

“PRE-COLUMBIAN REVIVAL”: DEFINING AND EXPLORING A U.S.
ARCHITECTURAL STYLE, 1910-1940

by

RUTH ANNE PHILLIPS

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2007

UMI Number: 3283183



UMI Microform 3283183

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

©2007

RUTH ANNE PHILLIPS

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Art History in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date

Professor Judy Sund
Chair of Examining Committee

Date

Professor Kevin Murphy
Executive Officer

Professor Kevin Murphy

Professor Katherine Manthorne

Dr. Joanne Pillsbury
Supervisory Committee

ABSTRACT

“PRE-COLUMBIAN REVIVAL”: DEFINING AND EXPLORING A
U.S. ARCHITECTURAL STYLE, 1910-1940

by

Ruth Anne Phillips

Adviser: Professor Judy Sund

During the first decades of the twentieth century, a number of U.S. architects, designers and patrons looked to the art and architecture of the pre-Columbian Americas for inspiration. Beginning with the Pan-American Union complex of 1910 (now Organization of American States, Paul P. Crét and Albert Kelsey, Washington, D.C.), the first significant instance of pre-Columbian appropriation in a U.S. building, my dissertation tracks the development of the style that peaked in the 1920s in Southern California before spreading, in the 1930s, throughout much of the United States. My dissertation’s terminus date, 1940, reflects waning interest in pre-Columbian aesthetics as Modernism and abstract expressionism took hold and as U.S. focus turned to the events of World War II.

Expanding on previous scholarship, my study provides the first thorough analysis of pre-Columbian appropriation in U.S. architecture—including the description and sourcing of its previously unrecognized Andean components. Through an analysis of data derived from a newly compiled list of pre-Columbian appropriations, the dissertation elucidates chronological, geographical and typological factors that underpin the style. It examines not just the pre-Columbian elements in the more “high brow” works of its foremost practitioners—Robert B. Stacy-Judd, Alfred C. Bossom, Francisco Mújica and

Frank Lloyd Wright—but recognizes a sliding scale in the style’s application with over-the-top exploitations of the exotic, such as in “themed” theaters and hotels, occupying the opposite end. This sliding scale concept considers intertwined notions of types of use, design motivations, intended audience, building typology and regional attitudes.

Pan-American sentiments that began in the early decades of the nineteenth century and laid claim in the United States to a pre-Hispanic past, as well as increasing visibility of pre-Columbian aesthetics, helped promote the appropriation of pre-Hispanic forms for an innovative American aesthetic. At the same time, the art forms of “exotic” American indigenes excited a U.S. public, especially when applied in escapist and commercial venues. U.S. buildings that allude—directly or more subtly—to pre-Columbian aesthetics are compared, in this dissertation, to other manifestations of “exoticism” in U.S. architecture, such as Egyptian Revival buildings, since all reflect a particular strain of innovation that challenged traditionalism by embracing and promoting non-European alterity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to first thank my wonderful adviser, mentor and teacher, Professor Judy Sund. I feel privileged to have worked with her, as she is demanding yet respectful and somehow manages to keep intact a pervasive sense of humor. Not only did Professor Sund provide tireless comments and edits to my dissertation, but she introduced me to the Andes, my love and area of specialty, in classes that she taught at the Graduate Center.

I am also grateful to my advisory committee. Professor Kevin Murphy endured my many questions and provided insightful suggestions and feedback that ultimately made this dissertation stronger. Likewise, Professor Katherine Manthorne, whom I also had the pleasure of working with as her assistant at the Graduate Center, was especially generous with advice as well as books and videos. A heartfelt thank you goes to Dr. Joanne Pillsbury who graciously agreed to take on my dissertation, despite her extremely busy schedule. I also appreciate the practical advice she has given me over the years regarding our mutual interest in the Andes and how to make a career out of this stuff.

Another thank you goes to Professor Murphy in his capacity as Executive Officer of the Ph.D. Program in Art History at the Graduate Center. Lauren Frederick-Bowen, the Assistant Program Officer of the Ph.D. Program in Art History at the Graduate Center, held my hand when I needed it and gave gentle pushes when appropriate. Since her retirement, the Program truly has a void. Sandylene Wakefield, another “assistant” in the Program office, also helped me in countless ways for which I am most appreciative.

Other professors at the Graduate Center deserve mention here as well. Professor Eloise Quiñones-Keber, an excellent teacher who makes her subjects come alive, introduced me to many aspects of pre-Columbian art that fueled my enthusiasm for the subject. Professor Rosemarie Haag Bletter, who would have been on my committee had she not had surgery at a particular moment, also answered questions and provided many sources and leads that helped guide the direction of this project. Professor Anna Chave, whom I had the pleasure of assisting and Professor Margaret Vendryes, whom I worked with as a Graduate Teaching Fellow at York College, CUNY, are both true role models, both professionally and personally. Dr. Timothy Pugh, whom I wish I had met years ago, helped with Maya glyph readings and provided practical advice both for my dissertation and career.

This project would not have been possible without financial support from fellowships and grants. I thank the following institutions and their selection committees for having confidence in my work: Luce Foundation (Luce Dissertation Award), Douglass Foundation (Douglass Dissertation Fellowship), CUNY Graduate Teaching Fellowship, PSC/CUNY Tuition Fellowships and other numerous awards offered by CUNY, including Art History Program Fellowships, University Tuition Fellowships, several Summer Travel Fellowships as well as Student Travel and Research Awards.

Assistance with my research at various institutions deserves special thanks. In particular, I'd like to acknowledge the work done by a number of librarians and archivists—in New York: the American Museum of Natural History (Anthropology Archives and library), Columbia University Archives, the New York Public Library (I am especially grateful for the Wertheim Study Desk) and Robert Goldwater Library of the

Metropolitan Museum of Art; in California: Huntington Library, the Los Angeles Art Deco Society, the Los Angeles Conservancy, the Los Angeles Public Library and the University of California at Los Angeles; in Washington, D.C.: Columbus Memorial Library at the Organization of American States and the Smithsonian Institution Archives; and in San Antonio: the San Antonio Conservation Society. The following individuals assisted in ways that went above normal duties: Cara Armstrong, Curator of Buildings and Collections and Curator of Education, Fallingwater, Western Pennsylvania Conservancy; Franklin DeGreet, Charles Ennis-Brown House; Kurt Helfrich, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara; Celeste Hong, Los Angeles Art Deco Society; James Krakker, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution (Others at the Smithsonian that were especially helpful include Deborah Hullwalski, National Museum of Natural History and Robert Leopold, National Anthropological Archives); Gregory D. Lattanzi, New Jersey State Museum; Laura Massino, Silver Lake Architectural Tours (Los Angeles); staff at the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles; Stan Mokowitz, Building Manager at 450 Sutter (San Francisco); William J. Munter, Esquire; Dr. Susan E. Niles, Christian Sonne, Tuxedo Park Historical Society; Clifton Tinker; staff at the Ventura County Church of Religious Science; and Dr. James Wecshler.

My most heartfelt appreciation goes to those who provided feedback or helped in various ways: Rebecca Phillips Abbott, Jonathan Applefield, Karen Holmberg Bracco, Dr. Emily Rekow Caglayan, Amanda Cohen (UCLA), Eugene Downing, Hannah Dunn (University of Colorado at Denver), Daniel Goering, Sarah Harvey, Eileen Hawley, Orlando Hernandez, Penny Jones, Keith Jordan, Dr. Karen Lemmey, Michael McAuliffe,

Dr. Margaret Connors McQuade, Brooke Olander, Melissa Patane, Dr. Shannon Plank (epigrapher and archaeologist), Dr. Deanne Pytlinski, Dr. Sarah Richardson, Amara Solari (University of California at Santa Barbara), Samantha Starr, Dr. David Valillee, Dr. Jennifer von Schwerin (Ahlfeldt), Carl Whitman and Peter G. Webster. Dr. Angela Herren and soon-to-be doctor, Elizabeth Morán, deserve a special place here. Personal thanks also goes to Dr. Terence N. D'Altroy who has inspired me in all things Andean.

The support and extreme generosity of Monica Barnes and Dr. Scott Frank made this dissertation process a much happier one. Monica supplied me with building leads, photographs, lunches and proofread my dissertation. Scott offered me, a virtual stranger, a couch and provided me with laughs, photographs and books. I count both of these people, not only as colleagues, but friends.

Other friends and family that contributed in myriad ways are: Deborah Clifford, Molly Pietz and Catherine Scarboro. I dedicate this dissertation to my husband and best friend, Kurt Ludwig, who will, no doubt, be ever so grateful that I soon will be returning to a world where all people in the household do dishes and laundry.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	xii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. PRE-COLUMBIAN APPROPRIATIONS: A SOCIAL AND ART HISTORICAL CONTEXT	34
3. SOURCES OF THE PRE-COLUMBIAN THROUGH THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY	74
4. CULTURE, SPECTACLE AND THE OCCULT: THE APPEAL OF PRE-COLUMBIANA	126
5. PRE-COLUMBIAN INCLINATION: REASONS FOR THE APPROPRIATION OF PRE-COLUMBIAN AESTHETICS IN U.S. STRUCTURES	148
6. THE CHOICE TO APPROPRIATE: CHRONOLOGICAL, GEOGRAPHIC AND TYPOLOGICAL TENDENCIES	185
7. CONCLUSION	227
APPENDIX	
A. WORKING LIST OF PRE-COLUMBIAN APPROPRIATIONS	231
B. U.S. DISTRIBUTION MAP OF PRE-COLUMBIAN APPROPRIATIONS	238
C. MOST POPULAR PRE-COLUMBIAN SITES IN TEXT AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS	239
D. MESOAMERICAN CHRONOLOGY	241
E. CHRONOLOGY OF THE PRE-COLUMBIAN ANDES	242

REFERENCES	243
ILLUSTRATIONS	276

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure		Page
1.1	Map of Mesoamerica. Reprinted from Miller, <i>Art of Mesoamerica</i> , pp. 12-13	277
1.2	Stela 1, Zapotec, c. 200 BC, Monte Alban, Mexico. Reprinted from www.flickr.com/photos/sangatiche	277
1.3	Altar Q, Maya, c. 770 AD, Copan, Honduras. Reprinted from Stephens, <i>Travel in Central America</i> , vol. I, b/w pp. 142-43 . .	278
1.4	Stela D (north face), Maya, c. 700 AD, stone, ht. 19'6", Quirigua, Guatemala. Reprinted from Totten, <i>Maya Architecture</i> , Pl. 17	278
1.5	Temple II, Maya, c. 300 AD, Tikal, Guatemala. Reprinted from Totten, <i>Maya Architecture</i> , Pl. 13	279
1.6	Bas-relief panel, Temple of the Foliated Cross, Maya, c. 600 AD, Palenque, Mexico. Reprinted from Stephens, <i>Travel in Central America</i> , vol. II, b/w pp. 344-45	279
1.7	Bas-relief panel, Temple of the Sun, Palenque. Reprinted from Stephens, <i>Travel in Central America</i> , vol. II, b/w pp. 352-53 . .	280
1.8	Lintel 24, Maya, c. 650 AD, Yaxchilan, Mexico. Reprinted from Charnay, <i>Ancient Cities</i> , p. 451	280
1.9	Castillo, Maya, c. 1000 AD, Chichen Itza, Mexico. Reprinted from Totten, <i>Maya Architecture</i> , Pl. 34	281
1.10	Eastern Façade Detail, Nunnery Quadrangle, Maya, c. 900 AD, Uxmal, Mexico. Reprinted from Charnay, <i>Ancient Cities</i> , p. 402	281
1.11	Detail, House of the Governor, Uxmal. Reprinted from Stephens, <i>Travel in Central America</i> , b/w pp. 434-35	282
1.12	Detail, House of Masks, Maya, c. 1000 AD, Kabah, Mexico. Reprinted from Charnay, <i>Ancient Cities</i> , p. 381	282

1.13	Pyramid of the Sun, Teotihuacan culture, c. 100 AD, Teotihuacan, Mexico (drawing by Mújica, c. 1926). Schávelzon and Tomasi, <i>La Imagen</i> , p. 34	283
1.14	Temple of the Feathered Serpent, Teotihuacan, c. 450 AD (drawing by Mújica). Schávelzon and Tomasi, <i>La Imagen</i> , p. 66	283
1.15	<i>Talud-tablero</i> architectural profile, Teotihuacan. Reprinted from Coe, <i>Mexico</i> , p. 110	284
1.16	Atlantean figures, Toltec/Central Mexican, c. 1200 AD. Reprinted from Spinden, <i>Maya Art</i> (1913), p. 207	284
1.17	Sun Stone, Mexica, stone, 141 3/4" dia., c. 1450 AD, Museo Nacional de Antropología, Mexico City. Reprinted from Humboldt, <i>Vues des cordillères</i> , Pl. 8	285
1.18	Map of the Andes. Reprinted from Quilter, <i>Treasures of the Andes</i> , p. 9	285
1.19	Detail of adobe structures, Chimú, c. 1300 AD, Chan Chan, near Trujillo, Peru. Reprinted from Rivero and Tschudi, <i>Peruvian Antiquities</i> , p. 270	286
1.20	Earspools, probably Chancay, c. 1300 AD. Reprinted from Wiener, <i>Pérou et Bolivie</i> , p. 713	286
1.21	"Living" rock, Inka, c. 1450 AD, Machu Picchu, Peru (photograph by Hiram Bingham). Reprinted from Bingham, "Wonderland of Peru," <i>National Geographic</i> , p. 484	287
2.1	Aztec Theater, Leonard F. Seed, 1915, Eagle Pass, Texas. Photograph by author, 2003	288
2.2	Mayan Theatre, Morgan, Walls & Clements, 1927, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004	288
2.3	"Nahuan Palace." Reprinted from Viollet-le-Duc, <i>Habitations</i> , p. 303	289
2.4	Detail of "Nahuan Palace." Reprinted from Viollet-le-Duc, <i>Habitations</i> , p. 305	289

2.5	Portion of House of the Governor, Uxmal. Reprinted from Charnay, <i>Cités et ruines</i> , p. 398	290
2.6	“Peruvian House.” Reprinted from Viollet-le-Duc, <i>Habitations</i> , p. 309	290
2.7	James McNeill Whistler, <i>Harmony in Blue and Gold</i> (“ <i>The Peacock Room</i> ”), 1876-77, Recreated in the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, DC (accession number 04.61). Reprinted from Stokstad, 1995, p. 26	291
2.8	Hall Loggia, Pan-American Union (now Organization of American States), Annex, Albert Kelsey, Washington, DC, 1910-1912. Photograph by author, 2004	291
2.9	Charles Ennis-Brown house (exterior), Frank Lloyd Wright, 1924, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004	292
2.10	Ennis-Brown house (exterior). Photograph by author, 2004	292
2.11	450 Sutter (exterior entrance), Timothy Pflueger, 1928-30, San Francisco. Photograph by Monica Barnes, 2000	293
2.12	Foyer, 450 Sutter. Photograph by author, 2004	293
2.13	Foyer (above entrance), 450 Sutter. Photograph by author, 2004	294
2.14	Detail, Foyer (above entrance), 450 Sutter. Photograph by author, 2004	294
2.15	“Serpent Bird,” Temple of the Foliated Cross, Palenque. Reprinted from Spinden, <i>Maya Art</i> , p. 60	295
2.16	Detail (exterior) S. H. Kress Department Store (demolished in 1980), Edward Sibbert, 1935, New York City. Reprinted from Robinson and Bletter, <i>Skyscraper Style</i> , fig. 106	295
2.17	Main Building Façade, Pan-American Union, Albert Kelsey and Paul P. Crét, 1910, Washington, DC. Photograph by author, 2003	296

2.18	Pan-American Union, Main Building patio. Left: Fountain designed by Gloria Vanderbilt Whitney. Right: Detail, patio floor designed by Enfield Pottery and Tile Works based on Altar Q (Rulers 16 and 15), Copan. Photographs by author, 2003	296
2.19	Medical College of Virginia, T.S. Stewart, 1844, Richmond. Reprinted from Carrott, <i>Egyptian Revival</i> , fig. 103	297
2.20	Paramount Theater, George Castle (?), c. 1932, Abilene, Texas. Reprinted from Breeze, <i>Pueblo Deco</i> , p. 50	297
3.1	Interior details, Aztec Theatre, Robert Kelley, 1926, San Antonio. Reprinted from www.aztecontheriver.com/restoration.html	298
3.2	Hollyhock (Aline Barnsdall) House, Frank Lloyd Wright, 1921, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004	298
3.3	Section detail, Mitla Palace, Zapotec, c. 1000 AD, Oaxaca, Mexico. Reprinted from Humboldt, <i>Vues des cordillères</i> , Pls. 49 and 50	299
3.4	Coatlicue statue, Mexica, stone, ht. 8'3", c. 1450 AD, Museo Nacional de Antropología, Mexico City. Reprinted from Humboldt, <i>Vues des cordillères</i> , Pl. 29	299
3.5	House interior, Cañar, Ecuador, Inka, c. 1450 AD. Reprinted from Humboldt, <i>Vues des cordillères</i> , Pl. 20	300
3.6	Inka mortarless wall with door and niches, Callo, Ecuador, c. 1450 AD. Reprinted from Humboldt, <i>Vues des cordillères</i> , Pl. 24	300
3.7	"Ancient Mexico," William Bullock's 1824 exhibition, Piccadilly Square, London. Reprinted from Graham, "Three Early Collectors," p. 61	301
3.8	Temple of the Feathered Serpent, Central Mexico (culture unknown), c. 950 AD, Xochicalco, Mexico (drawing by Dupaix). Reprinted from Kingsborough, <i>Antiquities of Mexico</i> , vol. 4, II.15, fig. 35	301

3.9	Detail, “Temple of the Sun,” (portion of Nunnery Quadrangle), Uxmal (drawing by Waldeck). Reprinted from Waldeck, <i>Voyage pittoresque</i> , Pl. 14	302
3.10	Oval Tablet, Palenque (drawing by Waldeck). Reprinted from Brasseur de Bourbourg, <i>Monumens Anciens du Mexique</i> , Pl. 17	302
3.11	Panel, Temple of the Foliated Cross, Palenque (drawing by Waldeck). Reprinted from Brasseur de Bourbourg, <i>Monumens Anciens du Mexique</i> , Pls. 21-22	303
3.12	Urn, Zapotec, c. 100 AD, Monte Alban (drawing by Waldeck). Reprinted from Brasseur de Bourbourg, <i>Monumens Anciens du Mexique</i> , Pl. 52	303
3.13	Stela, c. 750 AD, Copan (drawing by Catherwood). Reprinted from Stephens, <i>Travel in Central America</i> , vol. I, frontispiece	304
3.14	Bas-relief panel, Palace, Palenque (drawing by Catherwood). Reprinted from Stephens, <i>Travel in Central America</i> , vol. II, b/w pp. 310-11	304
3.15	Temple, Maya, c. 1000 AD, Tulum, Mexico (drawing by Catherwood). Reprinted from Stephens, <i>Travel in Yucatan</i> (1996), p. 255	305
3.16	Atlantean figures (photo by Teobert Maler). Reprinted from Totten, <i>Maya Architecture</i> , Pl. 40	305
3.17	Mitla palace. Reprinted from Charnay, <i>Ancient Cities</i> , p. 509	306
3.18	Mexican restaurant, American Museum of Natural History, walls decorated like Mitla buildings. Reprinted from <i>General Guide</i> , 1911, inside cover	306
3.19	“Cyclopean” mortarless stonework, Inka, c. 1400 AD, Cuzco, Peru. Reprinted from Squier, <i>Peru</i> , p. 433	307
3.20	Adobe wall, Chan Chan, Chimu style, c. 1300 AD, North Coast, Peru. Reprinted from Squier, <i>Peru</i> , p. 137	307
3.21	Sun Gate, Tiwanaku, c. 750 AD, Tiwanaku, Bolivia. Reprinted from Squier, <i>Peru</i> , p. 288	308

3.22	Sun Gate (detail), Tiwanaku. Reprinted from Squier, <i>Peru</i> , 291	308
3.23	Bird-human figure, Sun Gate (detail), Tiwanaku. Reprinted from Stübel and Uhle, <i>Die ruinenstaette von Tiahuanaco</i> , Pl. 11	309
3.24	Left: Pan-American Union, Main Building patio fountain (Zapotec glyphs side), Gloria Vanderbilt Whitney; Right: detail, Photographs by author, 2005	309
3.25	Urn, c. 100 AD, Monte Alban (drawing by Dupaix). Reprinted from Kingsborough, <i>Antiquities of Mexico</i> , vol. 4, Pl. II.26, fig. 80	310
3.26	Zapotec urn figures in U.S. architectural examples. Top Left: Aztec Theatre, San Antonio. Photograph by www.aztecontheriver.com/restoration.html . Top Right: Mayan Theater, Montana Fallis, Denver, 1930. Photograph by Deanne Pytlinski, 2003. Bottom: Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004	310
3.27	Temple of the Feathered Serpent, Teotihuacan, c. 450 AD. Photograph by author, 2002	311
3.28	Stepped ceiling murals (after Teotihuacan), Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004	311
3.29	Cast of portion of Labna Building, Maya, c. 900 AD, 1893 World's Columbian Exposition. Reprinted from Bancroft, <i>Book of the Fair</i> , vol. 7, p. 636	312
3.30	Casts of portions of the Governor's Palace and Nunnery Quadrangle, Uxmal, 1893 World's Columbian Exposition. Reprinted from Braun, <i>Pre-Columbian Art</i> , p. 141	312
3.31	Temple I, c. 200 AD, Tikal (photograph by Alfred Maudslay). Reprinted from Graham, <i>Alfred Maudslay</i> , fig. 29	313

- 3.32 Mesoamerican exhibits, 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition, St. Louis. Model of Temple of the Cross, Palenque (foreground), Coatlicue statue cast (right), Copan stela (behind model), site photographs on wall (left). Reprinted from Photo Lot 82-31, Plate 5, Louisiana Purchase, St. Louis: Louisiana Purchase Exhibit, 1904, Museum Support Center, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD 314
- 3.33 Mesoamerican exhibits, 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition, St. Louis. Model of Mitla palace (sample of Mitla building on wall behind), model of Castillo, Chichen Itza (right). Reprinted from Photo Lot 82-31, Plate 4, Louisiana Purchase, St. Louis: Louisiana Purchase Exhibit, 1904, Museum Support Center, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD 314
- 3.34 Hall 23 (photograph neg. #28589), Xochipilli (“Sad Indian” cross-legged figure in case on left), National Museum. Photograph from National Museum of Natural History Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD 315
- 3.35 Hall 23 (looking opposite direction from above, photograph, neg. #41942-F), National Museum. Photograph from National Museum of Natural History Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD 315
- 3.36 Feathered Serpent Column, National Museum, Smithsonian Institution. Reprinted from Holmes, “Feathered Serpent Column,” 1914, p. 83 316
- 3.37 Feathered Serpent Columns, Chichen Itza. Reprinted from Totten, *Maya Architecture*, Pl. 61 316
- 3.38 Feathered Serpent Column (detail), Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004 317
- 3.39 Mexican Hall, American Museum of Natural History, 1910. Photograph American Museum of Natural History, Division of Anthropology, Gordon Eckholm’s Mexico Hall file, negative number 33036 317
- 3.40 “Sad Indian” (Xochipilli, Mexica culture), Aztec Garden, Pan-American Union. Photograph by author, 2004 318

- 3.41 “Return of the Oracle,” Jean Cook-Smith, plaster (?), 1915 Panama-California Exposition, San Diego. Reprinted from Hewett, *Ancient America*, n.p. 318
- 3.42 Left: Federal Hall (detail), Richard S. Requa, 1935 California-Pacific Exposition, San Diego. Reprinted from Requa, *Inside Lights*, 31; Right: Photograph by author of building today, 2004 319
- 3.43 Maya glyphs, Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004 319
- 3.44 Bird-human figure, Sun Gate (detail). Reprinted from Mortimer, *Peru*, p. 143 320
- 3.45 Figure 3.45: Bird-human figure (Sun Gate) with Chancay and other pre-Inka earspool designs, Pan-American Union, Main Building patio. Photograph by author, 2004 320
- 3.46 “Living” and manipulated rock (a fountain), Machu Picchu (photograph by Hiram Bingham). Reprinted from Bingham, “Wonderland of Peru,” *National Geographic*, p. 461 321
- 3.47 Tiled-floor scene based on Palenque (Oval Tablet) panel, Pan-American Union, Main Building patio, Photograph by author, 2004 322
- 3.48 Oval Tablet, Palenque. Reprinted from Stephens, *Travel in Central America*, vol. II, b/w pp. 318-19 322
- 3.49 Tiled-floor scene based on Dresden Codex, Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004. 323
- 3.50 Page 10 (detail), Dresden Codex, Maya, c. 1500 AD. Figure on right similar to theater image. Reprinted from Kingsborough, *Antiquities of Mexico*, vol 3, n.p. 323
- 3.51 Sun Gate imagery (foyer), Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004 324
- 3.52 Lobby (with 2 Xochipilli cross-legged figures), Fisher Theatre (now demolished), Graven and Mayger, 1928, Detroit. Reprinted from Ingle, *Mayan Revival Style*, p. 47 324
- 3.53 “Mayan Warrior,” Mayan Theater, Denver. Photograph by

