building “not handsome” externally but commodious, well sited, and “capable of being made an elegant seat.” We know what it would have taken to make the building “elegant” in Jefferson’s eyes because we have his design for transforming the Palace with a stunning display of the Orders. Jefferson’s project (fig. 10) proposed turning the structure into a powerful temple-form edifice with a mighty and deep octastyle portico in front, a grand but shallower octastyle portico in back, and colonnaded wings at the sides. On the exterior the conception is an ancestor of Jefferson’s consummate reform design, the University of Virginia (fig. 11). On the interior the drawing shows us Jefferson once again accepting most of a received plan.⁹

Jefferson’s third and fourth examples of public buildings were the College of William and Mary (fig. 9, top) and the Public Hospital. But for their roofs these “rude, mis-shapen piles” would have passed as brick-kilns, he wrote. That is, they did not have porticoes. Jefferson continued that “there are no other public buildings but churches and courthouses *in which no attempts are made at elegance. Indeed it would not be easy to execute such an attempt, as a workman could scarcely be found here capable of drawing an order* [emphasis added].” Once again, just as with the Palace, it is clear that elegance in architecture meant the display of the Orders (fig. 3).

Jefferson then observed generally that the guardian spirit or *genius* of architecture seemed to have shed its curses on Virginia. He lamented the expensive private buildings that lacked “symmetry and taste,” often displaying a “burthen of barbarous ornaments,” that is, ornaments very different from

⁸For the chronology of the composition and editions of the *Notes*, see Peden’s Introduction, xi-xxi. Mark R. Wenger, in “Thomas Jefferson and the Virginia State Capitol” (Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 101 [January 1993]:77-102), demonstrated Jefferson’s reliance on the Williamsburg Capitol plan for the Richmond building. For Latrobe’s description, see his Journal, 5 April 1796, available in *The Papers of Benjamin [sic] Henry Latrobe*, microfiche edition, edited by Thomas E. Jeffrey (Clifton, New Jersey: James T. White & Company, for the Maryland Historical Society, 1976), and *The Virginia Journals of Benjamin [sic] Henry Latrobe, 1795-1798*, edited by divers hands, 2 vols., The Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe, Series 1 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), 1:87.

⁹Jefferson’s design is drawing no. K98 (also numbered N425) in the Massachusetts Historical Society.

properly used Orders. Jefferson stated that “the first principles of the art are unknown” – one must remember that the Orders dominate the discussion of first principles in Palladio’s Book I – “and there exists scarcely a model among us sufficiently chaste to give an idea of them.” Jefferson voiced the hope that the revised curriculum at William and Mary would produce the necessary reformers.

Now Jefferson opened the third major section of his discussion of Virginia architecture. He squared off against the overwhelmingly dominant structural tradition among Virginians, who from their first settlement onward had built all but exceptional structures with wood – with post construction, log construction, and frame. In Jefferson’s concluding discussion, he launched into an extended attempt to counter a prejudice against masonry houses because of condensation problems. In fact, this concluding section promoting the erection of masonry dwellings amounts to more than half of Jefferson’s discussion of Virginia architecture. The section closed with Jefferson’s well-known argument that, “when buildings are of durable materials, every new edifice is an actual and permanent acquisition to the state, adding to its value as well as to its ornament.”

Jefferson’s discussion is winding, it is only approximately divisible into three parts, and a number of values emerge in no clear order. Nonetheless, two themes surface over and over to dominate the text: Virginians should adorn their public edifices with the Orders, and they should build their private houses of more lasting materials than wood. Reviewing Jefferson’s remarks prepares us for his reform of courthouses, a program based on instating the Orders, on refining the durable construction that Virginians had used for many public buildings, and – the topic that Jefferson slighted in writing -- on accepting established room layouts. Jefferson’s own text even points to the three principal techniques on which he meant to rely in his campaign: to set “a model . . . sufficiently chaste,” to train workmen so that they were “capable of drawing an order” (and of executing fine masonry), and to educate a class of leaders in architecture. It was not to be at William and Mary, however, that Jefferson would set his exemplars, instruct craftsmen, and inculcate values in patrons.

II. B. Jefferson and the Orders

I have examined carefully all the antient Corinthians in my possession, and observe that Palladio, as usual, has given the finest members of them all in the happiest combination.

Jefferson to Arthur S. Brockenbrough, 22 April 1823¹⁰

The Orders in which Jefferson believed were to no small extent a recent fiction. Working from Egyptian and Near Eastern precedent, the ancient Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans had developed various kinds of column, or post, and entablature, or beam, and the theorist Vitruvius had relayed a body of lore on the subject. In attempting to bring ancient wisdom back to life, Italian Renaissance architects and their successors systematized column and entablature far beyond anything that Vitruvius ever imagined. Moreover, such writers as Palladio gave the Orders close attention at the expense of other matters, such as vaulted construction. From the Renaissance into Jefferson's time, down the center of the Classical tradition ran the belief that columns were the principal ornament of architecture. Indeed, columns (along with half-columns and pilasters) and their entablatures did provide the chief means of ornamenting and articulating buildings in these centuries.¹¹

In the passage quoted at the head of this section, Jefferson gave the key to his practice after his very first attempts at design: at least in the matter of the Orders, the great Modern, Palladio had surpassed the Ancients (fig. 3). Palladio had selected the best elements ("the finest members") of the ancient Orders, and he had composed these elements in the best way ("the happiest combination"). Jefferson

¹⁰Jefferson, *Papers*, University of Virginia, microfilm, reel 9; cp. William B. O'Neal, *Jefferson's Buildings at the University of Virginia*, vol. 1, *The Rotunda* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1960), 26. Jefferson was defending his original choice of Palladio's Corinthian entablature for the University of Virginia Rotunda.

¹¹The founder of this line of thought was the fifteenth-century master Leon Battista Alberti.; see his treatise *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*, translated by Joseph Rykwert, Neil Leach, and Robert Tavernor (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1988), p. 183: "In the whole art of building the column is the principal ornament without any doubt; . . ." It was not Alberti but Palladio, however, who spoke authoritatively to Jefferson, who read in *The Architecture of A. Palladio; in Four Books*, translated by Nicholas Dubois and edited by Giacomo Leoni, 2nd ed. (London, 1721), in Book 1, Chap. 11, p. 17, that, "having spoken hitherto of mere Walls, 'tis now time we should pass to their Ornaments, the greatest of all which are the Columns, when they are fitly plac'd, and in their due proportion with the whole Fabrick."

was not writing exclusively about Palladio's Corinthian but about Palladio's performance with the Orders "as usual." (One must always keep in mind that, when Jefferson wrote about Palladio's Orders, what he had in mind was Leoni's deeply altered reinterpretations.)

There is extensive and vivid evidence that the Jefferson-Brockenbrough passage encapsulates Jefferson's mature practice. Three pointed samples will suffice. First, at Monticello II, Jefferson wrapped his house in the Doric of the Leoni Palladio (figs. 12-14) and brought the visitor inside by the sequence of the Doric of Palladio (façade, with portico), the Ionic of Palladio (Entrance Hall), and the Corinthian of Palladio (Parlor). Second, after a lifetime of learning painfully about the uncertainty of large construction projects, Jefferson made the first three pavilions that he built at the University of Virginia examples of the Doric of Palladio (Pavilion VII, fig. 15), the Ionic of Palladio (Pavilion V), and the Corinthian of Palladio (Pavilion III), joined by colonnades that exemplify the Tuscan of Palladio. Third, Jefferson uniformly avoided following Vitruvius, the great Ancient, on the score of Tuscan, Doric, and – to a significant extent -- Ionic column bases, instead preferring the treatments of Palladio, the great Modern. (For instance, in the Doric examples just mentioned, Jefferson provided molded column bases, even though Vitruvius treated the Doric as an Order with no base at all.)¹²

In setting models for the Orders via the Virginia courthouse, Jefferson had only a compromised success. It is in proposing a Palladian Tuscan Order for the Virginia courthouse that Jefferson met with a

¹²Visitors to Monticello may be distracted by Jefferson's borrowing of friezes from ancient temples for the Entrance Hall and Parlor Orders, but Jefferson firmly inserted these borrowings into the middle of Palladio's profiles for the Ionic and the Corinthian; see Brownell, "Jefferson's Models," 341-44; cp. pp. 62-64 in William L. Beiswanger, "Jefferson's Sources from Antiquity in the Design of Monticello," *The Magazine Antiques* 143 (July 1993):58-69. On Jefferson's simple original conception of a "sixpack" of the Orders for the University of Virginia, see Brownell in *Making of Virginia Architecture*, 49; cp. Survey No. 28. Jefferson initially envisioned the models as the Modern Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian of Palladio on the west, facing an Ancient Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian on the east. Jefferson called the clockwise arrangement a "circuit" for the architectural lecturer. With the expansion of the University to ten Pavilions and the Rotunda, the simple pattern became lost. As to the Ancient base treatments that Jefferson simply did not use, Vitruvius gave the Tuscan a circular plinth, unknown in Jefferson's work; Vitruvius gave the Doric no base, a treatment that Jefferson accepted only once, at Pavilion X, as one of the extra models that he used as afterthoughts at the University; and, for the Ionic, Vitruvius offered the choice of the true Ionic base, which Jefferson ignored, and the Attic base, which Palladio, Jefferson, and most Moderns used; see Vitruvius, *Les dix Livres d'Architecture de Vitruve, corrigez et traduits nouvellement en François, avec des Notes & des Figures*, translated and edited by Claude Perrault, 2nd ed., revised, corrected, and augmented (Paris, 1684), 4.7.3, 3.1-10, and 3.5.2-3.

conspicuous defeat. The Adamesque taste, which revolved around breaking longstanding rules for the Orders and indulging in subjective proportions, was far too strong for Jefferson's purity. In the vernacular, "skinny Tuscan" overpowered "husky Tuscan." The consequences of the defeat, however, were not as bad as Jefferson might have supposed.¹³

Orthodox Tuscan. The Tuscan Order descended from the Order that the ancient Etruscans adapted for their temples from the Greek Doric. The hallmark of Greek architecture is subtlety, a trait lacking in the Tuscan Order, which was robust or crude, depending on one's point of view. Thanks to the sweeping destruction of Etruscan architecture, the main source of information on the Etruscan temple is Chapter 7 in Book 4 of Vitruvius. (That is to say, this source dates from a time when Etruscan civilization had been in decline for centuries. Moreover, Vitruvius's illustrations did not survive the Middle Ages.) Apropos of the Tuscan Order, Vitruvius named three traits of significance for the present study. First, Vitruvius' base, properly called the *Tuscan base*, has a single, bold convex molding or *torus* (fig. 3, far left). Thus the base differs from the standard ancient or *Attic base*, which has multiple convex, concave, and straight moldings (fig. 3, all other bases). Second, the height of Vitruvius' column is seven times its diameter at the bottom and thus strikingly stouter than any of the other Vitruvian Orders. Third, Vitruvius' cornice projects very far, to a distance equal to just over a quarter of the height of the column.¹⁴

Vitruvius interested Jefferson more than twentieth-century architectural historians recognized, and from Vitruvius stretches a chain of writers – Palladio, Fréart de Chambray, and Gibbs – who mattered greatly to Jefferson. As to Palladio, the scantness of evidence about the Tuscan gave the Renaissance broad leeway in reconstructing the style, and Palladio took advantage of this leeway in his *Quattro Libri*

¹³The apt terms "skinny Tuscan" and "husky Tuscan" emerged from my discussions of the present project with my graduate students.

¹⁴For standard studies of the Tuscan see James S. Ackerman, "The Tuscan/Rustic Order: A Study in the Metaphorical Language of Architecture," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 42 (March 1983):15-34, and Sir John Summerson, "Inigo Jones" (British Academy Lecture on a Master Mind), *Proceedings of the British Academy* 50 (1965):69-92. For the most recent English version of Vitruvius' commentary, see Rowland's translation, 4.7, nn. p. 229 (with the caution that Vitruvius was probably describing a Roman adaptation of Tuscan sources), and fig. 73. Jefferson knew Vitruvius only as translated by Claude Perrault; see *Dix Livres*, 4.7.

(figs. 16-18). For each of the other four Orders Palladio gave essentially a single interpretation, but for the parts of the Tuscan he offered half a dozen alternatives, leaving it to his readers to choose. Following Vitruvius, Palladio did offer the hearty Tuscan base among his alternatives (fig. 17), he did specify a column height seven times the diameter (fig. 16), and he did illustrate a widely overhanging cornice (fig. 16). Palladio further illustrated an alternative cornice with a normal projection and a beautiful concave-convex bedmold (fig. 18) – a detail that Palladio loved and repeated for other Orders – curling into a deeply sculpted cyma-curved soffit.¹⁵

Among Palladio's commentators, it seems to have been the seventeenth-century Classicist Roland Fréart, Sieur de Chambray, who composed the enduring Palladian Tuscan out of the alternative features in Palladio's plates. In Fréart's *Parallèle de l'architecture antique et de la moderne* (Paris, 1650; fig. 19), the French reformer incorporated Palladio's Tuscan base, he accepted the seven-diameter height, and, ignoring Palladio's widely overhanging Vitruvian cornice (fig. 16), Fréart picked Palladio's cornice with the graceful bedmold and the sweeping cyma-curved underside (fig. 18).¹⁶

The eighteenth-century brought a significant change with James Gibbs, the Scot who popularized many Palladian elements without belonging to the camp of British Palladians proper. In *Rules for Drawing* (London, 1732) Gibbs published a simplification of Fréart's Palladian Tuscan. He preserved the Tuscan base, he adhered to a height of seven diameters, but he flattened out the deeply hollowed soffit, probably for economy (fig. 20).¹⁷

¹⁵Palladio's main discussion of the Tuscan appeared as Chap. 14 of his Book 1. The most recent English version of the treatise is *The Four Books on Architecture*, translated by Robert Tavernor and Richard Schofield (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1997). Palladio derived his sculpted soffit at least in part from the Roman arena at Verona.

¹⁶Jefferson knew the *Parallèle* in the Paris edition published by Charles-Antoine Jombert in 1766; see p. 105 and the facing pl. 45 for Palladio's Tuscan.

¹⁷See *Rules For Drawing The several Parts of Architecture, In A More exact and easy manner than has been heretofore practised, by which all Fractions, in dividing the principal Members and their Parts, are avoided*, esp. pp. 3-5, 7-9, 19- 21, and pls. 1, 3-6, 24-27.

Jefferson began consulting Vitruvius on the Orders near the outset of his career, and at an early date he turned to Gibbs temporarily. It seems fairly certain, however, that for almost the whole of his career Jefferson regarded Palladio as the best interpreter of the Orders, and that he learned to supplement Palladio with Fréart, perhaps from 1789 onward. Notably, it is Fréart's rendition of Palladio's Tuscan that Jefferson used for his last word on the Orders, the Lawn of the University of Virginia.¹⁸

It is consequential that, in the literary tradition that Jefferson followed, the Tuscan existed under a cloud. So it was, for instance, that Jefferson's Leoni Palladio told him that "the *Tuscan* is so rude and material, that it is seldom used above ground, unless it be for a *Rustick* Edifice of one Order only; or in some vast Building, . . . having many Orders one upon the other; . . ." Fréart in his *Parallèle* went much beyond the customary opinion, attempting to suppress the Renaissance recreations of the Tuscan altogether as unnecessary recent concoctions. Such an effort could not succeed: as the least expensive of the Orders, the Tuscan was indispensable, particularly in North America.¹⁹

Adamesque Tuscan. In Britain during the 1760s and 1770s, Robert Adam, recognizing that Antiquity did not provide the canon of forms and proportions in which Palladio and the Palladians believed, promoted subjectively composed and subjectively proportioned Orders. His vogue, with its elegantly elongated Orders, took off, flowering in the United States long after its extinction in Britain. Following Fréart, Adam condemned the Tuscan. It was followers of his who Adamized the proportions of the Tuscan, a particularly important imitator in the present connection being the New England writer of builder's guides, Asher Benjamin (fig. 21). The more slender versions had an economic benefit, particularly for building in masonry, where they saved on the cost of material and on the cost of

¹⁸For Jefferson's ownership of the *Parallèle* (in the Paris edition of 1766), see William Bainter O'Neal, *Jefferson's Fine Arts Library: His Selections for the University of Virginia, together with His Own Architectural Books* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1976) under "Fréart de Chambray, Roland."

¹⁹For the passage on the Tuscan in the Leoni *Architecture of A. Palladio*, see Chap. 12, p. 17, and cp. Chap. 14, p. 21. Fréart's chief coverage of the Tuscan in the 1766 edition of his *Parallèle* occurs on pp. 95-112. Fréart argued that only the three Orders from the Greek world – the Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian – were excellent and necessary. From his censure of the Orders of the Italian peninsula he excepted ancient Roman honorary columns, especially Trajan's, which he admired and classed as Tuscan. Of Modern Tuscans he chose Palladio's as best.

manipulating material into place. It was to the Adamesque that Jefferson referred when he wrote in 1787 that in England he encountered architecture “in the most wretched stile I ever saw,” and it was to the Adamesque that Jefferson referred in 1816 when he spoke to Isaac Coles of “false architecture, so much the rage at present.” In the Adamesque, Jeffersonian Palladianism had a powerful opponent. Even Jefferson’s Virginia State Capitol succumbed to a display of attenuated Tuscan in the form of the window and door frames of the main story (fig. 22) that as-yet-unidentified hands instated in place of the surrounds that Jefferson intended.²⁰

Every one of the Tuscan courthouses studied for the present project has an elongated Order. The results are by no means as disastrous as Jefferson might have thought, however. Some of the courthouses, such as Nansemond (fig. 23) do indeed have a flimsy effect. Others, specifically Charlotte (fig. 24), with columns of 7.7 diameters, and Goochland (fig. 25), with columns of well over 7 diameters, have passed for orthodox until the measurements were checked for the present project.

²⁰For the migration of elongated Adamesque Orders to North America, see Asher Benjamin, *The Country Builder's Assistant: Containing A Collection of New Designs of Carpentry and Architecture* (Greenfield, Massachusetts: printed by Thomas Dickman, 1797), pl. 2 and accompanying text; and Asher Benjamin and Daniel Raynerd, *The American Builder's Companion: Or, a System of Architecture: Particularly Adapted to the Present Style of Building in the United States of America* (Boston: Etheridge and Bliss, 1806), esp. vi (stating the authors’ goal of lightening the Orders for private building only, at savings of from 1/6 to 1/4), vii, and p. 12-16 with accompanying plates. Benjamin subsequently converted to the orthodox Roman-inspired Orders of Adam’s competitor Sir William Chambers, and then to the Greek Orders of Adam’s and Chambers’s rivals James Stuart and Nicholas Revett. For Jefferson on English architecture, see his letter to John Page, 4 May 1786, in *Papers* 9:445; for “false architecture,” Jefferson to Coles, 23 February 1816.

II. C. Jefferson and Durable Construction

When Jefferson criticized the reliance on perishable construction in his *Notes*, he specifically referred to wooden dwellings. In Virginia, however, with its dominant custom of building in wood, the wooden public building was by no means a thing of the past. Log courthouses, frame courthouses, and probably, for that matter, insubstantially built masonry courthouses were a feature of the Virginia landscape. For instance, in 1782 Bedford County built its third courthouse, a log structure, only to replace the building in 1787. By August of 1787, nearby Charlotte County had replaced its second courthouse, a casualty of fire, with a frame facility (fig. 26) that was adorned, not with the Orders, but with a color scheme of red (the roof), white (the walls), and blue (the door and window frames). The practice of raising brick public buildings, though, was firmly rooted in Virginia, as witness the fact that the third Bedford County and the second Charlotte County courthouses gave way to courthouses made of the more enduring material.²¹

What Jefferson did, then, was to enlarge and refine the custom of building brick courthouses. In this endeavor, Jefferson faced two distinct matters: walls and columns. He usually did not pursue other applications of masonry, such as vaulting, nor did he attempt to unseat wood as the material for entablatures and pediments.

Walls. Like masonry construction in general, walls presented Jefferson with two issues, the *structure* and the *surface*. As to *structure*, Jefferson's quest for permanence culminated in the best brickwork at the University of Virginia and the Jeffersonian courthouses. The trail that Jefferson had to travel becomes apparent when one compares the brickwork of these later buildings with the walls at Monticello, but the analysis of Jefferson's progress in brick construction must wait for the attentions of a competent specialist.²²

²¹For the examples, see William H. Gaines, Jr., "Courthouses of Bedford and Charlotte Counties," *Virginia Cavalcade* 21 (Summer 1971):4-13.

²²I thank Calder Loth for sharing his connoisseurship of brickwork with me and my students for almost twenty years. I have learned much from Loth's study "Notes on the Evolution of Virginia Brickwork from

Apropos of the wall *surfaces*, the present study can make a contribution by pointing out that Jefferson underwent a significant evolution from Palladian stucco to exposed brick. The stuccoed façade is sometimes associated too exclusively with the English Regency Period and subsequent nineteenth-century developments. In actuality, the stuccoed brick facade was a venerable Mediterranean tradition and Palladio's structural mainstay, while the stuccoed brick exterior wall was, although not a universal trait in the architecture of Palladio's English-speaking followers, nonetheless a fundamental one. It appears that Jefferson, at the outset of his career in civic architecture, intended a wholesale application of this practice but later converted to the more practical Virginia custom of using unconcealed red brick with lighter trim. Certainly the Virginia State Capitol (fig. 4) was built with a stuccoed brick exterior, and the stucco failed. (In 1811 Latrobe called the Virginia Capitol a "Warning beacon against the projects of Stucco-men.") By contrast, the University of Virginia and the Jeffersonian courthouses have exposed brick walls with trim – trim normally derived from the Orders – of a lighter color, however uncertain the exact nature of the original paint schemes (figs. 23-25, 33-34, 40, 53). This contrast probably had become established in Virginia building practice from around 1700, with the creation of the Later Stuart public buildings of Williamsburg (fig. 9). Jefferson's acceptance of the contrast is a milestone: in doing this, he accepted one of the most recognizable of architectural "Americanisms" into his Palladian reform program of permanent structure and decoration with the Orders.²³

Columns. Like walls, columns presented Jefferson with two constructional issues, one being the material of the shaft and the other being the material of the base and the capital. For the shaft, Jefferson's choice of stuccoed brick was pregnant with significance: this was a structural Palladian-ism that did work in Virginia. One need not question that Palladio was the inspiration, for Jefferson recorded

the Seventeenth Century to the Late Nineteenth Century," *Bulletin of the Association for Preservation Technology* 6, no. 2 (1974):82-120.