	Deanne Pytlinski, 2003	325
4.1	Peter F. Rothermel, <i>Cortés before Tenochtitlan</i> [<i>Cortés's Invasion of Mexico</i>], 1846, oil on canvas, 37 1/2 x 48 in./95.3 x 121.9 cm, Lowe Art Museum, University of Miami, museum purchase through Harry and Sonja Zuckerman funds. Reprinted from Thistlewaite, <i>Painting in the Grand Manner</i> , p. 42	326
4.2	Emanuel Leutze, <i>The Storming of the Teocalli by Cortez and his Troops</i> (detail), 1848 (oil on canvas, 84 3/4 x 98 3/4 in./215.4 x 250.9 cm, Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, CT, Ella Gallup Sumner and Mary Catlin Sumner Collection). Reprinted from Truettner, "Storming the Teocalli—Again" <i>American Art</i> , p. 56	326
4.3	Christian Mayr, <i>Conquest of Peru: King Atahualpa Filling a Room with Gold to Purchase His Freedom from Pizarro</i> , 1849, oil on canvas, 40 x 54 in./101.6 x 137.2 cm, Kennedy Galleries. Reprinted from Manthorne, <i>Tropical Renaissance</i> , p. 21	327
4.4	Frederic Church, <i>Cayambe</i> (and detail), c. 1858, oil on canvas, 30" x 48" (76.2 cm x 121.9 cm), New York Public Library. Robert L. Stuart Collection, on permanent loan to the New-York Historical Society. Reprinted from Manthorne, <i>Tropical Renaissance</i> , Pl. 3	327
4.5	Edward Weston, <i>Pirámide del Sol, Teotihuacan</i> , 1923, vintage gelatin silver print (19 x 23.7 cm), Coll. Center for Creative Photography, The University of Arizona, Tucson. Copyright 1981 Center for Creative Photography, Arizona Board of Regents. Reprinted from Oles, <i>South of the Border</i> , p. 161.	328
4.6	"Aztec Children," (Bartola and Maximo). Reprinted from Bogdan, <i>Freak Show</i> , p. 128	328
4.7	"Ancient Aztecs" (Aurora and Natali). Reprinted from Bogdan, <i>Freak Show</i> , p. 133	329
4.8	Laura Gilpin, <i>Sunburst, Kukulcan, Chichen Itza, Yucatan</i> , 1932, silver bromide print on gevaluxe paper (35.6 x 25.4 cm), Courtesy Amon Carter Museum, Fort Worth. Gift of Laura Gilpin (P1979.95.13). Copyright Amon Carter Museum, Laura Gilpin Collection. Reprinted from Oles, <i>South of the Border</i> , p. 161.	329

5.1	Aztec Hotel, Robert B. Stacy-Judd, 1925, Monrovia, California. Photograph by author, 2003	330
5.2	First Baptist Church (now Ventura County Church of Religious Science), Robert B. Stacy-Judd, 1931, Ventura, California. Photograph by author, 2003	330
5.3	Aztec Hotel, exterior detail. Photograph by author, 2003	331
5.4	Hanging light, Aztec Hotel lobby. Photograph by author, 2003	331
5.5	Corbel vault cutouts, Aztec Hotel lobby. Photograph by author, 2003	332
5.6	Ladies' room entrance, Aztec Hotel lobby. Photograph by author, 2003	332
5.7	Exterior "Frieze" (detail) with Maya-like imagery and, above it, a Puuc-like row of truncated columns (in blue), First Baptist Church. Photograph by author, 2003	333
5.8	Left: Sanctuary detail showing corbel vault window and door. "Glyphs" are in corners of ceiling, First Baptist Church; Right: Detail, "glyph." Photograph by author, 2003	333
5.9	Perspective of a 68-Story Office Building in Neo-American style, Francisco Mújica. Reprinted from Mújica, <i>History of the Skyscraper</i> , Pl. 131	334
5.10	Left: Drawing front (detail), 68-story office building. Right: Mújica's drawings showing use of pre-Columbian elements in architecture. He designates: "primitive" element; impression created by modern artist; and Neo-American detail. Reprinted from Mújica, <i>History of the Skyscraper</i> , Pl. 132	334
5.11	"The City of the Future: Hundred Story City in Neo-American Style," (drawing by Mújica). Reprinted from Mújica, <i>History of the Skyscraper</i> , Pl. 134	335

- 5.12 Alfred C. Bossom beside and in front of his models of the Liberty Bank Building in Buffalo (1925) with photo of Castillo, Chichen Itza (Maya) on wall. In his hands is a photo of a stepped pre-Columbian temple (from Palenque?). Bossom's caption for this photograph reads, "The Author studying the possibilities of different cresting designs for the Liberty Bank, Buffalo." Reprinted from Bossom, *Building to the Skies*, p. 17 . 335
- 5.13 Albert Dell Cold Storage German Warehouse, Frank Lloyd Wright, 1915, Richland Center, Wisconsin. Reprinted from Heinz, *Vision of Frank Lloyd Wright*, p. 305 336
- 5.14 Studio and Home, Frank Lloyd Wright, 1898, Oak Park, IL. Reprinted from Smith, *Frank Lloyd Wright*, p. 28 336
- 5.15 Palace, Palenque (drawing by Dupaix). Reprinted from Kingsborough, *Antiquities of Mexico*, vol. 4, 3rd pt., Pl. II.31, fig. 35. 336
- 5.16 Frederick C. Bogk House. Above: rendering. Right: detail, Frank Lloyd Wright, 1916, Milwaukee. Reprinted from Alofsin, *Frank Lloyd Wright*, pp. 249-50 337
- 5.17 Maya corbel vaults. Reprinted from Viollet-le-Duc, *Habitations*, p. 301 337
- 5.18 Abstracted human integrated into building (photograph by T. Maler). Maya, c. 800 AD, Hochob, Campeche, Mexico. Reprinted from Spinden, *Study of Maya Art* (1913), Pl. 11, fig. 1 337
- 5.19 Patent drawing, mortarless textile-blocks (1923), Frank Lloyd Wright. Reprinted from Sweeney, *Wright in Hollywood*, p. 44 338
- 5.20 Profile (detail), Taliesin West, Frank Lloyd Wright, 1937-59, Scottsdale. Reprinted from Heinz, *Vision of Frank Lloyd Wright*, p. 322 338
- 5.21 Edgar J. Kauffman House (Fallingwater), Frank Lloyd Wright, Mill Run, Pennsylvania, 1935-39. Reprinted from Kaufmann, Jr., *Fallingwater*, p. 126 339
- 5.22 Fallingwater, "Living" and Manipulated Rock. Reprinted from Kaufmann, Jr., *Fallingwater*, p. 90 339

5.23	Observatory (detail, photograph by Hiram Bingham), Machu Picchu. Reprinted from Bingham, “Wonderland of Peru,” <i>National Geographic</i> , p. 485	340
5.24	Under the bridge (detail), Fallingwater. Photograph courtesy Fallingwater, Western Pennsylvania Conservancy	340
5.25	Interior “living” rock, fireplace, Fallingwater. Reprinted from Kaufmann, Jr., <i>Fallingwater</i> , p. 87	341
5.26	Interior “living” rock, kitchen, Fallingwater. Reprinted from Kaufmann, Jr., <i>Fallingwater</i> , p. 86	341
5.27	Interior “living” rock, Machu Picchu. Photograph by author, 2002	342
5.28	Fountain, Fallingwater. Reprinted from Kaufmann, Jr., <i>Fallingwater</i> , p. 99	343
5.29	Drawing of Inka bath, Copacabana. Reprinted from Wiener, <i>Pérou et Bolivie</i> , p. 467	343
5.30	Ticket window (glyphs at right), Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2003	344
5.31	Eastern “frieze,” First Baptist Church. Photograph by author, 2003	344
6.1	Façade, Mayan Theater, Denver. Photograph by author, 2002	345
6.2	Cliff Dweller apartments, Herman Lee Meader, 1911-14, New York City. Photograph by author, 2000	345
6.3	Fireplace panel (detail), “Xiuhtecutli=The God of Fire,” Julius Dietzmann, Ennis-Brown house. Photograph by author, 2004	346
6.4	Fireplace Panel, Dietzmann, Ennis-Brown house. Photograph by author, 2004	347
6.5	Lintel 39, Structure 16, Yaxchilan. Reprinted from Spinden, <i>Maya Art</i> (1913), p. 57	347
6.6	Side façade (detail, abstracted Sun Stone), Aztec Theater, Eagle Pass. Photograph by author, 2003	348

6.7	Left: Front façade (detail, “6 Water” Mexica day sign), Aztec Theater, Eagle Pass. Photograph by author, 2003; Right: Mexica “water” sign (ritual calendar). Reprinted from Pasztory, <i>Aztec Art</i> , p. 60	348
6.8	Lobby, Aztec Hotel. Photograph by author, 2003	349
6.9	Entrance gate, Ennis-Brown house with scrolling patterns, key designs and Maya-like glyphs, Julius Dietzmann. Photograph by author, 2004	349
6.10	Detail (entrance gate, left side), Ennis-Brown house. Photograph by author, 2004	350
6.11	Door (top center, abstracted Sun Stone; bottom center, symbol based on Mexica “reed” day sign), Dietzmann, Ennis-Brown house. Photograph by author, 2004	350
6.12	Feathered serpent entrance (drawing by Waldeck). Reprinted from Brasseur de Bourbourg, <i>Monumens Anciens du Mexique</i> , Pl. 45	351
6.13	Sowden House, Lloyd Wright, 1926, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004	351
6.14	Mayan Theater (interior), Denver. Photograph by Deanne Pytlinski, 2003	352
6.15	Auditorium doorways (based on Lintel 25, Yaxchilan), Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles. Photograph by author, 2004	353
6.16	Lintel 25, Maya, c. 650 AD, Yaxchilan, Mexico. Reprinted from Miller, <i>Art of Mesoamerica</i> , p. 147	353
6.17	“Nunnery,” (detail), Chichen Itza. Reprinted from Charnay, <i>Ancient Cities</i> , p. 334	354
6.18	Tiled-floor scene based on Palenque panel (Palace), Pan-American Union, Main Building patio. Photograph by author, 2004	355
6.19	Mexica day sign, “reed.” Reprinted from Pasztory, <i>Aztec Art</i> , p. 60	356
6.20	Window, Ennis-Brown house. Photograph by author, 2004	356

Chapter One: Introduction

The deliberate and repetitive sound of a drumbeat punctured the quiet pre-dawn morning. Despite the early hour and that most of the festivities would not begin until much later, crowds had already begun gathering, as “Indians,” decked out in feathers and leather, began the ritual designed to purge the building (itself lavishly adorned with indigenous ornament) of “evil spirits.” The occasion was the dedication of this newly erected structure and elite personages were about to enter the building and “implore the good [spirits] to make it their abode.”¹ Thus began, on November 20, 1930, the existence of the Mayan Theater in Denver, Colorado (Montana Fallis, 1930); the attendant pomp and circumstance lasted all day and continued into the wee hours of the night.²

The copiously ornamented Denver theater represents but one example of a broad and varied adaptation of indigenous American forms to Western art and architecture during the first four decades of the twentieth century. By the turn of the century, a

¹This reconstruction of opening-day events draws upon on an article that appeared one week prior to the scheduled festivities; see *Denver Post* (13 Nov. 1930): 26.

²Other opening-day events included the theater’s dedication by Denver Mayor Benjamin Stapleton, a parade that passed by the theater, fireworks, and a dance in a nearby bank. The feature film was *Monte Carlo*, starring Jeannette MacDonald. See Marjorie Ingle, *The Mayan Revival Style: Art Deco Mayan Fantasy* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith/Peregrine Smith, 1984), 48.

number of Euro-American artists, designers and architects were looking to a variety of non-Western cultures for inspiration in everything from ceramics to architecture,³ and the use of pre-Columbian imagery in U.S. architecture was part of this larger trend. The overarching goal of this dissertation is to explore the reasons for Western co-option of pre-Columbian forms and motifs, and to examine the intersecting political, cultural and aesthetic circumstances that encouraged and fostered that practice in this particular period.

Though pre-Columbian appropriation occurred throughout the West, it was particularly pronounced in the United States, where it was imbued with nationalistic dimensions. I have chosen to focus on architecture, since this art form is tied to place and region and demands significant investments of time and money⁴—indications of pronounced commitment to a particular style. For this reason, I am more concerned with realized structures than with the dozens (perhaps hundreds) of pre-Columbian-inspired designs that went unconstructed.

While the topic of my study certainly relates to and draws upon architectural discourse, I have approached it primarily from the vantage point of a pre-Columbianist. My focus, therefore, is on social and historical issues related to notions of exoticism, primitivism, nationalism and pan-Americanism as these relate to perceptions of

³See Barbara Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art and the Post-Columbian World: Ancient American Sources of Modern Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1993). Her study examines the pre-Columbian elements in both European and U.S. arts and architecture.

⁴As anthropologist Jerry D. Moore writes, “Architecture is more than a passive product of potential labor investment; it reflects other dimensions of public life and, in turn, helps shape the nature of social interaction.” *Architecture and Power in the Ancient Andes: The Archaeology of Public Buildings* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 3.

indigenous Americans and their visual cultures at a particular juncture in U.S. social and art history.

As many U.S. artists, designers and patrons sought cultural distance from Europe, the art and architecture of American indigenes was seen not just as non-Western source material, but as rooted in American soil. Riding the wave of pan-American sentiment that emphasized hemispheric unity,⁵ those who looked to pre-Columbian art for inspiration, had varying motivations. Some, attracted to the excitement of primitive exoticism, turned to indigenous American forms to generate attention and amusement, while others saw their enterprise as a more serious mission, linking the appropriation of pre-Columbian forms to a pointedly “American” aesthetic agenda. Still others were motivated, to varying degrees, by both of these notions.

Dissertation Contribution

This dissertation expands on previous scholarship that examines the use of pre-Columbian forms in the art and architecture of Europe and the United States by citing additional examples of Mesoamerican influence in early-twentieth-century U.S. architecture and, for the first time, examining the Andean components of the so-called “Maya Revival.” Dissatisfied with such generic labeling, I have traced the sources of motifs and forms with as much specificity as possible, in order to determine which

⁵For a concise discussion of the ebbs and flows of pan-American sentiment and its connection to U.S. culture and art, see Katherine Manthorne, “Plantation Pictures in the Americas, circa 1880: Land, Power, and Resistance.” *Nepantla: Views from South*, 2, no. 2 (2001): 322-23. See also, Helen Delpar, *The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican: Cultural Relations between the United States and Mexico, 1920-1935* (Tuscaloosa, AL/London: University of Alabama Press, 1992), discussed below.

indigenous cultures are referenced most frequently and to evaluate how accurately they were quoted.⁶

Whereas previous scholarship has presented pre-Columbian-inflected design as an early-twentieth-century phenomenon, I establish its roots in the British and U.S. Aesthetic and Arts and Crafts movements, and present its manifestations in the 1920s and '30s as outgrowths of an aesthetic exoticism that is already in place and simply gains momentum in those decades. I amend some datings, and, more significantly, make distinctions among building types within pre-Columbian-influenced architecture in order to explore the relation of chosen forms and motifs to building types and functions.

While other scholars have characterized pre-Columbian-style art and architecture in the United States as “kitsch,” using adjectives such as “goofy,” “humorous” and “off-beat,”⁷ my study—while acknowledging “lowbrow” structural appropriations that exploited the exotic—places emphasis upon buildings that constituted serious attempts by architects, designers and patrons to forge an innovative, American aesthetic. Popular culture appropriations and American aesthetic assimilations represent opposite ends of a trajectory along which buildings belonging to this style adhere.⁸ The Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles (Figure 2.2, Morgan, Walls & Clements, 1927), for example, is a pop confection that strikes a note of kitsch in its eclectic conglomeration of pre-Columbian

⁶The identification of sources and influences, however, is only part of this investigation, and is not an end in itself. As architectural historian Anthony Alofsin admonishes (in his study of Frank Lloyd Wright), “Influences are often passed off as explanations of meaning, yet they rarely explain how or why an artist creates or how an artist assimilates, copies, imitates, or transforms the work of other artists.” *Frank Lloyd Wright, The Lost Years, 1910-1922: A Study of Influence* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 6.

⁷See, for example, Ingle, *Mayan Revival* and Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art*, discussed below.

⁸This trajectory is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five.

ornament covering the façade and every interior surface (although, as I explain in a detailed description of the theater in Chapter Five, a good deal of thoughtful research and a commitment to accurate replication informed this building's design). An example of "highbrow," American-style assimilation is Frank Lloyd Wright's Fallingwater, designed for the Edgar J. Kaufmann family in Mill Run, Pennsylvania (Figure 5.21, 1935-39). The integration of water, natural-looking boulders and structure throughout the house and its grounds recalls similar Inka practices in Machu Picchu and other elite sites, especially in Peru. The interior stepped ceiling is also reminiscent of stepped structures of the Maya, such as the Castillo of Chichen Itza.

My analysis of the ways that pre-Columbian-inspired forms and motifs are used in U.S. architecture reveals three dominant trends that relate to the architect's, designer's or patron's relationship to his or her pre-Columbian sources as well as to a building's function: overall ornamental coverage of motifs (as at the Mayan Theater in Denver); isolated instances of pre-Columbian-based applied ornament scattered throughout a building (as at the Charles Ennis-Brown house, Frank Lloyd Wright, Los Angeles, 1924); and subtle, "assimilated" references to pre-Hispanic art and architectural forms (as at Fallingwater).⁹ I provide detailed descriptions of each of these representative examples to illustrate further the three types of usage.

⁹This categorization of use relates to binary, hierarchical and temporal approaches to "structure" and "ornament" with the overall and isolated categories described here relating predominantly to "ornament" while the subtle references are more concerned with "structure." See the discussion in Chapter Six detailing the shortcomings of such structure-ornament relationships taken from Anne-Marie Sankovitch's article, "Structure/Ornament and the Modern Figuration of Architecture," *Art Bulletin*, 80, no. 4 (Dec. 1998): 687-717. Examinations of individual motivations as well as social context of design tend to elide the structure/ornament categories thereby easing the foibles of such readings. A structure/ornament approach cannot be ignored, however, as the architects, artists and patrons who participated in the pre-Columbian-based style themselves saw this division and approached their buildings this way. The architectural plans for

To help systematize and elucidate broad chronological and geographic patterns within pre-Columbian architectural appropriation, I have charted my observations in a building-by-building list (Appendix A).¹⁰ My study grounds building types and their geographic distribution in social, historical and political circumstance, placing particular emphasis upon U.S. policies toward and concerning the whole of the Western hemisphere (i.e., pan-Americanism) *vis-à-vis* other Western nations. The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries witnessed an increasingly powerful and assertive United States with a heightened sense of nationalism, a pride in its progress, and a protective, even proprietary, attitude toward Latin America. This focus on the Western hemisphere in the

many of these pre-Columbian appropriations, for instance, fail to include indigenous “ornamental” details with outside consultants or contractors hired to render and install the pre-Columbian elements. One exception to this structure-ornament division is the Aztec Theatre in San Antonio (Robert Kelley, 1926); its plans include details of much of the overall pre-Columbian surface ornament.

¹⁰Information on the buildings that figure in this dissertation has been compiled mainly from general readings as well as architectural guidebooks. Those by David Gebhard and his various co-authors have proved especially valuable. See, for instance, Gebhard’s several guides to Los Angeles and Southern California, some co-written with Robert Winter and/or Eric Sandweiss: David Gebhard and Robert Winter, *A Guide to Architecture in Los Angeles and Southern California* (Santa Barbara/Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, 1977); David Gebhard, Eric Sandweiss and Robert Winter, *The Guide to Architecture in San Francisco and Northern California*, rev. ed. (Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 1985); and David Gebhard, *The National Trust Guide to Art Deco in America* (New York: Preservation Press/John Wiley & Sons, 1996). Other guidebooks consulted include: Francis Morrone, *The Architectural Guidebook to New York City* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 1998); and Dirk Sutro, *San Diego Architecture: From Missions to Modern, a Guide to the Buildings, Planning, People and Spaces That Shape the Region* (San Diego: San Diego Architectural Foundation, 2002).

Other important leads and observations derived from archival research, personal interviews and on-site examinations of most of the extant structures that figure prominently here. Archaeologist and editor, Monica Barnes, a particularly enthusiastic source, pointed me toward the Alexander Hamilton U.S. Custom House in New York City and the Koppers Building in Pittsburgh (Graham, Anderson, Probst & White; E.P. Mellon, 1927-29), and preservationist Catherine Docter told me that Timothy Pflueger’s 450 Sutter in San Francisco, California (1928-30), resembles an inverted feathered serpent with the entranceway an open mouth (personal communication, May 2003).

United States helped prompt an emphasis in architecture on the development of a uniquely American aesthetic.

Previous Scholarship: “Mayan Revival” Style

The aesthetic at issue here has been identified and explored by other scholars, most notably Marjorie Ingle and Barbara Braun. Ingle’s *Mayan Revival Style: Art Deco Mayan Fantasy* (1984) describes the general characteristics of a pre-Columbian-inspired architectural style, identifying many examples in extant buildings as well as in unrealized designs.¹¹ Acknowledging that the label “Mayan Revival” is culturally inaccurate, Ingle explains that she uses it “both for the sake of brevity and because the Mayas seemed most often cited in the literature, even when not correctly.”¹² Ingle posits a variety of reasons for the vogue of ancient American forms and motifs in “fine” and “decorative” U.S. arts—from heightened nationalism to preoccupation with the mystical to a taste for novelty—and discusses sources of pre-Hispanic imagery available to U.S. architects and designers who drew inspiration from it. In her admirable overview Ingle makes little attempt to provide specific contexts for individual architects’, designers’ and patrons’ interests in pre-Columbiana, and does not take into account the increasing visibility of

¹¹Ingle, *Mayan Revival Style*.

¹²Ingle (vi) writes, “The Mayan Revival Style borrowed from all cultures of Mexico and Guatemala, predominantly the Mayas, Aztecs, Toltecs, and Mixtecs. However, to the average observer, the distinctions between the groups are probably a bit blurred. Therefore, ‘Mayan Revival’ has been used as a general term for all pre-Columbian or Mesoamerican influences on the arts and architecture. Perhaps we culturally prefer to associate ourselves with the peaceful and enlightened Mayas, rather than the bloodier and more aggressive ways of the Aztecs.”

On the other hand, Barbara Braun (170) asserts that architect Robert B. Stacy-Judd chose the name of his mostly Maya-styled 1925 Aztec Hotel in Monrovia, California, “because he thought it was a catchier name.”

pre-Columbian materials in ethnographic and natural history museums as well as private collections.

Drawing upon Ingle's work, as well as her own expertise in the histories of modern and pre-Columbian art, Barbara Braun, in *Pre-Columbian Art and the Post-Columbian World: Ancient American Sources of Modern Art* (1993), begins with a brief historiography of pre-Columbian studies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Braun discusses Western attitudes toward pre-Hispanic peoples from the time of the Spanish Conquest in the sixteenth century through the Modern era, and makes the important point that modern appropriations of indigenous American forms and motifs shed light on contemporary perceptions of and attitudes toward ancient Americans (and non-Western peoples in general). Braun sees pre-Columbian appropriation as

part of a larger narrative that traces the history of the reception of Pre-Columbian artifacts in the West since the Conquest as well as the ways in which the relations of later generations of artists to Pre-Columbian art have altered and developed in the second half of the twentieth century.¹³

Like Ingle, Braun speculates on the reasons for uses of indigenous American forms and motifs in modern Western visual culture,¹⁴ and, unlike Ingle, notes the impact that exhibitions and growing collections of pre-Columbian materials had on artists, designers and their patrons. Adopting Ingle's "Maya Revival" label, Braun describes a pre-Columbian-inspired aesthetic that is marked by "smooth planes punctuated by

¹³Braun, 13.

¹⁴Throughout her book, Ingle explores political, social and aesthetic motivations for the pre-Columbian-inflected trend in the United States, whereas Braun gives more attention to the role that colonialism played in pre-Hispanic arts' escalating status, which she sees as driving their appropriation in both Europe and the Americas (10-11).

geometric ornament derived from pre-Columbian forms” and notes its application to “everything from skyscrapers to ashtrays.”¹⁵

Helen Delpar also touches on the “Mayan Revival Style” in her book *The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican: Cultural Relations between the United States and Mexico, 1920-1935* (1992).¹⁶ She sees pre-Columbian appropriation as part of the broad and wide-ranging impact of things Mexican—both modern and pre-Conquest—upon cultural and artistic practices in the United States, arguing that the United States’s emergence, around 1900, as an international, economic and military power fostered its focus on other cultures. Such events as the Spanish-American War of 1898, the opening of the Panama Canal in 1914, and the ratification of Roosevelt’s Good Neighbor Policy of the 1930s—along with increased U.S. investments throughout Latin America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—all pushed the United States’s relations with its southern neighbors to the forefront of national consciousness. Increased cultural and artistic reciprocity accompanied political and economic interconnections, and as wide-ranging pan-Americanism substantially increased after 1920,¹⁷ pre-Columbian appropriations reached their height in Southern California.

While Ingle, Braun and Delpar are satisfied with the “Maya Revival” label, others—including David Gebhard and Robert Winter—prefer “Pre-Columbian Revival.”¹⁸ I have coined an alternate term, “pre-Columbian appropriation”—an

¹⁵Braun, 40.

¹⁶Delpar, 129-32.

¹⁷Delpar, vii.

¹⁸Gebhard and Winter, *Architecture in Los Angeles*.

appellation that is at once more inclusive and more precise. Several of the exotic pre-Hispanic motifs and forms borrowed for use in U.S. buildings of the early twentieth century were derived from sites and artifacts of the Maya culture, but many others were not; indeed, most of the buildings described elsewhere as “Mayan Revival” blend and juxtapose borrowings from the Maya with motifs and forms scavenged from a wide range of ancient American cultures. The broad term “pre-Columbian,” an umbrella adjective used to denote pre-Conquest cultures and style groups of Mexico, Central and South America, is therefore—despite its otherwise objectionable subsumption of diversity within an overarching label¹⁹—appropriately imprecise in this case. As for the term “revival,” U.S. architects’ practice of incorporating centuries-old, indigenous elements into their designs for modern buildings does not constitute a “revival” *per se*—that is, the resurrection of a style that went before—but is more accurately described as “appropriation”—that is, the practice of seizing upon aspects of another’s production for use in one’s own project.