²³In 2002, at "Building Richmond," Virginia Commonwealth University's Tenth Annual Symposium on Architectural History and the Decorative Arts, graduate student Justin Gunther's paper "Jefferson, Palladio, and the Capitol of Virginia" reopened the discussion of Jefferson's Palladianism, particularly in connection with stuccoed brick. For Latrobe's opinion of the Virginia Capitol stucco, see his letter to John Wickham, 16 March 1811, in *The Papers of Benjamin [sic] Henry Latrobe*, microfiche edition, edited by Thomas E. Jeffrey (Clifton, New Jersey: James T. White & Company, for the Maryland Historical Society, 1976) 84/E14; 3:42-44.

this circumstance. What would prove a long, wearying debate with Latrobe about the Order for the Hall of Representatives at the Capitol in Washington drew from Jefferson a memorable statement on 28 February 1804. On the basis of one of his Palladian books, the President wrote the Surveyor of Public Buildings that “most of the buildings erected under Palladio’s direction . . . have their columns made of brick . . . and covered over with stucco.” Jefferson argued for using stuccoed brick shafts, with stone bases and capitals, in the Hall. Latrobe, who won the day for stone columns for the Hall, led Americans to build major public buildings with finely dressed stone Orders. Jefferson, by contrast, led Virginians to build major public buildings in the manner of Palladio, with column shafts of stuccoed brick (figs. 4, 11, 15, 24-25, 30, 40-41). The problems of using stone shafts – expensive shafts consisting of exceedingly heavy drums that had to consist of workable stone and had to be dressed regularly on all sides -- were substantial in a nation with scant practice in sophisticated masonry construction. Jefferson had run into these problems head-on in 1800-03 when he tried to re-erect the stone columns on the east portico at Monticello.²⁴

²⁴For Jefferson to Latrobe, 28 February 1804, see Latrobe, *Papers*, microfiche, 172/A1, and cp. B. Henry Latrobe, *The Correspondence and Miscellaneous Papers of Benjamin [sic] Henry Latrobe*, edited by John C. Van Horne et al., 3 vols., *The Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe*, Series 4 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984-88), 1:439-40. (The microfiche edition is authoritative for the text, but the letterpress edition, which sets no standards for care in proofreading, nonetheless supplies annotations.) In the letter, Jefferson, who never saw a building by Palladio in the flesh, identified the source of his information on Palladio’s stuccoed brick columns as “Ld. Burlington in his notes on Palladio.” The statement has occasioned much bewilderment because there is no such book. James Gilreath and Douglas L. Wilson have probably settled the matter in their editorial note to *Thomas Jefferson's Library: A Catalog with the Entries in His Own Order*, edited by Gilreath and Wilson (Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1989), 14. Gilreath and Wilson conclude that Jefferson meant “Inigo Jones in his notes on Palladio.” Jefferson had Jones’s notes (after a fashion) in Giacomo Leoni’s third London edition of *The Architecture of A. Palladio* (1742). The notes had never before appeared in print, and Leoni had tried for almost thirty years to add them to his version of Palladio’s treatise. Because of Leoni’s tendency to paraphrase and expand on Jones, Jefferson actually read a trifle more on brick and plaster construction than he would have found in the real Jones notes. Compare *The Architecture of A. Palladio* (1742), book 2, pp. 70-72, with Inigo Jones, *Inigo Jones on Palladio: Being the Notes by Inigo Jones in the Copy of "I Quattro Libri dell' [sic] Architettura di Andrea Palladio," 1601, in the Library of Worcester College, Oxford*, edited by Bruce Allsopp, 2 vols. (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England: Oriel Press, 1970), vol. 1, book 2, pp. 19-30 passim, and vol. 2, book 2, pp. 6-59 passim. Gilreath and Wilson point out that Jefferson at least twice confused Jones with Burlington. (One must observe, however, that they do raise a false lead apropos of the Isaac Ware edition of Palladio [London, 1737-ca. 1740]). On the re-erection of Monticello’s east portico, see Jack McLaughlin, *Jefferson and Monticello: The Biography of a Builder* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1988), 286-89. Jefferson turned instead to stuccoed brick for the later west portico.

Bases and capitals also presented a challenge, particularly outside major cities such as Philadelphia, where the building crafts had developed. Deposits of good freestone – sedimentary rock that can be cut and chiseled readily – are the exception in Virginia. Stone is heavy and thus was expensive to transport. Like the drums of shafts, bases and capitals had to be regularly dressed for a full 360° of their circumference, another expensive proposition. Crisp moldings were liable to damage if the bases and capitals were shipped rather than shaped on the construction site. If, as Jefferson wrote in his *Notes*, “a workman could scarcely be found here capable of drawing an order,” the situation was surely no better for workmen who could dress an Order. How Jefferson envisioned the dissemination of masonry detailing and how the process worked in practice at Jeffersonian courthouses must remain a question for the time being. Still, a large term in the equation was surely the craftsmen whom Jefferson gathered for his building projects, above all for the University of Virginia. Such men had to migrate to make a living.

Jefferson succeeded in enlarging and refining the custom of building brick courthouses. He drew masons to him, he probably retrained a good many of them, and he let them go their way. He abandoned the Palladian stuccoed façade, with its effect of a single, homogeneous material, and he accepted a vivacious Anglo-Americanism, brick walls with vividly contrasting pale trim (compare figs. 24, 43-44). For the Orders he found salvation in the Palladian stuccoed shaft, and he was right in deciding on the chiseled freestone base and the chiseled freestone capital, above which wood continued to reign as the material for entablatures and gables.

II. D. Jefferson and Models

Jefferson is popularly associated with inventiveness. In architecture, at least, it would be wiser to associate him with the judicious use of the principle of imitation from one end of his designing career to the other. The issue centers on the idea of *models*. Some of Jefferson's recourse to the principle of setting models is well known but little analyzed; other evidence has not been cited prominently. Even a brief chronological sampling of Jefferson's diverse applications of the principle of imitation forcibly demonstrates how fundamental the principle of setting models was to him. His activities with setting models reveal a rich play of ideas that he got from European sources and ideas that came from his American surroundings.

One must start the chronology by acknowledging a custom in Jefferson's background that has not received adequate recognition in writings on American architecture. This custom is, in the words of Dell Upton, "the traditional practice of modeling a new building on a standing one." The custom was a standard one in America before the twentieth century and no doubt represented merely the transplanting of European practice. The record is strong for public buildings and particularly strong for Virginia courthouses.²⁵

The case of Albemarle County's three courthouses offers a particularly neat set of illustrations of the practice. Samuel Scott built the first courthouse around 1745. At the wish of the justices (who

²⁵For Upton's phrasing, see his *Holy Things and Profane: Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia*, Architectural History Foundation Books, 10 (New York, 1986), 31, with examples *ibid.* and *passim*. I am grateful to Carl L. Lounsbury, Architectural Historian, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, for discussing with me the habit of specifying that a new building imitate an extant one from Medieval England onward. For examples of the custom of basing a new Virginia building or part of it on a standing structure, see Lounsbury, ed., *An Illustrated Glossary of Early Southern Architecture & Landscape*, with editorial assistance by Vanessa E. Patrick (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), under "Model," and Marcus Whiffen, "The Early County Courthouses of Virginia," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 18 (March 1959):2-10. For a sample of the practice outside Virginia, see the eighty-six cases that Peter Benes reports from the written record in "The Templeton 'Run' and the Pomfret 'Cluster': Patterns of Diffusion in Rural New England Meetinghouse Architecture, 1647-1822," *Old-Time New England* 68 (Winter-Spring 1978):1-21. In "The Building Career of George Winston (1759-1826)" (M. A. thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003), my student James Martyn Bodman presented a revealing cache of Central Virginia documents that demonstrate the strength of the custom by showing the practice at work in private commissions, for which records survive more rarely than in the case of public buildings. 2005: A welcome handling of the custom now appears in Carl R. Lounsbury, *The Courthouses of Early Virginia: An Architectural History*, Colonial Williamsburg Studies in Chesapeake History and Culture (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005); see *passim* but esp. 181-83, with an invaluable table on 182.

included Peter Jefferson, father of the infant Thomas), the building was modeled on the first Goochland County Courthouse, which had been constructed by James Shelton beginning in late 1730 or 1731.

William Cabell built the second Albemarle County Courthouse in 1762, modeling the new building on the recent Henrico County Courthouse (which had already served as the prototype for the first Chesterfield County Courthouse of 1749-50).²⁶

The story of the third Albemarle courthouse is more intricate (fig. 27). John Jordan erected the building in 1803 after plans drawn up by George Divers, William D. Meriwether, and Isaac Mills. Current historians suspect that the original form of this extant but much-altered building belonged to the “Town Hall” class of courthouse. The Town Hall pattern is most recognizable for a façade with a two-story-and-attic gabled front incorporating a ground-level arcade or loggia (fig. 28); that is, the façade bears some resemblance to the fronts of many traditional British town halls (fig. 29). The Town Hall pattern had made its appearance in Virginia just before Albemarle’s third courthouse, first with James Wren’s design for the Fairfax County Courthouse (1799; fig. 28), and second with the construction of the district courthouse in Prince William County at Haymarket (1802), attributed to Wren. Having reached Charlottesville, the Town Hall pattern radiated from it. In 1821-22 the Albemarle building competed as the model for the new Buckingham County Courthouse against a temple-form design provided by Jefferson (figs. 30-31). After a near-victory for the Albemarle exemplar, the Buckinghamites changed their minds, expanded Jefferson’s temple, and raised a building (fig. 32) that in its turn served as model for other courthouses. The influence of the Albemarle County structure had probably only just begun, however. For instance, one suggests that a series of Town-Hall-style courthouses by or attributed to Jefferson’s workmen William B. Phillips and Malcolm Crawford – for Madison County (1829-30),

²⁶On these episodes, see pp. 6-7 of William H. Gaines, Jr., “Courthouses of Goochland and Albemarle Counties,” *Virginia Cavalcade* 17 (Spring 1968):4-11, and p. 32 of Gaines, “Courthouses of Henrico and Chesterfield,” *Virginia Cavalcade* 17 (Winter 1968): 30-37; also (2005) Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, *passim*, esp. 182, 338.

Caroline County (ca. 1830; figs. 33-34), and Page County (finished 1834) -- are at least in part “corrected” versions of the courthouse in Charlottesville.²⁷

How Jefferson first encountered the practice of modeling new buildings on extant ones remains undocumented, but the circumstances of his early exposure are probably not material. What does matter is that the procedure was commonplace and that Jefferson understood how to use the custom to disseminate his reforms. The present section will conclude with the ripest piece of documentary evidence as to how the custom worked to spread Jefferson’s kind of design.

It is not yet clear how Jefferson saw his buildings as models for building technique. From first to last, though, Jefferson saw at least his major designs and probably all his architectural opportunities as chances to set models for the Orders. That is, his designs are what we can call “Museums of the Orders” -- he did not name the practice himself.²⁸

It seems most likely that Jefferson’s designing career began with the first house at Monticello (1769ff.; fig. 8). It also seems most likely that the Jeffersonian Museum of the Orders began here, although questions remain for study: when exactly did Jefferson take this step, and did he know European prototypes for the practice? The details of how his canon of the Orders evolved during his lifetime also require clarification, but about this we do know a good deal. If we combine the first design for the body of the house (fig. 8) with Jefferson’s list of “Orders of the Rooms” we get a simple reading: Jefferson now as thereafter favored the Orders of the great Modern, Palladio (or, rather, the Orders of Palladio as altered by Leoni) over the Orders of the Ancients. Conspicuously, the most formal parts of

²⁷The term *Town Hall* for this kind of courthouse originated with Whiffen, “Early Courthouses of Virginia,” 6. For the current state of understanding of the third Albemarle County Courthouse and the Town Hall pattern I have used Delos Hughes, “The Courthouses of Buckingham County,” typescript, [ca. 1997], 7, 10; John O. Peters and Margaret T. Peters, *Virginia’s Historic Courthouses* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), esp. 35-41; and Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, 123-24, 338. On Wren I am indebted to Kathryn Campbell, “James Wren (1728-1815), Architect of Colonial Virginia,” research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003. Campbell condensed her findings in her paper “James Wren, Virginia Architect (1728-1815) and the Disappearing Pilaster” for “Classics and Exotics,” Virginia Commonwealth University’s Eleventh Annual Symposium on Architectural History and the Decorative Arts (2003). For the Buckingham County Courthouse see Section I below .

²⁸I first adumbrated the “Museum of the Orders” interpretation in *The Making of Virginia Architecture*, 49, 52, 210, 212, 220, 248-52.

house were to provide the sequence of Palladio's Doric, Ionic and Corinthian in quick succession -- a portico with the Doric of Palladio downstairs and the Ionic of Palladio upstairs, leading almost immediately into a parlor adorned with Palladio's Corinthian entablature. Jefferson meant to use numerous other Ancient and Modern Orders (mostly as entablatures or perhaps even just as cornices, without columns or pilasters). Jefferson relegated the Tuscan to two outbuildings and for these locations specified a pair of ancient Tuscan capitals that Palladio illustrated. Jefferson did not finish building Monticello I, and he seems to have failed to execute much if any of his internal Museum of the Orders. He also envisioned a wholly unexecuted second Museum of the Orders for Monticello I. At an uncertain date he devised an Observation Tower which he meant, after an ill-conceived fashion, to display a full set of five Orders.²⁹

Jefferson became a designer because he had no other way of getting architecture for his own house. He advanced into civic design because he saw no other way of getting architecture for public buildings. His concern to set models becomes well documented with the Virginia State Capitol (1785 ff.; fig. 4). Near the outset, fighting for his design, Jefferson asked both James Madison and Edmund Randolph "how is a taste in this beautiful art to be formed in our countrymen, unless we avail ourselves of every occasion when public buildings are to be erected, of presenting . . . models for . . . study and imitation?" Jefferson had in mind setting an example of ideal proportions overall. After construction, he wrote that the Richmond Capitol "is on the model of the temples of Erectheus at Athens, of Balbec, and of the Maison quarrée of Nismes . . . which . . . are considered as the most perfect examples of Cubic architecture, as the Pantheon of Rome is of the Spherical." (Jefferson's writings and recent scholarship

²⁹*Thomas Jefferson's Monticello* (Charlottesville: Thomas Jefferson Foundation, 2002) is the most recent monograph on the subject. It does not discuss Jefferson's compendium of the Orders except in an unsigned and highly popularized section on 36. For the Museum of the Orders interpretation of the first house at Monticello, see pp. 331-37 in Brownell, "Thomas Jefferson's Architectural Models. This essay includes an annotated transcription of Jefferson's "Orders of the Rooms," from a problematic notebook apparently dating largely from the mid-1770s or after. See also *Making of Virginia Architecture*, Survey No. 8 (Monticello, First House) and No. 7 (Monticello, Observation Tower). William L. Beiswanger, Robert H. Smith Director of Restoration at the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, has pointed out to me in conversation that, because of the tower's intended site overlooking the house, the Orders (which Jefferson meant merely to have sawn in silhouette from boards) would have been quite indistinguishable.

reveal that he turned to other ancient models, too, such as fig. 1). Jefferson's concern for "Cubic" proportions, although highly germane to the story of Jeffersonian courthouses, must be left to another writer to unriddle.³⁰

Jefferson's goal of forming a Museum of the Orders is a different matter, even though the clearest information comes from before Design 3, the final phase of the Capitol design. As of Design 2, Jefferson prepared a set of specifications, his "Notes explicatives des plans du Capitole pour l'état de la Virginie" (1785), for his French helper, Charles-Louis Clérisseau. Jefferson stipulated a generous collection of Palladian Orders, many in the form of entablatures only. He meant the internal culmination to come in a fine, lofty hall (fig. 35) around the Jean-Antoine Houdon statue of George Washington, with a Leoni-Palladio Ionic colonnade downstairs under a Leoni-Palladio Corinthian colonnade upstairs. As to the Tuscan, Jefferson reserved entablatures in this Order for lesser rooms and did not identify which of Palladio's alternatives he wanted. Internally, Capitol Design 3 very likely incorporated much the same group of Orders as those of the "Notes explicatives," whereas externally the Ionic Order underwent a development that we still understand only imperfectly. In the execution of the Capitol (1786-98) and its rebuilding and enlargement (1904-06), the building diverged from Jefferson's intentions for the Orders. The extreme case is the Adamesque Tuscan of the first-floor window and door surrounds (fig. 22), an original feature with wildly unorthodox attenuated shafts throughout and an utterly crude handling at the main entry.³¹

³⁰For Jefferson to Madison and Randolph, see *Papers*, 8:534-39. For the current understanding of the design of the Virginia State Capitol, see Brownell, "Introduction to the 2002 Edition," in Kimball, *Capitol of Virginia*, xv-xxxi, with the source and corrected reading of the passage on Cubic models discussed in n. 2; and F. Carey Howlett, "Revealing Jefferson's Model for the Capitol of Virginia," *ibid.*, 49-63. See also Brownell in *Making Virginia Architecture*, Survey Nos. 9-10. The decoding of what Jefferson meant by "Cubic architecture" appears in Justin Gunther's paper "Jefferson, Palladio, and the Capitol of Virginia." If Gunther indeed prepares a Ph. D. dissertation in Art History at Virginia Commonwealth University, he will set the understanding of the Richmond Capitol on a fresh footing.

³¹Jefferson's "Notes explicatives" (N271) are MS 9374 in the collections of the Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, San Marino, California. For details on the Museum-of-the-Orders scheme, see Brownell, "Jefferson's Models," 338-41. "Jefferson's Design of the Capitol of Virginia" (Master of Architectural History thesis, University of Virginia, 1991), by Brien J. Poffenberger, the virtual discoverer of the "Notes explicatives," remains a valuable resource.

The sequel to creating a capital city in Richmond came in Washington, D.C. For the national capital Secretary of State Jefferson strove diligently to see Ancient and Modern exemplars set, sometimes with little success. In a celebrated letter to Pierre Charles L'Enfant of 10 April 1791, Jefferson advised that "whenever it is proposed to prepare plans for the Capitol, I should prefer the adoption of some one of the models of antiquity which have had the approbation of thousands of years; and for the President's house I should prefer the celebrated fronts of Modern buildings which have already received the approbation of all good judges." On the same day, Jefferson suggested to President George Washington a means of providing Modern domestic models that might "decide the taste of the new town." Jefferson proposed engraving copies of European prints that he had collected of "a dozen or two of the handsomest fronts of private buildings" and giving the copies away.³²

The suggestion of distributing prints came to nothing, but Jefferson wielded a profound influence over the architecture of the Federal City because he set models. Through this technique Jefferson in fact functioned as an architect of the national Capitol, just as fully as anyone who formally held the office. To say it again, Jefferson's hierarchy seems to have called for the greatest new buildings, such as the Capitol, to imitate the form of the greatest ancient buildings, which normally meant temples. It is almost surely because of Jefferson's use of ancient exemplars that we have the Capitol Rotunda, a survival of his idea of modeling the entire building on the Pantheon in Rome, the great specimen of "Spherical" architecture of which Jefferson wrote. It is definitely to Jefferson's imitative practices that we owe the magnificent East Portico, for which he set Latrobe the model of a reconstruction of a reputed "Portico of Diocletian" (fig. 36). Jefferson's idea of a Museum of the Orders reached a realization (1815 ff.) in the extant form of the three greatest Neoclassical interiors in the nation, the Doric Courtroom (fig. 37), the Ionic Senate Chamber (now the Old Senate Chamber), and the Corinthian Hall of Representatives (now Statuary Hall),

³²"Jefferson's Models." For Jefferson to L'Enfant, 10 April 1791, see Jefferson, *Papers*, 20:86; for Jefferson to Washington, 10 April 1791, see *ibid.*, 20:87-88. For this letter see also George Washington, *The Papers of George Washington*, edited by Dorothy Twohig and others, Presidential Series, vol. 8, edited by Mark A. Mastromarino and Jack D. Warren, Jr. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999), 77-80, which varies insignificantly in the transcription. The editors (80 n. 6) agree with the present writer's belief that Jefferson's suggestion bore no fruit.

although Latrobe rather than Jefferson decided on the Orders that these chambers display. And these instances are only part of the story of how Jefferson's models shaped the Capitol.³³

One rung down his architectural hierarchy, Jefferson seems to have taken Palladio's Villa Rotonda (in its Leoni version, fig. 2) as the ideal pattern for a magistrate's house. He failed to have his versions of the Villa Rotonda theme accepted for the Governor's Mansion in Richmond and for the President's House in Washington (fig. 5) although he succeeded in molding the latter edifice in ways not germane here. At least as interesting as these failures is another one, a tantalizing special case from 1803. In that year Robert Mills, serving as Jefferson's draftsman (not his pupil), made a set of presentation drawings for a Jefferson design under the provocatively generic title "Building suited to a Public Officer" (fig. 6). At least as of 1803 one has to ask whether Jefferson had begun to design generic models independent of any single application.³⁴

On a rung of Jefferson's hierarchy below a civil official's dwelling stood the private house, an architectural genre to which Jefferson gave freer forms rather than imitating Modern models whole. Such was Monticello II (1796-1809; fig. 12). The main application of the model principle at the second house is that Jefferson at last made his home a liberally outfitted museum of the Orders. To this day one enters via a portico in the Doric, steps into an Entrance Hall in the Ionic, and reaches a Parlor in the Corinthian, the Orders deriving from the Leoni Palladio and, in the latter two cases, taking the form of entablatures embellished with friezes from ancient buildings. The roster of Orders goes on from there. Variations on

³³For a part of the evidence from the huge topic of Jefferson's impact on the national Capitol, see Brownell, "Jefferson's Models."

³⁴For the "Building suited to a Public Officer, see Brownell in *Making of Virginia Architecture*, 158-59 and n. 45. In a 1991 seminar presentation, my University of Virginia graduate student Donald W. Matheson proposed that Jefferson made the "Public Officer" design as "a model for seats of government in the Northwest and Louisiana Territories"; see Matheson, "Thomas Jefferson, Robert Mills, and the Rotunda House Design of 1803," seminar report, AR H 700 (Brownell), School of Architecture, University of Virginia, 1991, (1). Mills's biographers have never served him well. For a riveting recent account of the Rotunda House design as "probably based on Jefferson's Leoni edition (1715) of Vitruvius' [sic] *I Quattro Libri dell' Architettura*" and Delorme's "*Nouvelles Inventions pour dien [sic] bastir*," see John M. Bryan, *America's First Architect, Robert Mills* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2001), 22-23.

the Palladian Tuscan, the Order of greatest interest in a study of Jeffersonian courthouses, appear in less important areas .³⁵

We can glimpse Jefferson's means for giving these elements influence. Piquant evidence hints that he may have written a script so that members of his household could guide visitors through his collections, including his collection of the Orders; certainly an inventory of the Orders on display made its way from Monticello into a series of publications in English and French. We know that in at least one case and probably more Jefferson arranged for other householders to get composition friezes from the molds that he had had made for the Monticello Orders. In the unquestionable case, helping a former housejoiner of his named James Oldham with the remodeling of a Richmond villa called Moldavia, Jefferson did so because, in his own words, "a single example of chaste architecture may guide the taste of the city."³⁶

Beyond the walls of his house, Jefferson contemplated another kind of architectural museum at Monticello. In his garden he wanted to build pavilions as models of "Cubic" architecture, "Spherical" architecture, and so on. Around 1805, he even contemplated erecting unclassical pavilions, which he called by the word *specimen*, and classical ones, which he called by the word *model*. Jefferson's differentiation in labels between *specimen* and *model*, taken with the unclassical designs themselves, suggests that he was considering illustrating bad as well as enlightened style.³⁷

³⁵On the slippery issue of the identity of the Orders inside Monticello II, see Brownell, "Jefferson's Models," 341-44. See also *Making of Virginia Architecture*, Survey No. 12.

³⁶On the hypothetical script and the use of the molds at Moldavia in 1805 and probably at the Albemarle County villa Farmington in 1803, see Brownell, "Jefferson's Models," 344-48. Jefferson's comment on "a single example of chaste architecture" appears in his letter of 19 January 1805 to James Oldham regarding Moldavia (Library of Congress, reel 31). On Moldavia see Bodman, "Building Career of George Winston," 15-19; Brownell and Karri L. Jurgens, "Moldavia (Allan House)," in Bryan Clark Green, Calder Loth, and William M. S. Rasmussen, eds., *Lost Virginia: Vanished Architecture of the Old Dominion*. (Charlottesville: Howell Press, 2001), 41; and Karri L. Jurgens, "The Hancock-Wirt-Caskie House, Richmond, 1808-1809," 2 vols. (M. A. thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2000), esp. 255-62.

³⁷On the unclassical architectural specimens that Jefferson proposed for his grounds, see pp. 183-84, 185 of William L. Beiswanger, "The Temple in the Garden: Thomas Jefferson's Vision of the Monticello Landscape," *Eighteenth Century Life*, n. s., 8 (January 1983):170-88, and Beiswanger, "Thomas Jefferson's Designs for Garden Structures at Monticello" (Master of Architectural History thesis, University of Virginia, 1977), 24-26, 33-34, 61, and figs. 29-

Jefferson's method of setting models with his buildings reached its summit at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville (1817 ff.; (figs. 11, 15). Here he even managed at last to create a model of "Spherical" architecture in the form of the University Rotunda. More to the present point is his lavish display of the Orders for – as he repeatedly wrote -- teaching purposes. Jefferson's celebrated letter to Latrobe of 12 June 1817 might seem to say it all: the university pavilions "should be *models of taste and correct architecture*, and of a variety of appearance, no two alike, so as *to serve as specimens of the orders for the architectural lectures* [emphasis added]." As an early university document, however, the letter cannot convey the abundance of samples that in the long run Jefferson spread out, outdoors and indoors, for his supreme exhibition of the Orders. In all this wealth of examples, a special place went to the humble but handsome Palladian Tuscan of Fréart de Chambray (fig. 19). More than 150 freestanding columns of this Order parade along the East and West Lawns, and that is not to count the lesser manifestations of this Tuscan, such as the bold entablatures of the East and West Ranges.³⁸

What a range of techniques we have seen Jefferson contemplate for setting models: dwellings, garden structures, statehouses, the free distribution of engravings, a plausibly generic design, a probable tour script, access to composition molds, and an entire university complex – this list is lengthy, ingenious, and by no means complete. If we end this section as we began it, we can see the force of one of the most effective means on which Jefferson counted, the habit of modeling new buildings on standing ones.

The case in point comes from the end of Jefferson's life. The crux of the matter is Jefferson's conception of a reformed Virginia courthouse, to take the form of a traditional Virginia courthouse plan rethought by inserting the courtroom within a temple-like exterior. The case entails the chain Jefferson-Buckingham-Goochland-Fluvanna. We must start with the Goochland link in this four-piece chain.

32. Jefferson's notes, reproduced in Beiswanger, "Jefferson's Designs," 61, and Kimball, *Jefferson*, fig. 161, seem to employ the term *Gothic* not in the modern stylistic sense but in an older pejorative sense.

³⁸For more of my interpretation of the University of Virginia, see *Making of Virginia Architecture*, 52-53 and Survey Nos. 26-28. For Jefferson's letter to Latrobe, see Latrobe, *Papers*, microfiche edition, 232/F3, annotated in Latrobe, *Correspondence*, 3:901-03.

We have to start with this third link because our case is documented by the specifications (fig. 39) written in late 1825 or early 1826 by the commissioners charged with building the third Goochland County Courthouse. Narcissus W. Miller, the Deputy Clerk of the County, and Colonel William Bolling, presiding justice in Goochland for many years and one of the commissioners who had just built the courthouse, annotated the document not long after construction. According to their annotations, the specifications had been largely followed in the creation of the Goochland building, one of the finest Jeffersonian courthouses, which Dabney Cosby and Valentine Parrish erected in 1826–27 (fig. 25). These specifications call for a building that unmistakably descends from an undated and probably generic courthouse design by Jefferson, hereafter called K214-215. That design, consisting of a drawing and specifications for a Virginia courtroom inside a temple, will be discussed in detail shortly (figs. 30-31). One reason for the similarity between the extant Goochland building and the Jefferson design has become evident. The Goochland specifications stipulate “the jury rooms to be on a plan taken in part from the plan of the Buckingham Courthouse herewith shown.”³⁹

Regrettably the Buckingham County Courthouse of 1822-23 burned unrecorded in 1869, and no “plan of the Buckingham Courthouse herewith shown” accompanies the Goochland specifications. Nonetheless, thanks to two recent scholarly projects – by Brian D. Bates, Director of the Longwood Archaeology Field School, Longwood University, and by Delos D. Hughes, Professor Emeritus, Department of Politics, Washington and Lee University -- the Buckingham tie begins to make sense. We must look briefly at these

³⁹The untitled specifications are preserved in the Papers of the Cocke Family, No. 640 etc., Box 182, Folder “N.d. Goochland County – Court House Specifications and Roads,” in the Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia Library. As we shall see below, these specifications are not the originals but an 1829 copy. In Wood Sweet Swofford Architects, “Goochland County Courthouse,” Historic Structure Report for the Circuit Courthouse; Administrative and Judicial Space Planning Analysis (Charlottesville, 1989), 16, Joseph Michael Lasala attractively dates the original composition of the specifications between 22 December 1825 and 17 January 1826 but is on uncertain ground in attributing them to William Miller. The quoted passage comes from the second page of the specifications. The most essential documentary literature on Goochland County’s courthouses is Helène Barret Agee’s minutely documented account in her *Facets of Goochland (Virginia) County’s History* (Richmond: Dietz Press, 1962), chap. 6, with revisions by William H. Gaines, Jr., “Courthouses of Goochland and Albemarle Counties,” *Virginia Cavalcade* 17 (Spring 1968):4-11, and Elie Weeks, “The Early Courthouses of Goochland,” *Goochland County Historical Society Magazine* 7 (Autumn 1975):6-11.

findings now to understand the sequence Jefferson-Buckingham-Goochland-Fluvanna, reserving a closer look at Buckingham's courthouse for later in this study.⁴⁰

In 2003 and 2004 Brian Bates conducted excavations at the Buckingham Courthouse site and discovered that the core of the courthouse (fig. 32) derived from Jefferson's courthouse design K214-215. That is, the core of the building was an oblong, apsed courtroom encased inside a temple-like exterior. No doubt Jefferson sent a lost variant on K214-215 to Buckingham. Bates and his students found that Buckingham's extraordinarily grand building differed very materially from K214-215, but that the deviations – such as wings leading to pavilions – took their form from other Jefferson models, as we shall see. The Buckingham County Courthouse, then, consisted of a Jeffersonian hall of justice inside a temple container, à la K214-215, amplified with Jeffersonian embellishments.⁴¹

And who created this spectacular variation on the Jeffersonian courthouse and other Jeffersonian themes in 1822-23? Delos Hughes's study of the Buckingham Courthouse provides strong evidence for the participation of Valentine Parrish and William A. Howard, together with less clear evidence regarding a role for Dabney Cosby.⁴² In other words, the core of the Buckingham County Courthouse was a Jefferson design the execution of which is associable with much the same team that would build Goochland. The composers of the Goochland specifications had got a drawing of the Buckingham plan (very likely a drawing made by Howard after the commissioners modified the design). The Goochland officials attached this drawing to their specifications or copied it there, and they cited the Buckingham drawing for an as-yet-unidentified handling of the jury rooms that Jefferson did not mention in the surviving copy of his specifications. So far, so good: Jefferson made a design, it was adapted for Buckingham County, and the Buckingham County adaptation became the basis for the

⁴⁰These new sources obviate the germane portions of William H. Gaines, Jr., "Buckingham and Appomattox Courthouses," *Virginia Cavalcade* 17 (Spring 1968):32-39, and Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, esp. 340-41.

⁴¹See Brian D. Bates with Mark Howard and James W. Jordan, "Buckingham Courthouse Archaeological Project: Report of Archaeological Investigations at Buckingham Courthouse, Buckingham, Virginia," Report to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, 2003, and Bates, "Buckingham Courthouse Archaeological Project: An Update to the Report of Archaeological Investigations at Buckingham Courthouse, Buckingham, Virginia," Report to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, 2004.

⁴²Hughes, "The Courthouses of Buckingham County: Jefferson and Beyond," (2004). I am grateful to Hughes for sharing with me his manuscript "The Courthouses of Buckingham County" (ca. 1997).

Goochland specifications and the Goochland temple of justice. Moreover, in 1826 the Goochlanders temporarily considered adding a pair of 16" x 18" offices "to be united to the Courthouse." This unexecuted proposal sounds very much like a derivative of the 16" x 16" offices that the Buckingham commissioners added to Jefferson's temple there, as Brian Bates has discovered.⁴³

But there is more. The surviving version of the Goochland specifications is *not* the original, which has disappeared. The surviving text is a copy sent in December, 1829, to a former member of Jefferson's circle, General John Hartwell Cocke. Cocke, a distinguished amateur architect, obviously wanted the specifications to study in creating the Fluvanna County Courthouse at Palmyra, Virginia (1830-31; figs. 40-41), with Walker Timberlake, an undertaker from outside the Jefferson orbit, and perhaps with William B. Phillips, a former Jefferson workman. If one does not let the ornament distract one, the Fluvanna temple readily reveals that its bloodlines run back through the Goochland courthouse and the Buckingham courthouse to Jefferson's design. Pregnantly, Cocke's copy of the Goochland specifications is not just any kind of a copy but an official transcript. It was provided by Cocke's peer, Colonel William Bolling, who we know was presiding justice in Goochland and one of the commissioners who had just built Goochland's courthouse. The transcript was prepared by Narcissus W. Miller, the Deputy Clerk of the County, son of William Miller, who was not only the County Clerk but also another of the commissioners for building Goochland's courthouse. In transcribing the document for a fee, the younger Miller was probably performing one of the standard tasks of a county clerk.

Thus we see the chain -- Jefferson design, Buckingham adaptation of Jefferson's outlines, Goochland adaptation of the Buckingham outlines, and Fluvanna adaptation of the pattern. Thus, too, we

⁴³Hughes, "Courthouses," 12, invaluabley contributes Valentine Parrish's 1871 recollection concerning Buckingham that "the drawings of the general plan, modified by the Commissioners, were all prepared by Mr. Howard." A design modified by the commissioners, available in a plan by Howard, might easily explain the discrepancy noted earlier by Hughes ("Charlotte," 12) that Jefferson's K215 specifies three jury rooms but the Goochland specifications, citing Buckingham, call for only two. For the proposal to add the offices at Goochland, see Goochland County Court Order Book, 31 (1825-31), 69 (order of 21 August 1826, treating the proposed additions as clerk's offices) and 82 (order of 18 September 1826, speaking of the additions merely as "offices" and guaranteeing the right of the County Clerk, William Miller, to keep his office at his house. For the dimensions of the Buckingham pavilions, 16' x 16' in intent but somewhat larger in execution, see Bates, "Buckingham Courthouse," 73, 94.

see how the chain was forged by the custom of imitating standing buildings, facilitated by the possibility of getting official transcripts of documents, a circumstance easily overlooked today. After all, if Cocke had not saved his own copy of the Goochland specifications, we would not know those specifications at all.⁴⁴

⁴⁴A series of historians such as Helène Barret Agee have searched through the Goochland records without finding the original courthouse specifications. Most recently, Erika S. A. Moore examined the Goochland documents on microfilm at the Library of Virginia during the summer of 2003. I am grateful to Phyllis B. Silber, Executive Director of the Goochland County Historical Society, and Lee G. Turner, Clerk of Circuit Court, the County of Goochland, for sharing their view that that the original specifications are unlikely to be traceable. As a transcription the surviving specifications do not contain the drawing of Buckingham that accompanied the original. Both Miller and Bolling annotated the transcript as to changes made during construction. I thank John and Margaret Peters for discussing with me some of the issues entailed in this problem document. On the Fluvanna County Courthouse, see Muriel B. Rogers, "John Hartwell Cocke (1780-1866) and Philip St. George Cocke (1809-1861): From Jeffersonian Palladianism to Romantic Colonial Revivalism in Antebellum Virginia" (Ph. D. diss., Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003), 77-86 and Appendix B, 343-48, reproducing the Goochland specifications. On Bolling see Barry A. Crouch, "Bolling, William," in *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, edited by John T. Kneebone and others, 2 vols. to date (Richmond: Library of Virginia, 1998-). On William Miller, founding member of a remarkable family of Goochland clerks, see pp. 2-3 of "Early Officials of Goochland County," *Goochland County Historical Society Magazine* 1 (Autumn 1969):1-7, and Agee, *Facets*, passim but esp. 49, 172; also CeCe Bullard with Margaret Henley Walker and Eve Barenholtz, *Goochland, Yesterday and Today: A Pictorial History* (Virginia Beach, Virginia: Donning Company, 1994), 107-08, and F. Johnston, *Memorials of Old Virginia Clerks* (Lynchburg: J. P. Bell Company, 1888) 189, 191.

It is just one passage of the specifications --"the jury rooms to be on a plan taken in part from the plan of the Buckingham Courthouse herewith shown" -- that establishes the tie to Buckingham. By an irony, we still do not know what the traits were of the Buckingham jury rooms that were supposed to be imitated in Goochland.

II. E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson

“If a community has a pulse, it still beats most strongly on the courthouse green. People of high station and low still gather there. They come both to conduct legal business and to engage in the social intercourse and commerce that bespeaks a sense of place. The hustings were the great meeting grounds of earlier Virginians, when court days drew not only lawyers, judges, and litigants but also farmers, traders, revelers, and tellers of tales, frequently tall.”

John O. Peters and Margaret T. Peters, *Virginia's Historic Courthouses* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), 1.

“The county court was the center of public life for most Virginians during Thomas Jefferson’s entire life and approached his ideal of self-government more closely than any other institutional form.”

Delos Hughes, "The Charlotte County Courthouse: Attribution and Misattribution in Jefferson Studies," *Arris* 4 (1993):17.

As we have seen, Jefferson condemned Virginia architecture in his *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Even so, the worst that he had to say against courthouses was that “no attempts are made at elegance,” that is, that courthouses lacked the principal ornament in architecture, the Orders. We can translate Jefferson’s opinion into Vitruvius’ “tripod.” Jefferson condemned Virginia’s courthouses for violating *attractiveness*, but he did not criticize the *utility* of their layout or the *soundness* of their construction. In actuality the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries bequeathed to Jefferson quite a promising body of material to reform. New scholarship by John and Margaret Peters and, even more recently, Carl R. Lounsbury enables us to understand Jefferson’s raw material. During the Colonial Period, the purpose-built Virginia courthouse had evolved from buildings conceived of as houses of perishable construction into an array of durable, recognizably public buildings. There had occurred a commingling of transplanted Northern European ways, Southern European ways, broadly North American characteristics, and Virginia traits. As a result, the Virginia courthouse had acquired a range of usable plans, a tradition of solid construction, and a habit of making courthouse architecture dignified, with even a little more of noble ornamentation than Jefferson admitted.⁴⁵

The plan that Jefferson took over consisted of an oblong or longitudinal hall, a tall space, with an apse at the bench and jury rooms on the second floor at the other end. The parts of this layout had emerged by degrees.

The longitudinal hall had arisen without the apse. In the most rudimentary phase of accommodations, the often-peripatetic Virginia courts met in dwellings and taverns, in an agrarian colony where English urban patterns for civic institutions and civic architecture did not fit. The first county courthouses proper appeared in the third quarter of the seventeenth century. These courthouses embodied a major Americanism: they were of wood, in contrast to the masonry that had supplanted timber construction in British public buildings during the seventeenth century. In contrast with the solidly

⁴⁵The following discussion depends chiefly on Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, and Peters and Peters, *Virginia's Courthouses*, chaps. 1-2. See also Whiffen, “Early Courthouses.”

framed public buildings found in the New England colonies, however, the first Virginia courthouses were built with earthfast or post construction, a technique that may have an unbroken history back to Neolithic Europe and Asia. Virginia's first courthouses were one-story buildings with garrets, differing little from houses. They were often cheap and rapidly became shabby. Their courtrooms, not meant for numbers of people, were domestic in scale and often were entered broadwise, that is, on the long sides rather than at an end. In this period, the raised bench, a differentiated seat for the chief magistrate, a table for writing, and the balustraded bar separating the judges from the rest of the room migrated from England. Other participants – from the clerk and the sheriff to juries and lawyers – only gradually received special accommodations. Clerk's rooms, jury rooms, and storage might be relegated to the garret.

In a process stretching from the eighteenth century into the early nineteenth, courthouses of brick or stone supplanted their highly perishable wooden predecessors of post construction, the misleadingly named “English frame” construction, and, on the western frontier, log construction. The process began in the Tidewater region, only slowly reaching west and south. Lounsbury writes of the proliferation, after 1730, of a plan of seventeenth-century origin called for convenience in the present study the *Virginia Basilica*, for reasons that will become evident. This layout, an oblong with side entries, had “a large open courtroom at one end with one or a pair of jury rooms at the other end or abovestairs in one gable end” (Fig. 42). Unlike orthodox classical design, which focuses on a central opening, these courtrooms often focused distinctively on a solid, a pier behind the chief magistrate's chair, with a window at either side. These interiors became increasingly subdivided in an orderly fashion to serve the developing systematization of the law.⁴⁶

An alternative plan, flourishing from the 1730s, took the form of a *T*, its stem formed by the oblong courtroom. This longitudinal courtroom was often a Virginia Basilica inserted into the *T*, but the room was reached not by a broadwise entry but by an endwise one. That is, one entered through one narrow end, on axis, with the entrance supplanting the jury rooms that stood opposite the bench in the

⁴⁶Quotation from Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, 128.

Virginia Basilica. At either side in the T-plan stood a so-called jury room. These rooms, the only heated ones, in reality served grand and petit juries on the infrequent occasions when they deliberated, but also provided heavily used office space for the clerks, consultation rooms for lawyers and clients, and chambers for the judges.

Four further eighteenth-century elements hold major significance apropos of Jefferson's revision of courthouse design: apse, porch, Orders, and cupola. The apse, embracing a curved bench, came ultimately from Roman basilicas, which functioned partly as lawcourts, and it reached Virginia by an uncertain route. Most likely the apse made its way from Inigo Jones's early seventeenth-century basilican designs for halls where justice was administered and traveled through English civic architecture to the profoundly influential chamber of the General Court in the First Capitol in Williamsburg (1701-05). The pattern became, in Lounsbury's words, the "most common, if not universal, seating arrangement" for judges in Virginia courtrooms from the 1730s, typically following a semicircular curve. Sometimes the apse projected from the back of the building, and sometimes -- in the pattern that Jefferson would take up -- the apse was built inside the rectangular walls at the rear of the courthouse. In Virginia the bench-within-an-apse took on a distinctive modification. In standard Virginia practice this arc embraced a curved bench for petit juries below the justices, in contrast with the use of jury boxes at the side of the justices' bench in Britain and other colonies. These concentric curves embraced the table and chair of the county clerk. So widely used a layout needs a name, and *Virginia Basilica* gives the major ingredients their due.⁴⁷

⁴⁷The Jones designs are an unbuilt proposal for the Star Chamber at the Palace of Westminster (1617) and the Banqueting House at Whitehall Palace (1619-22). In the basilican interior of the latter, James I administered justice, but the "Great Niche" that was built for his throne was eliminated, apparently because the niche conflicted with the customary rectangular canopy over the throne, as of 1625-26. See Simon Thurley, with Alan Cook and others, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1698* (New Haven: Yale University Press in association with Historic Royal Palaces, 1999), 84-85, 87; cp. John Summerson, *Inigo Jones*, new ed., with a foreword by Sir Howard Colvin (New Haven: published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2000), 38-49; John Harris and Gordon Higgott, *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings*, exhibition catalogue (New York: Drawing Center, 1989), 98-100, 108-23.

In three places on p. 139, Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, discusses the curved bench -- an obvious derivative from the basilican layout -- as a standard late seventeenth-century feature of English courtrooms; cp. figs. 40-41 and p. 140.