In addition to works by Ingle, Braun and Delpar, the scholarly treatments of pre-Columbian imagery in U.S. structures that have proved most useful to my study include Cervin Robinson and Rosemarie Haag Bletter’s *Skyscraper Style: Art Deco New York* (1975); Susan Tunick’s *Terracotta Skyline: New York’s Architectural Ornament* (1997); and, Patricia Bayer’s *Art Deco Architecture: Design, Decoration and Detail from the*

¹⁹The term “pre-Columbian,” literally defined as “before Columbus” reflects a European bias. The term is also quite broad, referencing a diversity of cultures, a timespan of at least 12,000 years, and a wide-ranging geographic area. While some Western-focused scholars may use “pre-Columbian” to denote all indigenous peoples of the Americas, including Native American peoples of North America, pre-Columbian specialists use the term to denote the geographic regions inhabited by major indigenous cultures of Mexico, Belize, Honduras, Guatemala, parts of El Salvador, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia and parts of Argentina and Chile.

Twenties and Thirties (2001).²⁰ Bletter's essay on the Art Deco style in New York, a concise and insightful exploration, is one of the few sources to mention specifically architects' uses of pre-Columbian forms and motifs. Her book's illustrations document a number of pre-Columbian appropriations that no longer exist, such as Midway Gardens by Frank Lloyd Wright (Chicago, Illinois, 1914) and the S. H. Kress Department Store by Edward Sibbert (New York City, 1935). Bayer, like Bletter, mentions the use of indigenous American forms and motifs in her exploration of Art Deco architecture. She focuses more attention on "Mayan Revival" architecture than do Robinson and Bletter, portraying it as a self-sufficient, though related, subcategory of Art Deco. While Robinson and Bletter focus on New York architecture, Bayer discusses several regional variations of the style and examines the ways in which building typology affects types and degrees of appropriation. Specifically, Bayer notes that Mayan Revival residences are much more common to the West Coast than other areas of the United States and she discusses the general trend toward "exoticism," as well as specifically "Mayan" and "Aztec" motifs, in movie theaters.²¹ Tunic's most important contribution to my study lies in her discussions of the terra-cotta industry (polychromed terra-cotta was used for a

²⁰Cervin Robinson and Rosemarie Haag Bletter, *Skyscraper Style: Art Deco New York* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975); Patricia Bayer, *Art Deco Architecture: Design, Decoration and Detail from the Twenties and Thirties* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2001); and, Susan Tunic, *Terra-Cotta Skyline: New York's Architectural Ornament* (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997).

²¹See Bayer, 16-20 and chaps. 4 and 5.

number of pre-Columbian appropriations²²), although she manifests little particular interest in pre-Columbian influences.

Pre-Columbian Appropriations: The Major Players

A number of scholarly works examine a particular architect's use of or connection to pre-Hispanic aesthetics. Of most relevance to this study is the body of writings about and by two of the most prolific and (in their day) prominent architects to appropriate and assimilate indigenous American art forms: Frank Lloyd Wright (1867-1959) and Robert B. Stacy-Judd (1884-1975). Wright's designs began looking suspiciously pre-Columbian shortly after he first viewed Maya architectural casts, objects and photographs at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition,²³ although his Albert Dell German Warehouse in Richland Center, Wisconsin (1915), usually is identified by scholars as the one of the earliest instances of pre-Columbian-inflected design in his *oeuvre*.²⁴ While Wright himself denied the impact of outside influences on his work,²⁵ he spoke of his fascination

²²Among the most notable pre-Columbian appropriations with polychromed terra-cotta are: Two Park Avenue, Ely Jacques Kahn (New York City, 1926-28) and the Fuller Building, Walker and Gillette (New York City, 1928-29).

²³Frank Lloyd Wright's studio and home addition in Oak Park, Illinois (Figure 5.14, 1898), for example, resembles a Maya temple, although somewhat generically (see Chapter Five).

²⁴See discussion of this building in Chapter Five.

²⁵Wright's use of sources has been the subject of much scholarly discussion. One example that can be applied to Wright's attitudes toward pre-Columbian art and architecture is illustrated in a discussion by Kevin Nute, *Frank Lloyd Wright and Japan: The Role of Traditional Japanese Art and Architecture in the Work of Frank Lloyd Wright* (London/Glasgow/New York: Chapman & Hall, 1993), 2. Regarding the presence of Japanese elements in Wright's architecture, Nute states, "Wright steadfastly maintained that he found in Japanese culture, not the inspiration which many suspected, but merely *confirmation* of many of his own 'organic' ideals."

with pre-Columbian art and architecture,²⁶ and several scholars have noted the kinship between certain Wright designs and indigenous American (including Native American) aesthetics.²⁷

Stacy-Judd, if obscure today, was one of the most boisterous proponents of the use of pre-Columbian forms and motifs as inspiration for the development of a uniquely American U.S. architectural aesthetic. His designs, enthusiasm for Maya architecture, numerous publications on the Maya and tireless self-promotion are largely responsible for Southern California being the heartland for pre-Columbian appropriations.²⁸ While Stacy-Judd is the subject of only one book—a 1993 biography by David Gebhard—he

²⁶Frank Lloyd Wright describes his boyhood fascination with several pre-Columbian cultures including the Maya, “Aztec,” and Inka in *A Testament* (New York: Horizon Press, 1957), 111, 205. See also, Wright, *An Autobiography*, 3d ed. (1932; New York: Horizon Press, 1977), 97.

²⁷See, for example, Dimitri Tselos, “Exotic Influences in the Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright,” *Magazine of Art: The American Confederation of Arts* (April 1953): 160-69, 184; Vincent Scully, *Frank Lloyd Wright* (New York: George Braziller, 1960); Ingle, *Mayan Revival Style*; Gebhard, *Romanza: The California Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1988); Alofsin, *Frank Lloyd Wright*; Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art*; Robert L. Sweeney, *Wright in Hollywood: Visions of a New Architecture* (New York/Cambridge, MA/London: Architectural History Foundation/MIT Press, 1994); and, Franklin Toker, *Fallingwater Rising: Frank Lloyd Wright, E. J. Kaufmann, and America’s Most Extraordinary House*. New York: A.A. Knopf, 2003.

²⁸Stacy-Judd’s writings, lectures and radio interviews detailing his interest in the Maya and other pre-Columbian peoples and the use of their art forms in U.S. architecture are numerous. After a 1930 film expedition to several post-Classic Maya sites on the Yucatan Peninsula, Stacy-Judd wrote three books about the Maya and the origins of the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas: *The Ancient Mayas: Adventures in the Jungles of Yucatan* (Los Angeles: Haskell-Travers, 1934); *Atlantis: Mother of Empires* (1939; Kempton, IL: Adventures Unlimited Press, 1999); and *Kabah: Adventures in the Jungles of Yucatan* (Hollywood, CA: House-Warven, 1951). Stacy-Judd’s countless lectures and radio interviews in Los Angeles and vicinity, began in the late 1920s. (Many of these transcripts are housed at the Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara).

and his work were much written about in the 1920s and '30s, the height of his Los Angeles practice.²⁹

While Wright and Stacy-Judd represent the most prominent and prolific designers of pre-Columbian-inflected architecture, Alfred C. Bossom (1881-1965) and Francisco Mújica (1889-c. 1979)³⁰ likewise promoted architectural interest in Mesoamerican motifs. In his *An Architectural Pilgrimage in Old Mexico* (1924), Bossom stressed the inspirational potential of Mexican ruins, noting that

Mexico is logically a far greater source of influence than has yet been realized or will be until more journeys are made to its ancient fanes. The American architect and the American artist may find much there to kindle their imaginations and inspire their efforts, and the layman also can discover much indeed by making Mexico an inspirational and artistic Mecca.³¹

Both Bossom and Mújica suggested that the skyscraper actually had roots in ancient America. In *Building to the Skies: The Romance of the Skyscraper* (1934), for example, Bossom describes Temple I in Tikal, Guatemala, as “the Original American Skyscraper” and asserts that the “first hint of a skyscraper in America [was] built in Tikal. . . . [and]

²⁹Gebhard, *Robert Stacy-Judd: Maya Architecture and the Creation of a New Style* (Santa Barbara: Capra Press, 1993). Although articles about Stacy-Judd are numerous, two stand out in this context: Alfred C. Bossom and Estelle Ries, “New Styles in American Architecture: And What We Might Learn from the Mayas,” *World’s Work* 56, no. 2 (June 1928): 189-95, and Edward Lloyd Hampton, “Creating a New World Architecture,” *Southern California Business* (April 1928): 16-17, 38, 45, 48.

³⁰Biographical information on Mújica is sketchy. The author obtained his dates from Dr. Daniel Schávelzon, an archaeologist and co-editor with Jorge Tomasi of *La Imagen de América: Los dibujos de arqueología Americana de Francisco Mújica Diez de Bonilla* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Fundación CEPPA and Fundación para el avance de los estudios mesoamericanos [FAMSI]), 2006 (personal communication, Daniel Schávelzon, August 2006).

³¹Alfred C. Bossom, *An Architectural Pilgrimage in Old Mexico* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1924), x. Though the buildings pictured in this book are all of Spanish Colonial style, Bossom’s subsequent book, *Building to the Skies: The Romance of the Skyscraper* (London/New York: Studio, 1934) includes illustrations of several pre-Columbian structures, including Temple I at Tikal (18) and Chichen Itza’s so-called Castillo (17).

may have inspired the inhabitants of North America.”³² Mújica, in his *History of the Skyscraper* (1930), compares pre-Columbian architecture and the development of the modern skyscraper in the United States, stating, “Primitive American architecture has approached us miraculously through modern skyscrapers, because architects are seeking inspiration in alien styles of architecture closely resembling our primitive style.”³³ He includes numerous images of Maya, Toltec and Mexica (formerly known as “Aztec”)³⁴ buildings and envisions a “Neo-American architecture” reliant on “profound study of the primitive American architecture and of the geometrical and mechanical elements of the nature of the region.”³⁵

Pre-Columbian Appropriations: An Overview

The pre-Columbian-inflected architectural style had its beginnings in the eastern part of the United States in 1910, with the construction of the Pan-American Union complex in Washington, D.C. (Albert Kelsey and Paul P. Crét), the first significant instance of pre-Columbian appropriation in a U.S. building (Appendices A and B). In

³²Bossom, *Building*, 18.

³³Francisco Mújica, *History of the Skyscraper* (New York: Archaeology & Architecture Press, 1930), 35.

³⁴The Mexica were formerly known as the Aztecs. For a concise definition of “Mexica” and an explanation of why “Aztec” is incorrect in its current U.S. usage, see Angela Herren, “Portraying the Mexica Past: A Comparison of Sixteenth-Century Pictorial Accounts of Origin in Codex Azcatitlan, Codex Boturini and Codex Aubin,” Ph.D. diss., Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York, 2005, vi –vii. Most of the early epigraphic studies on Mesoamerica focused on the Maya and Zapotec. Several U.S. universities and institutions, including the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Harvard University, the University of Pennsylvania and the Smithsonian Institution, were among the earliest to conduct excavations and surveys in the pre-Columbian regions; these began in the late nineteenth century.

³⁵*Ibid.*, 20.

this study, I track the development of the trend inaugurated by the Pan-American Union, a trend that got off to a slow start in the 1910s, but gathered momentum in the 1920s during the U.S. vogue of Latin America,³⁶ when it peaked in Southern California. During the period of Art Deco's ascendance, the most ornamental of pre-Columbian styles were particularly admired, most especially the geometricized, cut-stone ornament adorning the Puuc Maya structures of Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula.

Pre-Columbian-style buildings eventually cropped up in almost every region of the United States, though most were constructed in and around the largest U.S. cities—Los Angeles, New York and Chicago. A comparison of the ways in which pre-Columbian appropriations occurred in urban versus rural areas, as well in various geographic regions of the United States, highlights local variations that adhere to overall chronological trends. The influence of Hollywood, with its “anything goes” mindset and escapist agendas, helps explain the prominence of pre-Columbian-inspired architecture in Southern California. Its spread to other regions of the United States, in the 1930s, surely was a result of the attention garnered by its Southern Californian manifestations, as well as a reflection of U.S. focus on Latin America especially after the inauguration of Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy.

My dissertation's 1940 terminus date reflects waning excitement surrounding pre-Columbian cultures as archaeological discoveries slowed and as the Latin American vogue subsided, especially as events leading to U.S. involvement in World War II escalated. The dominance of architectural Modernism—with its emphasis on smooth

³⁶Delpar, *Enormous Vogue*. See also, James Oles, *South of the Border: Mexico in the American Imagination, 1914-1947* (Washington/London: Smithsonian Institution, 1993) and R. Tripp Evans, *Romancing the Maya: Mexican Antiquity in the American Imagination, 1820-1915* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004).

surfaces and rejection of the sorts of ornament integral to pre-Columbian appropriations³⁷—as well as the rise of abstract expressionism—which embraced individuality, emphasized the subconscious, and rejected nationalist sentiments of the sort that nourished the vogue of truly “American” architecture³⁸—certainly played a part in the demise of pre-Columbian-inspired design as well.

From the 1910s through the 1930s, however, Pre-Columbian appropriation was deployed in a wide range of building types from residences to office buildings to movie palaces. A quantitative analysis, based on a building-by-building working list (Appendix A), reveals that residences account for the greatest number of pre-Columbian inspired buildings, although the most memorable, flamboyant and easily recognized instances of pre-Columbian appropriation are seen in movie palaces and hotels with proliferate, eclectic, and perhaps self-consciously deliberate gleanings from pre-Columbian art and architecture.

The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries witnessed the birth of a number of new building types, including skyscrapers, movie theaters and department stores—a development that generated a good deal of discussion about the shapes new types should take.³⁹ Developed first in the United States, the skyscraper often was characterized as particularly “American,” leading both Mújica and Bossom to promote pre-Columbian

³⁷Chapter Six provides a more in-depth discussion of Modernism’s role in the decline of pre-Columbian appropriations.

³⁸For the role that abstract expressionism played in the decreasing popularity of the Mexican vogue in the United States (as evidenced in part in a decrease in commissions of the Mexican Muralists) around 1940, see Laurance P. Hurlburt, *The Mexican Muralists in the United States* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989).

³⁹See Chapter Six for an in-depth analysis of building typology.

forms as particularly well suited to skyscraper design. Although movie palaces were quintessentially American constructs, it was their escapist function that prompted their “exotic” forms and adornment; Pre-Columbian-style movie houses took their places amid those in Chinese, Moorish and other styles denoting faraway places. Likewise, the pre-Columbian-style forms and motifs incorporated in U.S. department store designs of the late 1920s and 1930s probably had less to do with the stores’ “Americanness” than with their consumerist function; extravagant ornament—some of it pre-Columbian—drew shoppers’ attention and suggested the rich bounty of goods within the establishment. Thus, while the use of pre-Columbian aesthetics in these newly conceived building types might be seen as part of the larger issue of defining an “American aesthetic,” other factors (discussed above) were at play, and despite ample experiments with pre-Columbian-inspired skyscraper, movie palace and department store architecture, the style did not predominate in any of these building types.

For the buildings that employed pre-Columbian aesthetics, however, three dominant modes of use of indigenous American art forms that loosely adhere to typological categories (and relate to the popular culture versus American aesthetic trajectory described above) emerge from an analysis of the buildings. The most conservative of these—commonly employed in houses, office buildings and government buildings—make subtle references to indigenous American architecture, employing such elements as corbel vaults, trapezoidal openings, mansard roofs and/or organic-looking building materials. The most conspicuous of the modes of usage employs an overall coverage of surface ornament that tends to draw, more or less directly, from indigenous sources. This mode combines together the art forms from a variety of pre-Columbian

groups despite cultural, geographic and temporal distinctions, although such gleanings were not recognized by most in the early twentieth century as the eclectic assemblages they were. The third way indigenous American art and architecture was employed in U.S. structures is in the placement of surface ornament, again drawn in varying degrees of “accuracy” from pre-Columbian sources, in isolated areas throughout the building.

Reasons for Pre-Columbian Appropriations

To determine the sources and intentions behind individual architects’ and designers’ pre-Columbian borrowings, I have mapped what was generally known about the ancient Americas and when it came to light—with an eye to distinguishing the sorts of information accessible to the general public from that known only to a more select group of scholars and aficionados. The paucity of historiographies of pre-Columbian studies, and the fact that those that do exist are sometimes contradictory, has made this aspect of my work daunting. Moreover, the impact in the United States of studies published in languages other than English is unclear.⁴⁰

U.S. architectural appropriations of pre-Columbian designs might be seen as a corollary to European artists’ (slightly earlier) incorporation of non-Western forms in their works, though as Robert Goldwater and, more recently, Barbara Braun have

⁴⁰Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century publications related to pre-Columbian sites and objects in languages other than English are numerous. Although many of these are illustrated, thus potentially exposing even the (relatively common) foreign-speaking reader to pre-Columbian sources, the question still remains if someone who did not read French, for example, would have examined the illustrations of a publication in French. Even if some of the architects in question could read French or Spanish, it is unclear which foreign publications circulated in the United States in these years. For more discussion on the sources of pre-Columbian cultures, see Chapters Three and Four.

shown,⁴¹ the European avant-garde favored motifs and designs developed by groups indigenous to their countries' various colonial outposts in Africa and Oceania.⁴² In many European minds, non-Western art and artifacts called up idyllic and idealized lifestyles that seemed far removed from the ills of modern society. A similar "exotification" of the "primitive" was a component of pre-Columbian appropriation in the United States, where urbanites were increasingly disillusioned with what they saw as the pitfalls of modern life: its fast pace, crowded and dirty cities and the rise of disease and poverty.

Still, many U.S. architects' and patrons' attraction to pre-Columbian forms and motifs in the early twentieth century was colored by circumstances and attitudes that were more closely allied to pan-Americanism than to the primitivist vogue in Europe. Politically, the United States was a young country vying for its place in the extant Western power structure, and its proprietary attitude toward the whole of the Western Hemisphere—which had blossomed as Spain's control of the Americas receded in the nineteenth century—became more pronounced as the twentieth century got under way.

As more and more pre-Columbian sites and art objects were discovered by Western explorers and then archaeologists in the late nineteenth century, *norteamericanos* were increasingly inclined to co-opt ancient Americans as ancestors of

⁴¹Robert Goldwater, *Primitivism in Modern Art*, rev. ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), and Braun *Pre-Columbian Art*. See also, Kirk Varnedoe, "Abstract Expressionism," in "*Primitivism*" in *20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern*, ed. William Rubin, vol. 2 (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1984), 614-59. Although it focuses on the late 1930s and 1940s, Varnedoe's essay correlates colonialism and the use of non-Western sources.

⁴²James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art* (London/Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), especially 196-200.

sorts.⁴³ Major monuments—including “pyramids”—unearthed throughout Mexico, Central America and the Andean region were proudly pointed to as evidence of a unique American spirit of innovation that belonged exclusively to the Americas. The “accomplishments” of pre-Columbian peoples—their finely crafted artworks as well as their massive structures—were seen as evidence of a relatively advanced cultural status, especially in comparison to more “barbaric” non-Western groups.⁴⁴

Artistically, the United States was widely viewed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, within and without, as secondary to and lagging behind Europe. Art centers in France, Germany and England set trends in both art and architecture for the whole of the Western world, the United States included. Customarily, U.S. artists and architects spent some time studying in Europe, and most architectural programs at U.S.

⁴³Among those who discuss the U.S. trend that viewed pre-Columbian peoples as ancestral is Marvin Cohodas in his essay, “Elizabeth Hickox and Karuk Basketry: A Case Study in Debates on Innovation and Paradigms of Authenticity,” in *Unpacking Culture: Art and Commodity in Colonial and Postcolonial Worlds*, eds. Ruth B. Phillips and Christopher B. Steiner (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1999), 143-61. There, Cohodas writes, “The new [late 1880s] economic elite in North America, allied with the expanding bourgeoisie, began to adopt Native Americans as their premodern ancestors, a construction designed not only to define individual Canadian or American identity within a community of industrialized nations but also as a tool in the exploitation of immigrant non-Anglo laborers” (145-46).

Numerous writings through the 1930s reflected this ancestral attitude, if only implicitly. In *Building to the Skies* (as discussed in Chapter Five), Bossom, for example, provides an illustration of Temple I at Tikal and also observes, “In the skyscraper America has invented and developed a wholly new and revolutionary form and type of building that is absolutely and characteristically her own. Search for foreign inspiration or example and you will search in vain. The skyscraper is as indigenous as the Red Indian” (18, 9). Similarly, architect Rexford Newcomb, in an article entitled, “Aboriginal American Architectural Types” writes, “*our* [emphasis mine] American aborigines, to whom we often attribute so little of value, had, through a long period of experience in a given environment, developed a culture that can be favorably compared with that of any of the world’s peoples preceding the Hellenic Greeks . . .” *Western Architect* 36, no. 7 (July 1927): 106.

⁴⁴For a discussion of how pre-Columbian cultures were regarded by Euro-Americans, see Benjamin Keen, *The Aztec Image in Western Thought* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990), especially chaps. 10 and 11, and Braun, 34.

colleges and universities were modeled on European ones, especially that of the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris.⁴⁵

Like their European counterparts, U.S. artists of this period were consumed by the idea of developing a new aesthetic that reflected modern life.⁴⁶ Ironically, many turned to the past for inspiration, intent on reworking Greco-Roman and other “ancient” aesthetics in new ways. Following the emergence of American archaeology as an academic discipline at the end of the nineteenth century, the “ancient” date of pre-Columbian cultures was established within the first decades of the twentieth century, and U.S. architects and designers in pursuit of a unique and innovative ancient *American* aesthetic turned increasingly to indigenous art for reference points and ideas.⁴⁷

⁴⁵The architecture school at Columbia College (now Columbia University), for example, resolved in 1879 to adopt a program that mimicked that of the École des Beaux Arts, with minor changes to reflect local practices. See F. A. Schermerhorn, “Columbia College. Proposal to Establish a Course in Instruction in Architecture in the School of Mines. Resolution of Inquiry, Adopted by the Trustees, April 7, 1879,” pp. 4-5, Columbia University Archives, Box 1, Folder 1: “Architecture Course in School of Mines, 1879-1904.” No mention is made of materials assigned as readings in the course curricula that would have exposed students of architecture to pre-Columbian art or architecture.

⁴⁶For further discussion, see Chapter Two.

⁴⁷Herbert J. Spinden, an anthropology student at Harvard University, earned the first Ph.D. with a pre-Columbian focus in 1909. His dissertation, “A Study of Maya Art: Its Subject Matter and Historical Development,” was published as a book of the same title in 1913 (see: *Memoirs of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. 6 [Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum, 1913]). For a brief, but well-written historiography of American archaeology, see Ignacio Bernal, *A History of Mexican Archaeology: The Vanished Civilizations of Middle America* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1980). See also, Gordon Willey and Jeremy A. Sabloff, *A History of American Archaeology*, 2^d ed. (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1980). Braun also provides a brief history of the establishment of chronology and origins of pre-Columbian peoples (34-35).

Pre-Columbian Sources and Background

The indigenous American monuments and motifs that were most commonly quoted in later pre-Columbian appropriations tend to reflect those that were given primacy of place in written accounts. Alexander von Humboldt provided one of the first illustrated descriptions of pre-Columbian remains in both Mesoamerica and the Andes⁴⁸; his *Vues des cordillères et monumens des peuples indigènes de l'Amérique* (1810) included drawings of many of the objects and monuments that even today are considered canonical works—shorthand representations of “Mexico” or the “Inka” (even if the monument in question originates from Copan, Honduras or Quirigua, Guatemala). This is partly because those who followed Humboldt used his tome as a guidebook, and sought out the same sites and monuments for themselves. As photography came into vogue and cameras became more and more portable, photographs began to replace drawings in illustrated accounts. All the while, enthusiasts were also making plaster casts of carved monuments and even sections of buildings (and some, of course, carried away that which most intrigued them)—the result being a fixed compendium of expected images, one that was reiterated in publications, at world’s fairs, and in museum displays—in the forms of drawings, photographs and/or three-dimensional molds and models.

By 1910, the best-known objects from Mesoamerica were those made by the following linguistic/cultural groups: Zapotec, Maya, Teotihuacan, Toltec and Mexica

⁴⁸See, for example, Alexander von Humboldt, *Vues des cordillères et monumens des peuples indigènes de l'Amérique*, 2 vols. (Paris/London: F. Schoell, 1810), and *Researches, Concerning the Institutions and Monuments of the Ancient Inhabitants of America, with Descriptions and Views of Some of the Most Striking Scenes in the Cordilleras!*, 2 vols., trans. Helen Maria Williams (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme & Brown, J. Murray & H. Colburn, 1814).

(Aztecs) (Figure 1.1 and Appendices C, D and E).⁴⁹ The Zapotec had a long dominance (c. 600 BC to c. 1519 AD) in what today is the Mexican state of Oaxaca. The Zapotec works tapped for quotation in U.S. architectural examples come primarily from two sites, Monte Alban and Mitla.⁵⁰ Monte Alban had several periods of florescence, but those most relevant to this study are Monte Alban I (c. 600 BC to 150 BC) with its carved stone stelae inscribed with both figures and glyphs (Figure 1.2), and Monte Alban II (c. 150 BC to 250 AD), the subterranean tombs of which yielded dozens of figural urns that take the form of people sitting cross-legged, with hands on their knees, their faces usually masked and surmounted by elaborate headdresses (Figures 3.12 and 3.25).

The ancient “Maya” consisted of a large number of separate, yet interrelated, polities that shared common glyphic, calendric and ritual systems.⁵¹ They occupied the Yucatan Peninsula and parts of Tabasco and Chiapas in Mexico, as well as modern-day

⁴⁹The information on Mesoamerica here is derived from archaeologists Michael D. Coe and Rex Koontz, *Mexico: From the Olmecs to the Aztecs* (London/New York: Thames & Hudson, 2002) and Michael D. Coe, *The Maya* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1999).

⁵⁰Captain Guillermo Dupaix and Luciano Castañeda conducted a survey of Monte Alban in 1806 for Charles IV of Spain; it was later published in Lord Edward Kingsborough’s *Antiquities of Mexico, Comprising Facsimiles of Ancient Mexican Paintings and Hieroglyphs*, vol. 4 (London: A. Aglio, 1830-48). American William Henry Holmes excavated at the site in c. 1894 (Field Columbian Museum) and again in 1908 (Smithsonian Institution). Marshall Saville excavated a number of tombs in 1898 and conducted glyphic studies of some of the monuments (American Museum of Natural History). Mexican Leopoldo Batres conducted more excavations and glyphic studies in the early 1900s. Many of the same individuals excavated at Mitla. Dupaix and Castañeda were there in 1806 (again published in Kingsborough, *Antiquities*, vol. 4). Désiré Charnay produced the first photographs of the site when he excavated there in the late 1850s and early 1860s. William Henry Holmes of the Field Columbian Museum excavated at Mitla in 1894, and contributed to the later models of Mitla structures that appeared in a number of world’s fairs (see Chapter Three of this study) and at the Smithsonian Institution. Leopoldo Batres was at Mitla in the early 1900s.

⁵¹The Maya produced books painted on fig-bark paper or deerskin which were folded like screens. They possessed knowledge of the planets (especially Venus) and stars, and tracked their movements. They played a “ballgame” with a rubber ball on a special court and had highly specialized markets, human and autosacrifice (bloodletting) and a pantheistic religion. Coe, *Maya*, 13.

Guatemala and Belize and the western portions of modern Honduras and El Salvador. The Maya peoples, who emerged in roughly 400 BC and live on in their descendants today, reached their height (in population and production) during the “Classic period,” of about 250 AD to 900 AD. The Maya sites most often tapped for pre-Columbian appropriations were Copan in Honduras, Quirigua and Tikal in Guatemala, Palenque and Yaxchilan in Chiapas, and a variety of sites on the Yucatan Peninsula, including Chichen Itza, Uxmal, Labna and Sayil (Figures 1.3 – 1.12).⁵² Maya monuments were particularly appealing to a U.S. public in the early twentieth century because the Maya style is simultaneously naturalistic in its depictions of human forms and “exotic” in its inclusion of lavishly codified and puzzle-like glyphs, “costume” elements and applied geometricized architectural ornament. At a time when a sort of unified eclecticism was in vogue, Maya art and architecture appeared quite modern.

Teotihuacano imagery, too, had a modern appeal in its ornamental application, but its art style was (and remains) a bit harder for the Western eye to decipher, making it a less popular source for those who appropriated pre-Columbiana for U.S. architecture. Located in Central Mexico (near Mexico City), Teotihuacan was one of the largest cities of the pre-Columbian Americas (c. 100 BC to 700 AD). It is known for its large, stepped pyramids (Pyramids of the Sun and Moon and the Temple of the Feathered Serpent), its trademark architectural profile combining sloping *talus* and vertical *tablero*, its busy high relief designs (especially on the Temple of the Feathered Serpent), and its richly

⁵²These sites are the ones illustrated in the earliest treatments of Maya art and architecture, especially Stephens, *Travel in Central America*, Stephens, *Travel in Yucatan*, and Frederick Catherwood’s *Views of Ancient Monuments in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan* (New York: Bartlett & Welford, 1844). For more discussion on early sources of the Maya, see Chapter Three.

polychromed murals, which occur throughout the site and combine naturalism and stylization (Figures 1.13 – 1.15).⁵³ The references to Teotihuacan in pre-Columbian appropriations tend to consist of vague allusions to carvings on the Temple of the Feathered Serpent, although a few U.S. architectural examples employ *talud-tablero* massing that recalls Teotihuacan's.

The Mexica (popularly known as “Aztecs,” even today) traced their origins to the Toltecs, a people who had built their capital in Tula (c. 1200 AD to 1400 AD) in the present-day Mexican state of Hidalgo. French explorer Désiré Charnay brought this site to the attention of Euro-Americans shortly after he visited it in the 1880s. Stepped, canted pyramids with repetitive squared columns, some in human form (called “Atlantean” figures) are the diagnostic features of this site, the latter commonly cited in pre-Columbian appropriations (Figure 1.16).

The Mexica settled their capital city, Tenochtitlan (the remains of which are below present-day Mexico City) in c. 1300 AD. It thrived until the Spanish arrived in 1519. Because several Spanish conquistadors and missionaries made detailed accounts of Tenochtitlan and of the customs, beliefs and life-styles of the Mexica, these people have been among the best-known indigenes since the sixteenth century, despite the paucity of their material remains (Spanish and Catholic policies of destruction eliminated much that Mexica builders and artists produced). Although the “Aztec” name was borrowed more often than the actual art of these pre-Hispanic peoples, allusions to Mexica monumental

⁵³Early excavators and visitors to Teotihuacan were numerous. English collector and exhibitor William Bullock visited the site in c. 1822, William Henry Holmes in 1884 and 1897. Désiré Charnay excavated at the site in 1863 and again in the 1880s. Leopoldo Batres worked there from 1889-1905, Mexican Manuel Gamio, in 1922, American Alfred L. Kroeber in 1922 and American George C. Vaillant in *circa* 1932.

stone sculptures (which were first excavated, preserved and widely publicized in the last decades of the eighteenth century⁵⁴)—most commonly, abstracted versions of the Sun Stone—crop up with some frequency in pre-Columbian appropriations (Figure 1.17).⁵⁵

Andean imagery is largely more abstract than that of Mesoamerican cultures,⁵⁶ an aspect that was taken, in the early twentieth century, as evidence of “inferior” development (Figure 1.18). This attitude toward Andean abstraction perhaps explains, in part, its lower frequency of citation in U.S. architecture. The Andean styles co-opted for use in U.S. architecture are, however, some of that region’s most stylized ones, from Tiwanaku, Chimú (associated with the kingdom of Chimor), Chancay and the Inka.⁵⁷ The Tiwanaku style—which emanated from the pre-Columbian site of that name, located

⁵⁴For more discussion on the excavation history of these monuments, see Chapter Three.

⁵⁵Aside from the Contact-era and Viceregal-period literature produced between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, other early sources that brought Mexica aesthetics to the consciousness of a U.S. public, include: Humboldt’s, *Vues des cordillères*, William Bullock’s 1824 exhibition in Piccadilly Square, London, and the three catalogues that accompanied the show: *A Description of the Unique Exhibition Called Ancient Mexico: Collected on the Spot in 1823 by the Assistance of the Mexican Government, and Now Open for Public Inspection at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly* (London: William J. Bullock, 1824); *Catalogue of the Exhibition, Called Modern Mexico; Containing a Panoramic View of the City, with Specimens of the Natural History of New Spain, and Models of the Vegetable Produce, Costume, etc. etc. Now Open for Public Inspection at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly* (London: William J. Bullock, 1824); and *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Exhibition, Entitled Ancient and Modern Mexico; Containing a Panoramic View of the Present City, Specimens of the Natural History of New Spain, Models of its Vegetable Produce, Habitations, Costumes, etc. etc. and of the Colossal and Enormous Idols, the Great Calendar and Sacrificial Stones, Temples, Pyramids, and Other Existing Antique Remains. The Whole Forming the Rationally Instructive and Interesting Exhibition, Which Is Now Open, For Public Inspection, at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly* (London: William J. Bullock, 1824). Additionally, a number of world’s fairs and expositions in the United States featured Mexica objects (see Chapter Three).

⁵⁶A basic source of information on Andean cultures and art styles is Rebecca Stone-Miller, *Art of the Andes: From Chavín to Inca* (London/New York: Thames & Hudson, 2002).

⁵⁷Nearly all Andean objects were identified as Tiwanaku and Inka until the mid-1920s, when archaeologists began to devise more precise cultural and chronological designators. The illustrations in W. Golden Mortimer’s *Peru: History of Coca "The Divine Plant" of the Incas: With an Introductory Account of the Incas, and of the Andean Indians of To-day* (New York: J. H. Vail, 1901), for instance, include Moche and Chancay artifacts identified as Tiwanaku and Inka.

southeast of Lake Titicaca in Bolivia—held sway throughout much of the Andean region from c. 250 AD to 1000 AD. Tiwanaku captured the attention of some of the earliest travelers to the Andes, and the repetitive, blocky and “exotic” bird-humans adorning its so-called “Sun Gate” emerged as the most often emulated Andean forms in U.S. architecture (Figures 3.21, 3.22, 3.45 and 3.51).⁵⁸ Motifs derived from Chimú and Chancay (coastal Peruvian styles that flourished from c. 1000 AD to 1500 AD) also were appropriated by U.S. architects. Chimú—and its major site, Chan Chan—is best known for adobe architecture adorned with repetitive relief images that inspired some U.S. take-offs (Figure 1.19).⁵⁹ Chancay’s mark on pre-Columbian appropriation derives from portable objects (mostly earspools) that were identified in the nineteenth century as “Inka,” (Figures 1.20 and 3.45).⁶⁰

The actual Inka empire was vast, stretching from parts of Ecuador along the western Andes down to Chile (approximately 3,400 miles), yet short-lived (c. 1400 AD through 1532 AD) with the arrival of the Spanish to this region. Although Inka art tends toward minimalism and did not provide many replicable motifs, some Inka building concepts were mimicked in U.S. architecture. The architecture of the Inka was illustrated in the earliest nineteenth-century sources, but it was Hiram Bingham’s much-publicized

⁵⁸Many early sources provided drawings and photographs of the Sun Gate at Tiwanaku. These include: Squier, *Peru*, 288-92; Wiener, *Pérou et Bolivie*, 449, 747-49; and Alfons Stübel and Max Uhle, *Die Ruinenstaette von Tiahuanaco im Hochlande des alten Perú: Eine Kulturgeschichtliche Studie auf grund Selbstaendiger aufnahmen*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Verlag von Karl W. Hiersemann, 1892), especially Pls.5 and 11-17.

⁵⁹Early illustrated sources of Chan Chan include Squier’s, *Peru*. Also, Charles Lummis, American explorer and author of the novel, *The Gold Fish of Gran Chimú* (Boston: Lamson, Wolfe, 1896), took a number of nineteenth century photographs of Chan Chan (personal communication, Joanne Pillsbury, September 2005).

⁶⁰Illustrations of Chancay earspools appear in Wiener, 712-14, and Mortimer, 71, 346.

visit to and excavations of Machu Picchu, Peru, from 1911-1915, that truly ignited interest in the mortarless Inka stonework reserved for elite structures. Machu Picchu also holds examples of the Inka tendency to leave natural-looking boulders in place on both the exteriors and within the interior spaces of buildings (Figures 1.21 and 3.46)⁶¹—an idea replicated in at least one pre-Columbian appropriation.

Pre-Columbian Imagery at Play

Whereas U.S. painters and sculptors were relatively unaffected by ancient American artistic styles,⁶² architects used indigenous forms and motifs in a variety of innovative and eclectic ways.⁶³ This constitutes another significant difference between European and U.S. primitivisms; in Europe, painting and sculpture were its primary outlets, whereas in the United States, architecture was the most clearly affected medium.

Even as public awareness of ancient American cultures grew, in the 1920s and beyond (through exhibitions and popular publications), the iconography of pre-Columbian art and monuments was little understood by scholars, much less non-specialists. Pre-Columbian imagery often was misread, its motifs and meanings lost in

⁶¹Bingham's photographs of Machu Picchu appeared in articles in a number of newspapers and popular periodicals, including "The Discovery of Machu Picchu," *Harper's Magazine* 126, no. 755 (April 1913): 709-14 and "In the Wonderland of Peru: The Work Accomplished by the Peruvian Expedition of 1912, under the Auspices of Yale University and the National Geographic Society," *The National Geographic Magazine* 24, no. 4 (April 1913): 387-573.

⁶²Though some painters took up pre-Columbian subjects (e.g., José María Obregón, *Discovery of Pulque*, 1869, oil on canvas, 189 x 230 cm/74.4 x 90.6 in, Museo Nacional de Arte, Mexico City), these treatments tend to be rendered in European academic styles rather than influenced by the formal renderings of indigenous American aesthetics (see discussion in Chapter Four).

⁶³Pre-Columbian modes also informed "minor arts" like ceramics and jewelry design in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. See Ingle, especially chap. 3 and Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art*.

translation when borrowed and reproduced. Strange admixtures of motifs from varied cultures and time periods were commonplace in pre-Columbian appropriation,⁶⁴ and anyone unfamiliar with the styles and dates of individual cultures would have a difficult time sorting them out in their U.S. architectural usages. My training in pre-Columbian art and architecture has allowed me to identify the imagery of indigenous cultures as well as the sources of the indigenous forms and motifs that architects and designers working in the United States used in their buildings—sometimes in cases where the designers themselves did not know the actual identity of the culture from which they were borrowing.

Overview of the Project

Before pre-Columbian sources could be incorporated into U.S. design programs, a climate that allowed their usage had to exist. Chapter Two, “Pre-Columbian Appropriations: A Social and Art Historical Context,” roots the use of pre-Columbian forms and motifs in the political and social climates generated by intertwined notions of nationalism and pan-Americanism in the United States. Waxing and waning periods of U.S. political interests in Latin America—beginning with the Monroe Doctrine, first articulated in 1823 and continuing (more or less) through World War II—underlay a corresponding amount of attention to Southern “neighbors” and a putatively “shared” cultural patrimony. Aiding the later nineteenth-century period of Latin American ascendancy in the United States were new archaeological discoveries of pre-Columbian sites and objects as well as attitudes toward the primitive Other that fueled excitement

⁶⁴One example is Dietzmann’s fireplace panel in the Ennis-Brown house, which resembles Lintel 39 from Structure 16 at the Maya site of Yaxchilan in which the artist transformed the gender of the ruler (see Chapter Six and Appendix F).

and a sense of exoticism. That the newly found indigenous objects witnessed a growing appreciation is related to the Aesthetic and Arts and Crafts movements' more expansive notions of "art." My discussion of pre-Columbian monuments and artifacts *vis-a-vis* these movements' dominant philosophies situates pre-Columbian appropriation in contemporaneous European and U.S. aesthetic debate. This chapter goes on to highlight the problems inherent to subsuming pre-Columbian appropriations in the broader and better-known category of Art Deco, and argues that pre-Columbian appropriations constitute their own style.

After establishing the social and art historical roots of pre-Columbian appropriations, Chapter Three, "Sources of the Pre-Columbian through the Early Twentieth Century," offers an overview of bibliographic and visual source materials up to 1940, including books, articles and exhibitions that reflect the state of knowledge of pre-Columbian cultures and their material products. These varied media served to disseminate information, imagery and viewpoints to the general public. Many of the forms appropriated by U.S. architects in this period derived from portable objects seen firsthand at U.S. museums and/or world's fairs (e.g., painted or low-relief decorations on ceramics and small utilitarian objects). Others can be traced to large-scale pre-Columbian monuments (e.g., "altars," stelae and buildings) that may have been known to the borrower only through plaster cast or photographic reproduction—that is, in mediated form—as only a few U.S. architects and designers ventured south of the border in pursuit of pre-Columbian source material.

Chapter Four, "Culture, Spectacle and the Occult: The Appeal of Pre-Columbiana," reviews the appearance of pre-Columbian topics throughout a variety of

popular media as part of the broader vogue of ancient America. Although this fiction- and performance-based popular culture material rarely provided direct sources of imagery, it nonetheless helped promote the use of indigenous aesthetics by providing a rich backdrop against which pre-Columbian appropriation played out in its time.

Having established the means by which pre-Columbian forms and motifs became known—hence available for appropriation—I turn, in Chapter Five, “Pre-Columbian Inclination: Reasons for the Appropriation of Pre-Columbian Aesthetics in U.S. Structures,” to the ways in which dominant historic, nationalist and social thought shaped U.S. attitudes toward pre-Columbian peoples. As representative examples, I examine four prominent practitioners of pre-Columbian appropriation in U.S. architecture: Robert B. Stacy-Judd, Francisco Mújica, Alfred C. Bossom and Frank Lloyd Wright. Close examinations of the careers, writings and pre-Columbian-inflected designs of these individuals reveal that broad and collective notions informed individual sensibilities and played out in particular projects at a time when Western artists in both Europe and the United States attempted new ways to draw from the past in order to create innovative designs that reflected modern conditions. A desire on the part of each to develop an innovative and truly American aesthetic underpinned these four architects’ assimilations (to varying degrees) of pre-Columbian sources.

Stacy-Judd, Mújica, Bossom and Wright produced high-brow (to varying degrees) designs based on the pre-Columbian. Their buildings’ sophisticated and understated borrowings—sometimes more conceptual than actual—stand in contrast to the more “direct” and proliferate replications of pre-Columbian motifs common to mass-market applications. Thus, a sliding scale of appropriation exists in an intertwined relationship

of use, design motivation, building typology and intended audience, with such residences as Wright's Fallingwater on one end and an overall coverage of ornament such as at the Los Angeles Mayan Theatre at the other.

Chapter Six, "The Choice to Appropriate: Chronological, Geographic and Typological Tendencies," considers the ways in which pre-Columbian material was put to use in U.S. architecture. I discuss the methods by which particular forms were dispersed—chronologically, geographically and typologically—and draw distinctions between the ways that pre-Columbian-derived motifs were employed versus how they appeared in their original contexts. I discuss the three major modes of pre-Columbian appropriation in U.S. architecture: over-all ornament, isolated ornament and subtle visual and conceptual assimilations, providing more comprehensive discussion and descriptions of representative buildings to illustrate my points. Chapter Seven, the conclusion, summarizes the major contributions of this study.

Five appendices supplement the text. Appendix A, "Working List of Pre-Columbian Appropriations," compiles the known buildings constructed in the United States through 1940 that reflect pre-Hispanic inflections. Appendix B, "U.S. Distribution Map of Pre-Columbian Appropriations," charts the locations of known pre-Columbian appropriations in the United States; each building listed in Appendix A appears here as a color-coded dot (signifying chronology). Appendix C, "Most Popular Pre-Columbian Sites and Their Characteristics" is a quick reference guide to the sites referred to in this dissertation (i.e., those most commonly co-opted by U.S. architects). Appendices D and E provide chronologies and geographic breakdowns for the pre-Columbian cultures (and/or art styles) of Mesoamerica and the Andes.

Chapter Two: Pre-Columbian Appropriations: A Social and Art Historical Context

Some day America may live her own life in her own buildings in her own way.

--Frank Lloyd Wright, "In the Cause of Architecture"⁶⁵

Intertwined with Western notions of the “exotic,” pre-Columbian appropriations are the results of social and art historical circumstances in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including a heightened sense of nationalism, an idealization of the “ancient” indigenous inhabitants of the Americas and a re-evaluation of what had been considered the “lower” arts. This chapter begins with an exploration of Western attitudes toward non-Western—and, specifically, pre-Columbian—cultures, and explores ways in which these attitudes informed uses of indigenous American forms and motifs in U.S. architecture. I proceed to discuss pre-Columbian appropriations in relation to widespread modern aesthetic attitudes that encouraged the use of unconventional source materials and allowed for eclectic assemblages of historical prototypes. I also trace Western artists’

⁶⁵Frank Lloyd Wright, “In the Cause of Architecture,” *Architectural Record* 23, no. 3 (March 1908): 158. He writes, “In the hope that some day America may live her own life in her own buildings, in her own way, that is, that we may make the best of what we have for what it honestly is or may become, I have endeavored in this work to establish a harmonious relationship between ground plan and elevation of these buildings, considering the one as a solution and the other an expression of the conditions of a problem of which the whole is a project.”

and architects' enthusiastic embrace of the "primitive" to such influential thinkers as English art and social critic, John Ruskin (1819-1900) and French architectural theorist Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc (1814-1879), both of whom influenced the Aesthetic movement, as well as the Arts and Crafts, Art Nouveau and Art Deco movements.

In reviewing broad characteristics of these major art movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, I touch upon pre-Columbian appropriations' ties to the Art Deco style (a connection well established in extant literature on the subject), but locate the trend within a more expansive context; the last pages of this chapter, for instance, relate pre-Columbian appropriations to Egyptian Revival and "Pueblo Deco" architectural styles. Finally, I explore the concept of revivalism, and call into question the use of the term "revival," particularly as it relates to the use of pre-Columbian motifs and architectural features.

Western Perceptions of Pre-Columbian Peoples

From the time of the first encounters between the Spanish and the inhabitants of the New World in the sixteenth century, an air of mystery and exoticism surrounded indigenous peoples.⁶⁶ That aura lingered even after Mexico gained its independence in

⁶⁶Among the numerous scholarly discussions of Western attitudes (some of them subliminal) toward the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas from the Contact period (early decades of the sixteenth century) through the early twentieth century, the following were most helpful: Hugh Honour, *The European Vision of America* (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1975); Elizabeth Hill Boone and Tom Cummins, eds., *Native Traditions in the Postconquest World: A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1998); Brian Fagan, *Clash of Cultures* (Walnut Creek, CA/London/New Delhi: Altamira Press, 1998); Benjamin Keen, *The Aztec Image in Western Thought* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990); Helen Delpar, *The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican: Cultural Relations between the United States and Mexico, 1920-1935* (Tuscaloosa, AL/London: University of Alabama Press, 1992); and, Oles, *South of the Border*.

the nineteenth century, and pre-Columbian sites began to be excavated.⁶⁷ As Hugh Honour writes:

The many books published in the nineteenth century did nothing to dispel the clouds of mystery hanging over Central and South America. Precisely recorded information about the Maya, the Aztecs, and the Incas, as about the wild-life [sic] of the swampy jungles of the Orinoco and Amazon, served only to make them seem stranger and more remote from Europe.⁶⁸

That enhanced information about pre-Columbian cultures only made them “stranger and more remote” suggests that some Western agenda was served by that construct, and it would seem that Western insistence upon pre-Conquest cultures’ enigmatic character supports the notion that Western culture is, by contrast, rational, transparent, predictable and easily mapped. The presumed superiority of Euro-American culture is supposedly demonstrated, moreover, by the demise of previous American civilizations, such as the Maya⁶⁹; a culture’s “sudden” disappearance fosters a sense of its haplessness and—by contrast—a sense of Western control. Feeding further into this feeling of superiority are the Spanish Conquests of the Mexica and Inka, further “proof” of indigenous weakness and Western ascendancy.

The life ways of “primitive” peoples have often been seen to illustrate the ways people lived before humanity “progressed.” As Marianna Torgovnick remarks:

⁶⁷The “disappearance” of the Maya, for example, continues to be addressed in popular media as one of the great world mysteries, despite the fact that scholars have determined the bases for a Maya decline (around 900 AD) with some certainty. Although the reasons vary from region to region and place to place, the Northern Maya area, for example, experienced severe drought as well as soil depletion and erosion linked to overpopulation and resultant overuse of crop land. See Michael D. Coe, *The Maya* (London/New York: Thames & Hudson, 1999), 39.

⁶⁸Honour, *European Vision*, 267.

⁶⁹A relatively small number of Maya were living in the Yucatan when the Spanish arrived, yet the Spanish failed to connect these people to those who made the magnificent structures that lay in ruins.

A fundamental basis of Western interest in the primitive depends on archaic and evolutionist meanings of the word as the “original” or “natural” state of things. Within these meanings, explorations or representations of the primitive could be seen as explorations of origins and the marking of patterns that could reveal the truth about human nature and social organization.⁷⁰

Westerners tend to reconstruct pre-Columbian cultures as doomed but fascinating components of the past. Torgovnick notes “two alternating and yet complementary pulsations” in Euro-American representations of the primitive: “a rhetoric of control . . . and a rhetoric of desire, ultimately more interesting, which implicates ‘us’ in the ‘them’ we try to conceive as the Other.”⁷¹

Although Torgovnik is writing about living colonial cultures, the “pulsations” she identifies may be applied to Euro-American accounts of pre-Columbian cultures. Urgent pleas to recover fast-disappearing remains have echoed through pre-Columbian scholarship since the early nineteenth century; this emphasis on the ephemeral quality of pre-Columbian cultures’ masterworks not only reflects their ruined states, but suggests Western superiority in a subtle way, as the Westerner imagines himself taking control of a dire situation and rescuing disintegrating markers of the past. Airs of superiority play out, too, in associations with the ephemeral nature of “primitive” dwellings, which, in the early twentieth century, were thought to have been devised purely out of necessity of shelter (i.e., the “primitive hut”) and without regard for aesthetics or deeper symbolism.

⁷⁰Marianna Torgovnick, *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 46.

⁷¹*Ibid.*, 245.

This was viewed as being in direct opposition to the more durable architecture of modern Western society that stressed the importance of beauty and symbolism.⁷²

Two dominant modern tropes concerning pre-Columbian peoples revolve around notions of the primitive and exotic.⁷³ The trope of the primitive encompasses dichotomous conceptions of a free-living people in tune with nature on the one hand, and, on the other, irrational and violent.⁷⁴ Ancient Americans—some of whom practiced human sacrifice and all of whom lacked the wheel, metal tools and draft animals—fit the European-devised “primitive” mold, although the degree of American indigenes’ primitivism was something even the Spanish debated.⁷⁵ At one end of the spectrum were those who questioned whether the inhabitants of the New World were even human (thus capable of grasping the tenets of Christian doctrine); at the other end were those who argued that the cultures of the Americas were highly evolved and should be allowed to

⁷²For more discussion of the “primitive hut,” see Anthony Vidler, *The Writing of the Walls: Architectural Theory in the Late Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1987), especially “Rebuilding the Primitive Hut: The Return to Origins from Lafitau to Laugier” (7-21) and “From the Hut to the Temple: Quatremère de Quincy and the Idea of Type” (147-64). See also, Joseph Rykwert, *The First Moderns: The Architects of the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1980), especially chaps. 1 and 4.