The second of the four elements, the porch -- of various kinds -- holds great importance for the Virginia courthouse. No later than the 1730s the arcaded “piazza” across the courthouse façade entered into popularity. It takes an effort for denizens of an age of air conditioning to appreciate the importance of these well-lighted but sheltered and shaded “outdoor rooms,” the resort on teeming court days of all manner of people, from attorneys and their clients to gossips. With its pavement lying near ground level, the arcade brought a special quality of accessibility to the architecture of the law. Such piazzas competed historically with other forms of porch, which sometimes stood higher from the ground.

The third element is the Orders, and here what is most of the essence is the set of moldings called *the cornice*. The cornice -- rather than the base, shaft, capital, architrave, or frieze -- is the minimum to which one can reduce an Order, and it is the most widely used manifestation of the Orders. This set of moldings is an abbreviation or shorthand for a full Order. To change the figure of speech, conceptually a cornice is like a window-shade, and one can mentally pull the other elements of an ordonnance out of it and down the façade. (In a few cases, the Orders were “unrolled” below the cornice: the James City County Courthouse [fin. 1770 or 1771] has a full pediment; the Warwick County Courthouse [1810] may have had a complete temple portico from the first.) The *modillion cornice*, that is, a cornice resting on scrolled horizontal brackets or modillions, was a particular eighteenth-century favorite in America, conspicuously in the form of Palladio’s Ionic cornice (fig. 46). It would appear that modillioned cornices were widely used on pre-Jeffersonian courthouses (fig. 44-45). Jefferson, it is true, discounted such vestiges of the Orders when he wrote of courthouses in his *Notes on the State of Virginia* that “no attempts are made at elegance”; nothing less than a complete entablature satisfied him, and he leaned on the full temple portico like a Palladian crutch. The fact remains that the cornices of the Orders in general and the modillioned cornice in particular had stamped themselves onto the facades of Virginia courthouses at least from the outset of the eighteenth century.⁴⁸

For the quoted material see Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, 144.

⁴⁸Given the traps that historic buildings may set because of modifications, it is best to cite documents on the subject of the modillion cornice on Virginia courthouses. See Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, 178-79 (1767), 180, 185 and 203 fig. 133 (ca. 1755); and Lounsbury, ed., *Illustrated Glossary*, s.v. “modillion,” for instances of 1699 and 1707.

The fourth and last element to consider is the cupola, also called a *lantern* or *lanthorn*. This element held a bell to summon the public and became a mark of civic architecture in towns. Alone of the four features under consideration, the cupola was repugnant to Jefferson, who regarded it as “most offensive” and “one of the degeneracies of modern architecture,” as we shall see below. By rejecting bell cupolas as unclassical, Jefferson entangled himself in a design problem that he never solved.

At the very end of the eighteenth century, in the 1790s, a fresh pattern joined the two standard layouts, the Virginia Basilica and the T-plan courthouse. The new pattern held an oblong courtroom entered endwise on axis. One of the narrow, gabled walls served as the entry wall and held an arcaded ground-story loggia beneath second-story jury rooms [FIGS. 27-28]. As noted above (Section II. D), writers have associated the conception with the arcaded English town hall or market house and, perhaps less fruitfully, with a taste for temple-like fronts.

The period after the Revolution saw significant changes. The courtroom acquired a new importance as the locale of elections to Congress and the General Assembly until 1831, as Peters and Peters have noted. In 1792 the General Assembly enacted a law to protect county documents. This law required every county to build a fireproof clerk’s office on the courthouse grounds. The delayed response, which Lounsbury has studied, produced not only the erection of freestanding buildings for clerks but also the absorption of offices into the courthouse itself, notably into the wings of buildings related to the T plan, or into one floor of a two-story courthouse.

A last matter pertains to porches, those outdoor rooms for the public. As of the early 2000s, Jeffersonian courthouse porches display evidence of their historic role as gathering places. Here information has circulated, as witness twentieth-century bulletin boards, locked or unlocked, and nails left embedded in the brickwork from posting notices in earlier days. Here, too, sometimes benches afford public seating. Unfortunately the documentation on such features historically is less than slim, amounting only to a record that in 1750 Richmond County provided benches for the two piazzas of the courthouse.⁴⁹

⁴⁹On the Richmond County benches, see Peters and Peters, *Virginia’s Courthouses*, 12, and Lounsbury,

Pointed questions about the early Virginia courthouse linger. Nonetheless, the recent flowering of germane scholarship shows us that the two centuries before Jefferson set out to reform the Virginia courthouse had been productive. Jefferson's course was to blend what he had inherited, to add to it, and to subtract from it.

II. F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)

If one is to make progress with understanding Jefferson's reform of the Virginia courthouse, one must examine two neglected bodies of evidence. One such body is two pieces of paper (figs. 30-31), once attached to each other by wax, later glued back to back, and conveniently called K214-K215. This document matters because it is probably Jefferson's generic model for the Virginia courthouse. The other body of evidence is the lost Loudoun County Courthouse of 1809-11 (figs. 51-52), examined in the next section of this report. This building matters because it was the earliest Jeffersonian courthouse in Virginia.⁵⁰

Our first body of material, K214-K215, raises questions, but its significance is still probably simple. As other historians have adumbrated or proposed, the document is most likely to be Jefferson's design, not for a specific location, but for a model Virginia courthouse, to be executed as opportunities arose. Reviewing the two sheets will illustrate how Jefferson combined and revised elements from Virginia courthouse planning, inserting his layout inside a temple-like container that obeyed the principles of permanent structure and ornament drawn from the Orders. He had done this before on a giant scale with his Virginia State Capitol designs of 1785, and now he did this again. Indeed, the confluence of elements is even richer than such a summary statement suggests.⁵¹

Publishing the Coolidge collection of Jefferson's architectural drawings in 1916, Fiske Kimball introduced the pages into the study of American architecture and catalogued them as 214-215. The front of the pair (K214) bears Jefferson's only plan for a courthouse, drawn on a printed grid; the back (K215)

⁵⁰Hughes in the MS of "Courthouses" (ca. 1997), 25, corrected Kimball by pointing out that K214 and K215 are two decidedly different pieces of paper. The passage, unfortunately, is omitted from the corresponding part of the published version of Hughes's study (17). I follow Hughes in believing that the two pieces of paper belong together.

⁵¹I owe the suspicion that K214-K215 is generic to Delos Hughes ("Charlotte," 11; "Courthouses," 17) and John Peters (Peters and Peters, *Virginia's Courthouses*, 47-48, vigorously reinforced by "Courthouse Architecture in Virginia before the Civil War," a lecture that the Peterses graciously gave at Virginia Commonwealth University in my seminar ARTH 789 on 3 March 2003). On the current understanding of the Richmond Capitol, see Brownell, "Introduction to the 2002 Edition," in Kimball, *The Capitol of Virginia*, xv-xxxix. I hope to see this discussion superseded by the work of Justin Gunther.

has Jefferson's specifications for the design, written on plain paper. Jefferson did not label or date the document; both sheets contain evident second thoughts; the drawing is unfinished; the specifications offer no functional analysis; and the plan exemplifies how maddeningly unclear Jefferson's self-taught conventions for drawing can be.⁵²

Kimball wrongly supposed that he had solved the essential problems of the composite sheet when he identified the document as a design for the Buckingham County Courthouse (fig. 32). Kimball pointed to Jefferson's correspondence (1821-22) with his friend Colonel Charles Yancey of Buckingham. The exchange of letters demonstrates that Jefferson did prepare a design for the Buckingham County Courthouse, and that the County chose to modify the design with Jefferson's acquiescence. Nonetheless, in one of the publications that marked the renaissance of Jefferson architectural studies during the last fifteen years, Delos Hughes demonstrated that K214-K215 does not record Jefferson's thinking for the Buckingham County Courthouse and tallies closely with the Charlotte County Courthouse.⁵³

K214-K215 will not soon give up the secrets of its fabrication, but one can make headway. The paper of the drawing is an example of the coordinate or graph paper that Jefferson discovered in France and began using no later than 1785. The drawing, then, cannot predate Jefferson's European years. This sheet unquestionably shows how to insert a blend of customary features from the Virginia courthouse inside a container shaped along the lines of a temple with a four-column or tetrastyle portico. We can learn more by touring the design as if it were a standing building.⁵⁴

⁵²Frederick Doveton Nichols renumbered K214-K215 as 23-24 (that is, N23-N24, as usually cited) in his bizarrely erratic catalogue *Thomas Jefferson's Architectural Drawings . . . with Commentary and a Check List*. I have used the 5th ed. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society; Charlottesville: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation and The University Press of Virginia, 1984). The Massachusetts Historical Society numbers K214-K215 as 227.

⁵³For the reattribution, see Delos Hughes, "The Charlotte County Courthouse: Attribution and Misattribution in Jefferson Studies," *Arris* 4 (1993):8-18.

⁵⁴Carl R. Lounsbury kindly discussed K214-K215 with me in 1992. On the traditional features of a Virginia courthouse, see Lounsbury, "The Structure of Justice: The Courthouses of Colonial Virginia," in *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, III, edited by Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman, 214-26 (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press for the Vernacular Architecture Forum, 1989), esp. 219-26. The basic literature on K214-215 is Hughes, "Charlotte County," and Bryan Clark Green, "Thomas Jefferson's Design for the Buckingham County Courthouse," a penetrating research report for AR H 700 (Brownell), University of Virginia, 1989. I am deeply grateful to John and Margaret Peters for assisting me in unriddling Jefferson's plan in June of 2003. My discussion

We walk through the plan across a grid made of larger squares that mark out 10-foot units, each containing ten smaller, 1-foot squares. At the bottom of the page is an addendum, Jefferson's final thoughts for the wall behind the Bench. We shall consider this fragment in its place. The plan proper starts above this emendation.⁵⁵

We approach the courtroom through a portico of four columns. That is, the Orders are not reduced to the abbreviation of a cornice. On K215 Jefferson specified "the Order Tuscan" for this area and, in Palladian tradition, directed "columns of brick plastered / caps and bases stone." This front area is both a temple portico and an equivalent to the eighteenth-century courthouse "piazza," that public "outdoor room." The specifications call for a 3-foot basement. Confusingly, Jefferson – whose skill of course did not lie with staircases – has not shown us how we are to ascend this podium to the portico. If Jefferson thought the matter through, he would seem to have meant six steps, each 6" high. In designing the Virginia State Capitol, as scholars have not previously noted, he brought his Temple of Democracy down much closer to ground level than his final model, the *Maison Carrée* (fig. 47). Similarly, he proposed elevating his smaller temple of justice but not lifting it very high. That is, his courthouse portico would stand on a low platform, not atop a tall podium, like many of the grand ancient temples that Jefferson knew from books, nor at ground level, like the "temples" along the Lawn at the University of Virginia. Jefferson's decision reflects Palladio's reconstruction of the Tuscan or Etruscan temple portico as resting on a low platform (fig. 16), the need for economy, and the traditional accessibility of Virginia courthouses, which often sat only a little above ground level (fig. 44).⁵⁶

Jefferson appears to have drawn this front area well after drawing the body of the building. Certainly the front wall shows where he originally drew four windows, two of which quite unclassically

incorporates many suggestions from them as well as a series of penetrating observations by my former graduate student Craig A. Reynolds, now Community Preservation Specialist, Central Regional Office, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana.

⁵⁵On the paper, BD in Kimball's classification, see Kimball, 112.

⁵⁶On the uses of older piazzas, see Lounsbury, "Structure," 220, 222. In execution Jefferson's design for the State Capitol podium was changed into a high basement for offices. For the Leoni Palladio reconstruction of the Etruscan portico, see Palladio, *Architecture*, bk. 1, pl. 9.

would have aligned with two of the portico columns. Jefferson erased this original fenestration and reinked the wall with two windows that fall between columns. So egregious a slip and correction tells us that this drawing began as an early study of its subject. At the same time, suffering from an old injury to his wrist that could make writing and drawing painful, Jefferson did not draw needlessly. K214 may well have begun as his first attempt at the subject and have evolved into his final thoughts.⁵⁷

Jefferson's dimensions for the body of the building, exclusive of the portico, are 59'6" x 44' inside the walls and 61'8" x 46'2' outside the walls. These dimensions approximate 60' x 45', and the portico is roughly 15' x 45'. These figures raise the question of whether Jefferson saw the design as "Cubic architecture." That is, he may have used graph paper not just to facilitate drawing but, as far as possible, to calculate the design from even multiples and even subdivisions of 10-foot squares.

Through the front door we find the courtroom. Jefferson chose an oblong space entered endwise on an axis that runs from under raised jury rooms to a Virginia-style apse. That is, just beneath the surface lies the precedent of the Virginia Basilica (but not its broadwise entries) as well as the precedent of the T-Plan and Town Hall courthouses, with their purely longitudinal halls. Jefferson's amateur code of symbols is sometimes confusing, and he did not render the furnishings of the room completely. Such a space had to accommodate (1. the Bench; (2. the sheriff, perhaps with an undersheriff; (3. the clerk; (4. counsel and clients; (5. the jury; and (6. the public.⁵⁸

Immediately in front of us we see the space where the public would stand or possibly sit. Jefferson did not mark the placement of the Bar to tell us that as the lay public we can go no farther. In his specifications, lover of mezzanines and the juggling of floor levels that he was, he referred to the frontmost part of the interior as "2. half stories." We stand in one of these half stories under the other,

⁵⁷Particularly puzzling is Jefferson's notation "within the portico a socle 8. I[inches]. to make the floor of the portico 8.I. lower than that of the courtroom."

⁵⁸I am particularly grateful to John O. Peters for his help in analyzing the functional needs of a courtroom.

which is a gallery supported by six columns. The specifications identify the Order of the colonnade as Tuscan.

Second-story jury rooms, we know, were an established feature of courthouses as of Jefferson's day. In fact, jury rooms resting specifically on a columnar gallery had appeared in a Virginia county courthouse not later than the first Town-Hall-style building, James Wren's Fairfax County Courthouse (1799-1800), a structure that Jefferson may have known. Nonetheless, Jefferson's columnar courtroom gallery, like much else in the interior of K214, is unquestionably inseparable from Jefferson's first interpretation of the Virginia courtroom, that is, his 1785 plans for the courtroom at the Virginia Capitol. Virginia elements are obvious in the Capitol drawings, such as the broadwise entry or the central pier between windows in the apse wall behind the bench. Jefferson's gallery treatment perhaps also reflected some Virginia model. At the same time, in the first and second phases of Jefferson's thinking, this courtroom expressly took the form of an apsed Roman basilica with a gallery on a colonnade running around three sides. In his final design, Jefferson reduced the gallery to a colonnade across the narrow end of the room opposite the apse. Jefferson took only a short step from that Capitol drawing to his model courthouse design. The tie between the model courthouse and the Capitol designs absolutely guarantees us that the Roman basilica was not far from his thoughts, even as the apse in K214 would have argued by itself.⁵⁹

In K214, a pair of staircases leads to the gallery from the courtroom floor. The staircases start at lateral entrances, survivors of the old broadwise entries. In our second case of heavy erasures, Jefferson scrubbed out the original lines at the upper ends of the staircases, redrawing the steps as tightly winding instead of as forming a straight flight. A dotted line running from stair to stair shows that he wanted to cantilever the gallery out over the Tuscan colonnade. This provision no doubt has some connection with the balconies of some of the University of Virginia pavilions.

⁵⁹For the Fairfax plan, see Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, 348. For the sequence of Virginia Capitol designs as corrected from Fiske Kimball's interpretation, see my introduction to Kimball, *Capitol*, with a convenient pictorial summary on xxxii-xxxix.

On the gallery stand three jury rooms, designated in the specifications as about 14 feet square. To one of these a jury would retire to consider its verdict, at a remove from contact with activities in the courthouse square. In a world of scanty public buildings, jury rooms were also put to “wide and indiscriminate uses” for various office, conference, and storage purposes, particularly because they were heated. In a typical Jeffersonian touch, though, K214 and K215 make no provision for stoves or hearths. Heating was an issue that Jefferson often addressed only late in a design.⁶⁰

When we step into the body of Jefferson’s hall of justice and turn to the difficult task of envisioning what Jefferson meant there, we can get help from a painting of *Patrick Henry Arguing the “Parson’s Cause”* (fig. 48). The picture, attributed to George Cooke and possibly painted in the 1830s – certainly long after the event that it portrays -- shows a pivotal episode in Henry’s career, an oration that he gave in the Hanover County Courthouse in 1763. The canvas does not tally with the architecture of the Courthouse, so we cannot take the painting as an accurate likeness of the interior at any time, but we can cautiously use it to suggest the generic elements of a traditional Virginia courtroom.⁶¹

Directly in front of us in Jefferson’s drawing are four bewildering lines. These one-dimensional marks look like some form of seating, but they differ completely from the dotted lines for seating drawn in the apse. The four straight lines make the most sense as an amateur’s notation that the Lawyers’ Bar, the railed area with benches for attorneys and possibly their clients, belongs here, in its customary place – just as in *Patrick Henry* -- but that the number of benches was to be decided.⁶²

Just beyond these seats a polygonal apse enfolds the Bench. Here dotted lines signify a lower and an upper set of seats, similar to those visible in *Patrick Henry*. The magistrates used the upper seats. Sitting only intermittently, petit juries occupied the lower ones rather than seats in a jury box to one side

⁶⁰The phrase “wide and indiscriminate uses” comes from Lounsbury, “Structure,” 222.

⁶¹For *Patrick Henry* see Virginius Cornick Hall, Jr., comp., *Portraits in the Collection of the Virginia Historical Society: A Catalogue* (Charlottesville: published for the Virginia Historical Society by the University Press of Virginia, 1981), 114-15. I am grateful to Craig Reynolds for calling my attention to this painting. 2005: See now also Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, 151-59.

⁶²I owe the interpretation of the four lines to Craig Reynolds.

of the courtroom, the more familiar arrangement outside early Virginia. The half-octagon wraps around a movable central table, placed like the one in *Patrick Henry*, where the clerk would record the proceedings. Jefferson neglected to draw in a box or (as was more usual) a pair of boxes for the sheriff and undersheriff at one or both sides of the hall, like the box in the rear of *Patrick Henry*.

At the center of the upper benches, between two windows, a pier rises behind the seat of the chief magistrate, whose chair Jefferson did not mark. The specifications say that “the windows embrac’g the judge’s chair give light & air there,” and Jefferson’s *Notes on the State of Virginia* have already given us an instance of the value that he placed on the light and the airy throughout his life. This pier and pair of windows are one of the most traditional elements in the room, and a highly unclassical one, for, in an orthodox Classical elevation, the center has an opening, not a support. K215, though, mitigates the solid center by stipulating a 10-foot lunette window spanning a 4-foot pier and the 2-foot windows. As shown in the apse, the pier is 6 feet across. The fragmentary wall at the bottom of the page has a 4-foot pier and must be Jefferson’s memorandum of his final preference for the rear wall.

An oddity in K214-215 occurs behind the Bench. Jefferson treated this area as a continuation of the oblong body of the building, tucking his three-sided apse within the squared corners. That is, up to a point Jefferson followed a standard courthouse plan, the plan in which the apse was created inside the rectangular rear walls rather than projecting from them (Fig. 42). The oddity enters in that Jefferson opened the rectangular walls around his apse into arches. (The insertion of a polygonal bow into a kind of arcade bears some similarity to Monticello’s “caged bow,” a bow inserted inside a portico [fig. 12, center]. We might call the courthouse feature a “caged apse.”) Here is our third case of major erasures. Jefferson erased and redrew the end wall, which he originally spaced like the fragment on the bottom of the page. He also erased but did not finish redrawing the diagonal walls that look out into the open arches. Jefferson’s specifications say that these courthouse arches “are to give light & air thro’ the windows of the court [bench?].” The apse would have given more light and air without the rectangular

arcade, so Jefferson must have meant *shaded* light and air, for a Virginia that had little amelioration for baking summer heat.⁶³

Such are the internal features of K215-K215. Jefferson, as we have seen, made express provision for (1. the Bench; (3. the clerk; (4. counsel and clients; (5. the jury; and – insofar as he provided space to stand at the rear of the courtroom -- (6. the public. He did not specifically accommodate (2. the sheriff.

One other omission from K214-215 calls for comment: provision for a bell to command the notice of the public. Jefferson never arrived at a sophisticated way to integrate such a feature into a design. The natural solution would have been to put the bell in a cupola. Jefferson, however, found cupolas “most offensive” and “one of the degeneracies of modern architecture,” as he had informed Latrobe in 1807. Jefferson’s last word on how to hang bells must have been the University of Virginia, where he meant to suspend these elements inelegantly on frames raised above the roof ridges, after the example of tavern bells. Jefferson’s successors in designing temple-form Virginia courthouses would face the placement of the bell as a fundamental problem.⁶⁴

One can summarize the essential traits of the interior of K214 by saying that customary Virginia planning and venerable European ideas flowed together here in an intricate confluence. To restate an issue, one cannot separate the apsidal bench from Jefferson’s awareness of comparable areas in Roman basilicas, apsed longitudinal buildings with galleries that served as lawcourts. Under Jefferson’s nose, in his architectural “Bible,” Palladio (as translated by Nicholas Dubois for Leoni) had written of basilica apses (fig. 49) that:

⁶³On Jefferson and the “caged bow,” see Brownell in *Making of Virginia Architecture*, 50 and Survey No. 12.

⁶⁴Jefferson’s letter to Latrobe of 22 April 1807, bears quoting on the subject of the “lantern, Cupola, or belfry. I have ever supposed the Cupola an Italian invention, produced by the introduction of bells on the churches and one of the degeneracies of modern architecture.” See Latrobe, Papers, microfiche ed., 190/B5; cp. Latrobe, *Correspondence*, 2:410-11. Jefferson may well have owed some of his thinking about cupolas to Palladio’s remarks on cupolas as a difference between temples and churches (*Architecture*, book 4, chap. 5, p. 53). On the University bells, see Appendix Q of Frank Edgar Grizzard, Jr., “Documentary History of the Construction of the Buildings of the University of Virginia” (Ph. D. diss., University of Virginia, 1996), now available on line as “Documentary History of the Construction of the Buildings of the University of Virginia, 1817-1828,” <http://etext.virginia.edu/jefferson/grizzard/>; and O’Neal, *Jefferson’s Buildings* 4, 40, 45, 48-49, 55, and pl. 14.