⁷³This discussion draws on Torgovnick, *Gone Primitive* as well as Hayden White, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978) and Deborah Root, *Cannibal Culture: Art, Appropriation, and the Commodification of Difference* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996). Root provides a clear and concise definition of the trope as a “conceptual mechanism that organizes images. So whereas a narrative strings together events, a trope binds together or organizes many diverse concepts, symbols, and associations into one idea. . . . Thus, notions of sublimity, violence, or eroticism, all of which can fall under the general rubric of exoticism, function as tropes that continue to structure our perceptions of cultural difference. . . . Tropes differ from stereotypes precisely because of this ability to do so many things at once” (34).

⁷⁴Torgovnick, 3.

⁷⁵See Keen, especially chaps. 4 and 5.

remain largely intact, maintaining their pre-Conquest political constructs, and even some religious practices.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, followers of Voltaire and Rousseau also took opposing views of New World natives.⁷⁶ Voltaire wrote of American indigenes as uncivilized and inferior, whereas Rousseau romanticized the same population as uncorrupted rather than uncivilized, and splendidly allied to nature (hence, “Noble Savages”).⁷⁷ In the early part of the twentieth century, when the first buildings with pre-Columbian-inspired forms appeared in the United States, a fairly tolerant, relativist attitude toward other cultures had begun to emerge, underpinned by attitudes that developed in the wake of Charles Darwin’s publication of his theory of natural selection, which raised profound questions about the genesis and development of the universe. These questions hit at the heart of Christian tenets, shaking the assumption that all people descended from Adam and Eve.

The trope of the exotic, as it relates to pre-Columbian cultures, reflects Western ambivalence toward the Other,⁷⁸ and attendant “us” and “them” constructs that are as much about the Euro-American’s perception of self as they are about her/his perceptions

⁷⁶Generally, Voltaire promoted reason as the basis for all things and saw “primitive” peoples as lacking reason, therefore subjugating them in the West. Among the most famous of his writings is his two-volume *Dictionnaire philosophique* of 1764. See *Voltaire’s Philosophical Dictionary*, selected and trans. H. I. Woolf (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1924).

Rousseau’s views (again, generally) concerning indigenous peoples are aligned with Romantic notions that upheld nature as pure and good and looked unfavorably on the corrupting properties of civilization. The concept of the “Noble Savage” is outlined in Jean-Jacques Rousseau, “A Discourse on the Origin of Inequality,” in *The Social Contract and Discourses*, trans. and intro. G. D. H. Cole (New York: Dutton, 1950).

⁷⁷For a brief outline of the concepts and literature related to the “Noble Savage,” see Fagan, 24-25.

⁷⁸Root, 160.

of the Other. Often, “we” brand “their” unfamiliar customs, beliefs and lifestyles as contemptible; judging, labeling and denouncing are easy, almost reflexive ways of coming to terms with the incomprehensible. Deborah Root describes the “exotification” of the Other as a means of envisioning its incorporation and charting our own escape, noting that in modern Western culture “that which is deemed different is consumed, its aesthetic forms taken up and used to construct a dream of the outside and sometimes of escape from the Western nightmare.”⁷⁹ In the United States in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the nightmares from which many sought respite included levels of urbanism and industrialization that some found overwhelming, and the heightened pace mechanization that that engendered. Some also hoped to distance themselves and their nascent culture from the long shadow of Europe. Aesthetically, U.S. focus on the Western Hemisphere led to (among other things) varied appropriations of pre-Columbian forms in U.S. architecture.⁸⁰ Root notes that in the process of appropriation, “Difference is transformed into something that is no longer all that different and hence ceases to be dangerous.”⁸¹ And indeed, when architects and designers in the United States took up pre-Columbian forms, they participated in a transformative process that made “primitive” forms more familiar and less threatening. They appropriated—and often abstracted,

⁷⁹Ibid., 30.

⁸⁰For discussion connecting the U.S. political climate of the late nineteenth century to the appropriation of pre-Columbian art, see Holly Barnet-Sanchez, “The Necessity of Pre-Columbian Art: U.S. Museums and the Role of Foreign Policy in the Appropriation and Transformation of Mexican Heritage, 1933-1944,” Ph.D. diss. (Los Angeles: University of California, 1993). In her exploration of the processes that led to the “aestheticization” of pre-Columbian art by U.S. museums, Barnet-Sanchez draws parallels between political and aesthetic spheres that relate to this discussion of appropriating the pre-Columbian in U.S. architecture.

⁸¹Root, 160.

recast and/or recontextualized—pre-Columbian forms not only to evoke the ancient cultures that devised them, but also to conjure up the enticingly exotic and/or mysterious connotations ancient America held for modern Westerners.⁸² As Root writes:

Different places have come to stand for different sensibilities in Western thinking, and images and commodities from those places have been able to summon, point to, and substitute for these sensibilities. It is these complexes of ideas, and the acquisitions and appropriations that underpin them, that can most properly be called exoticism.⁸³

Pre-Columbian Appropriations: The “Exotic” and a National Architecture

A handful of architects and designers employed pre-Columbian forms and motifs in U.S. structures in the early part of the twentieth century, in part, to tap the trope of the “exotic.” In the United States such usages also had a nationalistic dimension⁸⁴ and were

⁸²Heinrich Wöfflin was among the first to extend the connection between architecture and attitude in his 1888 statement, “Architecture expresses the attitude to life of an epoch.” *Renaissance and Baroque*, trans. Kathrin Simon (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966), 78.

⁸³Root, 30. This is similar to what Dell Upton calls “associational aesthetic theory” which holds that a visual form can evoke qualities of its place of origin (born from eighteenth century notions of *Zeitgeist* or “spirit of the age”). Upton provides a concise and well-articulated discussion of “new relativism” and its relation to “associational aesthetic theory” in “Outside the Academy: A Century of Vernacular Studies, 1890-1990,” in *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall (Hanover, NH/London: National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, 1990), 199-200. Leland M. Roth discusses a similar idea in his treatment of Enlightenment-period “associational eclecticism.” *Understanding Architecture: Its Elements, History, and Meaning* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1993), 415-16, 459-60.

⁸⁴The literature that attaches a nationalistic emphasis to the use of indigenous American forms in U.S. art and architecture is too extensive to cite in its entirety here. Representative examples include: Alfred C. Bossom and Estelle H. Ries, “New Styles in American Architecture: And What We Might Learn from the Mayas,” *World’s Work* 56, no. 2 (June 1928): 189-195; Edward Lloyd Hampton, “Creating a New World Architecture,” *Southern California Business* (April 1928): 16-17, 38, 45, 48; Rose Henderson, “A Primitive Basis for Modern Architecture,” *Architectural Record* 54, no. 2 (August 1923): 189-96; and Robert B. Stacy-Judd (as told to R.P. White), “Move for True American Architecture Growing: Local Man’s Dream of Recalling Mayan Civilization Reflected in New Building Trends,” *Los Angeles Times*, 20 August 1933, 23.

Elisabeth Blair MacDougall points out one very early primary source: R. Cary Long, Jr., “The Ancient Architecture of America: The Historical Value and Parallelism of Development with the Architecture of the Old World,” *New-York Historical Society Proceedings* (1849). See

connected to proprietary or familial attitudes that the United States held toward the Western hemisphere and—as Katherine Manthorne writes—to the “awakening inter-American consciousness” that began taking hold in the early decades of the nineteenth century.⁸⁵ Articulated for the first time in 1823 by James Monroe, the Monroe Doctrine asserted U.S. control in the Western hemisphere against European attempts at further colonization. Yet, as Katherine Manthorne asserts, the Monroe Doctrine was more of a warning to Europe rather than an active engagement with Latin America.⁸⁶ It was not until the 1880s with the creation of and U.S. participation in the International Union of American Republics (later the Pan-American Union, the same organization that constructed, in 1910, the first significant example of pre-Columbian-appropriated architecture in the United States⁸⁷) that the United States began to demonstrate a commitment to nurturing and maintaining good relations with its southern neighbors. The Spanish-American War of 1898 brought a new level of commitment to Latin America in its interventions in Cuba against Spain followed by the building and opening of the Panama Canal in 1914 brought more attention to Latin America. Roosevelt’s Good Neighbor Policy of the 1930s, which sought to encourage trade and political

“Before 1870: Founding Fathers and Amateur Historians,” in *Architectural Historian in America*, ed. MacDougall, 18. Elsewhere, Richard G. Carrott notes that Long (1810-1849), who designed two major “Egyptian Revival” buildings, lectured and wrote about Maya architecture; see *The Egyptian Revival: Its Sources, Monuments and Meaning, 1808-1858* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1978), 50.

⁸⁵Katherine Manthorne, *Tropical Renaissance: North American Artists Exploring Latin America, 1839-1879*, New Directions in American Art (Washington, DC/London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989), 3.

⁸⁶Manthorne, “Plantation Pictures in the Americas, circa 1880: Land, Power, and Resistance,” *Nepantla: Views from the South* 2, no. 2 (2001): 323.

⁸⁷For further discussion of the Pan-American Union and the building of its headquarters (Albert Kelsey and Paul P. Crét, 1910, Washington, D.C.), see Chapter Five.

relations with Latin America, focused still more political attention to the region. This increase in political policies toward and in support of Latin America through World War II correlates to heightened cultural interactions between the regions, especially between Mexico and the United States.⁸⁸

Pre-Columbian art and architecture, as products of the “ancient” cultures of this Latin American region (especially Mexico⁸⁹) came to be regarded as belonging to those who had come to settle the United States from Europe. Yet as part of a non-Western tradition, these materials were simultaneously “exotic.” As Holly Barnet-Sanchez writes:

Pan-Americanism had created a context for a specific art-culture system in the United States that permitted and even encouraged the collection . . . and presentation of Pre-Columbian objects as part of a greater hemispheric heritage, which, by definition, made these antiquities *ours*, that is belonging very specifically to the citizens of the United States. These objects came to embody an irreconcilable contradiction, being both the product of the ‘Other’ . . . and a part of the U.S. Euro-American patrimony,⁹⁰

The irony, of course, is that by claiming pre-Columbian art and architecture as “ours” we tame the wild beast, taking some of the “primitive” out of the “exotic,” thus witnessing Root’s transformative process.

⁸⁸See, for example, Honour, *European Vision*, Honour, *The New Golden Land: European Images of America from the Discoveries to the Present Time* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1975), Delpar, *Enormous Vogue* and Manthorne, “Plantation Pictures.”

⁸⁹Delpar presents a broad discussion of the Mexican craze in the United States that she sees as beginning in earnest in 1920. Mexico was of special interest in the United States in large part because the two countries share a border and because of economic ties centering largely around Mexico’s prolific oil industry. This greater political and economic attention on Mexico in the United States is borne out in pre-Columbian appropriations that borrow most commonly from the Maya and other indigenous cultures of Mexico.

⁹⁰Holly Barnet-Sanchez, “The Necessity of Pre-Columbian Art in the United States,” in *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past: A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks*, ed. Elizabeth Hill Boone (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1993), 188.

The exploitation of exoticism surrounding the pre-Columbian is especially evident in the emergence of lavishly ornamented pre-Columbian-“themed” theaters and hotels that cropped up throughout the United States especially in the 1920s. These buildings—intended as alter-environments or places of escape—were designed to draw attention—and crowds—through the novelty of otherness. William Epstein, who owned the Aztec Theatre (1926), “dreamed,” for example, “of a theater in San Antonio ‘so different’ that of it all the theatrical world would talk.”⁹¹ While the theater’s exterior is quite plain, it was the heavily decorated interior with its over-all coverage of pre-Columbian forms and motifs—giant Coyaxauhqui heads on two-story columns that parade around the main lobby, two polychromed bas-relief scenes from Palenque with life-size human figures that greet patrons on both stair landings from lobby to second floor, Atlantean-figure drinking fountains and trapezoidal Inka-like doorways set at the balcony entrance—that indeed got people talking.⁹²

Other pre-Columbian-themed buildings were also quite eclectic in their borrowings; the Aztec Theater in Eagle Pass, Texas (Figure 2.1, Leonard F. Seed, 1915), featured an abstracted take-off on the famed Mexica Sun Stone, but the geometricized ornament of its façade is more Zapotec than “Aztec.” The nearly contemporaneous Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles (Morgan, Walls and Clements, 1927), includes forms

⁹¹Quoted in Marjorie Ingle, *The Mayan Revival Style: Art Deco Mayan Fantasy* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith/Peregrine Smith Books, 1984), 45.

⁹²The opening night ceremony, for example, held on June 4, 1926, attracted a crowd of some 6,000 people, half of whom had to be turned away. San Antonio Conservation Society and Arts Council of San Antonio, “Aztec Theatre” June 1928 pamphlet, Aztec Theatre File, San Antonio Conservation Society.

drawn from several extant objects and monuments, not all of them Maya (Figure 2.2); the proliferate ornament of its façade extends to nearly every interior surface.

While some who employed pre-Columbian forms and motifs wished to tap into the excitement surrounding the “exoticism” of the indigenous Americas, others —such as architects Alfred C. Bossom (1881-1965) and Francisco Mújica (1889-c. 1979)⁹³—sought to develop a truly “American” look rooted in past styles. The material remains of the hemisphere’s indigenous inhabitants were considered a natural starting point as such architects believed that native designs ultimately reflected unique physical conditions of the Americas, and so turned to the art forms of America’s ancient past.⁹⁴ This looking to the past was part of a broader trend observed in architecture in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, as Dell Upton remarks:

These new intellectual attitudes were commonly expressed in a fascination with the *exotic*, meaning nonclassical and non-Western buildings; the *primitive*, based on the assumption that earlier and cruder forms were more innocent, natural, or spontaneous, and therefore truer, than later, refined ones; and later the *native*, since local styles, particularly the Gothic, were thought to embody national character.⁹⁵

John Ruskin and Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc: Setting the Stage

The use of exotic and primitive source materials in the art and architecture of Europe and the United States burgeoned as non-European visual culture were

⁹³Both architects are discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five.

⁹⁴Alfred C. Bossom, as one example, discusses the unique light of the Americas, which, to his mind, calls for “simple surface decoration.” See Bossom, *Building to the Skies: The Romance of the Skyscraper* (London/New York: Studio, 1934), 15.

⁹⁵Upton, “Outside the Academy,” 199-200.

increasingly displayed in ethnographic museums and other venues.⁹⁶ As William J.R. Curtis observes, early-twentieth-century primitivist trends in Europe and the United States were born of the idea of “going back to basics and forward to new inspirations simultaneously.”⁹⁷ Such appropriation can be related—if obliquely—to the lectures and writings of John Ruskin and Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, both of whom challenged the supremacy of academically promulgated classicism and promoted revivals of pre-Industrial styles and techniques.

Ruskin, a poet and painter as well as an art and social critic, frequently challenged established aesthetic canons.⁹⁸ His rejection of machine-made, mass-produced objects, furnishings and ornament in favor of “honest,” handmade works of the sort that were produced (by necessity) during the Gothic period,⁹⁹ encouraged—by extension—enthusiasm for a variety of non-Classical forms and motifs. Ruskin, who

⁹⁶Colonial arts, especially from Africa and Oceania, were collected and exhibited in Europe on a much wider scale than had previously been seen. Japan opened its doors to the West in 1854, flooding the European market with Japanese art objects and newly discovered pre-Columbian sites and objects began to be noticed by the general public, especially in the United States.

⁹⁷William J. R. Curtis, *Modern Architecture since 1900* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982), 20.

⁹⁸Ruskin’s first major volume, *Modern Painters* (published anonymously “By a graduate of Oxford” in London, 1843), for example, praised the controversial painting style of J. M. W. Turner, preferring it to the more traditionalist works. *Modern Painters* eventually was expanded to five volumes, published from 1851 to 1860 (London: Smith, Elder). Ruskin’s most influential books on architecture are *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (London: Smith, Elder, 1849) and *The Stones of Venice*, 3 vols., 4 tomes (London: Smith, Elder., 1851-53). For discussion of Ruskin’s philosophies on architecture see Giovanni Leoni, “Architecture as Commentary: Ruskin’s Pre-Modern Architectural Thought and Its Influence on Modern Architecture,” in *Ruskin and Modernism*, eds. Giovanni Cianci and Peter Nicholls (Basingstoke, Houndmills, UK/New York: Palgrave, 2001), 203.

⁹⁹Unlike members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, who shared many of his ideas, Ruskin detested Renaissance art, which he saw as striving for (and reaching) a sort of bland and lifeless “perfection.”

assigned a moral value to art, considered nature the embodiment of beauty and an apt foundation for Western aesthetics.¹⁰⁰ He was a proponent of architectural ornament based on natural forms, and focused attention on interior design and well-made household furnishings as ways of bringing beauty (and “good taste”) to everyday surroundings. Through his high regard for workmanship and nature, Ruskin helped promote such “lower” arts as vernacular architecture¹⁰¹ and the “decorative” arts.¹⁰²

Pre-Columbian artworks, as products of pre-Industrial peoples considered closer to nature, might be seen as generally allied to the sorts of objects Ruskin favored, although he never explicitly endorsed pre-Columbian or other non-Western works *per se*. Still, his ideas helped broaden categories of art, setting the stage for European and U.S. usages of non-Western aesthetics in Western settings.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰Ruskin considered the goods on display at the Crystal Palace Exhibition of 1851 in London the epitome of poor taste; they goaded him to propose an alternative aesthetic, grounded in the pre-Industrial past.

¹⁰¹Strictly speaking, vernacular architecture represents a style and type of construction indigenous to a particular place or region, although the practical usage of the term is somewhat ambiguous. It generally refers to an architecture of the “everyday,” as opposed to one of, say, palaces or temples. Originating from the Latin term *vernaculus* (“native-born”) the term has been associated with slaves and, in architecture, was once used to describe slave’s quarters.

¹⁰²See Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, especially vol. II, chap. 2. For discussion relating the complexities surrounding Ruskin’s influence on modern architecture, see Leoni, “Architecture as Commentary.”

¹⁰³Jonathan Batkin notes about Pueblo pottery, for example that “The peak of the mail-order trade [for Pueblo ceramics] around 1905, the emphasis on handicraft, and promotion of the Indian corner are all due to the influence of the Arts and Crafts Movement.” See “Pueblo Pottery and the Early Curio Trade” in *Unpacking Culture: Art and Commodity in Colonial and Postcolonial Worlds*, eds. Ruth B. Phillips and Christopher B. Steiner (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1999), 295.

Like Ruskin, French theorist and architect Viollet-le-Duc rejected classical forms in favor of pre-Industrial styles.¹⁰⁴ Viollet-le-Duc's assertion that "only primitive sources can furnish the energy for a long career"¹⁰⁵ reflect his beliefs that indigenous art offered a novelty and freshness that traditional European forms lacked.¹⁰⁶ His notion of "organic analogy"—which held that natural organisms offered paradigms of functional and structural expression—paralleled, to some extent, Ruskin's preference for natural forms and his ideas concerning "truth" in design.¹⁰⁷ Furthermore, Viollet-le-Duc believed that the "passive imagination" of primitive peoples, whom he saw as lacking reason, allowed organic form to emerge from function without the obstacle of intellectual thought processes.¹⁰⁸

Viollet-le-Duc's architectural philosophies were grounded in his belief in the purity of structural function (i.e., "structural rationalism") and were not focused, as

¹⁰⁴Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle*, 10 vols. (Paris: B. Bance, A. Morel, 1854-68) and *Entretiens sur l'architecture*, 2 vols. (Paris: A. Morel, 1863-72). As discussed in Chapter Five of this dissertation, Frank Lloyd Wright read and admired some of Viollet-le-Duc's works.

¹⁰⁵Viollet-le-Duc, *Discourses on Architecture*, 2 vols., trans. Henry Van Brunt (Boston: J.R. Osgood., 1875), VI, 227. (This is the English translation of the first ten of the twenty *Entretiens*.)

¹⁰⁶For further discussion of Viollet-le-Duc's thoughts on nature and the primitive, see Martin Bressani, "Notes on Viollet-le-Duc's Philosophy of History: Dialectics and Technology," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 48, no. 4 (December 1989): 339-40, and Donald Hoffmann, "Frank Lloyd Wright and Viollet-le-Duc," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 28, no. 3 (October 1969): 177-83.

¹⁰⁷This is not to say, however, that Ruskin's and Viollet-le-Duc's attitudes toward architecture, and especially architectural preservation, were concordant, as they most definitely were not. Whereas Ruskin stressed the importance of a building's age, Viollet-le-Duc considered a structure's complete history and conducted its restoration under the premise of a unity of style, to the detriment of the other styles found in the building. Leoni, 197-99, and Mark Swenarton, *Artisans and Architects: The Ruskinian Tradition in Architectural Thought* (Basingstoke, Houndmills, UK/London: MacMillan Press, 1989), 15. For further discussion related to Viollet-le-Duc's restoration philosophy, see Bressani, 327-50.

¹⁰⁸Bressani, 339.

Ruskin's were, on a rejection of mechanistic production methods.¹⁰⁹ While both men called for the development of an architectural aesthetic grounded in historical prototypes, Viollet-le-Duc stressed the importance of stylistic “unity,” particularly in restoration projects, where he sought a cohesive end product. To prolong a building's life, moreover, he allowed for the use of new materials (especially metals) to bolster strength.

Unlike Ruskin, Viollet-le-Duc was actively engaged with pre-Columbian art and architecture. He provided the text for French explorer Claude-Joseph Désiré Charnay's *Cités et ruines Américaines. Mitla, Palenqué, Izamal, Chichen-Itza, Uxmal* (1862-63)¹¹⁰ and touched on pre-Columbian architecture in his own *Histoire de l'habitation humaine depuis les temps pré-historiques jusqu'à nos jours* (1874-75).¹¹¹ Charnay's book is an important early “archaeological” study that provides illustrations as well as descriptions of numerous Mesoamerican sites and objects; Viollet-le-Duc's *Histoire de l'habitation* is

¹⁰⁹Scholarly treatments related to Viollet-le-Duc's architectural philosophies and influence on later architects and art movements are numerous. Among those that proved particularly pertinent to this study are: Hoffmann, “Frank Lloyd Wright and Viollet-le-Duc,” Robin D. Middleton, “Viollet-le-Duc's Influence in Nineteenth-Century England,” *Art History* 4, no. 2 (June 1981): 203-19; Bressani, “Notes” and Kevin D. Murphy, *Memory and Modernity: Viollet-le-Duc at Vézelay* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000).

¹¹⁰Claude-Joseph Désiré Charnay, *Cités et ruines Américaines. Mitla, Palenqué, Izamal, Chichen-Itza, Uxmal* (Paris: Gide, 1862-63). For further discussion of Charnay's book, see Chapter Three of this dissertation.

¹¹¹Viollet-le-Duc, *Histoire de l'habitation humaine depuis les temps pré-historiques jusqu'à nos jours*. (Paris: Bibliothèque d'éducation et de récréation, 1874-75), 294-310. Viollet-le-Duc's *Histoire de l'habitation* was translated into English in 1876 by Benjamin Bucknall: *The Habitations of Man in All Ages* (Boston, J.R. Osgood, 1876), and excerpts from the book appeared in popular periodicals during the late nineteenth century. See, for instance: “Originality in American Architecture,” *American Architect and Building News* 3 (5 January 1878): 3. According to Mary N. Woods, Viollet-le-Duc's piece was not the sort of article *American Architect and Building News* normally published. She speculates that “the editors may have felt that Viollet-le-Duc's simple discussion, originally written for laymen with an emphasis on built form as a response to climate, materials, and indigenous traditions, was a useful object lesson for American architects who strained after novel effects.” See Woods, “History in the Early American Architectural Journals,” in *Architectural Historian in America*, ed. MacDougall, 85.

a descriptive exploration of domestic architecture throughout the world, from prehistoric through modern times, and includes a chapter on pre-Columbian (mostly Maya) cultures. At a time when most illustrations of pre-Columbian buildings were presented as ruins,¹¹² Viollet-le-Duc chose, instead, to present the buildings as they might once have been—down to details like textiles draped in doorways,¹¹³ allowing the viewer to see the works in their original (if fictional) glory, eliminating connotations of decay that some associate with ruins, and by extension, to those who made them.¹¹⁴

The story told in *Habitations of Man* is presented from the viewpoints of its fictional protagonists, Epergos (the personification of Progress) and Doxius (who embodies “obstinate adherence to traditional forms and habits”¹¹⁵). These two journey the world critiquing the art and architecture of various societies, some of them ancient American cultures. Chapter 22, “The Nahuas and Toltecs,”¹¹⁶ finds Epergos and Doxius accompanied by a “sage” named Nimak, with whom they share their impressions of

¹¹²Frederick Catherwood, for example, included vegetation embedded in structures and showed some monuments as fragments and/or leaning precariously in his *Views of Ancient Monuments in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan* (New York: Bartlett & Welford, 1844).

¹¹³No Maya textiles have survived intact, although archaeologists have seen evidence for them in some poorly preserved burial contexts, and costumes and draperies of woven and possibly embroidered cloth are depicted in numerous Maya stone carvings and paintings.

¹¹⁴For further discussion of the implication of representing pre-Columbian buildings and sites as ruins, see Chapter Four.

¹¹⁵Viollet-le-Duc, *Habitations*, v.

¹¹⁶Viollet-le-Duc describes Maya sites and ornament here, even though his chapter heading invokes the Nahuatl (i.e., Nahuatl speakers, including the Mexica, who lived in the Central Mexican region from the post-Classic period [c. 1300 AD] through the Spanish Conquest in 1519) and Toltecs (i.e., a dominant Central Mexican people, who flourished from c. 1200 AD through 1400 AD). Viollet-le-Duc also refers to the ancient inhabitants of this region as “Olmecas,” a term that has been used since the sixteenth century AD to denote natives of Mexico’s Gulf Coast. When American archaeology was in its first bloom, such elisions were commonplace.

various sites on the Yucatan Peninsula in Mexico.¹¹⁷ Among other sights, Nimak shows them a “Nahuan Palace” (Figures 2.3 and 2.4); through his characters’ discussion of it, Viollet-le-Duc highlights such “decorative arts” details as the building’s floor—painted, he writes, to resemble a “most magnificent carpet”—and its interior furnishings, which were covered with “strange carvings and paintings and enriched with gold and silver.”¹¹⁸ Epergos apparently is confounded by the building’s conjunction of “simple” plan and proliferate, seemingly superfluous, exterior ornament:

What shocks me in everything is the absence of reasoning; one seems to be in a dream. What then are we to think of the life of these grandees among the Nahuas or Toltecs who live in cells, all exactly alike, just as compartments for animals would be made? And yet these habits, which by implication are so simple, are accompanied by a prodigious exterior show of luxury—a luxury which is simply decorative, and has no concern with any real requirement. We have seen nothing like it on the face of the earth.¹¹⁹

The image of the “Nahuan Palace” that accompanies this section of the text (Figure 2.4) shows a lavishly ornamented building with a repetitive march of vertical masks, geometricized designs and truncated attached columns, typical of Yucatec (Puuc-style) architecture (e.g., Figures 1.10, 1.12 and 2.5). Viollet-le-Duc’s probable point of reference is the Charnay book for which he wrote the text.¹²⁰ Near the structure stands a

¹¹⁷Viollet-le-Duc’s descriptions and illustrations indicate that he is writing about Maya sites on the Yucatan Peninsula.

¹¹⁸Viollet-le-Duc, *Habitations*, 304.

¹¹⁹*Ibid.*, 308.

¹²⁰Charnay, *Cités et ruines Américaines*.

scantly clad, dark-skinned indigene,¹²¹ who—ostensibly included to establish scale—serves to underscore the scene’s exoticism.

From the Yucatan, Epergos and Doxius “diverged westwards, to the shores of the Pacific” where they encountered

populations of harmless disposition, of whiter skin than the Nahuas, subjected to a sacerdotal government, and who appeared to belong to a purer branch of the same race. In this country, as in the peninsula of Yucatheca [sic], there existed an inferior class, brown-skinned, short, robust, and subjected to labour of all kinds.¹²²

They apparently examine a “Peruvian House,” which is identified as such in the caption of an illustration (Figure 2.6), but no textual description is provided¹²³—suggesting that Epergos and Doxius are more intrigued by the skin color and religion of the people than they are by the region’s architecture. Indeed, they dismiss the whole of South America almost immediately:

Despite his regard for authority and dislike for discussion, Doxius himself experienced an excessive weariness amidst these inert populations. There also he attempted to preach; they listened or appeared to listen to him, but his words glided from their minds like water on polished marble. He felt that his labour was thrown away; and, contrary to what was generally the case, it was he who persuaded Epergos to make a move, and to quit this continent.¹²⁴

While Barbara Braun and others have suggested that a wide range of non-Western peoples were more or less undifferentiated in Europe and the United States during the late

¹²¹The man’s attire has little resemblance to the types of clothing and accoutrements worn by the Maya as depicted in art objects. Here the man wears a loincloth and plain, cone-shaped hat, whereas Maya figures featured in the art tend to be elaborately dressed in clothing and headdresses that cover the body and head.

¹²²Viollet-le-Duc, *Habitations*, 309.

¹²³*Ibid.*

¹²⁴*Ibid.*, 310.

nineteenth and early twentieth centuries,¹²⁵ Viollet-le-Duc's segregation of particular groups into separate chapters, based on geographic region, reflects a conceptual (if somewhat banal) division. Similarly, the Mesoamerican and ancient Andean forms and motifs that were co-opted for use in modern architecture generally were used in concert with one another, rather than in combination with design elements drawn from other non-Western peoples, such as Egyptians or even Native Americans. Yet, just as Viollet-le-Duc failed to draw distinctions among the highly varied culture groups of Mesoamerica and the Andes, those who deployed decorative elements and/or structural features drawn from pre-Columbian art and architecture tended to jumble together characteristic forms of disparate cultures within that larger whole, failing to view this practice as the eclecticism that it was.¹²⁶

Pattern Books and Architectural Ornament

Exotic borrowings were encouraged further by popular publications such as *The Grammar of Ornament* (1856),¹²⁷ a pattern book produced by Welsh architect, designer and illustrator Owen Jones (1809-1874), who aimed to provide new sources for an

¹²⁵Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art and the Post-Columbian World: Ancient American Sources of Modern Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1993), 13. See also, Curtis M. Hinsley, "The World as Marketplace: Commodification of the Exotic at the World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893," in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, eds. Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine (Washington, DC/London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), 355.

¹²⁶A more in-depth discussion related to the appearance of pre-Columbian forms and motifs together and in tandem with other cultures occurs in Chapter Five.

¹²⁷Owen Jones, *The Grammar of Ornament, Illustrated by Examples from Various Styles of Ornament*, 2 vols. (London: Day & Son, 1856), 2.

innovative modern architectural style.¹²⁸ Jones gathered ornament cross-culturally and grouped design elements formally (rather than chronologically or geographically), stressing the “universal” qualities of forms based in Nature. Emphasizing the importance of unity, Jones remarks:

I have ventured to hope that, in bringing thus into immediate juxtaposition the many forms of beauty which every style of ornament presents, I might aid in arresting that unfortunate tendency of our time to be content with copying, whilst the fashion lasts, the forms peculiar to any bygone age, without attempting to ascertain, generally completely ignoring, the peculiar circumstances which rendered an ornament beautiful, because it was appropriate, and which as expressive of other wants, when thus transplanted, as entirely fails.¹²⁹

Jones echoes both Ruskin (in emphasizing appropriate uses of ornament based in Nature for the sake of beauty) and Viollet-le-Duc (in stressing unity), yet the irony of producing a book of patterns hoping to deter “copying” and decontextualization of form does not escape him:

It is more than probable that the first result of sending forth to the world this collection will be seriously to increase this dangerous tendency, and that many will be content to borrow from the past those forms of beauty which have not already been used up *ad nauseum*. It has been my desire to arrest this tendency, and to awaken a higher ambition.¹³⁰

Jones implores the student of design to “endeavour to search out the thoughts which have been expressed in so many different languages,”¹³¹ since such “thoughts,” originating in nature, are a binding force that links various cultures. Still, aware that

¹²⁸Architects’ and designers’ use of pattern books such as this indicates a binary structure-ornament approach that has become commonplace in architecture since the 1830s. For further discussion see Chapter Six.

¹²⁹Jones, 1.

¹³⁰Ibid.

¹³¹Ibid., 2.

artists, architects and designers will continue to copy without regard for the “universal” laws of nature, Jones provides a wide range of motifs (Oceanic, “South American,” Egyptian, Assyrian and Persian, Greek, Pompeian, Roman, Byzantine, Arabian and Turkish) in oversized color plates in the hope that those so inclined will at least copy novel forms. He includes a few examples of pre-Columbian motifs—designs taken from Yucatec architecture as well as ceramics at the British Museum—but these are rendered in black and white.¹³²

The Aesthetic Movement: Appropriating East and Non-West

The long shadows of both Ruskin and Viollet-le-Duc fell across the dominant art movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as well as across the Atlantic. The Aesthetic movement—which originated in England in the 1870s and soon spread to the United States¹³³—was much more strongly imprinted by Ruskin’s ideas than Viollet-le-Duc’s, however.¹³⁴ As Roger B. Stein observes, the Aesthetic movement “encouraged

¹³²Jones’s pre-Columbian illustrations include nineteen black-and-white drawings of step frets and other geometric designs (two labeled “From Yucatan” and seventeen labeled “Ornaments from Mexican Pottery in the British Museum”), n.p.

¹³³The Philadelphia Centennial Exposition of 1876 promoted the Aesthetic movement in the United States. A 1986 exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, detailed its rise. See Doreen Burke et al., *In Pursuit of Beauty: Americans and the Aesthetic Movement* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1986). For a more general account of the Aesthetic movement in the United States, see Carter Ratcliff, “Aestheticism Then and Now,” *Art in America* 75, no. 2 (February 1987): 90, and Roger B. Stein, “The Aesthetic Craze,” *ARTnews* 85, no. 10 (December 1986): 100-105.

¹³⁴Artists, designers and writers including Owen Jones, Christopher Dresser (1834-1904), Charles Locke Eastlake (1836-1906), Edward William Godwin (1833-86), and Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin (1812-52), as well as various members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, propelled the formation of the Aesthetic movement as well. See Burke et al., 20.

Major works dealing with the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and their influence on the Aesthetic movement include: Elizabeth Prettejohn, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites* (Princeton:

the aesthetic appropriation of all cultures, past and present, East and West, to the needs of an idealized and reified conception of beauty . . . with powerful implications for the twentieth century.”¹³⁵ Artists and designers under its sway emphasized “art for art’s sake,” and were not terribly interested in moral or social matters.¹³⁶ They did, however, stress the potential artfulness of consumer goods made for household use—furniture, metalwork, ceramics, stained glass, textiles, wallpapers, and even books—in the conviction that well-designed everyday objects could bring beauty to the lives of common people (though their decorative schemes were sometimes incredibly elaborate productions that were beyond the means of average consumers¹³⁷).

Proponents of the Aesthetic movement were, according to Carter Ratcliffe, eager to harmonize “wildly assorted cultures and periods” no matter how geographically and/or temporally distant.¹³⁸ The result, Ratcliffe writes, was a proud eclecticism,¹³⁹ in which diverse sources mingled.

A monument of the Aesthetic movement that exerted great influence was James Abbott McNeill Whistler’s *Harmony in Blue and Gold*, a reconception of interior designer Thomas Jeckyll’s installations in the London dining room of Frederick R.

Princeton University Press, 2000), and Prettejohn, ed., *After the Pre-Raphaelites: Art and Aestheticism in Victorian England* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999).

¹³⁵Stein, 102.

¹³⁶James D. Kornwolf, “American Architecture and the Aesthetic Movement,” in Burke et. al., 341.

¹³⁷Stein, 100. The works that the American Aesthetic artists produced were too expensive for the average American, rendering their attempts to beautify the average American home ultimately unsuccessful.

¹³⁸Ratcliff, “Aestheticism Then and Now,” 97.

¹³⁹*Ibid.*, 93.

Leyland (1832-92), undertaken in 1876-77.¹⁴⁰ Designed by Jeckyll for the display of Leyland's Chinese porcelain collection, the room originally featured dark wood paneling and antique leather wall coverings, which Whistler transformed with turquoise paint and ornamented with gold, platinum and silver peacocks and peacock feathers, which cover the wall and ceilings.¹⁴¹ Subsequently known as the "Peacock Room," it was acquired by U.S. railway magnate Charles Lange Freer (1854-1919) in 1904, and was reconstructed in the Freer Gallery in Washington, D.C., after his death (Figure 2.7).

Whistler was an early advocate of *Japonisme*, a movement that arose during the late nineteenth century in both Europe and the United States, as Japanese decorative arts became wildly popular with Western consumers and Japanese modes of depiction inflected Western painting styles.¹⁴² With the re-opening of Japan to the West in 1854 (it had been closed to Westerners since 1641 by the ruling shogunate), Japanese prints and decorative objects appeared in Europe and the United States, where—by the 1870s—they were enthusiastically collected and displayed.¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰For an in-depth background and description of the Whistler's commission and the room, see Linda Merrill, *The Peacock Room: A Cultural Biography* (Washington, D.C./New Haven/London: Freer Gallery of Art/Yale University Press, 1998).

¹⁴¹See John Winter and Elisabeth West FitzHugh, "Some Technical Notes on Whistler's 'Peacock Room'," *Studies in Conservation* 30, no. 4 (November 1985): 149.

¹⁴²The impact of Japanese aesthetics spread to other artforms through at least the early decades of the twentieth century. Frank Lloyd Wright, as one notable example (that nonetheless falls outside the purview of the current study), rendered a number of Japanese-inflected designs in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. See Kevin Nute, *Frank Lloyd Wright and Japan: The Role of Traditional Japanese Art and Architecture in the Work of Frank Lloyd Wright* (London/Glasgow/New York: Chapman & Hall, 1993).

¹⁴³See Julia Meech-Pekarik and Gabriel P. Weisberg, *Japonisme Comes to America: The Graphic Arts 1876-1925* (New York/New Brunswick, NJ: Harry N. Abrams/Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, 1990); Siegfried Wichmann, *Japonisme: The Japanese Influence on Western Art since 1858*, trans. Mary Whittall, et al. (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1999), and Gabriel P. Weisberg and Yvonne M. L. Weisberg, *Japonisme: An*

In the United States, *Japonisme*—along with the Aesthetic movement—instigated a more general interest in non-European art, which helps account for the heightened appreciation, in the late nineteenth century, for “native antiques.” Though Barbara Braun asserts that pre-Columbian and Japanese imagery would have been viewed by most as interchangeable in their foreignness,¹⁴⁴ the burgeoning late-nineteenth-century interest in ancient America probably relates as well to rising nationalism. As pre-Columbian decorative motifs became better known in the United States—through a whole series of publications, and their prominent display at the World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893, other such fairs and in museums—ancient American motifs began to replace Japanese inspirations in the decorative schema developed by the American Aesthetic movement—in the form of what James D. Kornwolf describes as “flat, intricate ornamental detailing—with rich surfaces but simple, rectilinear proportions.”¹⁴⁵ For instance, an elaborately decorated room in the Annex to the Pan-American Union Building (Figure 2.8, now Organization of American States, Albert Kelsey and Paul P. Crét, 1910-1912), recalls earlier Aesthetic movement interiors, but features elaborate rectilinear and figural designs derived from the Maya of Mesoamerica, and repetitive floral designs based on those of Chimú in the Andes, as well as a small number of generically rendered pre-Columbian motifs.

Annotated Bibliography (New Brunswick, NJ/New York: International Center for Japonisme/Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey/Garland Publishers, 1990). For the impact of Christopher Dresser on the *Japonisme* craze in the United States in the late nineteenth century, see Widar Halén, “Dresser and Japan,” in *Shock of the Old: Christopher Dresser’s Design Revolution*, ed. Michael Whiteway (New York/London: Cooper-Hewett, National Design Museum, Smithsonian Institution/V&A Publications, 2004), 127-39.

¹⁴⁴Braun, 36.

¹⁴⁵Kornwolf, 342-43.

Arts and Crafts Movement: Beauty in the Everyday

Like followers of the Aesthetic movement, artists of the (contemporaneous yet longer-lived) Arts and Crafts movement—inspired by the ideals and social activism of artist/designer William Morris (1834-96)—emphasized beauty in the everyday, and sought both integrated interiors and unorthodox sources.¹⁴⁶ Unlike the Aesthetic artists (and more like Viollet-le-Duc), Morris vaunted Gothic forms, though he was more interested in the “purity” of pre-Industrialized production than in Viollet-le-Duc’s structural rationalism. And while Morris and his followers did emphasize form and structure over surface ornament, they tended to equate craftsmanship and the use of natural materials with moral goodness, to the detriment of machine production and the sorts of modern materials Viollet-le-Duc praised.

Like Ruskin, Morris was convinced that good art could reform society¹⁴⁷ and his displeasure with machine-made, mass-produced furnishings and decorative elements motivated his formation in 1861, of a cooperative firm that specialized in high-quality, handcrafted works: Morris, Marshall & Faulkner, Fine Art Workmen in Painting, Carving, Furniture, and the Metals.¹⁴⁸ Morris’s designs, although comprehensive in their

¹⁴⁶See William Morris, *The Decorative Arts: Their Relation To Modern Life And Progress, An Address Delivered Before the Trades' Guild of Learning* [4 December 1877] (London: Ellis and White, 1877). For Morris’s philosophies on art and society, see Linda Parry, ed., *William Morris* (London: Philip Wilson, 1996), and Diane Waggoner, ed., *The Beauty of Life: William Morris and the Art of Design* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2003).

¹⁴⁷Scholars often point out the overlap between the Aesthetic and Arts and Crafts movements. See, for example, the essays in Burke et al., *In Pursuit of Beauty*.

¹⁴⁸Along with the named partners of William Morris’s firm, Sir Edward Burne-Jones (1833-98), Philip Webb (1831-1915), Gabriel Dante Rossetti (1828-1882) and Ford Madox Brown (1821-93) also participated to varying degrees.

ornamentation of interior spaces, speak to his desire to maintain simplicity of form as well as a harmony between the built environment and nature.

By the late nineteenth century, Arts and Crafts tenets made their way to the United States, where emphases on progress and modern inventions led to a more widespread acceptance of the machine and its role in arts production than Morris would have liked.¹⁴⁹ The Gothic forms Morris loved were, in the United States, often supplanted by other sorts of pre-Industrialized production, including indigenous “Red Indian Art”—a term used with frequency in *The Craftsman* magazine edited by Gustav Stickley, and one that encompassed both North American Indian artifacts and the art and architecture of pre-Columbian Mesoamerica and the Andes.¹⁵⁰

According to Barbara Braun, Morris’s writings—along with those of Ruskin—were instrumental in formulating the Euro-American notion of “primitivism”:

Primitivizing begins here [with Morris]: the artisan was instructed to project himself into the place of the ancient worker and to do the thing as it was done in the beginning, pursuing the primal instinct for art, without its sophistication.¹⁵¹

While designers affiliated with the Aesthetic movement also referenced “primitive” sources, they did so in eclectic profusion, whereas Ruskin, Morris and their followers advocated more harmonious alliances.

¹⁴⁹Although a disdain for the machine and its products is associated with the British Arts and Crafts movement, some of Morris’s followers in England, such as Charles Robert Ashbee (1863-1942), saw the machine as an inevitable part of modern life, and, instead of fighting its use, encouraged mastery of things mechanical. See Nikolaus Pevsner, *Pioneers of Modern Design: From William Morris to Walter Gropius*, intro. Richard Weston (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2005), 17-18, and Michael Fitzsimmons, Ann Yaffe Phillips and James L. Reinisch, “foreword,” to *From Architecture to Object: Masterworks of the American Arts & Crafts Movement*, ed. Sheila Schwartz (New York: Hirschl & Adler Galleries, 1989), 7.

¹⁵⁰Braun, 37.

¹⁵¹*Ibid.*, 38.

The increased appreciation of the “primitive” in the United States manifested itself most directly in a rising appreciation for and collection of pre-Columbian and Native American works—an enthusiasm Braun links to the American Arts and Crafts movement’s elevation of unique, handmade objects.

It was only in the second half of the nineteenth century that the aesthetic interest in pre-Columbian forms moved from the margins to the center of consciousness in the West, after the decorative arts were elevated to the status of fine arts as a result of the crusades of John Ruskin and William Morris.¹⁵²

While Braun implies that pre-Columbian objects were considered part of the “decorative arts,” others disagree with this categorization. Marvin Cahodas, for example, sees the increased value placed on indigenous American art at this time as related to their status as “curiosities,” rather than their aesthetic qualities:

Native curios were privileged in bourgeois parlor decoration as metonymic representations of the premodern, their significations enhanced by the handmade production and utilitarian function, two aspects of the premodern also valorized in the contemporary American Arts and Crafts movement.¹⁵³

Whether elevated as aesthetic objects or appreciated as curiosities, pre-Columbian objects gained value in conjunction with the Arts and Crafts movement’s U.S. rise.

Frank Lloyd Wright is often linked to the Arts and Crafts movement by virtue of the “simplicity” of his designs, as well as his use of rectilinear forms, his integral attention to structure and nature, and his tendency to design every aspect

¹⁵²Ibid., 36.

¹⁵³Marvin Cohodas, “Elizabeth Hickox and Karuk Basketry: A Case Study in Debates on Innovation and Paradigms of Authenticity,” in *Unpacking Culture: Art and Commodity in Colonial and Postcolonial Worlds*, eds. Phillips and Steiner, 148.

of the environments he created.¹⁵⁴ These inclinations can be seen in Wright's pre-Columbian appropriations of the 1920s, including the Ennis-Brown house in Los Angeles (1924), the façade of which features repetitive rectilinear designs (Figures 2.9 and 2.10).¹⁵⁵

Like Ruskin and Morris, Wright held complex beliefs about how specific designs could help reform society.¹⁵⁶ But while Morris vaunted the Gothic as the pre-Industrial mode *par excellence*, Wright distanced himself from European paradigms as he worked to develop a uniquely American personal style. He sought to integrate his buildings with surrounding landscapes, and was particularly interested in using the land and its inherent features (e.g., large boulders) as integral components of his designs.¹⁵⁷

Art Nouveau: New Materials, Sinuous Lines

Like their predecessors, proponents of the Art Nouveau style (which emerged around 1890 and continued through World War I¹⁵⁸) emphasized the importance of

¹⁵⁴Wright's connections to the Arts and Crafts movement are discussed in numerous sources. Examples particularly relevant to this study include Robert L. Sweeney, *Wright in Hollywood: Visions of a New Architecture* (New York/Cambridge, MA/London: Architectural History Foundation/MIT Press, 1994), xvii; Braun, 297; Curtis, 49, 75-90.

Anthony Alofsin, however, successfully highlights the problems and complexities of Wright's relationship to the Arts and Crafts movement, in *Frank Lloyd Wright, the Lost Years, 1910-1922: A Study of Influence* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 19-24.

¹⁵⁵Wright's pre-Columbian-inflected designs are discussed in detail in Chapter Five.

¹⁵⁶See Alofsin, especially pp. 92-100, 121, 153 and 306.

¹⁵⁷Some of these seeming similarities to the Arts and Crafts movement overlap with affinities Hoffmann notes between Wright and Viollet-le-Duc. Both architects, for example, emphasized unity or harmony of design (175-76), and both stressed the role of the organic in their designs (177-83).

¹⁵⁸Sources differ regarding the dates of the Art Nouveau style. Paul Greenhalgh, for example, assigns the style a beginning date of 1893—based on Aubrey Beardsley's cover design for the

interior design and drew on a variety of nontraditional sources, incorporating forms and motifs from many of the same non-Western cultures (e.g., Japanese, Islamic) while exploring some untapped sources (e.g., Celtic and Viking art).¹⁵⁹ Art Nouveau designers also exploited natural forms, some rendering them in an organic, curvilinear manner, with others transforming them by way of rectilinear stylizations.¹⁶⁰

While there are significant similarities between the Aesthetic, Arts and Crafts and Art Nouveau movements, the last is distinguished by its Symbolist dimensions, and most particularly by its suggestions of the sensual and erotic via natural forms presented as manifestations of the psyche. While the Arts and Crafts movement was grounded in social activism and the belief that art could aid in society's reform, Art Nouveau artists tended to be interested in metaphysical and psychological realms—in part as a reaction against the materialism of the modern age.¹⁶¹

Practitioners of Art Nouveau, like their Arts and Crafts counterparts, put a high premium on stylistic unification, and worked in many media, from architecture to

first issue of the English periodical, *The Studio* that appeared that year. He notes that works exhibiting Art Nouveau style appeared much earlier, but were devoid of philosophical underpinnings. See Greenhalgh, "Art Nouveau, 1890-1914," *Magazine Antiques* (1971) 157, no. 4 (April 2000): 619. Nikolaus Pevsner (81) dates Art Nouveau's origin to an 1883 book cover design by Arthur Heygote Mackmurdo.

¹⁵⁹Louis H. Sullivan (1856-1924), for example, employed Celtic designs in some of his architectural ornament. See National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, "Conversation with Chief of Exhibitions D. Dodge Thompson," in *Anatomy of an Exhibition: Art Nouveau, 1890-1914*, http://www.nga.gov/feature/nouveau/concept_dodge.shtm. Many Norwegian designers (e.g., Gerhard Munthe) employed imagery from recently excavated Viking funerary ships. See Greenhalgh, 624.

¹⁶⁰Bevis Hillier sees the curvilinear Art Nouveau style as older and centered in France, and the rectilinear style as newer (beginning in 1909) with roots in Charles Rennie Mackintosh and the Glasgow School of Art. See *The Style of the Century* (London: Herbert Press, 1998), 44.

¹⁶¹Greenhalgh, 623.

jewelry. Taking cues from Viollet-le-Duc, Art Nouveau designers embraced new materials—especially iron, steel and ceramic panels—and, as their work gained adherents in major cities throughout Europe and the United States,¹⁶² the movement’s aesthetic infiltrated everyday Western culture much more effectively than had those of the Aesthetic or Arts and Crafts movements. Timothy Pflueger’s San Francisco skyscraper at 450 Sutter Street (Figures 2.11 – 2.14), which reflects the impact of Art Nouveau in its sinuous ornament rendered in metal, incorporates ornamental components derived from the Maya, Mexica and Xochicalco. The building’s design—itsself a feathered serpent with scrolling patterns adorning the façade that suggest the markings of a snake and curved awning at the entranceway, signifying an open mouth—recalls the Maya.¹⁶³ The etched and relief metalwork in the building’s foyer is an eclectic concoction based on several pre-Columbian styles.¹⁶⁴ Its stepped ceiling is reminiscent of the set-back structures typical of the Maya (such as Temple I at Tikal, Figure 1.5), while the scrolling floral and geometric patterns punctuated with interior circles that cover the elevator doors and other doors in the foyer are typical of Palenque. These doors also feature undulating serpentine forms that recall depictions of the feathered serpent at Xochicalco, and those

¹⁶²Art Nouveau took on different names and slightly different, yet similar veins, throughout Europe. In connection with the National Gallery of Art “Art Nouveau, 1890-1914” exhibition, curator Paul Greenhalgh observes: “A whole set of principles were held in common across the face of the style, but it took on a local flavor everywhere as well; it reflected the ethnic conditions of the places in which it appeared. So it’s impossible to mistake what happened in Chicago for what happened in Brussels, but at the same time, you see they’re related.” National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, “Conversation with Victoria & Albert Curator Paul Greenhalgh, in *Anatomy of an Exhibition: Art Nouveau, 1890-1914*, http://www.nga.gov/feature/nouveau/concept_paul.shtm.

¹⁶³Catherine Docter (personal communication, January 2003).