. . . in the end opposite to the entrance . . . it would be better to have . . . a great nich [sic] made of a portion of circle . . . , where might stand the Praetor's Tribunal, or that of the Judges, if there be many; as there shou'd be an ascent to it by steps, that it might have the more of Majesty and Grandeur.

In Jefferson's courthouse design, he converted the curved apse into a polygonal one that did not require the expense of making curved bricks, and he instated the accustomed Virginia feature of a central pier rising behind the chief magistrate's chair between two windows. Jefferson had once before inserted such a basilica in the manner of Virginian style – gallery, raised apsidal bench, central pier, twin windows, and all – into a civic temple when he designed the state Capitol in 1785 (fig. 50).⁶⁵

So much for the conception itself. One must take very seriously the proposition that K214-K215 is a generic design, for application as needed. One further must take very seriously the proposition that K214-K215 embodies the evolution of Jefferson's ideas about courthouse design from preliminary thoughts to a master model.

It is particularly John O. Peters to whom we owe the suggestion that Jefferson made K214-K215 as a generic design. We can add two pieces of germane evidence that we have recognized. We saw that, by no later than 1791, Jefferson had had the idea of circulating prints as generic models. As of 1803, he had had the professional draftsman Robert Mills make presentation drawings for what may well have been a generic pattern for a magistrate's house (fig. 6). K214-K215 could have been the successful sequel to the two earlier, unrealized projects. The document and its provenance would answer well to the idea of a master copy. The major erasures have revealed the evolution of the drawing from preliminary thinking, while the preservation of this sheet with its specifications would tally with a role as a master version to copy. As to provenance, the pieces came to the Massachusetts Historical Society with a *collection of Jefferson's drawings*, which is to say it is unlikely that the document left Jefferson's

⁶⁵For the quotation, see Palladio, *Architecture*, book 3, chap. 19, p. 33. Green, "Buckingham County Courthouse," 3, opened up the issue of the basilican current in K214, and I am much indebted to his paper.

possession during his lifetime. (Almost thirty years of experience with the provenance of early American architectural drawings firmly suggests to the present writer that builders rarely have been so kind as to return to its creator any drawing used in construction.) Nor would there have been much need to return such a drawing to Jefferson, for he was perfectly capable of reproducing drawings at will, despite his injured wrist. Throughout his life Jefferson followed the traditional practice of *pricking* his drawings. That is, he used a tool variously called a *pricker*, a *protracting pin*, or a *needle holder* to perforate his drawings with tiny holes. Pricking was first and foremost an almost invisible technique for laying out conceptions with precise measurement, but it was also a means for copying.⁶⁶

Let us sum up K214-K215. As if he were sliding a hand into a glove, Jefferson inserted an essentially customary Virginia courthouse plan into a casing like a temple. The temple carcass exemplified his principle of permanent construction (extending to masonry walls and columns but not to vaulting) and it exemplified his principle of “elegance,” that is, of worthy adornment via the Orders. The internal layout had the sanction of long Virginia practice and of older European authority back to the Ancients. The design may further have embodied the proportions of “Cubic” architecture. We shall proceed on the hypothesis that Jefferson did not make this fusion for a specific commission but rather as a model for the reform of Virginia’s most important class of civic building.

⁶⁶For Peters’s suggestion, see Peters and Peters, *Virginia’s Courthouses*, 47-48. I am much indebted to Peters for discussing his thinking with me. On pricking see Brownell in *Making of Virginia Architecture*, 150-52.

II. G. An “Eloquent Muddle”: The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811).

With K214-K215 out of the way, we can look at our other neglected body of evidence, the lost Loudoun County Courthouse in Leesburg (figs. 51-53). We can call this building an “eloquent muddle.” Architecturally the building was an unsightly hodgepodge of elements, truly a muddle. Nonetheless, thanks to Erika Moore’s research, the building speaks eloquently about what happened the first known time that Jefferson’s conception for the Virginia courthouse reached execution.

The data are few. Loudoun County was created in 1757, and the court’s initial quarters, as usual, were temporary. In 1758 the court wrote the specifications for the first proper courthouse, to be a two-story brick structure measuring 40 x 28 feet, with two galleries, a square jury room, and a “circular” justices seat. Aeneas Campbell began building the courthouse in 1758. By the early nineteenth century this first building had needed many repairs. Of the second courthouse the county records indicate only that the structure was raised ca. 1809-11, apparently by one William Wright. On 10 May 1815 Latrobe, passing through Leesburg, was so appalled at the design, particularly the barbarity of the Tuscan portico, that he drew the building and an annotated detail of the Order, which he contrasted with an orthodox specimen of the Tuscan (figs.51-52). (With the Bank of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia [1799-1801; fig. 54] Latrobe had just created one of the architectural wonders of the age in America, a white marble temple with a cupola-topped rotunda, constructed according to the highest standards of design and craft). It must have been the contrast between his building and the Leesburg one that seized his attention. As usual, Latrobe sketched on the site, filling in the drawing afterward, and he perpetrated some errors in his view [compare figs. 51-53]. Leesburg’s “eloquent muddle” gave way to the third Loudoun County Courthouse, constructed in 1894-95 to the design of William Callis West of Richmond. Two Tuscan column bases and two Tuscan capitals from the second courthouse survive near the site of the lost building.⁶⁷

⁶⁷On the Leesburg building see Erika S. A. Moore, “Jefferson, Latrobe, and the Lost Loudoun County Courthouse of 1809-1811,” research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2002; B. Henry Latrobe, *Latrobe's View of America, 1795-1820*, edited by Edward C. Carter II, et al., *The Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe*,

One footprint of the building and a miscellany of engravings and photographs survive. The footprint appears on a Sanborn fire insurance map of 1894, which shows the courthouse as a rectangular brick edifice of 40 x 50 feet, with a 10-foot-deep portico and wooden portico columns. Although the map does not show an apse, this building may have had an apsidal bench encased in the rectangular body. The probable existence of a “circular” bench in the first courthouse increases the plausibility of this idea.⁶⁸

Despite the paucity of data, we can understand a good deal about the patchwork conception of the Leesburg courthouse. In some fashion or other, a courtroom was placed inside a temple-shaped body with a tetrastyle Tuscan portico. This much signifies either of two things. It may signify that William Wright or an associate precociously anticipated the Jeffersonian courthouse, drawing the temple conception from the Richmond capitol, much as eighteenth-century builders had derived their apses and their arcaded piazzas from the first Williamsburg capitol. Alternatively, the Leesburg configuration may mean that Wright worked from a Jefferson design predating Jefferson’s documented courthouse-designing activity.

The courthouse sat upon a low podium of two steps, not on the 3-foot basement that Jefferson specifies in K215 (much less a full basement story without steps like the Capitol in Richmond as completed). The lowness of the base suggests that an eighteenth-century taste for low-lying, accessible courthouses had asserted itself (fig. 44), but the Jeffersonian courthouse would come closer still to the ground.

Above the steps, much of the detailing takes its lead from the Adamesque of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Specifically, the portico is Adamesque Tuscan, with columns of some 10 diameters by Latrobe’s reckoning. This Order is not merely stiff and unbeautiful but also ungrammatical: as Latrobe noted, the portico had no architrave or frieze, merely a cornice. In line with the Adamesque

Series 3, Sketchbooks and Miscellaneous Drawings (New Haven: Yale University Press, for The Maryland Historical Society, 1985), 334-35, publishing Latrobe’s *Leesburg Courthouse* and his unlabeled detail, Sketchbook 13, 2a and 3, Latrobe Papers, Maryland Historical Society. See now also Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, 364-65.

⁶⁸On the evidence regarding the plan, see Moore, “Jefferson, Latrobe,” 6-7 and fig. 11, Moore’s hypothetical reconstruction of the layout.

delight in mixing Orders, the cornice for these Tuscan columns seems to have been Ionic, probably Palladian Ionic. The portico ceiling behind the cornice rested flat on the column capitals, a clumsy treatment recalling the Monticello II porticoes.⁶⁹

William Wright provided for a bell in a most un-Jeffersonian fashion by putting a cupola atop the roof. The old photographs show that Latrobe misrepresented that belfry as octagonal when in fact it was hexagonal. Via an uncertain family tree, this distinctive six-sided cupola probably descended from a trio of hexagonal cupolas erected in Williamsburg around 1700 (fig. 9): at the College of William and Mary as rebuilt after the fire of 1705, at the Capitol (1699-1705), and at the Governor's Palace (1706-21). Late Stuart in origin, then, the Leesburg cupola was probably dressed up by recourse to the plates of James Gibbs's *Book of Architecture* (London, 1728).⁷⁰

The Loudoun County Courthouse was an unlovely cut-and-paste assemblage of elements. Which of two possibilities explains how it came to be? Did Wright just so happen to anticipate the Jeffersonian courthouse, perhaps by envisioning a smaller Tuscan version of the Virginia State Capitol with the functional addition of front steps and a cupola? This is not impossible, but it does seem strained. Given that Virginia was a small world, a different interpretation makes more sense. By this second interpretation, Jefferson had arrived at the essentials of his Tuscan Virginia courthouse, and the idea of combining an accustomed kind of courtroom with a temple body made its way to Leesburg through the network of the powerful. (It may be significant that that Jefferson's great friend James Monroe had property interests near Leesburg at Oak Hill.) By this reading, when Jefferson's conception reached Loudoun County, it was tricked out with a miscellany of practical and decorative elements that were strikingly unsympathetic to Jefferson's chaste temple.⁷¹

⁶⁹Latrobe's notes appear in pencil near the upper lefthand margin of *Leesburg Courthouse*. Curiously, the Tuscan temple with only a cornice reappeared shortly afterward at the two end pavilions of Bremo, built in Fluvanna County by John Neilson and John Hartwell Cocke in 1816-20.

⁷⁰The bell, which has no maker's mark but reputedly was bought in 1769 for the first courthouse, survives in the Loudoun County Museum.

⁷¹Monroe acquired Oak Hill by bequest from his uncle in 1798. He did not, however, build his villa at Oak Hill until 1820-23. I thank Erika Moore for clearing up the Monroe chronology.

Whatever the truth about the Loudoun County edifice, this “eloquent muddle” speaks of the alternatives that stood ready to compete in the design of an early nineteenth-century Virginia courthouse. When you put a courtroom in a temple, to what extent would you make the building of durable materials? Would the structure sit on a modest podium or almost on the ground? What un-Jeffersonian styles would intrude themselves? Would orthodox Orders or Adamesque Orders appear? Would there be a bell and, if so, where would it find a home? These issues are leitmotifs that wind through the rise of the later, unquestionably Jeffersonian courthouses.

II. H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe

“Now what we wish is that these pavilions, as they will shew themselves above the Dormitories, should be models of taste and correct architecture, and of a variety of appearance, no two alike, so as to serve as specimens of the orders for the architectural lectures.”

Jefferson to Latrobe on the University of
Virginia Pavilions, 12 June 1817⁷²

In Section II. A. we have seen how Jefferson’s *Notes on the State of Virginia* voiced his hope for a reform of Virginia architecture that would radiate from the College of William and Mary. That reform was not destined, however, to spread for another thirty-five-odd years, and then it stemmed from a very different academic institution, the University of Virginia (fig. 11). With the enormous group of buildings at the university, Jefferson’s lifelong habit of setting up examples of durable construction and noble Orders reached its summit. True, his idea that the gentry would formally study the models in Charlottesville did not reach fruition, for an architectural program had to wait a century to enter the university curricula, and the informal appreciation of the buildings by patrons remains ill documented. But, partly by assembling craftsmen and partly by training them, Jefferson created the work force to execute his models and to disseminate the qualities of those exemplars. Moreover, by responding to ideas from the nation’s other architectural giant, Latrobe, Jefferson set up even greater models than he had foreseen. Latrobe gave Jefferson the monumental idea of erecting temple facades with giant Orders, that is, with two-story columns. In turn, Jefferson gave those temple facades a beautiful, unique intimacy by bringing their pavements down to the ground. In a short time the porticoes of giant Orders, sometimes rising from near ground level, along with the fine masonry – the red brick walls, the stuccoed column

⁷²For Jefferson's letter to Latrobe, see Latrobe, *Correspondence*, 3:901-03, and Latrobe, *Papers*, 232/F3.

shafts, the dressed stone bases and capitals -- would make their way from the university into the Virginia courthouse.

Jefferson and the Workmen.

“The lack of sufficiently skilled local builders for the university was quickly apparent, and advertisements . . . brought many to the university, including twenty from Philadelphia alone. Others came from as far away as Northern Ireland (then called Ulster), England, and Italy.”

K. Edward Lay, *The Architecture of Jefferson
Country*⁷³

During the last two decades such researchers as Richard Cote, K. Edward Lay, Delos Hughes, Frank E. Grizzard, Jr., Bryan Clark Green, and Tracy Watkinson have transmuted our knowledge about Jefferson’s craftsmen, especially the craftsmen who worked at the university. In the present study it is neither possible nor desirable to condense so large a body of scholarship on the labors of teams of men working for roughly a decade on one of the largest American building complexes of its time. Instead, let us sample two pieces of evidence. One piece indicates that Jefferson, more than merely assembling masters of masonry, sometimes took a hand in their training. The other bit of evidence suggests that Jefferson likewise schooled builders in the most noble ornament of architecture.⁷⁴

The first item concerns the distinguished brickmason Dabney Cosby. Cosby a Virginian, originating professionally with a large practice in Staunton, went on from the university to erect numerous

⁷³For the quoted matter, see pp. 95-96 of Lay’s study, subtitled *Charlottesville and Albemarle County, Virginia* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000).

⁷⁴The major statements by the authorities cited are Cote, “Architectural Workmen”; Lay, *Architecture of Jefferson Country*; Hughes, “Courthouses”; Grizzard, “Documentary History”; Green, *In Jefferson’s Shadow: The Architecture of Thomas R. Blackburn* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, in press), augmenting Green’s “In the Shadow of Thomas Jefferson: The Architectural Career of Thomas R. Blackburn, with a Catalog of Architectural Drawings,” Ph. D. diss., University of Virginia, 2004; and Watkinson, “Jefferson, Latrobe, and the Architectural Drawings of John Neilson (Before 1775-1827),” M. A. thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003.

buildings in Virginia and North Carolina, including some of the finest courthouses noted in the present study. Furthermore, having worked with Jefferson, Cosby served two other commanding architects, Thomas U. Walter and Alexander J. Davis. According to Cosby's 1862 obituary,

More than sixty years ago [sic] Mr. Cosby, when a young man, worked on the University of Virginia, under the direction and superintendence of Mr. Jefferson. We have often heard him speak of his conversations with that illustrious man, and of the information he received from him in architecture and the art of making brick.

We could almost translate "architecture and the art of making brick" into "the Orders and the art of making brick." Certainly Cosby, alone or with others, built memorable edifices where the Orders were used with sophistication. More immediately germane, though, here is important testimony – admittedly secondhand -- that the successful Staunton contractor changed his brickwork technique under Jefferson's instruction. Cosby is unlikely to have been uniquely favored. As the record of the United States Capitol demonstrates, one of Jefferson's most pronounced tendencies was to see to it that buildings were erected according to his views of building technology, a major interest of his.⁷⁵

The second item of evidence concerns Thomas Blackburn, a young Virginia carpenter who turned into a major Virginia Palladian architect by way of lessons that he learned at the university. The three volumes of Blackburn's architectural drawings, discovered by Bryan Clark Green, contain two bodies of material that speak unforgettably of Jefferson's tutelage in design. First, the books contain a series of painstaking copies of the Orders as illustrated in the *Leoni Palladio*, copies that most plausibly were made from Jefferson's *Palladio* while Blackburn was working at the university. (Here, then, was the antidote to the problem that Jefferson identified in his *Notes*: "a workman could scarcely be found here capable of

⁷⁵Dabney Cosby's obituary appears in *The North Carolina Standard* (Raleigh), 12 July 1862, 3:1. Sara Moline's "Dabney Cosby (1779-1862), Early Nineteenth-Century Architectural Master," research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2002, is a recent attempt to summarize Cosby's career, but see also Lay, *Architecture of Jefferson Country*, 103-04, and Grizzard, "Documentary History," chaps. 3, 7, n. pag. As to the national Capitol, no one has recounted the full story of Jefferson's unending involvement, but Cohen and Brownell, *Architectural Drawings*, 344-424, details Jefferson's self-elected participation in construction techniques from the cellar to the dome.

drawing an order.”) As the volumes show, Blackburn subsequently left the university and designed a series of Jeffersonian Palladian villas executed for members of Jefferson’s circle. Blackburn’s case, like Cosby’s, cannot have been unique. Drawing the Orders is a leitmotif in documents concerning Jefferson’s workmen, and it is a matter of time before we shall perceive Jefferson’s role in this more clearly.

Jefferson and Latrobe

When Jefferson set out to design the University of Virginia buildings in detail (fig. 11), he faced a peculiar situation: he was running short of models to set. The framework of the design presented no such problem. For the overall conception Jefferson simply meant to border three sides of an oblong space with the kind of one-story pillared wings (“Dormitories”) and two-story pavilions that he had used at Monticello II and that he had had Latrobe use at the President’s House or White House in Washington. The difficulty came with the Pavilions. Jefferson wanted their upper stories -- the Pavilions “as they will shew themselves above the Dormitories” -- to be “models of taste and correct architecture, . . . , no two alike.” There is no more striking commentary on his nature as an architect than that at this point in his architectural life he had to ask friends for models.⁷⁶

Jefferson, it is well known, first turned to an old associate from the early days of devising the national Capitol, the amateur architect Dr. William Thornton, in May of 1817. Thornton sent a set of none-too-apposite suggestions predicated on models resting on top of the pillared wings. On 12 June 1817, the day after receiving Thornton’s drawing and no doubt propelled by its limitations, Jefferson chose to impose on the time of a professional. He now wrote Latrobe, phrasing his request – partly quoted in the epigraph to the present section, II. H. – in much the same language as he had used to Thornton. (The irony is profound,

⁷⁶On the often-misrepresented evolution of the University design, Survey Nos. 26-28 in Brownell and others, *Making of Virginia Architecture*, remain a sound summary, supplemented by Patricia C. Sherwood and Joseph Michael Lasala, “Education and Architecture: The Evolution of the University of Virginia’s Academical Village,” in *Thomas Jefferson’s Academical Village: The Creation of an Architectural Masterpiece*, edited by Richard Guy Wilson (Charlottesville, Virginia: Bayly Art Museum of the University of Virginia, 1993), 8-45., and Lasala’s stellar study, “Thomas Jefferson’s Designs for the University of Virginia,” Master of Architectural History thesis, University of Virginia, 1991.

for Jefferson had made Latrobe's work in Washington excessively difficult by habitually thrusting models upon him.)

Fiske Kimball established the truth ninety years ago: Latrobe contributed the idea of Pavilions with giant Orders. Today we know more about Latrobe's dedication to monumental coherence. In fact, Latrobe's admiration for this effect and his distaste for tiers of motifs had become a bone of contention with Jefferson a decade before, when Latrobe had had to execute Jefferson's design for the White House wings, a forebear of the university design. Their differences aside, it is probable that Latrobe, delighting to please a man whom he had admired for decades, proposed that some of these Pavilions take the form of temples, thus giving back the temple form to the architect who had revived it for American public buildings. The Latrobe-Jefferson correspondence even establishes that Latrobe's sheet of drawings, now lost, featured the Orders of Palladio to suit Jefferson, rather than the Greek Orders to which Latrobe was devoted.⁷⁷

It is not to Latrobe, though, that we owe the notion of "temples" standing right at ground level without even a hint of a podium or crepidoma. This treatment was uniquely Jefferson's. Jefferson lowered the Dormitory walkways to the ground plane and, by omitting even the least masonry podium, effected very large savings. At the same time, Jefferson lowered the temple porticoes to ground level, an unprecedented handling of the motif. The accessibility, even intimacy, of the brick walks along the Colonnades and through the Pavilion porticoes is one of the most beguiling features of the university. Like other exceptionally winning traits – red brick and pale trim instead of entirely stuccoed facades, or the axial asymmetry that springs from the fact that no two Pavilions are alike – the low-lying walks and "temple" pavements are among the least studied elements on the Lawn.⁷⁸

⁷⁷For Kimball's view, see his *Thomas Jefferson, Architect*, 76-80, and cp. 186-92. Latrobe's only surviving drawing, the sketch reproduced by Kimball as pl. 213 (or K-213), clearly shows a hexastyle pavilion with a giant Order to the left of the prototype for the University Rotunda. In Latrobe's small elevation one cannot tell whether this pavilion has a pedimental roof and is thus temple-form or has a hipped roof and thus is like Pavilion V. In the pavilion to the right of the Rotunda, Latrobe's sketch shows the stacked kind of pavilion that Jefferson had originally contemplated. On the tug of war between the two kinds of facades during the nineteenth century, see Brownell in *Making of Virginia Architecture*, 68-71.

⁷⁸Latrobe's sketch elevation (Kimball, *Thomas Jefferson, Architect*, pl. 213) unmistakably shows a low podium running the entire length of Latrobe's façade.

Another Jeffersonian element has received more attention: the lunette windows in the pediments of various pavilions. Lunettes in pediments are not Latrobean. More than that, as Heather A. Foster has argued, such lunettes have nothing to do with Palladio, with the major British Palladians, or with the Classical temples that Jefferson knew. Such windows originated with the Romans as wall openings that fitted under the curve of vaulted ceilings, for instance in baths. In the English-speaking world the genealogy of the pedimental lunette is no purist's pedigree. The line runs from Sir Christopher Wren to the English Baroque to provincial designers in America, particularly in Philadelphia, where Jefferson probably picked the motif up. Once again, that is, one sees Jefferson adopting an element from American custom. Jefferson probably liked the practicality of the pediment lunette as a means of lighting and ventilating an attic, and he certainly liked its geometry of a semicircle within a triangle. The motif would migrate from the second Monticello to the university to the Jeffersonian courthouse.⁷⁹

So it was that the university provided the men and the models. The men came from North and South, from at home and abroad. Jefferson and his helpers collected them, sometimes Jefferson trained or retrained them, and in time they became available for commissions beyond the Lawn. At the university these tradesmen built model after architectural model in fine red brickwork. They adorned the complex with a variety of model Orders published by Palladio's disciples, chiefly Giacomo Leoni and Fréart de Chambray. They constructed no fewer than seven Pavilion porticoes whose stuccoed brick column shafts rise two stories from ground level (to ignore the portico of the Rotunda). They built three of these Pavilions in the form of temples. They raised more than 150 one-story stuccoed brick columns in a Palladian Tuscan Order, the basic Order of the university. And – be it noted in reference to the Jeffersonian Market-House-style courthouses to come – they erected one Pavilion (Pavilion VI) where the model Order was reduced in very Jeffersonian fashion to a powerful entablature. In varying

⁷⁹On the pedimental windows, see Heather A. Foster, "Jefferson, Wren, Philadelphia, and the Portico with Lunette," In *The Classical Tradition: From Andrea Palladio to John Russell Pope: New Findings from Virginia Commonwealth University*, Abstracts of the Sixth Annual Architectural History Symposium, 1998, ed. by Charles Brownell, 10-11 (Richmond: Department of Art History, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1998).

combinations, these features that Jefferson summoned up at his university would make their way into a constellation of Virginia courthouses.

II. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

And what of the 1822-23 Buckingham County Courthouse, which Fiske Kimball derived from K214-215? This building, unrecorded when it fell victim to a fire in 1869, was a severe puzzle into the twenty-first century. Then, as we have acknowledged above in abbreviated form, came the work of Brian Bates and Delos Hughes in 2003-2004. Disclosures so important require recapitulating the authors' revisions of the Buckingham story.⁸⁰

In the past the written sources have told a shadowy tale, starting not with the Buckingham structure but with the second Botetourt County Courthouse. A Jefferson letter of October 1818 is the earliest datable document of his activity in designing courthouses. Jefferson wrote that letter to James Breckinridge, the commissioner most concerned with building the Botetourt courthouse in Fincastle. The document records that Jefferson, following up on a conversation during the preceding summer, was sending Breckinridge a design and instructions for the Botetourt structure. The Botetourt courthouse, erected in 1818-19, was replaced in 1845-47 by a temple-and-wings Greek Revival edifice, extant but restored after a disastrous 1970 fire. Researchers who looked into the 1818-19 building brought forward only a little documentation. They were thus in a poor position to evaluate whether Breckinridge used Jefferson's design or what that design could have been, to say nothing of where that conception fitted into the evolution of Jefferson's thinking about courthouses.

It is once again Delos Hughes who has thrown a beam of light into the murk, applying remarkable fresh documentation and incisive analysis. We now know that Breckinridge had put the Botetourt County Courthouse under construction some four months before the Breckinridge-Jefferson conversation and more than half a year before Jefferson sent his design. We have to ask with Hughes why, then, did Jefferson send drawings and instructions: did Jefferson make a design not for the whole courthouse but for the details, or had Jefferson misunderstood his conversation with Breckinridge as a request to design a

⁸⁰For the Buckingham courthouse see Bates with Howard and Jordan, "Buckingham Courthouse"; Bates, "Buckingham Courthouse . . . Update"; and Hughes, "Buckingham County." Hughes and Bates largely supplant the older literature, notably Kimball, *Thomas Jefferson, Architect, 192-95 et pass.*, and Gaines, "Buckingham and Appomattox Courthouses," but see Peters and Peters, *Virginia's Courthouses*, 46-49.

building, or did Jefferson hope that Botetourt County would tear down what it had begun and instate a design by him? Hughes argues compellingly that the finished building could not have followed a Jefferson design that arrived, if at all, only when construction had advanced very far. Hughes further argues that the courthouse did reflect Jeffersonian influences, which is to say influences from domestic architecture. The courthouse had a domed, semi-octagonal core with wings and, seemingly, a portico. It is highly likely that Breckinridge designed this building himself. We still cannot say what Jefferson's design was, but that gap matters little. For, if we have rightly proposed that the Second Loudoun County Courthouse of ca. 1809-1811 reflected a generic design by Jefferson, then Jefferson had arrived at the model plan that concerns us by the early eighteen-teens.⁸¹

As to Buckingham County, the building that the Jeffersonian Courthouse replaced remains ill-documented. Suffice it to say that in 1777 the county commissioners advertised their intention to erect a brick building, while in 1778 Powhatan County's officials directed that their new courthouse not only follow the model of Buckingham but also be built of brick. The Buckingham County Courthouse that preceded the Jeffersonian building may well have had walls more durable than wooden ones.⁸²

As of summer, 1821, the commissioners appointed to direct the raising of a new courthouse enter the record. They had begun making preparations well before 12 July 1821, when Jefferson's friend Charles Yancey, one of their number, wrote Jefferson requesting a design. Yancey listed the commissioners' preferences, such as a square building with an arcaded "Piazzar."⁸³

Jefferson placidly ignored the preferences. He sent a design, his second documented essay in courthouse architecture, "in the plainest style," with a letter of 23 July 1821. The ex-President urged the

⁸¹Hughes's study is "'Building a Courthouse in Fincastle': A Footnote to Jefferson Studies," *Arris* 8 (1997):41-57. See also Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, and Peters and Peters, *Virginia's Courthouses*, 46.

⁸²The most detailed consideration of the evidence is Hughes, "Buckingham County," 1-3. Cp. Bates, Howard, and Jordan, 9, 11. For the Powhatan reference, however, see Gaines, "Buckingham and Appomattox Courthouses," 33.

⁸³The Yancey-Jefferson letters here cited are in the Library of Congress in the Thomas Jefferson Papers, Series 1, General Correspondence, 1651-1827. The letters in question are readily found by searching under "Yancey" at the Library's American Memory website, <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/>.

Buckinghamites to use University of Virginia workmen, noting the existence of a three-foot basement in his design, and mentioning “4 pr. of stone caps & bases for your columns.” The latter, Jefferson wrote, could be dressed in Buckingham by one of the university workmen if the local stone was good, or they could be cut in Charlottesville and shipped by water. (It is a major contribution of Bates’s work to have demonstrated by reexamining the Yancey-Jefferson correspondence how warm an interest Jefferson felt in the Buckingham undertaking. This interest extended to offering Yancey resources at the university and inviting him to Monticello.) Jefferson’s 1821 letter, buttressed by his tendency to rely on a small group of models for public buildings, would tally with a Tuscan temple body.

A year later, on 4 July 1822, Yancey resumed the correspondence. Yancey wrote that the Buckingham board of commissioners had rejected Jefferson’s design and chosen the model of the Albemarle County Courthouse. (A choice element in Delos Hughes’s study is evidence that the Albemarle County Clerk provided a “rough sketch” of the Charlottesville building. This once again intimates that architectural models may have exerted their influence via the circulation of documents copied by county clerks as part of their duties.) Only in June, 1822, did the commissioners, learning of the dissatisfaction in Charlottesville with the Albemarle courthouse, change their minds, after the work had “progressed.” “Your plan,” Yancey wrote, “was adopted entire,” but with “a wing on each side, of 16 feet sq. attached to the main building by an entry of eight feet with an arch on each side, flat roof & columns to the wings.” Yancey feared that the colonnades -- a feature unmistakably revealing the role of the University of Virginia as a model -- would not “*finish* well to the portico of the main building.” On 23 July, Jefferson, acquiescing to the wings, advised on how they should meet the body of the building.⁸⁴

The Buckingham structure arose in the years 1822-23, looming up from the side of a major east-west road. Workmen who played leading parts in disseminating the Jefferson courthouse style built the edifice. Delos Hughes cautiously attributes the Buckingham masonry to Dabney Cosby as “undertaker”

⁸⁴For Valentine Parrish’s 1871 recollection that the Albemarle clerk furnished a “sketch” of the Charlottesville courthouse, see Hughes, “Courthouses,” 12.

and the woodwork more surely to the subcontractors Valentine Parrish and William A. Howard. Howard also made the necessary working drawings.⁸⁵

No picture or description of the finished building survives from the years before the Buckingham edifice burned in 1869. Only now can it be visualized, at least broadly, thanks to Brian Bates's evidence (fig. 32). The body of the courthouse was oblong. It had two telltale features, a temple portico the full width of the entry wall, and a polygonal apse (however treated externally) at the bench end. That is, the core of the complex embraced the Jeffersonian union of traditional courtroom planning and a temple casing, à la K214-215, as noted above in Section II. D. The building went as far toward permanent construction as Jefferson ever did, with brick walls, brick columns, and stone bases and capitals. The Order was Tuscan, although whether it was Palladian Tuscan remains a question, as does the possible use of stucco. Almost certainly the courthouse was roofed with tin, another Jeffersonian preference.⁸⁶

In two respects, probably three, the Buckingham courthouse deviated sharply from K214-215, but these deviations represent imitation of other Jefferson models. First, the K214 temple portico is shallow, a single intercolumniation in depth, but the Buckingham courthouse was deep, two intercolumniations in depth, in the vein of Etruscan and Roman temples. A love of such deep porticoes was a distinctively Jeffersonian trait in America in the period by contrast with, say, Latrobe. One should think of the garden fronts of the first and second Monticellos and, more appositely, the fronts of the Virginia State Capitol and the University of Virginia Rotunda.

In the second deviation, Buckingham's courthouse extended to a frontage of 100 feet by means of Tuscan colonnades linking the central temple to an office pavilion roughly 16 feet square at each end. (The Buckinghamites intended the pavilions to serve as offices for the clerks of the superior and the county courts. We recall that a 1792 act of the General Assembly had required every county to build a

⁸⁵The Cosby attribution does lie open to question, as Hughes intimates (Hughes, "Courthouses," 6). Whether Cosby executed all the masonry, added the portico as part of a second building campaign, or measured the portico for the payment of another mason, he knew the building as of 1825.

⁸⁶It remains desirable to have the surviving bases and capitals analyzed in the interest of determining whether the stone was brought from Charlottesville and thus was most likely dressed by University craftsmen.

“fireproof” clerk’s office on the courthouse grounds. Buckingham gives us an early example of the response, but one where, characteristically, fireproofing went no further than brick walls.) Colonnade and pavilion were one of the most essential of all Jefferson themes, a theme allied to Palladio’s work but not purely derived from it. Monticello’s wings and pavilions (partly used for office-like purposes) were probably one source for Buckingham, while the Lawn of the University of Virginia was obviously another. A major difference from Jefferson is that the Buckingham pavilions had one story, not two. Indeed, in Bates’s reconstruction, the Buckingham wings with their one-story offices look significantly like fragments of the dormitories between the Lawn Pavilions. Almost certainly the wings had zig-zag roofs like the wings at the Lawn and Monticello.⁸⁷

In the third deviation from the K214-215 pattern, the Buckingham complex probably rose from a platform very little above ground level, as opposed to the 3-foot podium of Jefferson’s design as well as the crepidomas and podiums of ancient temples. If the complex did lie this close to the ground, then the treatment came along quite naturally as part of the imitation of the Lawn. That is to say, the treatment would have come along quite naturally as the imitation of that Latrobe-Jefferson synthesis at the Lawn, the temple at ground level. At the same time, the low-lying pavement would have continued the easy access that many eighteenth-century Virginia courthouses afforded. A number of Jeffersonian courthouses after the Buckingham one have low-lying portico pavements; Buckingham may be where this treatment began.

The lowered pavement aside, the significance of the departures from the K214-215 model clearly is this: Buckingham took a Jeffersonian pattern and, under Jefferson’s influence, aggrandized its temple of the law. We have seen some of the indications that this spectacular edifice wielded an important

⁸⁷The indispensable study of the treacherous subject of Jefferson’s winged plans remains Ann M. Lucas, “Ordering His Environment: Thomas Jefferson’s Architecture from Monticello to the University of Virginia” (Master of Architectural History thesis, University of Virginia, 1989). The early nineteenth-century “Dr. Tucker House” across Rte. 60 and slightly to the west of the courthouse square retains a zig-zag roof on one wing. The most believable explanation for the presence of this singular way of covering the wing is that the builders copied the treatment from the courthouse.

influence. It will take years to sort out the full story of this impact (which probably includes the nearby Maysville Presbyterian Church, perhaps the work of Dabney Cosby and perhaps built in 1828-30).

The Buckingham County Courthouse had evidently undergone some changes, at least to the offices, by the time that fire claimed it in 1869. A by no means unworthy if distant descendant is the present courthouse (1872-73), built, as Hughes established, by Valentine J. Clutter, and probably influenced by the Maysville Presbyterian Church. The 1872-73 courthouse automatically reminds us to try envisioning its extraordinary predecessor, a Jeffersonian union of traditional courthouse planning and the nobility of the temple form, executed in durable materials, and creating a hundred-foot-long parade of the Tuscan Order beside a major Virginia thoroughfare.

II. J. Courthouses in the Jefferson Lineage from Charlotte County to Powhatan County

“It is reasonable to suppose that Jefferson’s Capitol at Richmond would in any event have begotten a progeny of temple-form courthouses sooner or later, just as the first Capitol at Williamsburg had begotten courthouses with piazzas and compass ends. But, as it happens, what would seem to have been the earliest Jeffersonian courthouses were designed by none other than Thomas Jefferson.”

Marcus Whiffen, "The Early County Courthouses of Virginia,"

Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 18 (March 1959):6.

“The decision of the Buckingham commissioners to follow Jefferson’s plans may be the most significant in Virginia courthouse history. The temple form, which Jefferson reserved for major public buildings, became the rule, and the use of the classical orders, always at the heart of Jefferson’s architecture, became the major form of adornment.”

John O. Peters and Margaret T. Peters, *Virginia's Historic Courthouses*

(Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), 48.

Thomas Jefferson reshaped the Virginia courthouse. His most evident success unfolded for over a generation, between the early 1820s and the Civil War, although by mid-century changing stylistic preferences and the need for more ample accommodations began to curtail Jefferson's impact. In its great days, Jefferson's campaign changed the three chief architectural patterns, the Virginia Basilica, the T-plan courthouse, and the Town-Hall-style courthouse. Jefferson's values probably carried even further than that. We can put three kinds of certain or possible consequences into a column.

- (1. The fusion of an apsed, galleried, longitudinal courtroom with a brick-and-wood Temple Revival casing – often a casing of very fine brickwork – certainly became a fixture of the Virginia landscape. This class of courthouse, we know, braids elements from the Virginia Basilica, T-Plan, and Town-Hall courthouse as well as from Classical antiquity.
- (2. T-Plan and Town-Hall-type courthouses assumed Jeffersonian features, notably fine brickwork and abbreviated Orders. An examination of such buildings must wait for another day.
- (3. The authority of Jefferson's thought may have underlain a great deal more in Virginia courthouse architecture, as for instance the establishment of monumental Classical masonry for buildings outside the 1820s-1860s period under discussion here. That, however, is as yet a treacherous issue.

In truth, the whole story of the Jeffersonian courthouse in Virginia remains treacherous, given the lack of intensive study of building after building. The present project offers a stark warning of the dangers of forming conclusions about Virginia courthouses without adequately examining the physical evidence. The following passages again and again point to the uncertainty that hems the subject.

To see how Jefferson's shrewd reform worked, we can pick up from Buckingham with the sequence Charlotte-Lunenburg-Mecklenburg-Goochland-Fluvanna-Powhatan. In our chosen sequence, the pieces snap together as never before.

As to the third Charlotte County Courthouse (1822-23), a document discovered by S. Allen Chambers, Jr., is a revelation. That document is a letter of 28 December 1821 that Jefferson's friend William H. Cabell of Buckingham County wrote to Jefferson. Cabell's son-in-law, Henry Carrington, a

commissioner for the new Charlotte courthouse, had liked the Buckingham courthouse design so much that he had acquired Jefferson's drawing from Charles Yancey along with Jefferson's covering letter. (The Buckinghamites would not decide to execute Jefferson's design until the following summer. Somewhere along the line someone had to make a copy of Jefferson's drawing or drawings in order for the conception to be executed for two different courthouses.) Because the Charlotte commissioners wished to execute Jefferson's design faithfully, and because Jefferson's letter to Yancey had convinced them of the merit of the university workmen, Carrington wanted Jefferson's help in drawing up contracts with some of the Charlottesville artisans. Eventually, whether any of the university resources were involved, the principal builder was John Percival of Lynchburg, not a known university contractor, and the building essentially followed Jefferson's design. In this variation on the possibilities, officials not only imitated a standing Jefferson model but they even got its original Jefferson drawings, although they did not depend wholly if at all on Jefferson's builders.⁸⁸

The third Charlotte County Courthouse survives today (fig. 24) as a Temple Revival building of well laid brick with a tetrastyle Tuscan portico. We understand the background of the leading features. The portico platform lies low, rising only one step above the ground. A temple roughly at ground level is an innovation probably traceable to the Buckingham County Courthouse and certainly to the Latrobe-Jefferson synthesis on the Lawn. In the vein of Palladio, the column shafts are stuccoed or cemented over a presumable brick core, while the stone and wood elements of the Order must always have contrasted with the brick in the Virginia fashion. The bell, dangling from the entablature, reflects Jefferson's failure to integrate this feature into his designs. The pedimental lunette is a feature of specifically Jeffersonian Palladianism, not of Palladianism at large, and points directly to the University Pavilions. As built, the interior certainly followed the provisions that we see in K214-215 to a very significant degree. Thanks to

⁸⁸The present account condenses the accompanying National Historic Landmark Nomination for Charlotte County Courthouse, incorporating the observations of former VCU graduate student Craig A. Reynolds. See also Hughes, "Charlotte County Courthouse," and Hughes, "Courthouses of Buckingham County." I thank John O. Peters for calling my attention in 1993 to the Cabell letter, which is in the Thomas Jefferson Papers, Coolidge Collection, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

Delos Hughes's penetrating 1993 study, we know that the bench originally sat within much the same peculiar "caged apse" as appears in K214.

So far, so good. But, until Craig Reynolds's work for the present project, writers including the present author accepted most of the Charlotte interior as original, not detecting that only fragments from the first period survive in a courtroom that was heavily remodeled in 1852-54 and again in the early 1960s. Then, too, the present study shows that, as usual, the portico Order holds much more interest than historians have supposed, above all because Percival Adamized the shafts to 7.7 diameters. Even so, we see Jefferson's reliance on the imitation of standing models working elegantly, producing, as at Buckingham, a courtroom approved by custom within a temple carcass, with solid brick walls contrasting in color with the most noble ornament in Classical architecture.

The next member of the family line is the Lunenburg County Courthouse (1824-27), now much altered. In 1823 the Lunenburg Court directed that its new building was "to be built after the plan of the new courthouse in charlotte [sic] County." The commissioners employed two men who would carry the Jefferson gospel far. As we have seen, Dabney Cosby was the university workman who probably was in charge at Buckingham and whose obituary half a century later recalled that Jefferson had schooled him in design and brickwork during Cosby's employment at the university. William A. Howard came from obscurer origins but had contracted for the woodwork and made the drawings for Buckingham.⁸⁹

Cosby and Howard set out not to repeat a pattern exactly but to excel, which they did. They erected a Temple Revival edifice of excellent brickwork with a tetrastyle portico that is exceptional for its Order. Instead of the Tuscan that became the norm, Lunenburg rejoices in a much costlier Doric with

⁸⁹The present account condenses the accompanying National Historic Landmark Nomination for Lunenburg County Courthouse, incorporating the observations of former VCU graduate student Craig A. Reynolds. See also Reynolds, "William A. Howard, Dabney Cosby, and the Jeffersonian Palladian Courthouse," paper for the conference "Classics and Exotics: New Findings from Virginia Commonwealth University," Eleventh Annual Symposium in Architectural History and the Decorative Arts, Virginia Commonwealth University/Virginia Historical Society/Center for Palladian Studies in America/and other cosponsors, Richmond, November, 2003, and Reynolds, "William A. Howard, Southside Virginia Carpenter and Jeffersonian Builder (ca. 1787-1854/1860)," research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003. Cp. Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, 365-66. The quotation comes from County of Lunenburg, Order Book 24, p. 408 (10 November 1823).

dressed stone and wooden detailing. In fact, with slight modifications and a few blemishes, the Order is Jefferson's favorite Doric, the Doric of the Leoni Palladio, which Jefferson had preferred for the exterior of Monticello, for the portico of the first Pavilion at the university, and for other important locales. As exceptional as the choice of Order is the lack of Adamesque elongation of the columns. Unlike the Charlotte and probably the Buckingham County Courthouses, the portico platform rises 28" from the ground and thus is closer to K214-215. The column shafts are obscured with later cement, but we can strongly suspect that they began life as brick cores beneath a coat of stucco. We must also suppose that the stone and wood elements of the Order have always contrasted with the brick, whatever the original paint color. The bell, hidden inside the portico roof and rung from a cord that dangles from the portico ceiling, is undated but in any case reflects Jefferson's inability to fit bells into Classical facades. The lunette puts in another appearance in a pediment that may owe directly to Monticello.

Within, Cosby and Howard provided the orthodox courtroom, longitudinal, galleried, and apsed, but the apse was segmentally curved and not encased in a rectangle in Jefferson's peculiar fashion. (The "caged" treatment may have appeared for the last time at Charlotte Court House, and the apse itself would disappear in numerous later courtrooms). An equally material point not previously discerned comes again from Craig Reynolds: the vestibule and pair of rectangular rooms just inside the front wall – under the gallery -- are not replacements but were part of the original construction. The arrangement no doubt sprang from the new interest in providing clerking offices. Given the slowness with which Virginians acceded to the 1792 act requiring fireproof offices for Clerks, this is an early instance. In other words, Jefferson's plan had begun to metamorphose, in this case into an improved form. We nonetheless have all our ingredients in place: derivation from standing models; at least one Jefferson-trained workman; accustomed courtroom plan and temple casing; durable brickwork and a display of the Orders.