¹⁶⁴Much of the interior designs seem to be based upon the drawings in Herbert J. Spinden, *A Study of Maya Art: Its Subject Matter and Historic Development* (1913; repr., New York: Dover, 1975).

fronting the elevator have stylized and somewhat Europeanized versions of the Mexica Sun Stone image. Faces similar to those seen on the Copan breastplates illustrated in Herbert J. Spinden's *Study of Maya Art* (1913) adorn the ceiling and the interior area above the front entranceway.¹⁶⁵ Other foyer motifs that closely resemble images illustrated by Spinden are shields, cross shapes and hatched designs. Particularly striking is the nearly exact replication at 450 Sutter of Spinden's "Serpent Bird"¹⁶⁶ from Palenque¹⁶⁷ (Figure 2.15), also in the area above the entranceway. Double-headed feathered serpents, heads and more scrolled and geometricized ornament derived from Spinden's drawings of both Maya and Mexica motifs further adorn this area.¹⁶⁸

Art Deco and Pre-Columbian Appropriations

While connections between pre-Columbian appropriations and the Aesthetic, Arts and Crafts and Art Nouveau movements are undeniable, those who have written about pre-Columbian-inflected buildings have most commonly categorized them as Art Deco.¹⁶⁹ Some aspects of pre-Columbian architecture are quite similar to those favored

¹⁶⁵Ibid., 17, 47.

¹⁶⁶Ibid., 60.

¹⁶⁷Spinden's drawing is similar to, but not an exact replication of, the bird depicted in the main panel at the Temple of the Cross at Palenque.

¹⁶⁸The central head and surrounding elements located above the entranceway to the left of the "Serpent Bird," for example, are similar to Spinden's drawings in *A Study of Maya Art* (1913, pp. 55, 67) of the "Two-headed Dragon" from Palenque. The vertical shapes in front of the opaque window represent an amalgam of motifs based on Spinden's illustrations, especially those he believes "may represent falling water" from Quirigua and Palenque (1913, p. 67).

¹⁶⁹See, for instance, Ingle, *Mayan Revival Style*, Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art*, and, David Gebhard, *The National Trust Guide to Art Deco in America* (New York: Preservation Press/John Wiley & Sons, 1996).

by Art Deco designers (e.g., geometric ornament, seemingly eclectic assemblages, cut-out relief, blocky massing and stepped forms¹⁷⁰) and certainly several characteristics of pre-Columbian appropriation—as employed in U.S. architecture—parallel characteristic Art Deco elements (most notably both styles’ repetitive, eclectic and oftentimes geometricized ornament, unconventional building materials and/or use of bright colors).¹⁷¹ Such stylistic intersections occurred, for instance, in the flagship building for the S. H. Kress Department Store on Fifth Avenue in New York City (Edward Sibbert, 1935, demolished in 1980) with its white marble façade and use of applied ornament (though here a bit sparser than was typical) of the Art Deco style.¹⁷² The pre-Columbian elements of the Kress store occurred in its use of Maya-like glyphs on the façade as well as bas-relief European-style depictions of Maya deities on walls inside the front entrance,¹⁷³ executed by New York sculptor René Paul Chambellan (1893-1955),¹⁷⁴ the

¹⁷⁰Scholars have largely dismissed the question of pre-Columbian influence as a basis for stepped structures in the United States, instead citing zoning laws (first passed in New York City in 1916), which called for the set-back upper floors in order to allow more light to penetrate the street level. Rosemarie Haag Bletter, for example, writes, “In Art Deco crafts the frequent stepped design of appliances and furniture is assumed to derive from Mayan or Aztec pyramids. Similar stepped formations in architecture, on the other hand, depend more likely on the New York City zoning law that required such setbacks.” See Bletter, “The Art Deco Style,” in Cervin Robinson and Rosemarie Haag Bletter, *Skyscraper Style: Art Deco New York* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), 63.

¹⁷¹*Ibid.*, especially pp. 37-40. See also, Patricia Bayer, *Art Deco Architecture: Design, Decoration and Detail from the Twenties and Thirties* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2001), especially pp. 7-12, and Gebhard, *National Trust Guide*, 4.

¹⁷²For an in-depth discussion on the New York Kress Department store, see Bernice L. Thomas, *America’s 5 & 10 Cent Stores: The Kress Legacy* (Washington, D.C./New York/Chichester: National Building Museum/Preservation Press/John Wiley & Sons, 1997), esp. chap. five, “New York/Fifth Avenue.”

¹⁷³Both figures are illustrated in Thomas, *5 & 10*, 128-29.

¹⁷⁴*Ibid.*, 126.

same designer of another pre-Columbian appropriation: the Shrine of the Little Flower in Royal Oak, Michigan by Henry J. McGill and Talbot F. Hamlin of 1929. Instead of actual Maya symbols, however, the Kress store's take-offs featured images of merchandise it offered for sale, such as an outstretched hand with ring, indicating jewelry and gloves (Figure 2.16).¹⁷⁵ In total, there were thirty-five Maya "glyphs" (some duplicates) depicting items sold in the store.¹⁷⁶ Thomas raises the question about why S. H. Kress & Co. would have used Maya motifs in their flagship store, speculating that Samuel Kress's connection to the Freemasons—his own Masonic lodge in New York associated with Mexico—may have helped spawn a personal interest in pre-Columbian cultures.¹⁷⁷

Since the first pre-Columbian appropriations appeared nearly two decades before the widely accepted starting point of Art Deco¹⁷⁸—the 1925 "Exhibition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industriels Modernes" in Paris—Patricia Bayer rightly notes that the style she calls "Mayan Revival" is "less a subcategory of the larger style and more a self-sufficient though not entirely separate movement."¹⁷⁹ Her point is borne out by examination of specific buildings such as the Pan-American Union complex of 1910,

¹⁷⁵Ingle, v.

¹⁷⁶Thomas, *5 & 10*, 127.

¹⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 130-31.

¹⁷⁸Bletter notes that while some scholars place the beginnings of the Art Deco movement in the first decades of the twentieth century, most agree on 1925 as a "central date" for the style. "Art Deco Style," 75, n.18.

¹⁷⁹Bayer, 16.

which substantially predates Art Deco and—despite being peppered with Mesoamerican and Andean elements—is largely Beaux-Arts in design (Figures 2.17 and 2.18).

Pre-Columbian Appropriations and “Revivals”

In addition to the exotic elements that punctuated products of the Aesthetic, Arts and Crafts, Art Nouveau and Art Deco movements, exoticism in Western architecture of the modern period (i.e., from the eighteenth through early twentieth centuries) manifested itself in a variety of themed styles, including Egyptian Revival, Pueblo Deco, Colonial Revival and Spanish Colonial.¹⁸⁰ While these represent minor architectural styles, they are significant to this study of pre-Columbian appropriations in their similarly eclectic treatment of borrowings from the past. These styles, like pre-Columbian appropriation, overlap with dominant art movements and—in the cases of Egyptian Revival and Pueblo

¹⁸⁰While the Egyptian Revival and Pueblo Deco have closest affinities to pre-Columbian appropriations, I include Colonial Revival and Spanish Colonial Revival styles here for their use of unconventional sources, eclectic assemblages of past styles and claims to a re-emergence of forms and motifs rooted in a place separated in time from those employing the sources.

Literature on the Colonial Revival style (the dates of which—1880s to World War II—overlap with those of pre-Columbian appropriation) is abundant. The book published from William B. Rhoads’s dissertation, *The Colonial Revival*, 2 vols. (London/New York: Garland, 1977), is closely aligned with the current study in its focus on the “appeal the revival had for Americans in search of a native style, or a style identifiable as that of their ancestors” (xxxxiii). See also, Keith N. Morgan and Richard Cheek, “History in the Service of Design: American Architect-Historians, 1870-1940” in *Architectural Historian in America*, ed. MacDougall, 62.

The Spanish Colonial Revival style shares with pre-Columbian appropriation its Southern California heartland as well as a loose correlation of dates (c.1915-c.1930). It is considered to be an ancestral style in much the same way pre-Columbian appropriations are. David Gebhard expands the definition of Spanish Colonial Revival to include, for instance, the Chicago Secessionists, and discusses a number of pre-Columbian appropriations in “The Spanish Colonial Revival in Southern California (1895-1930),” *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 26, no. 2 (May 1967): 145-47. See also, David Gebhard and Robert Winter, *A Guide to Architecture in Los Angeles and Southern California* (Santa Barbara, CA/Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, 1977), especially pp. 15-19; Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art*, 157; and Elizabeth Jean McMillian, *California Colonial: The Spanish and Rancho Revival Styles* (Atglen, PA: Schiffer, 2002).

Deco in particular—are sometimes categorized as “Art Deco.” Because of their non-European sources, Egyptian Revival, Pueblo Deco and pre-Columbian appropriation have the closest affinities among these substyles.

According to architectural historian Richard G. Carrott, the Egyptian Revival in its architectural form¹⁸¹ yielded “some major¹⁸² structures in a wide geographical range of American cities within the years 1808-1858.”¹⁸³ While most of these were funerary, the Egyptian Revival style is also seen in other building types (Figure 2.19). The discovery of King Tutankhamen’s tomb in 1922 reinvigorated Western interest in Egypt, and fueled a second revival style in U.S. architecture,¹⁸⁴ this one often placed under the rubric of “Art Deco.”

Similarities between Egyptian Revival style architecture and pre-Columbian appropriation reside in their mutual evocation and manipulation of “exotic” source material¹⁸⁵ as well as in their architects’ endeavors to wrest modern “innovation” from ancient, but culturally unfamiliar, forms and motifs. Archaeological discoveries

¹⁸¹Carrott notes, “The actual emergence of the Egyptian mode as an independent style of its own occurs in the work of John Haviland (1792-1852) who is the Egyptian Revival architect par excellence” (66). Mills Lane discusses the use of Egyptian styles in “Christian” or funerary architecture. See *Architecture of the Old South* (Savannah, GA: Beehive Press; New York/London/Paris: Abbeville Press, 1993), 264-67.

¹⁸²Carrott’s comments about the discussion that ensued surrounding the use of “pagan” artforms in Christian contexts (83), echo reviews of Robert B. Stacy-Judd’s Maya-inspired First Baptist Church (now Ventura County Church of Religious Science, Ventura, CA, 1928-31). See, for example, “Church Building Working Plans,” *Journal of Commerce* (11 September 1930): n.p.

¹⁸³Carrott, 2.

¹⁸⁴See James Stevens Curl, *The Egyptian Revival: Ancient Egypt as the Inspiration for Design Motifs in the West* (Abingdon, England: Routledge, 2005).

¹⁸⁵Carrott discusses the Egyptian style as belonging to the Rococo Picturesque in its attitudes of “novelty, variety, exotica and ‘bizzarria’” (26).

propelled both styles, as did the proliferation of illustrated publications and waves of public excitement and curiosity that followed in each case.¹⁸⁶ Architects, designers and patrons of both styles often went to great lengths to include accurately rendered elements¹⁸⁷—applied eclectically as ornament or in massing details—as opposed to duplicating, for example, an entire building or part of the plan.¹⁸⁸

Carrott attributes the decline of the Egyptian Revival style to its “unfunctional” aspects—including small, windowless spaces and flat roofs—and to the “heathen associations” that Egyptian forms had for U.S. audiences.¹⁸⁹ A similar lack of practicality and comfort in actual pre-Columbian structures (small, unconnected rooms and diminutive or nonexistent windows) explains the rejection of their floor plans, even as applied ornament drawn from pre-Columbian sources was popular.

The architectural style Carla Breeze and Marcus Whiffen dubbed “Pueblo Deco” (Figure 2.20)¹⁹⁰ was born and developed in the southwestern region of the United States,

¹⁸⁶The earlier Egyptian Revival resulted from Napoleon Bonaparte’s late-eighteenth-century campaign into Egypt. Pre-Columbian appropriations began appearing shortly after archaeological expeditions increased in Mesoamerican and Andean regions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. See Chapter Three of this dissertation.

¹⁸⁷Carrott’s discussion of potential sources of Egyptian imagery in U.S. architecture indicates that those involved in these structures conducted (sometimes extensive) research (see especially pp. 17-29).

¹⁸⁸*Ibid.*, 130.

¹⁸⁹*Ibid.*, 136.

¹⁹⁰The style is variously called Pueblo Deco, Spanish Pueblo Revival or Pueblo Revival. Gebhard and Winter use “Pueblo Revival” in *Guide to Architecture*, 23. Carla Breeze, co-author and author of books on the “Pueblo Deco” [Marcus Whiffen and Carla Breeze, *Pueblo Deco: The Art Deco Architecture of the Southwest* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984), and Carla Breeze, *Pueblo Deco* (New York: Rizzoli, 1990)], also calls the style “Spanish Pueblo revival” in her *American Art Deco: Architecture and Regionalism* (New York/London: W. W. Norton & Co., 2003), 186.

where the Native American buildings that inspired it are found. Pueblo Deco's peak coincided with that of Art Deco, and David Gebhard and Robert Winter, writing of the similarities between Pueblo Deco and pre-Columbian appropriations, connect both to the "try anything" spirit at play in the development of U.S. architecture in the 1920s.¹⁹¹ In addition to their mutual usage of "exotic" forms and motifs in eclectic assemblages, Pueblo Deco and pre-Columbian appropriation may both be linked to nationalistic agendas that emphasized indigenous American forms in the creation of a new U.S. aesthetic.

The terms "Egyptian Revival," "Pueblo Revival" and "pre-Columbian Revival" for U.S. architectural styles call into question the general use of the word "revival." According to Carrott, a revival "evoke(s) an image of earlier models,"¹⁹² but "is not simply a copy of something from the original period. Specific motifs may be based on ancient details, but it can be said that exact replicas of entire structures hardly exist."¹⁹³ Elaborating upon this point, Carrott reverses the "new wine in old bottles" metaphor that Heinrich Wölfflin used in describing the Romantic Classic period¹⁹⁴ (which he considered a revival):

Thus the first question of what makes a revival building is in itself subdivided into the consideration of what parts are old and what elements

¹⁹¹Gebhard and Winter write, "The spirit of the twenties recognized that architecture, like the other arts, is an art of effect. If the effect is good, try anything. Perhaps this explains the Pueblo Revival and the pre-Columbian Revival, both of which also occurred in the twenties" (23).

¹⁹²Carrott, 10.

¹⁹³Ibid., 5.

¹⁹⁴Heinrich Wölfflin, *The Sense of Form in Art: A Comparative Psychological Study*, trans. Alice Muehsam and Norma A. Shatan (New York: Chelsea, 1958), 13.

are new. This is the meaning of Heinrich Wölfflin's "new wine in old bottles."

The law here is that of current needs and tastes. Wölfflin's metaphor might be reversed, if the question is considered in terms of the changes in form, to read "old wine in new bottles." The taste is the same, but the bottle has changed its shape. Whichever way the metaphor reads, the point is: the new attitude is of greater significance than the links to the past.¹⁹⁵

Webster's Dictionary provides several definitions of the term "revival" that relate to Carrott's use, including "renewed attention to or interest in something," and "a new presentation or publication of something old."¹⁹⁶ The terms "renewed" and "old" in *Webster's* definitions suggest an already-established affinity to whatever it is that is being revisited or re-presented. Carrott's evocation of "images of *earlier* models," also suggests a more-than-superficial knowledge of those models, since at the most basic level one must know that that which is being evoked was represented in the past. The context of this representation is what is lost in the use of the term "revival," which implies a reappearance of a form and motif in the totality of its original sense.

As this chapter's discussion of primitivism has shown, "appropriation" is the more accurate term to describe the architectural style at issue in this study. Pre-Columbian appropriations, borrowing from indigenous American art forms for use in a new Western aesthetic, exploited notions of the "exotic," but also occurred in an era of heightened nationalism (thus highlighting the indigenous aspect of pre-Columbian *exotica*), and at a time when decorative and vernacular art forms received greater appreciation. As the twentieth century approached, Western artists, designers and architects desired to develop new styles using unorthodox sources as inspirations. In so

¹⁹⁵Carrott, 9-10.

¹⁹⁶*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th ed. (2003), s.v. "Revival".

doing, they turned to the past for inspiration; some also ventured outside familiar cultural constructs. The brief period that witnessed the use of pre-Columbian aesthetics in U.S. architecture represents, then, a serendipitous dovetailing of social and art historical trends.

Chapter Three: Sources of the Pre-Columbian through the Early Twentieth Century

In all instances the buildings were shown surrounded and overgrown with dense jungle. I stared at each picture, fascinated. It was the most interesting, most entrancing subject imaginable. I turned to the title page and read “Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan.” By John L. Stevens [sic], 1841. For some unaccountable reason, I suddenly knew I wanted those books more than anything on earth.

--Robert B. Stacy-Judd, “The Autobiography of an Architect”¹⁹⁷

Beginning in the nineteenth century, the U.S. public gradually became aware of the pre-Columbian cultures of Mesoamerica and the Andes through increased exposure in books and articles as well as through exhibits at world’s fairs and museums. With this increased attention, some U.S. architects and artists searched out inspiration for new designs in ancient monuments and artifacts, while others simply borrowed from the pre-Columbian source material that was readily at hand.

My review of available pre-Columbian sources in this chapter aims not only to provide a foundation for identifying pre-Columbian elements in early twentieth-century U.S. buildings, but also to elucidate the significance of this imagery for architects,

¹⁹⁷Robert B. Stacy-Judd, “The Autobiography of an Architect,” unpublished typed manuscript (c. 1944), chap. XXXII, 348-49. (Several versions of this manuscript exist in the Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara. The pagination varies from version to version, so wherever possible, I provide the chap. and page nos.)

patrons and the general public. I not only examine these sources in a broad sense—noting textual and visual material available to those interested in appropriating pre-Columbian forms and motifs—but also approach them, when possible, in a more myopic way, documenting particular individuals' more specific engagements with pre-Columbian monuments and motifs.

In some cases, architects' reliance on pre-Columbian sources is obvious, as at the Aztec Theatre in San Antonio (Figure 3.1, Robert Kelley, 1926), which features accurate and fanciful replications of figures, glyphs, motifs as well as structural forms that seem generally pre-Columbian. In other buildings, such as Frank Lloyd Wright's Hollyhock House (Aline Barnsdall house) in Los Angeles (1921; Figure 3.2),¹⁹⁸ allusions to pre-Columbian forms and designs are vague and rather synthesized, making identifications and specific sourcing difficult. Once one recognizes the pre-Columbian aspects of a building, their sources can be traced, but when borrowings are indirect and/or meld with other styles, only a familiarity with pre-Columbian material allows one to see the allusions.

Humboldt and Prescott: Introducing Mesoamerica and the Andes

Accounts of indigenous Americans began to be written in the sixteenth century and continued throughout the Spanish occupation of the region, which endured through the early nineteenth century. The earliest of these, however, fall outside the purview of

¹⁹⁸Several scholars have argued convincingly for Wright's use of pre-Columbian elements in the Hollyhock House, despite the lack of documentary evidence linking specific pre-Columbian examples to Wright's design; see Chapter Six of this dissertation.

this study, since they remained virtually unknown in the United States.¹⁹⁹ I begin, then, with the earliest accounts of the ancient Americas to reach a broad audience: those written by Prussian naturalist and explorer, Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859)²⁰⁰ who managed to obtain permission from the Spanish Crown to travel in its American territories while the New World was still under Spanish control.

In the company of French artist and physician Aimé Bonpland (1773-1858),²⁰¹ Humboldt studied New World flora, fauna and topography *in situ* from 1799 through 1804. A keen observer and prolific writer, he published numerous volumes describing his travels and observations.²⁰² Particularly relevant here is Humboldt's *Vues des*

¹⁹⁹Some Mexican and Spanish investigators wrote on Mesoamerican subjects in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, including: José Antonio de Alzate y Ramírez (1737-1799), *Descripción de las antigüedades de Xochicalco ... escrita por Don Joseph Antonio Alzate y Ramírez ...* (Mexico City: Zuñiga y Ontiveros, 1791); Antonio de León y Gama (1735-1802), *Descripción histórica y cronológica de las dos piedras que con ocasión del nuevo empedrado que se está formando en la plaza principal de México, se hallaron en ella el año de 1790. Explicase el sistema de los calendarios de los Indios ... Noticia ... á que se añaden otras curiosas ... sobre la mitología de los Mexicanos, sobre su astronomía, y sobre los ritos y ceremonias ... en tiempo de su gentilidad* (Mexico City: Felipe de Zuñiga y Ontiveros, 1792); and Antonio Ferrer del Río (1818-72) *Description of the Ruins of an Ancient City Discovered near Palenque, in the Kingdom of Guatemala in Spanish America, Translated from the Original Manuscript Report* (London: Henry Berthoud, 1822). The U.S. distribution of these works was hindered by political turmoil in Mexico and Central America through the early twentieth century.

²⁰⁰Humboldt's full name was Friedrich Wilhelm Heinrich Alexander von Humboldt.

²⁰¹Bonpland's full name was Aimé-Jacques-Alexandre Goujoud Bonpland.

²⁰²See Alexander von Humboldt, *Voyage aux régions équinoxiales du nouveau continent, fait en 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803 et 1804, par Al. de Humboldt et A. Bonpland; rédigé par Alexandre de Humboldt. Avec deux atlas, qui renferment, l'un les vues des Cordillères et les monumens des peuples indigènes de l'Amérique, et l'autre des cartes géographiques et physiques*, 35 vols. (Paris, G. Dufour et Cie., 1805-34). This hugely popular work spawned numerous variations and translations. These include: Humboldt, *Vues des cordillères et monumens des peuples indigènes de l'Amérique* (Paris/London: F. Schoell, 1810)—excerpts of which were published in English as *Researches, Concerning the Institutions and Monuments of the Ancient Inhabitants of America, with Descriptions and Views of some of the Most Striking Scenes in the Cordilleras!*, trans. Helen Maria Williams, 2 vols. (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme & Brown, J. Murray & H. Colburn, 1814); *Essai Politique sur le Royaume de la Nouvelle-Espagne . . . Avec un atlas physique et géographique du Royaume de la Nouvelle-Espagne* (Paris: F.

cordillères et monumens des peuples indigènes de l'Amérique, a pictorial atlas that includes sixty plates of buildings and monuments in both Mesoamerica and the Andes as well as Mesoamerican codices, all with accompanying text. Among the sites, objects and buildings he addresses are the Temple of the Feathered Serpent at Xochicalco (in Central Mexico), the pyramid at Cholula, and a palace at Mitla (Figure 3.3).²⁰³ While in Mexico City in 1803, Humboldt saw three colossal Mexica works that he also included in his book: the Coatlicue statue, which Humboldt calls “Aztec Idol” (Figure 3.4), the Calendar Stone (later known as the Sun Stone), which Humboldt identifies as a calendar with day signs (Figure 1.17) and the Stone of Tizoc, which Humboldt calls “Stone of Sacrifice.”²⁰⁴

From the Andean region of South America, Humboldt presents ruined Inka structures and monuments at and near Cañar, Ecuador (Figure 3.5), and at Callo, Ecuador (Figure 3.6, known in Humboldt’s day as the “Kingdom of Quito”). His drawings of these ruins show the trapezoidal openings typical of Inka architecture, as well as the fine, mortarless stonework for which the Inka are renowned.

Another remarkable individual who produced works relating to both Mesoamerica and the Andes was best-selling American author William H. Prescott (1796-1859) whose

Schoell, 1811-12); *Aspects of Nature*, trans. Mrs. Sabine (London: H. G. Bohn, 1849); and *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Region of America, during the Years 1799-1804*, 3 vols., trans. Thomasina Ross (vols. 1-2: London: H. G. Bohn, 1852; vol. 3; London: H. G. Bohn, 1853).

²⁰³Humboldt also included drawings of two objects from European curiosity cabinets: an “hache” [sic] (probably from a Toltec or Central Mexican site) in the possession of the King of Prussia (Pl. 28) and “an Aztec idol” from the cabinet of the King of Berlin (Pl. 40).

²⁰⁴These massive stone sculptures were unearthed in Mexico City in 1790-99—some thirteen years before Humboldt visited the city. The Coatlicue statue was subsequently reburied (after religious offerings were found near it). For more discussion on the excavation history of these objects, see H.B. Nicholson and Eloise Quiñones-Keber, *Art of Aztec Mexico: Treasures of Tenochtitlan* (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1983), 17-18.

“histories” of Spanish incursions into Mexico and Peru were hugely successful. Unillustrated, Prescott’s volumes include vivid descriptions of ancient American ruins,²⁰⁵ although Prescott had not journeyed south of the border himself. His accounts are based on those of Austrian explorer and artist Jean-Frédéric-Maximilien Waldeck (1766-1875),²⁰⁶ Captain Guillermo Dupaix (c.1750-1817)²⁰⁷ and a number of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century chronicles.²⁰⁸ In his *History of the Conquest of Mexico* (1843), Prescott describes the Pyramids of the Sun and Moon at Teotihuacan, Xochicalco’s Temple of the Feathered Serpent, and the Cholula pyramid, and notes the recent “discoveries” of Mitla in Oaxaca, Palenque in Chiapas, and Uxmal in the Yucatan. He describes Mexica buildings that had long since been destroyed, including the “Great Temple” (known today as the Templo Mayor) of the Mexica and the palace of

²⁰⁵William H. Prescott, *History of the Conquest of Mexico and History of the Conquest of Peru* (1843: Mexico; 1847: Peru; New York: Cooper Square, 2000).

²⁰⁶Much confusion surrounds the details of Waldeck’s life, including his dates, partly because he himself reported inconsistently on the events of his life. See Robert L. Brunhouse, *In Search of the Maya: The First Archaeologists* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1973), chap. 4.

²⁰⁷Former military captain, Guillermo Dupaix was sent by Charles IV to conduct surveys of New Spain in the first decade of the nineteenth century. He was accompanied by Mexican artist, José Luciano Castañeda, to many pre-Columbian sites, including Monte Alban, Mitla, Xochicalco and Palenque. Dupaix’s reports (including Castañeda’s illustrations) were reproduced in vol. 4 of Lord Edward Kingsborough, *Antiquities of Mexico, Comprising Facsimiles of Ancient Mexican Paintings and Hieroglyphs*, 9 vols. (vols 1-5: London: A. Aglio, 1830-48, vols. 6-7: R. Havell and vols. 8-9 H.G. Bohn).