Another much-altered structure, the Mecklenburg County Courthouse in Boydton (1838-42) by William Howard and James T. Whitice was Howard's last word on civic architecture. The essential Jeffersonian constituents remained in place: durable construction and a display of the Orders on a Temple Revival enframing holding an apsed, galleried, longitudinal courtroom. There were improvements,

however. In this grand finale to his career, Howard was able to build an imposing hexastyle or six-column Ionic portico. The column shafts, although obscured in the twenty-first century, were made almost certainly of stuccoed brick, replete with entasis. The wooden angle-volute capitals derive, not from Palladio's Ionic, but from the Ionic that all English-speaking Palladians except Jefferson preferred, the Ionic of Palladio's successor Vincenzo Scamozzi. The cornice does, however, come from Palladio's Ionic. Despite the richer handling, the Mecklenburg building stands in the centerline of development. Those central features include the portico floor, which lies only one step above ground level; the bell, which has no place to hang but the front wall; and, above all else, the original color contrast. For, during most of its history, the courthouse exterior consisted of red brick with contrasting pale trim of wood and dressed stone. Since the 1950s an overall coat of white paint has thoroughly changed the building, creating the highly false impression that Howard and Whitice's model was the Virginia State Capitol.⁹⁰

Reynolds was the first to recognize the deceptive effect of the exterior and then to disclose the significance of the plan. As to that internal layout, the Mecklenburg courthouse has lost its apse in the reworking of the interior. That apse may well for a time have been planned for a "caged" treatment, to judge from reproductions of an unlabeled and lost nineteenth-century drawing, very likely by Howard. Still more materially, as at Lunenburg a pair of rooms stood under the gallery, flanking a vestibule. Once again we seem to have that novel element, dedicated clerks' offices. At Mecklenburg, though, someone – no doubt Howard – located the pair of staircases in between, in the vestibule, rather than in the courtroom. Surely this measure eliminated what must have been a source of disruption in courthouse after courthouse. The rethinking of the area under the gallery at Lunenburg and Mecklenburg represents

⁹⁰On the Mecklenburg County Courthouse, see Reynolds, "William A. Howard, Dabney Cosby, and the Courthouse"; Reynolds, "William A. Howard," research report; and Virginia Landmarks Register, File No. 173-06. Cp. Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, 366. It has not been possible to subject Mecklenburg's courthouse and Virginia's other Jeffersonian courthouses to the same detailed study as the courthouses hereby nominated for National Historic Landmark status. The combination of the Scamozzi Ionic capital and Palladio's Ionic cornice probably originated with Inigo Jones.

some of the most intelligent criticism of Jefferson's planning at any time. Nonetheless, these edifices are unmistakably variations on Jefferson's themes.⁹¹

The third Goochland County Courthouse (1826-27) by Dabney Cosby and Valentine Parrish takes us to a collateral line. The building is one of the high points of Jeffersonian reform and, indeed, one of the high points of Virginia architecture as a whole. The courthouse was meant from the first as a paragon: we can make no mistake about this if we look carefully at the building itself and the specifications of 1825/1826, annotated after construction by Narcissus W. Miller, the Deputy Clerk of the County, and Judge William Bolling, one of the commissioners who built the courthouse.⁹²

The bloodlines of the courthouse are quite visible. Of the builders, we know Cosby's relation to Jefferson, and Valentine Parrish had most likely contracted (with William A. Howard) for the Buckingham County Courthouse woodwork, probably under Cosby's direction. The Goochland specifications cite the Buckingham courthouse handling of jury rooms, these specifications even originally had a plan of the Buckingham building attached, and, in a period when clerk's offices were an uncommon novelty, the pair of offices at Buckingham explains a short-lived proposal to build a (freestanding) pair at Goochland.

If we let Carl Lounsbury lead us onto the site, we at once encounter the exceptional ambitions of Goochland. Lounsbury notes of the traditionally "untidy and jumbled appearance" of courthouse grounds that a few counties took steps toward converting "these amorphous public spaces into civic greens" in the early nineteenth century. First and foremost he instances the Goochland magistrates, who "went to great lengths to improve the setting of their new . . . courthouse. A post-and-rail fence with handsome gates went up . . . , and ornamental trees were planted. . . ."⁹³

⁹¹A photocopy of the lost plan, unidentified as to source, is in Virginia Landmarks Register File No. 173-06.

⁹²The present account condenses the accompanying National Historic Landmark Nomination for the Goochland County Courthouse. For the specifications as copied for the use of General John Hartwell Cocke, see above, II. D. Miller and Bolling annotated the specifications with detailed but incomplete lists of the changes.

⁹³Lounsbury, *Courthouses*, 319-320.

On this site the county had raised a Temple Revival structure of fine brickwork with a strikingly beautiful tetrastyle Tuscan portico. Like its ancestors at the Lawn Pavilions and probably at the Buckingham County Courthouse, the remarkably accessible portico platform lies low, not 6" above the ground. The column shafts are stuccoed brick, in a manner Palladio would follow, just as the specifications of 1825/1826 require, and these shafts, along with the dressed stone and wood elements of the Order, inevitably contrast with the red brick. (The specifications name no color for the plaster, suggesting that it was to be left white, and they do not identify the stone or its color, but they call for the wooden elements to be painted white except for the shutters, which were to be green.) Observers have previously praised what they saw as the purity of the Order. They have not recognized that Cosby and Parrish modified the Palladio-Fréart Tuscan significantly, above all by stretching it from the orthodox "husky Tuscan" of 7 diameters to a slimmer Adamesque Tuscan. The bell, dangling once again from the entablature and rung by a cord wrapped around a bent nail, reflects Jefferson's rejection of cupolas. The specifications call for a semicircular pedimental window, but a note on the document by William Bolling says that this "was dispensed with." Its absence, contributing handsomely to the simplicity and serenity of the portico, brings the façade closer to an ancient temple.

The Goochland interior preserves much of its Jeffersonian arrangement: apse (here a shallow one), columnar gallery, paired staircases, and jury rooms. The gallery, designated as Tuscan in the specifications, actually belongs to a finer Order, the baseless Roman Doric of the Theater of Marcellus, an Order that Jefferson took over from Fréart de Chambray for the portico of Pavilion X at the University of Virginia. The specifications call for a memorable seating pattern that formed a circle. The semicircular bench, the semicircular jury box around which the bench wrapped, and a semicircular Clerk's table made up one half of the circle. The bar, curving in the opposite direction, filled out the other half. This layout has perished, but the bench still occupies its shallow apse, one of the few such niches to survive in a Virginia courthouse.

We see anew what we have seen before. Standing models in Buckingham County and on the Lawn, an apostolic succession of workman, the fusion of courtroom and temple, the union of solid

masonry and the Orders – all are here. So too is the ascendancy of Adamesque proportions for the Orders and the weak handling of the bell. We must now acknowledge a further recurrent element. In courthouse after courthouse, from the hundred-foot-long façade in Buckingham through the memorable scheme for the Goochland interior, we have recognized an element of vaunting ambition in the Jeffersonian courthouse.

That same ambition characterizes the last two links on the chain that has occupied our attention: the Cocke family courthouses for Fluvanna and Powhatan Counties. These buildings were not scrutinized for the present study, but even a summary look tells a great deal about their place. With these buildings, the Jefferson influence certainly traveled via patronage but not so surely via craftsmen.

The Fluvanna County Courthouse at Palmyra (1830-31) was created by General John Hartwell Cocke and an undertaker, Walker Timberlake, not a Jefferson workman, but perhaps with the participation of William B. Phillips, one of Jefferson's best brickmasons. Cocke was an immensely distinguished associate of Jefferson's. For our purposes we need only remember the well-known facts that Cocke sought both Jefferson's council and the labors of Jefferson's right-hand man John Neilson in the creation of Cocke's great Jeffersonian Palladian villa, Breemo (Fluvanna County, 1817-20); that Cocke served on the University of Virginia Board of Visitors for thirty-three years, involving himself deeply in the construction at Jefferson's side; and that Cocke acquired the Goochland specifications – that is, a document in the Buckingham County Courthouse family line. The latter fact prepares us for a variation on the familiar theme on the “acropolis” at Palmyra.⁹⁴

Crowning its mount perfectly, and apparently surviving in a good state of preservation, the Fluvanna courthouse is another tetrastyle Temple Revival building of fine brickwork. This time the

⁹⁴The most recent discussion of the Fluvanna courthouse is Muriel B. Rogers, "John Hartwell Cocke (1780-1866) and Philip St. George Cocke (1809-1861): From Jeffersonian Palladianism to Romantic Colonial Revivalism in Antebellum Virginia" (Ph. D. diss., Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003), chap. 3, esp. 77-86. See also Grigg, Wood, Browne & Williams, "A Feasibility Study for the Restoration of Fluvanna County Courthouse, Palmyra, Virginia," manuscript, 1973-74. I am grateful to K. Edward Lay, Professor Emeritus of the School of Architecture at the University of Virginia for sharing a copy of the feasibility study with me. Talbot Hamlin popularized the comparison between the Palmyra group and a Greek acropolis in *Greek Revival Architecture in America: Being an Account of Important Trends in . . . Architecture and . . . Life Prior to the War between the States* (1944; reprint, New

temple has pilasters that, like the Flemish bond brickwork, run completely around the sides and rear. By national standards this would be an almost unaccountably early instance of a pilastrade around a temple were it not for the presence of the pilastrade that wraps around the Virginia State Capitol. Evidence suggests that the Palmyra courthouse was meant to have a covered walkway at either side leading to twin office pavilions, an arrangement obviously in the immediate line of descent from Buckingham. Because of expense, only in 1835 did the Court authorize a simplification of this plan, approving two 18-foot-square offices without colonnades. The decision, however, eventuated in the extant pair of non-matching brick offices.⁹⁵

At the courthouse proper, the platform is not low, and, in addition to surmounting a hilltop, the temple sits on four stone steps. The specifications directed that the column and pilasters shafts be stuccoed over brick in simulation of ashlar, and something of the effect survives. The Order, of course, with its various stone and wood elements, contrasts with the red brick walls. This Order is baseless, with a peculiar kind of entasis. The Order wavers between the Greek Doric (as witness the profiles of the masonry echinus and abacus) and the Roman Doric (exemplified by the treatment of the corners of the wood frieze, not with triglyphs in the Greek fashion but with half-metopes, along the lines recommended by Vitruvius). The intrusion of Greek elements suggests the impact of Latrobe and his disciples, while the front wall confirms this idea. This front wall repeats a trait of Latrobe's Bank of Pennsylvania (fig. 54) that originally raised some eyebrows but ultimately became popular in the Temple Revival. That is, the front walls of the Bank and the Courthouse, like a Greco-Roman temple façade, have no windows. In a very different vein, the wood pediment is treated as drafted ashlar. The story of the bell is cloudy, but in

York: Dover Publications, 1964), 191-92.

⁹⁵For the evidence regarding the wings, see Minnie Lee McGehee, [Fluvanna County] Courthouse Renovation Review Committee, memorandum to Architects on Short-List for Courthouse Renovations, 16 April 1992; I owe my copy to the courtesy of the firm of Browne, Eichman, Dalglish, Gilpin & Paxton, P.C., of Charlottesville in 1992.

1830 the idea of adding a steeple for it lay under consideration, before an apparent decision to mount it like the bell atop the portico of the University of Virginia Rotunda.⁹⁶

Internally Fluvanna lies well within the Jefferson lineage. The temple container houses a courtroom with two jury rooms upstairs. The gallery, reached by twin staircases, rests on a novel Order with quasi-Greek Doric columns and a Vitruvian scroll in the frieze. The largest departure from the Jefferson pattern is the use of a flat Bench wall rather than an apsed one. Un-Jeffersonian, too, is the use of more-or-less Adamesque detailing, partly from Owen Biddle's *Young Carpenter's Assistant* (Philadelphia, 1805), which was published as a workman's compendium of late Palladian and Neoclassical elements in use in Philadelphia. The title pages of the 1810, 1815, and 1817 editions of Biddle record that the publisher maintained a bookstore in Richmond, a circumstance that may account for the appearance of the book in Fluvanna County.

The Palmyra group is unforgettable by virtue of its scale, its materials, and, above all, its siting, but, in naïve hands, the styles became mixed. The other Cocke family courthouse, at Powhatan, affords a contrast. Here, on an unexceptional site, we see the Jeffersonian courthouse pattern as rethought by one of the most gifted architectural stylists in American history, Alexander J. Davis of Manhattan. The patron effectively was John Hartwell Cocke's son Philip St. George Cocke. Unsurprisingly, Davis had had no reason to go to little Palmyra during his travels in Virginia prior to the commission. The link in the Jefferson chain was the younger Cocke. Davis entered the design of the Powhatan courthouse in his Daybook and his Journal ("Hexastyle Doric front") under the date of 29 May 1848, five days after he noted a visit from Cocke during an extended trip by Cocke to New York City. What Cocke and Davis said to each other we may never know.⁹⁷

⁹⁶The specifications are in the Cocke Family Papers, no. 640 etc., Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia Library. I have relied on the photocopy in Grigg, Wood, Browne & Williams, "Feasibility Study," n. pag. On triglyphs, see Vitruvius 4.3.1-8. Vitruvius did not, however, countenance the oblong metopes that run across the front at Palmyra. For the bell, see Grigg, Wood, Browne & Williams, 5-6.

⁹⁷The intricate story of Powhatan's shrine of the law has never been told at all fully. The most recent discussion appears in Rogers, "Cocke," 123; cp. Mills Lane, *Architecture of the Old South: Virginia*, with editorial assistance by Calder Loth and special photography by Van Jones Martin (Savannah: Beehive Press, 1987), 236-38. Davis's Daybook, vol. 1 (October 1827-September 1853) is in the Rare Books and Manuscripts Division of the New York

The Powhatan County Courthouse was remodeled by the firm of Browne, Eichman, Dalgliesh, Gilpin, and Paxton, with much guidance by Calder Loth, in 1991-92. The firm simultaneously added a pair of wings to the rear that might pass for a derivative of the Buckingham conception had the latter been known in the early 1990s. Despite the immediate decay of the 1990s work, the radiant beauty of Davis's conception continues to shine through.

This temple belongs to an international Neoclassical format that the present writer has named distyle in muris. That is, the façade, which at first looks much like a temple with six columns across the front, in actuality consists of two columns embedded between twin blocks of wall with staircases behind and twin pillars on their front surface. These pillars are properly called anta-pilasters, a Davis specialty like the distyle-in-muris pattern itself. The anta-pilaster fuses two kinds of pillar attached to a wall, the Greek anta, which projects boldly but appears only at corners, and the Roman pilaster, which projects less prominently but runs along an entire facade. Davis designed his crisp and stately anta-pilaster to march not only across the front but also down the sides of the courthouse. The handling gives something of the effect of a columnar Greek temple without subjecting the building to the problems of colonnades, which were enormously costly and blocked the light from the interior. At Powhatan, the handling of the anta-pilaster Order, down to the minute details of its guttae, exhibit Davis's talents as a matchless master of the play of light and shade.⁹⁸

The Powhatan building is a compound of Jeffersonian and un-Jeffersonian features. The courthouse lies low, atop only three steps. The materials are stuccoed brick and, in the case of the Orders, wood, all of which Davis meant to simulate ashlar stonework, with no Jeffersonian contrast between walls

Public Library; the Journal is in the A. J. Davis Collection, Metropolitan Museum of Art, vol. I. The A. J. Davis Collection at the New-York Historical Society includes a study plan for the courthouse (Drawing Number 341) that records the evolution of Davis's ideas. For two further Davis drawings of uncertain date, see the A. J. Davis Collection, Metropolitan Museum of Art, vol. VII, fols. 58-58v, with an inscription stating that the first design was Ionic. One must, however, always use Davis's papers with the utmost caution because he revised his designs extensively and confusingly during the decades of his retirement.

⁹⁸On the term *distyle in muris*, see Brownell in *Making of Virginia Architecture*, 67-68, and, on Davis and the anta-pilaster, see "A. J. Davis's Projects for a Patent Office Building, 1832-34," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 24 (October 1965):229-51, by Davis's magisterial biographer, Jane B. Davies.

and Order. (Commonplace twentieth-century taste has preferred to pick details of the Order out like icing on a cake.) The two columns are baseless Greek Doric, while the anta-pilasters as usual approximate the Greek Doric Order. Seen head on, the front wall, like that of an ancient shrine, has no windows, which Davis tucked out of sight inside the porch. If much of the front bespeaks Latrobe's legacy, the bell dangles from the central intercolumniation in the fashion of the Goochland and Charlotte County courthouses.

Functionally Powhatan lies almost as unmistakably within the Jefferson line as Fluvanna. Davis planned the temple container to house a courtroom with two jury rooms upstairs on a gallery. The architect removed the twin staircases from the courtroom; as already hinted, a basic reason for the distyle-in-muris pattern is that the projecting walls of the front could hold staircases, as they do here. As at Palmyra we see a flat Bench wall rather than a Jeffersonian apse, and Davis's Greek Revival detailing is likewise a departure from the Jeffersonian Palladian past. The fact remains that the Powhatan structure, one of the brightest moments in Virginia architecture, could not have taken the form that it did without Jefferson's reform. Alexander J. Davis here reconciled Virginia practice of the second quarter of the nineteenth century with his own inspired bent.

The Powhatan County Courthouse brings us to the end of our chosen chain. It would take a study several times the scope of the present one to recount the stories of the other Virginia courthouses that derived from Jefferson's conception. Thus, research for the seminars that supported the present study has disclosed unanticipated significance for a series of temple-form buildings. Take the case of the lost Henrico County Courthouse in Richmond of 1825, built to the plan of Samuel Sublett by William C. Allen, William Street -- formerly misidentified as William Sheets -- and others. The building was Early Neoclassical in style and followed a unique design, with twin front doors flanking a central window behind the portico. The courthouse had partial reincarnations in previously unrecorded replacements of 1842 (by Isaac A. Goddin) and 1867 (by William H. Yeatman) that have been confused with the 1825 structure. Or take the quite different case of the extant Clarke County Courthouse of 1837-38 in

Berryville. Its designer, David Meade, like his famous brother Bishop William Meade, most likely developed surveying and drawing skills as a student at Princeton. David Meade may well have designed the Clarke County Courthouse as a corrected version, bell cupola and all, of the Loudoun County Courthouse. Or, for a contrasting last specimen, take the case of the 1838 Nansemond County Courthouse in Suffolk (now holding the offices of the County Department of Education). The building, with its starved and unbeautiful stuccoed wooden portico in a form of the Tuscan, illustrates a major point: when a reform becomes widely successful, it will probably give rise to travesties.⁹⁹

If one turns from the temple-encased buildings at the centerline of the reform, one encounters other courthouse types that changed because of Jefferson. Most conspicuous are the variations on the arcaded town hall type, such as the Caroline County Courthouse in Bowling Green (ca. 1830), plausibly attributed to university workmen William B. Phillips and Malcolm Crawford. The Caroline County edifice belongs to a courthouse pattern set by Phillips and Crawford after the example of Pavilion VI, a Jefferson model for gabled facades with powerful entablatures and pediments but no columns. At Caroline County and its kin, the Orders follow Jefferson's lead, taking the robust form of full entablatures rather than mere cornices. The brickwork, too, is excellent. On the other hand, townhall-tradition courthouses of this Phillips/Crawford strain have twin entries on the front. As a corollary that jars on a Classical eye, such courthouses have an even number of openings in their arcades rather than the central aperture that orthodox tradition leads one to expect.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹On these courthouses see John W. Dameron, "Henrico County Courthouse, 1825-1896: Three Jefferson Temples," research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003 (summarized in "Setting Styles," Virginia Commonwealth University's Twelfth Annual Symposium in Architectural History and the Decorative Arts, November, 2004); Kelly A. Goodman, "David Meade (1793-1837) and the Clarke County Courthouse, Berryville, Virginia (1837-1838)," research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2002 (addressing Calder Loth's oral hypothesis about the relations between the Loudoun and Clarke County buildings); and Emily C. Gerhold, "Failure and Success at the Nansemond County Courthouse, Suffolk, Virginia (1838)," research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell). Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003.

¹⁰⁰For a case study, see Cheryll Whitley Tassone, "Caroline County Courthouse: A Chronological Study," research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2002. See also Peters and Peters, *Virginia's Courthouses*, 55-59, 68-71.

And the national place of Virginia's Jeffersonian temple-courthouses? Without a doubt they constitute a unique and beautiful chapter in the architectural history of the United States. Jefferson was the fountainhead of the American Temple Revival; he thereby profoundly affected the nation's architecture for the first half of the nineteenth century and more. The national story is one of an American development that differs vividly from even the closest parallels abroad. The national story also differs vividly from the story within Virginia.

We can reduce the first thirty-five-odd years of the national story (1785-1820) to shorthand. Jefferson began the Temple Revival with the Virginia State Capitol (1785 ff.); in Philadelphia, Jefferson promoted the modern temple during planning for the U. S. Capitol in the 1790s; in Philadelphia, Latrobe converted Jefferson's Palladian Temple Revival into the Second Phase of Neoclassicism at the Bank of Pennsylvania (1799-1801); and, in Philadelphia, William Strickland reworked Latrobe's Neoclassicism at the second Bank of the United States (1818-24). Down to 1820 the two Philadelphia banks were the chief buildings to take the temple form outside Virginia. The smattering of lesser temples exhibits few patterns except that about half the group belongs to the Latrobe family line and none of the group was a courthouse.¹⁰¹

In the 1820s, while the Temple Revival took off in Virginia courthouses, it also took wing as a national phenomenon, in sacred, civic, and commercial buildings from Boston, Massachusetts, to Frankfort, Kentucky. But nationally the temples of this decade are typically quite un-Jeffersonian and traceable to Latrobe's influence. They exhibit such non-Jefferson features as real or simulated stone facades, temple-like front walls without windows, Greek Orders, and externally visible domes over rotundas.

¹⁰¹For a summary of the Temple Revival, see my comments in Brownell and others, *Making of Virginia Architecture*, 63-69. Latrobe pointedly did not use the temple format for his only courthouse, the lost Washington County Courthouse in Hagerstown, Maryland (1817), which took a basilican form; see Cohen and Brownell in *Architectural Drawings*, 677-78.

Moreover, in the 1820s, only a handful of temple courthouses, often not of the highest stature, show up beyond the borders of the Old Dominion. The largest group – three -- crops up with Robert Mills, Jefferson's sometime draftsman and Latrobe's pupil. In the 1820s Mills designed and built fourteen South Carolina courthouses. Mills favored a second-story courtroom and jury rooms over a basement story for fireproof record storage rooms and clerks' offices, features rarely found in Virginia in the period. Mills's combination of elements led away from the temple paradigm, but for two of his commissions (the Williamsburg County Courthouse, Kingstree, 1821-by 1825, and the Georgetown County Courthouse, Georgetown, 1823-24) Mills set a temple atop a basement story that concealed the stairs, while he treated a third building (the Kershaw County Courthouse, Camden, 1825-30) to look more pervasively like a temple on the outside. William Strickland, Latrobe's other celebrated architectural pupil, adds one example to the list, the Crawford County Courthouse, Meadville, Pennsylvania (1824-28), a Doric temple with a cupola. And Solomon Willard, a Latrobe architectural legatee, built the Norfolk County Courthouse in Dedham, Massachusetts (1824-26), as a hardy amphiprostyle temple, in contrast to an obscure New England fusion of Adamesque ornament with the temple of justice that seems referable to the Congregational meetinghouse, Gibbs, and Benjamin. To the foregoing specimens one can add only a few minor examples.¹⁰²

After the 1820s the national story changed. Now the Temple Revival reached its zenith in a phase of Greek Revivalism. This meant the proliferation of the oblong temple body for every function,

¹⁰²On Mills I am again indebted to Delos D. Hughes, who has shared with me the MS of "Geography, Politics, and the Courthouse Architecture of South Carolina and Virginia in the Early Republic," a paper given at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Society of Architectural Historians, Columbia, South Carolina, 2001. Hughes's analyses are invaluable. Mills has not been fortunate in his biographers; on the courthouses see Gene Waddell and Rhodri Windsor Liscombe, *Robert Mills's Courthouses & Jails* (Easley, South Carolina: Southern Historical Press, 1982), esp. 9, 35, 36, 41. For the Crawford County Courthouse, see Agnes Addison Gilchrist, *William Strickland, Architect and Engineer, 1788-1854* (1950; reprint with supplement, New York: Da Capo Press, 1969), 67 and pl. 14B. Edmund V. Gillon, Jr., *Pictorial Archive of Early Illustrations and Views of American Architecture* (New York: Dover Publications, 1971) handily illustrates Willard's Dedham building (fig. 17) before its enlargement as well as an Adamesque temple-courthouse in Springfield, Massachusetts, reputedly of 1821 (fig. 465). As to additional minor examples, the New England Adamesque development probably extended as far west as Michigan; see W. Hawkins Ferry, *The Buildings of Detroit: A History*, rev ed. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1980), 32 and pl. 35, for Obed Wait's Macomb County Courthouse (1823-28).

including courthouses, and the proliferation of the Greek Orders. For our purposes, though, it is the 1820s that are decisive. In this decade, outside Virginia, as the Temple Revival radiated nationally from Northeastern cities, the courthouse stood at the edge of the movement. Within Virginia, the temple of justice, emanating from Monticello, stood at the center of the Revival, it differed markedly from temples elsewhere, and its development displayed a unique consistency as well as exceptional architectural merit.

III. Conclusion

Thomas Jefferson succeeded in his wish to reform Virginia architecture. His triumph with the courthouse, the most important kind of public building in the Old Dominion, ranks among his chief architectural achievements. Jefferson's values embraced practical planning and enduring, monumental construction worthy of the majesty of the law. Turning to proven models, he authoritatively united elements from traditional courthouse layouts with a temple encasement, that is, with a temple-form arrangement of masonry walls and the Tuscan, the most applicable of the Orders. Further balancing the imported and the local, he fused stuccoed brick column shafts in the manner of Palladio with the Virginia practice of building in red brick with pale trim. Understanding the custom of modeling new construction on standing buildings, he retrained workmen so that they could carry his principles into practice, and he set models that won the admiration of patrons within his own class -- his Buckingham and Charlotte County courthouse designs, the University of Virginia buildings, and Monticello itself. With this study it has become possible for the first time to track, generation by generation, the genealogy of the uniquely Virginian courthouses that descended from Jefferson's conception and that, better than any other extant civic buildings except the University of Virginia, embody Jefferson's architectural beliefs. There are blemishes, such as imperfect circulation patterns, the failure to integrate the bell, and the Adamizing of the Palladian Orders. Nonetheless the accomplishment is a noble one. Jefferson is the nation's first architect of international consequence, and the present work has shown that the courthouse lineage owes deeply to Latrobe, the second. Even more significantly, the present pages give a special look inside Jefferson's mind, illuminating the practical understanding that enabled the Master of Monticello to change the world around him.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES CITED

Note: All Virginia Commonwealth University seminar papers, symposium papers, theses, and dissertations cited below are available in Special Collections and Archives, James Branch Cabell Library, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia.

Ackerman, James S. "The Tuscan/Rustic Order: A Study in the Metaphorical Language of Architecture." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 42 (March 1983):15-34.

Adams, Evelyn Taylor. *The Courthouse in Virginia Counties, 1634-1776*. With a foreword by Frederick D. Nichols, A. I. A. Warrenton, Virginia: printed in the shop of the Fauquier Democrat, 1966.

Agee, Helène Barret. *Facets of Goochland (Virginia) County's History*. Richmond: Dietz Press, 1962.

Bates, Brian D., with Mark Howard and James W. Jordan. "Buckingham Courthouse Archaeological Project: Report of Archaeological Investigations at Buckingham Courthouse, Buckingham, Virginia." Report to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, 2003.

Bates, Brian D. "Buckingham Courthouse Archaeological Project: An Update to the Report of Archaeological Investigations at Buckingham Courthouse, Buckingham, Virginia." Report to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, 2004.

Benes, Peter "The Templeton 'Run' and the Pomfret 'Cluster': Patterns of Diffusion in Rural New England Meetinghouse Architecture, 1647-1822." *Old-Time New England* 68 (Winter-Spring 1978):1-21

Beiswanger, William L. "Jefferson's Sources from Antiquity in the Design of Monticello." *The Magazine Antiques* 143 (July 1993):58-69.

_____. "The Temple in the Garden: Thomas Jefferson's Vision of the Monticello Landscape." *Eighteenth Century Life*, n. s., 8 (January 1983):170-88.

_____. "Thomas Jefferson's Designs for Garden Structures at Monticello." Master of Architectural History thesis, University of Virginia, 1977.

Benjamin, Asher. *The Country Builder's Assistant: Containing A Collection of New Designs of Carpentry and Architecture*. Greenfield, Massachusetts: printed by Thomas Dickman, 1797.

Benjamin, Asher, and Daniel Raynerd. *The American Builder's Companion: Or, a System of Architecture: Particularly Adapted to the Present Style of Building in the United States of America*. Boston: Etheridge and Bliss, 1806, and later editions.

Biddle, Owen. *The Young Carpenter's Assistant; or, A System of Architecture, Adapted to the Style of Building in the United States*. Philadelphia: printed and sold by Benjamin Johnson, 1805, and later editions.

Bodman, James Martyn Bodman. "The Building Career of George Winston (1759-1826)." M. A. thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003.

- Brownell, Charles E. "Thomas Jefferson's Architectural Models and the United States Capitol." In *A Republic for the Ages: The United States Capitol and the Political Culture of the Early Republic*, edited by Donald R. Kennon, 316-401. Charlottesville: published for the United States Capitol Historical Society by the University Press of Virginia, 1999.
- Brownell, Charles; Calder Loth; William M. S. Rasmussen; and Richard Guy Wilson. *The Making of Virginia Architecture*. Richmond: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 1992.
- Bucklen, Mary Kegley, and Larrie L. Bucklen. *County Courthouses of Virginia, Old and New*. Charleston, West Virginia: Pictorial Histories Publishing Company, 1988.
- Bullard, CeCe, with Margaret Henley Walker and Eve Barenholtz. *Goochland, Yesterday and Today: A Pictorial History*. Virginia Beach, Virginia: Donning Company, 1994.
- Campbell, Kathryn. "James Wren (1728-1815), Architect of Colonial Virginia." Research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell). Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003.
- _____. "James Wren, Virginia Architect (1728-1815) and the Disappearing Pilaster." Paper for "Classics and Exotics," Virginia Commonwealth University's Eleventh Annual Symposium on Architectural History and the Decorative Arts, cosponsored by the Virginia Historical Society, the Center for Palladian Studies in America, and others. Richmond, Virginia, November 2003.
- Cote, Richard Charles. "The Architectural Workmen of Thomas Jefferson in Virginia." 2 vols. Ph. D. diss., Boston University, 1986.
- County Court Houses of the United States: *The Seagram County Court House Archives and Other Photographic Collections in the Library of Congress*. Microform. Essex, New York: Dunlap Society, 1981.
- Dameron, John W. "Henrico County Courthouse, 1825-1896: Three Jefferson Temples." Research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell). Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003.
- Davies, Jane B. "A. J. Davis's Projects for a Patent Office Building, 1832-34." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 24 (October 1965):229-51.
- "Early Officials of Goochland County." *Goochland County Historical Society Magazine* 1 (Autumn 1969):1-7.
- Foster, Heather A. "Jefferson, Wren, Philadelphia, and the Portico with Lunette." In *The Classical Tradition: From Andrea Palladio to John Russell Pope: New Findings from Virginia Commonwealth University*, Abstracts of the Sixth Annual Architectural History Symposium, 1998, ed. by Charles Brownell, 10-11. Richmond: Department of Art History, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1998.
- Fréart, Roland, Sieur de Chambray, and Charles Errard. *Parallèle de l'architecture antique avec la moderne, Suivant les dix principaux Auteurs qui ont écrit sur les cinq Ordres*. Edited by Charles-Antoine Jombert. Bibliothèque portative d'architecture élémentaire, à l'usage des artistes. Paris, 1766.
- Gaines, William H., Jr., and others. [Courthouses of Virginia series.] *Virginia Cavalcade*, intermittent nos., 14 (summer 1964)-30 (summer 1980).

- Gerhold, Emily C. "Failure and Success at the Nansemond County Courthouse, Suffolk, Virginia (1838)." Research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell). Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003.
- Gibbs, James. *Rules For Drawing The several Parts of Architecture, In A More exact and easy manner than has been heretofore practised, by which all Fractions, in dividing the principal Members and their Parts, are avoided.* London, 1732.
- Goochland, County of. Goochland County Court Order Book, 31 (1825-31). Microfilm, Library of Virginia.
- _____. Specifications for Goochland County Courthouse. Late 1825 or early 1826. Transcription, 1829. University of Virginia Library, Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, Cocke Papers, No. 640 etc., Box 182, Folder "N.d. Goochland County – Court House Specifications and Roads."
- Goodman, Kelly A. "David Meade (1793-1837) and the Clarke County Courthouse, Berryville, Virginia (1837-1838)." Research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell). Virginia Commonwealth University, 2002.
- Green, Bryan Clark. *In Jefferson's Shadow: The Architecture of Thomas R. Blackburn.* New York: Princeton Architectural Press, in press.
- _____. "In the Shadow of Thomas Jefferson: The Architectural Career of Thomas R. Blackburn, with a Catalog of Architectural Drawings." Ph. D. diss., University of Virginia, 2004.
- _____. "Thomas Jefferson's Design for the Buckingham County Courthouse." Research report, AR H 700 (Brownell). University of Virginia, 1989.
- Green, Bryan Clark; Calder Loth; and William M. S. Rasmussen, eds. *Lost Virginia: Vanished Architecture of the Old Dominion.* Charlottesville: Howell Press, 2001.
- Grigg, Wood, Browne & Williams. "A Feasibility Study for the Restoration of Fluvanna County Courthouse, Palmyra, Virginia." Manuscript, 1973-74.
- Grizzard, Frank Edgar, Jr. "Documentary History of the Construction of the Buildings of the University of Virginia." Ph. D. diss., University of Virginia, 1996. (<http://etext.virginia.edu/jefferson/grizzard/>)
- Gunther, Justin. "Jefferson, Palladio, and the Capitol of Virginia." Paper for "Building Richmond," the Tenth Annual Virginia Commonwealth University Symposium on Architectural History and the Decorative Arts," cosponsored by the Virginia Historical Society, the Center for Palladian Studies in America, and others. Richmond, Virginia, October 2002.
- Hamlin, Talbot. *Greek Revival Architecture in America: Being an Account of Important Trends in . . . Architecture and . . . Life Prior to the War between the States.* 1944; reprint, New York: Dover Publications, 1964.
- Gilchrist, Agnes Addison. *William Strickland, Architect and Engineer, 1788-185.* 1950; reprint with supplement, New York: Da Capo Press, 1969.
- Gwathmey, John H. *Legends of Virginia Courthouses.* With pencil illustrations by Lucy Payne Pinder. Richmond: Press of the Dietz Printing Company, 1933.

- Harris, Eileen, assisted by Nicholas Savage. *British Architectural Books and Writers, 1556-1785*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Harris, John, and Gordon Higgott. *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings*. Exhibition catalogue. New York: Drawing Center, 1989.
- Hughes, Delos D. "'Building a Courthouse in Fincastle': A Footnote to Jefferson Studies," *Arris* 8 (1997):41-57.
- _____. "The Charlotte County Courthouse: Attribution and Misattribution in Jefferson Studies." *Arris* 4 (1993):8-18.
- _____. "The Courthouses of Buckingham County." Typescript. Ca. 1997.
- _____. "The Courthouses of Buckingham County: Jefferson and Beyond." *Arris* 15 (2004):1-25.
- _____. "Geography, Politics, and the Courthouse Architecture of South Carolina and Virginia in the Early Republic." Paper given at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Society of Architectural Historians, Columbia, South Carolina, 2001.
- Jefferson, Thomas. *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Edited. with an introduction and notes by William Peden. 1955; reprint, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1972.
- _____. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. Edited by Julian P. Boyd et al. 34 vols. to date. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950-.
- _____. *Jefferson's Library: A Catalog with the Entries in His Own Order*. Edited by James Gilreath and Douglas L. Wilson (Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1989.
- _____. "Notes explicatives des plans du Capitole pour l'etat de la Virginie." 1785. MS 9374 (Nichols 271), Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, San Marino, California.
- Johnston, F. *Memorials of Old Virginia Clerks*. Lynchburg: J. P. Bell Company, 1888.
- Jones, Inigo. *Inigo Jones on Palladio: Being the Notes by Inigo Jones in the Copy of "I Quattro Libri dell [sic] Architettura di Andrea Palladio," 1601, in the Library of Worcester College, Oxford*. Edited by Bruce Allsopp. 2 vols. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England: Oriel Press, 1970.
- Kimball, Fiske. *The Capitol of Virginia: A Landmark of American Architecture*. Edited by Jon Kukla, with Martha C. Vick and Sarah Shields Driggs. Revised and expanded ed., with a new introduction by Charles Brownell and an essay on the Capitol model by F. Carey Howlett. Richmond: Library of Virginia, 2002.
- _____. *Thomas Jefferson, Architect: Original Designs in the Collection of Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, Junior*. 1916; reprint, with an introduction by Frederick Doveton Nichols, New York: Da Capo Press, 1968.
- Kuroda, Tadahisa. "The County Court System of Virginia from the Revolution to the Civil War." Ph. D. diss., Columbia University, 1969.

- Lane, Mills. *Architecture of the Old South: Virginia*. With editorial assistance by Calder Loth and special photography by Van Jones Martin. Savannah: Beehive Press, 1987.
- Lasala, Joseph Michael. "Thomas Jefferson's Designs for the University of Virginia." Master of Architectural History thesis, University of Virginia, 1991.
- Latrobe, B. Henry. *The Correspondence and Miscellaneous Papers of Benjamin [sic] Henry Latrobe*. Edited by John C. Van Horne et al. 3 vols. *The Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe*, Series 4. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984-88.
- _____. *Latrobe's View of America, 1795-1820*. Edited by Edward C. Carter II, et al. *The Papers of Benjamin [sic] Henry Latrobe*, Series 3, Sketchbooks and Miscellaneous Drawings. New Haven: Yale University Press, for The Maryland Historical Society, 1985.
- _____. *The Papers of Benjamin [sic] Henry Latrobe*. Microfiche edition. Edited by Thomas E. Jeffrey. Clifton, New Jersey: James T. White & Company, for the Maryland Historical Society, 1976.
- Loth, Calder. "Notes on the Evolution of Virginia Brickwork from the Seventeenth Century to the Late Nineteenth Century." *Bulletin of the Association for Preservation Technology* 6, no. 2 (1974):82-120.
- Lounsbury, Carl R. *The Courthouses of Early Virginia: An Architectural History*, Colonial Williamsburg Studies in Chesapeake History and Culture. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005.
- Lounsbury, Carl R., ed. *An Illustrated Glossary of Early Southern Architecture & Landscape*. With editorial assistance by Vanessa E. Patrick. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- _____. "The Structure of Justice: The Courthouses of Colonial Virginia." In *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, III, edited by Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman, 214-26. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press for the Vernacular Architecture Forum, 1989.
- Lucas, Ann M. "Ordering His Environment: Thomas Jefferson's Architecture from Monticello to the University of Virginia." Master of Architectural History thesis, University of Virginia, 1989.
- Lunenburg, County of. Lunenburg County Order Book 24. Microfilm, Library of Virginia.
- McLaughlin, Jack. *Jefferson and Monticello: The Biography of a Builder*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1988.
- Matheson, Donald W. "Thomas Jefferson, Robert Mills, and the Rotunda House Design of 1803." Research report, AR H 700 (Brownell). University of Virginia, 1991.
- Moore, Erika S. A "Jefferson, Latrobe, and the Lost Loudoun County Courthouse of 1809-1811." research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell). Virginia Commonwealth University, 2002.
- Nichols, Frederick Doveton. *Thomas Jefferson's Architectural Drawings . . . with Commentary and a Check List*. 5th ed. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society; Charlottesville: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation and The University Press of Virginia, 1984.

- O'Neal, William B. *Jefferson's Buildings at the University of Virginia*. Vol. 1, *The Rotunda*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1960.
- _____. *Jefferson's Fine Arts Library: His Selections for the University of Virginia, together with His Own Architectural Books*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1976.
- Palladio, Andrea. *The Architecture of A. Palladio; in Four Books. . . . With Notes and Remarks of Inigo Jones. . . . And Also, An Appendix, containing the Antiquities of Rome. Written by A. Palladio. And a Discourse of the Fires of the Ancients*. Translated by Nicholas Dubois and edited by Giacomo Leoni. 3rd ed. 2 vols. London, 1742.
- _____. *The Four Books on Architecture*. Translated by Robert Tavernor and Richard Schofield. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1997.
- Peet, George, and Gabrielle Keller, photographers. *Courthouses of the Commonwealth*. Edited with a preface by Robert J. Brink. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984.
- Peters, John O., and Margaret T. Peters. *Virginia's Historic Courthouses*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995.
- Pevsner, Nikolaus. *A History of Building Types*. The A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, the National Gallery of Art, 1970; Bollingen Series XXXV, 19. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Poffenberger, Brien J. "Jefferson's Design of the Capitol of Virginia." Master of Architectural History thesis, University of Virginia, 1991,
- Reynolds, Craig A. "William A. Howard, Dabney Cosby, and the Jeffersonian Palladian Courthouse." Paper for the conference "Classics and Exotics: New Findings from Virginia Commonwealth University," Eleventh Annual Symposium in Architectural History and the Decorative Arts, Virginia Commonwealth University/Virginia Historical Society/Center for Palladian Studies in America/and other cosponsors, Richmond, November, 2003.
- _____. "William A. Howard, Southside Virginia Carpenter and Jeffersonian Builder (ca. 1787-1854/1860)," research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003.
- Rogers, Muriel B. "John Hartwell Cocke (1780-1866) and Philip St. George Cocke (1809-1861): From Jeffersonian Palladianism to Romantic Colonial Revivalism in Antebellum Virginia." Ph. D. diss., Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003.
- Sherwood, Patricia C., and Joseph Michael Lasala. "Education and Architecture: The Evolution of the University of Virginia's Academical Village." In *Thomas Jefferson's Academical Village: The Creation of an Architectural Masterpiece*, edited by Richard Guy Wilson, 8-45. Charlottesville, Virginia: Bayly Art Museum of the University of Virginia, 1993.
- Sommer, Frank H., III. "Thomas Jefferson's First Plan for a Virginia Building." In *Papers on American Art*, edited by John C. Milley, 87-112. Maple Shade, New Jersey: Edinburgh Press, for the Friends of Independence National Historical Park, 1976.
- Summerson, Sir John. "Inigo Jones." British Academy Lecture on a Master Mind. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 50 (1965):69-92.

- _____. *Inigo Jones*. New ed., with a foreword by Sir Howard Colvin. New Haven: published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2000.
- Tassone, Cheryll Whitley. "Caroline County Courthouse: A Chronological Study." Research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell). Virginia Commonwealth University, 2002.
- Thrane, Susan W. *County Courthouses of Ohio*. Photographs by Tom Patterson and Bill Patterson. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Thomas Jefferson's Monticello*. Charlottesville: Thomas Jefferson Foundation, 2002
- Thurley, Simon, with Alan Cook and others. *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1698*. New Haven: Yale University Press in association with Historic Royal Palaces, 1999
- Upton, Dell. *Holy Things and Profane: Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia*, Architectural History Foundation Books, 10. New York, 1986.
- Virginia Landmarks Register. Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia.
- Vitruvius. *Les dix Livres d'Architecture de Vitruve, corrigez et traduits nouvellement en François, avec des Notes & des Figure*. Translated and edited by Claude Perrault. 2nd ed., revised, corrected, and augmented. Paris, 1684.
- _____. *Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture*. Translated by Ingrid D. Rowland, with commentary and illustrations by Thomas Noble Howe, and additional commentary by Ingrid D. Rowland and Michael J. Dewar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Waddell, Gene, and Rhodri Windsor Liscombe. *Robert Mills's Courthouses & Jails*. Easley, South Carolina: Southern Historical Press, 1982.
- Watkinson, Tracey. "Jefferson, Latrobe, and the Architectural Drawings of John Neilson (Before 1775-1827)." M. A. thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003.
- Weeks, Elie. "The Early Courthouses of Goochland." *Goochland County Historical Society Magazine* 7 (Autumn 1975):6-11.
- Wenger, Mark R. "Thomas Jefferson and the Virginia State Capitol." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 101 (January 1993):77-102.
- Whiffen, Marcus. "The Early County Courthouses of Virginia." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 18 (March 1959):2-10.
- Wood Sweet Swofford Architects, "Goochland County Courthouse." Historic Structure Report for the Circuit Courthouse; Administrative and Judicial Space Planning Analysis. Charlottesville, 1989.