For more information about the work of Dupaix and Castañeda, see Brunhouse, chap. 2. See also, Ignacio Bernal, *A History of Mexican Archaeology: The Vanished Civilizations of Middle America* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1980), 96.

²⁰⁸Prescott conducted extensive archival research both in the United States and Spain. His prolific publications are even more impressive considering that he suffered an illness that left him blind. In order to finish his research and write his books, he hired a secretary who read thousands of pages of archival materials, much of it sixteenth-century Spanish, aloud to him. Through memorization, Prescott was able to identify and tease out many of the contradictions inherent in these Spanish texts. See the biography in Prescott, *Conquests of Mexico & Peru*, v.

Moteczuhzoma (usually spelled “Montezuma” in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries²⁰⁹) as well as the Sun Stone (which he calls the “Calendar-stone”) that had been unearthed in Mexico City in 1791—illustrated by Humboldt, and displayed in 1824 in cast form at an exhibition in London’s Piccadilly Square, organized by Englishman William Bullock (c. 1773 – 1849).

Throughout his account, Prescott compares aspects of Mexica culture to those of ancient Egypt—a commonly drawn parallel in the early and middle nineteenth century.²¹⁰ In describing the Sun Stone, for example, Prescott marvels at its enormous weight and size, reporting that it was quarried from “many leagues distant.” It was moved, he writes, “by means of long files of men, who dragged them [stones of this size] with ropes over huge wooden rollers,” noting that Egyptians transported huge blocks of granite in much the same way.²¹¹

In his descriptions of the Spaniards’ first impressions of Mexica architecture, Prescott writes,

The excellence of the architecture here [Valley of Mexico], also, excited the admiration of the general [Cortés], who does not hesitate, in the glow of his enthusiasm, to pronounce some of the buildings equal to the best in Spain. They were of stone, and the spacious apartments had roofs of

²⁰⁹Prescott remarks that though “Modern Spanish historians” call the Mexica ruler “Motezuma,” he preferred to use “Montezuma” after Bernal Díaz del Castillo, *The True History of the Conquest of Mexico*, 2 vols. (London: J. Wright, 1800), as this is “the name by which he is usually known to English readers” (164, n. 6).

²¹⁰One anonymous reviewer of Bullock’s 1824 exhibition, for instance, compares and contrasts the ancient Mexican culture with that of Egypt. See Ian Graham, “Three Early Collectors in Mesoamerica,” in *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past: A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks*, ed. Elizabeth Hill Boone (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1993), 62.

²¹¹Prescott, 318.

odorous cedar-wood, while the walls were tapestried with fine cottons stained with brilliant colors.²¹²

His book, then, stresses the skill and intelligence of the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas, even as it chronicles their defeat.

As in his account of the take-over of Mexico, Prescott describes several pre-Columbian sites, buildings and monuments in his *History of the Conquest of Peru* (1847). In addition to noting, generically, the Andes's "gorgeous temples" (which he, of course, had never seen), Prescott provides an in-depth account of the Coricancha (which he translates as "the Place of Gold") in Cuzco, a building that the Inka held sacred. Prescott notes that the stonework of this round-cornered building was so fine that a Spaniard "who saw it in its glory . . . could call to mind only two edifices in Spain, which, for their workmanship, were at all to be compared with it."²¹³ Yet, writes Prescott, "This substantial, and in some respects, magnificent structure, was thatched with straw!"²¹⁴ He describes the interior as "a mine of gold," with whole walls sheathed in the precious metal, while gold and silver ornaments were displayed all around. A garden, he writes, "sparkled with flowers of gold and silver" as well as animals constructed of gold.²¹⁵ Prescott, however, finds Spanish accounts of Inka buildings so incredible that he throws doubt on them:

Some of the statements, through credulity, and others, in the desire of exciting admiration, may be greatly exaggerated; but, in the coincidence of

²¹²Ibid., 293.

²¹³Ibid., 780. Here Prescott cites Sarmiento de Gamboa.

²¹⁴Ibid.

²¹⁵Ibid., 782.

contemporary testimony, it is not easy to determine the exact line which should mark the measure of our skepticism.²¹⁶

Prescott describes the massive boulders used for the Inka walls in and around the site of Sacsahuaman (identified as “a strong fortress”), just north of Cuzco, and notes that the mortarless stonework that surrounds and surmounts them fits so tightly together that “it was impossible to introduce even the blade of a knife between them,”²¹⁷ an observation about Inka stonework that has been repeated continuously ever since (with some variation of the instrument inserted), not only by Cuzco city guides²¹⁸ but in scholarly literature.²¹⁹ Marveling at the enormous size (e.g., “fully thirty-eight feet long, by eighteen broad, and six feet thick”) of some of the stones at Sacsahuaman, Prescott notes that “they were hewn from their native bed and fashioned into shape, by a people ignorant of the use of iron some distance away.”²²⁰ In his general description of “Peruvian architecture,”²²¹ Prescott mentions anew its mortarless constructions, commenting that these were “accommodated to the character of the climate, and [were] well fitted to resist those terrible convulsions which belong to the land of volcanoes.”²²² His text also describes the temple of Pachacamac in Central Peru.

²¹⁶Ibid.

²¹⁷Ibid., 740. Prescott (n. 22) cites “a manuscript housed in the British Museum” in this regard, but does not identify it further.

²¹⁸This writer heard this assertion while visiting Cuzco in July 2002.

²¹⁹See, for example, Rebecca Stone-Miller, *Art of the Andes: From Chavín to Inca* (London/New York: Thames & Hudson, 2002), 193.

²²⁰Prescott, *Conquests of Mexico & Peru*, 741. Here he cites Pedro Cieza de Leon.

²²¹Ibid., 811-14.

²²²Ibid., 813. Here he uses Humboldt’s description (from *Vues des Cordillères*) of the buildings at Cañar as an example.

Mesoamerica: Collectors and Explorers through 1870

Soon after Humboldt's earliest writings appeared,²²³ European collections of Mesoamerican objects began to be amassed. One particularly ambitious collector, Englishman William Bullock (c. 1773 – 1849) began his working life in Liverpool, where he eventually opened a museum for the purpose of exhibiting “exotic” objects.²²⁴ As his collections grew, he moved his museum to London in 1809, and in 1812 purchased a building on the south side of Piccadilly, which he renovated using an Egyptian theme before opening it as an exhibition space. Always looking for novel material for his museum, Bullock traveled to Mexico (only recently opened to non-Spaniards) in December 1822. He spent six months collecting natural specimens (birds, mammals, fish and minerals), as well as acquiring pre-Columbian works and a number of copies thereof. In Mexico City, Bullock ordered plaster casts of the colossal monuments illustrated by Humboldt—the Coatlicue (which Bullock calls “Goddess Teoyamiqui”), Sun Stone and Stone of Tizoc.²²⁵ He also gained permission to bring several early Contact-period

²²³As Katherine Manthorne notes in *Tropical Renaissance: North American Artists Exploring Latin America, 1839-1879*, New Directions in American Art (Washington, DC/London: Smithsonian Institution, 1989), 34. Humboldt's publications enjoyed their widest readership in the 1850s—not when the book was first released.

²²⁴Information on Bullock in this paragraph is from Graham, “Three Early Collectors” in *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past*, ed., Boone, 55-67, and Diana Fane, “Reproducing the Pre-Columbian Past: Casts and Models in Exhibitions of Ancient America, 1824-1935” in *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past*, ed., Boone, 156-59.

²²⁵Graham mentions that the Stone of Tizoc and Coatlicue statues had been reburied in Mexico City's main plaza since Humboldt's visit and that they “had to be disinterred before molds could be made,” implying that Bullock was responsible for their re-excavation. Graham, “Three Early Collectors,” 59. See also, Fane, “Reproducing,” 156.

manuscripts to England to be copied with the promise of their return to Mexico.²²⁶

Bullock also visited the nearby pre-Columbian site of Teotihuacan and had plaster casts made of two structures there.

A subsequent exhibition, divided in two parts—“Ancient Mexico” and “Modern Mexico”—opened at Bullock’s Egyptian Hall in Piccadilly Square in 1824, and constituted the first exhibition of pre-Columbian artifacts outside Mexico (Figure 3.7). In addition to the casts of Mexica and Teotihuacan monuments, Bullock displayed twenty-two large-scale reproductions of select pages from the Codex Boturini.²²⁷ Two (of the three) catalogs published in conjunction with the exhibition provide illustrations of the room dedicated to “Ancient Mexico,” in which some of the pre-Columbian objects on display can be seen.²²⁸ Graham describes the show as a “huge success,” explaining that it received “many brief notices in the press” and at least one long review.²²⁹

²²⁶These include: Codex Boturini, Huamantla, de la Cueva, Tlaxcala and the Plano en papel de Maguey. Graham notes that Bullock may have sold some of the manuscripts after the exhibition closed. The data is sketchy, however, and some of the manuscripts were eventually returned to Mexico, possibly by Bullock when he returned there in 1826. See “Three Early Collectors,” 59, 63–65.

²²⁷The copy of the Codex Boturini was made by Agostino Aglio, the same artist who would begin, six years later, rendering the copious illustrations for the first five volumes of Kingsborough’s nine-volume *opus*, *Antiquities of Mexico*. Graham, “Three Early Collectors,” 60–62.

²²⁸William J. Bullock, *A Description of the Unique Exhibition Called Ancient Mexico: Collected on the Spot in 1823 by the Assistance of the Mexican Government, and Now Open for Public Inspection at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly* (London: William J. Bullock, 1824; *Catalogue of the Exhibition, Called Modern Mexico; Containing a Panoramic View of the City, with Specimens of the Natural History of New Spain, and Models of the Vegetable Produce, Costume, etc. etc. Now Open for Public Inspection at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly* (London: William J. Bullock, 1824); and, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Exhibition, Entitled Ancient and Modern Mexico; Containing a Panoramic View of the Present City, Specimens of the Natural History of New Spain, Models of its Vegetable Produce, Habitations, Costumes, etc. etc. and of the Colossal and Enormous Idols, the Great Calendar and Sacrificial Stones, Temples, Pyramids, and Other Existing Antique Remains. The Whole Forming the Rationally Instructive and Interesting Exhibition, Which Is Now*

One frequent visitor to Bullock's exhibition,²³⁰ Lord Edward Kingsborough (1795-1837), would go on to produce a multivolume compendium, *Antiquities of Mexico* (1830-48).²³¹ Its assertions regarding pre-Conquest Mesoamericans' descent from a Lost Tribe of Israel have long since been dismissed, but Kingsborough's oversized folio remains valuable for its color facsimiles of all codices accessible to him (e.g., Figure 3.50),²³² excerpts from Spanish friar Bernardino Sahagún's twelve-volume *History of the Things of New Spain*²³³ and Dupaix's *Monuments of New Spain* (Figure 3.8). Fernando de Alvarado Tezozómoc's *Crónica mexicana* and Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxóchitl's *Historia chichimeca* are also reproduced in *Antiquities of Mexico*.²³⁴ The high cost of the original edition of *Antiquities of Mexico* limited its accessibility, but once it appeared in a less costly edition it circulated widely.

Open, For Public Inspection, at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly (London: William J. Bullock, 1824).

²²⁹Graham, "Three Early Collectors," 62. The review to which Graham refers is "Some Observations Caused by the Recent Introduction by Mr. Bullock into England of Various Rare and Curious Specimens of Mexican Antiquity; Intended Shortly to be Submitted by Him to the Inspection of the Public," *The Classical Journal* 29 (1824): 174-93.

²³⁰Graham, "Three Early Collectors," 60-62.

²³¹Kingsborough, *Antiquities of Mexico*. Kingsborough's undertaking cost £32,000 to produce and eventually led to his incarceration in debtor's prison, where he died of typhus. See Benjamin Keen, *The Aztec Image in Western Thought* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990), 348-49.

²³²According to Keen, Aglio spent five years preparing these facsimiles, which were mainly Maya and Mixtec codices housed in European libraries in Vienna, Rome and Dresden (348).

²³³Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, *Florentine Codex: General History of the Things of New Spain*, 13 vols., Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles E. Dibble, trans. and eds. (Salt Lake City: SAR, Santa Fe/University of Utah, 1950-82).

²³⁴Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxóchitl, *Obras históricas*, 2 vols., 3d ed., Edmundo O'Gorman, ed. (Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, UNAM, 1975).

Austrian explorer and artist Jean-Frédéric-Maximilien Waldeck (1766-1875) is, like Kingsborough, criticized today for his farfetched theories about pre-Columbian culture's connections to other groups—in his case, to Egyptians, Etruscans and the Japanese.²³⁵ Waldeck's illustrations, like his theories, are more imaginative than accurate, but they were taken quite seriously in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Waldeck's *Voyage Pittoresque et Archéologique dans la province d'Yucatan. (Amérique Centrale), pendant les Années 1834 et 1836* (1838) includes plans and detailed renderings of fragments from the Maya ruins of Uxmal (which he called "Ytzalana"). (Figure 3.9); Palenque, however, is located in Chiapas, not in the Yucatan.²³⁶ Waldeck also provided fifty-six drawings for Abbé Charles Étienne Brasseur de Bourbourg's (1814-1874) *Monumens Anciens du Mexique. Recherches dur les Ruines de Palenqué et sur les Origines de la Civilisation du Mexique* (1866)²³⁷; these include images of stone reliefs and architectural details from Palenque, and renderings of portable objects (particularly ceramics) from the Zapotec, Mixtec and Teotihuacan cultures (Figures 3.10, 3.11 and 3.12).

²³⁵The words of Mexican archaeologist Ignacio Bernal exemplify the common attitude today toward Waldeck when he proclaims that the Frenchman's ideas are "so absurd as to preclude any intelligent discussion of them." See *A History of Mexican Archaeology: The Vanished Civilizations of Middle America* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1980), 119. For more discussion on Waldeck's contributions to pre-Columbian archaeological thought, see Keen, 321-322.

²³⁶Jean-Frédéric-Maximilien Waldeck, *Voyage pittoresque et archéologique dans la province d'Yucatan. (Amérique Centrale), pendant les années 1834 et 1836*, Société de Géographie (Paris: Bellizard Dufour/London: Bossange Barthès et Lowell, 1838). Plates 8 through 21 are from Ytzalana while Plate 20 is entitled "Relief Astronomique de Palenqué."

²³⁷Charles Étienne Brasseur de Bourbourg, *Monumens Anciens du Mexique. Recherches dur les Ruines de Palenqué et sur les Origines de la Civilisation du Mexique*. Text publié avec les dessins de M. de Waldeck sous les auspices de S.E.M. le Ministre de L'instruciton Publique (Paris: Arthus Bertrand, ed., libraire de la Société de Géographie, 1866).

Arguably the most important figures in the popularization of Mesoamerica in the United States, however, were American lawyer and diplomat, John Lloyd Stephens (1805-1852) and his British illustrator—a trained architect and an author in his own right—Frederick Catherwood (1799-1859). Together, these two brought the pre-Columbian cultures of Mexico and Central America to the attention of a wide public in both the United States and Europe. Stephens's travel accounts *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan* (1841) and *Incidents of Travel in Yucatan* (1843), and Catherwood's own *Views of Ancient Monuments in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan* (1844)²³⁸ were instant best sellers. Stephens and Catherwood journeyed through Belize, Guatemala, Honduras and Mexico, but are most closely associated with the sites of Copan (Figure 3.13) and Palenque (Figure 3.14) and, on Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula, a series of sites that include Uxmal, Chichen Itza, Kabah, Labna and Tulum (Figures 1.11 and 3.15). Stephens's and Catherwood's travels inspired copious and fairly accurate renderings of places and people, and yielded entertaining and vivid descriptions of their experiences. In the books he penned, Stephens interwove accounts of his own travels with materials drawn from Colonial and early nineteenth-century sources²³⁹; both provide insights into the ways in which various pre-Columbian cultures were viewed. While

²³⁸John Lloyd Stephens, *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan*, 2 vols. (1841; repr., New York: Dover, 1969) and *Incidents of Travel in Yucatan* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1843). Frederick Catherwood, *Views of Ancient Monuments in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan* (New York: Bartlett & Welford, 1844). That these books have never gone out of print is a testament to their popularity.

²³⁹The sources consulted by Stephens include: Díaz del Castillo, *True History*, Humboldt, *Vues des cordillères*; Kingsborough, *Antiquities of Mexico*; Dupaix and Castañeda (in Kingsborough); Captain Antonio del Río, *Description of the Ruins of an Ancient City Discovered near Palenque in the Kingdom of Guatemala . . . Translated from the Original Manuscript Report of Captain Don Antonio del Río: Followed by Teatro critico americano: or, A Critical Investigation and Research into the History of the Americans, by Doctor Paul Felix Cabrera* (London: Henry Berthoud & Suttaby, Evance & Fox, 1822); and his contemporary, Waldeck, *Voyage pittoresque*.

Stephens uses the broad cultural referents “Aztec,” and “Toltec,” he does not use the term “Maya,” but instead employs more narrow and specific designators, such as “Quichés,” and “Kachiquels.”²⁴⁰ Nonetheless, Stephens was one of the first to recognize the overarching similarities between such groups, an observation that grounds contemporary perceptions of the Maya today as a single, yet multifaceted culture with many regional permutations.

French explorer and artist Claude-Joseph Désiré Charnay (1828-1915)—who was influenced by the publications of Stephens and Catherwood²⁴¹—made his first trip to Mexico in 1857, and returned several times in subsequent decades, his expeditions funded by the French government as well as by American tobacco merchant, Pierre Lorillard.²⁴² Like Kingsborough and Waldeck before him, Charnay theorized about pre-Columbian cultures’ origins outside the Mesoamerican region. Charnay, however, traced the ancestry of indigenous Americans to Asia—a theory also widely disparaged from the start. Nonetheless, Charnay made valuable contributions to pre-Columbian scholarship by providing good-quality drawings, papier mâché molds and casts of ancient

²⁴⁰The Quiche and Kachiquel Maya were post-Classic groups living in the Southern Maya area (Guatemala) when the Spanish arrived in the sixteenth century.

²⁴¹Keith F. Davis, *Désiré Charnay: Expeditionary Photographer* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1981), 102-04.

²⁴²The major publication to result from Charnay’s fieldwork in Mexico is *Cités et ruines américaines. Mitla, Palenqué, Izamal, Chichen-Itza, Uxmal. Recueillies et photographies par D. Charnay. Avec un texte par Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, suivi du voyage et des documents de l’auteur. With atlas* (Paris: Gide, 1862-1863). This book was translated into English as *The Ancient Cities of the New World, Being Voyages and Explorations in Mexico and Central America from 1857-1882*, trans. J. Gonino and Helen S. Conant (London: Chapman & Hall, 1887). Specific reasons for Lorillard’s sponsorship are unknown but can be seen as part of the wider trend articulated by Oles: “By the end of the [nineteenth] century, elite Americans had begun to finance scientific excavations, partly as a way of linking their aristocratic yearnings with ancient civilization in the Yucatan” (159).

monuments, and by making some of the earliest photographs of Mesoamerican sites including Teotihuacan, Monte Alban, Mitla, Chichen Itza and Uxmal. He is also credited with “discovering” the Toltec’s presumed capital, Tula (which lies northwest of Teotihuacan).²⁴³ Atlantean figures (blocky and columnar male figures)²⁴⁴ based on those found at Tula and other central Mexican sites appeared in many U.S. structures in the early part of the twentieth century (Figures 1.16 and 3.16).²⁴⁵ Charnay’s illustrations of the striking Zapotec stone mosaics that adorn façades at Mitla also inspired take-offs in many U.S. structures (Figure 3.17). The Mexican restaurant serving New York’s American Museum of Natural History (by 1911) was billed, for instance, as “an exact reproduction of temple ruins at Mitla, Mexico” (Figure 3.18).²⁴⁶

²⁴³Charnay first visited Teotihuacan in about 1863 where he studied a mound west of the Street of the Dead and a cemetery in San Juan. He returned with Mexican archaeologist, Leopoldo Batres c. 1880. During the 1880s, Batres conducted a general survey of the site and published a small book, written in both Spanish and English. See Leopoldo Batres, *Teotihuacan or the Sacred City of the Toltecs*, Monographs of Mexican Archaeology series (Mexico City: Talleres de la escuela N. de artes y oficios. Ex-convento de S. Lorenzo, 1889). It is now well established that the people of Teotihuacan were a separate and very powerful culture group and were not, in fact, either Toltec or Mexica.

²⁴⁴Archaeologist Herbert J. Spinden describes Atlantean figures as “caryatid supports, architectural and otherwise,” and describes them as stiff, angular and poorly proportioned figures. “The two arms are represented in a vertical position, with the elbows unbent, yet the hands are only on a level with the crown of the head.” He mentions that they may function as architectural columns, as lintels or, more commonly as “legs for table-like altars.” *A Study of Maya Art: Its Subject Matter and Historical Development* (1913; repr., New York: Dover, 1975).

²⁴⁵Atlantean figures are associated with such Central Mexican sites as Tula, Tlaxcala and the Mexica capital Tenochtitlan, and at Chichen Itza on the Yucatan Peninsula. The styles of these figures tend to vary from site to site. Tlaxcala-style Atlantean figures (squat proportions with raised arms), for example, can be found at the Aztec Theatre in San Antonio (Robert Kelley, 1926).

²⁴⁶The first mention of this restaurant is found in George H. Sherwood, *General Guide to the Exhibition Halls of the American Museum of Natural History*, no. 35, Guide Leaflet Series, AMNH, ed. Mary Cynthia Dickerson (New York: American Museum of Natural History, November 1911), inside cover. The first *General Guide* was issued in January 1904, the second in November 1911.

Andes: Archaeologists, Explorers and Collectors through 1892

Travel to the Andes, and examinations of its pre-Columbian sites, did not take off until the mid-nineteenth century. Andean studies really began with the contributions of individuals best described as archaeologists, who were followed by explorers and collectors (although at this early date there is certainly some overlap between these categories). Peruvian geologist and metallurgist, Mariano Eduardo de Rivero y Ustariz (1798-1857), together with Swiss naturalist Johann Jakob von Tschudi (1818-1889), American Ephraim George Squier (1821-1888), European²⁴⁷ Charles Wiener (1851-1913), German Wilhelm Reiss (1835-1904) together with German Alphonse Stübel (1838-1908) and German philologist and archaeologist Max Uhle (1856-1944) were the earliest of these investigators.²⁴⁸

²⁴⁷Charles Wiener's nationality is uncertain since varied sources state that he was Austrian, French or Belgian. All agree, however, that he received a commission from the French government in 1875.

²⁴⁸Other explorers ventured to the Andes but their works are less known or focused on aspects of Peru outside of the area of pre-Columbian studies. Frenchman Léonce Angrand (1808-1885), traveled throughout Peru in the 1840s, but his works were not widely known in the United States. His publications include a forty-five-page treatment of Tiwanaku, *Antiquités américaines: Extrait de la Revue Générale de l'Architecture et des travaux publics* (Paris: Imprimerie de J. Clayes, c.1866).

Antonio Raimondi (1826-1890) arrived in Peru from Italy in 1850 and journeyed throughout the country, examining floral, faunal and mineral specimens. He also visited some pre-Columbian sites, most notably Chavín de Huantar in the Northern Andean Highlands. He is said to be one of the first Westerners to lay eyes on that Early Horizon site. Raimondi was the founder of the Museum of Natural History in Lima in 1856 and published a five-volume study, *El Perú* (vols. I-III: Lima: Imprenta del estado, 1874-80; vol. IV: Lima: Geographic Society of Lima, 1902; vol. V: Lima(?): estudios mineralógicos y geológicos, 1913).

Adolph Francis Alphonse Bandelier (1840-1914) worked in Peru and Bolivia from 1892-1903, first for Henry Villard and then, beginning in 1894, for the American Museum of Natural History, gathering—according to Hiram Bingham—“a large part of the extensive collection of Peruvian antiquities which deservedly adds to the fame of that museum.” See the letter to the editor by Bingham, *The Nation* (26 March 1914), n.p. in William Henry Holmes Papers, 1870-

Rivero, born in Peru, studied chemistry and metallurgy in Europe, then returned to his native country. His two-volume study of Peru, *Colección de memorias científicas, agrícolas é industriales publicadas en distintas épocas* (1857)²⁴⁹ was overshadowed, in the United States, by the volume he co-authored with Tschudi,²⁵⁰ *Peruvian Antiquities* (1851), which was translated into English in 1853.²⁵¹ *Peruvian Antiquities* contains descriptions and rough renderings of Tiwanaku as well as Inka monuments, buildings and stonework, including the Sun Gate (called the “Monolithic Gateway”), the Coricancha (called the “Inti-huasi”), an example of the mortarless stonework at Ollantaytambo (an

1931, Record Unit 7084, Smithsonian Institution Archives, A&I Building, Box 4 of 4, Location A09/16/01 “Adolph Francis Alphonse Bandelier.”

English geographer and historian Sir Clements R. Markham (1830-1916) also published a number of works, some fictional, on pre-Columbian subjects. These include: *Cuzco: A Journey to the Ancient Capital of Peru; with an account of the History, Language, Literature, and Antiquities of the Incas. And Lima: A Visit to the Capital and Provinces of Modern Peru; with a Sketch of the Viceregal Government, History of the Republic, and a Review of the Literature and Society of Peru* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1856); *Peru* (London: S. Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington, 1880); *A History of Peru* (1892; repr., New York: Greenwood, 1968); *The Incas of Peru* (London: Smith, Elder, 1910). He served as editor, moreover, of Augustus Henry Keane’s *Central and South America* (London: E Stanford, 1901), and translated from Quechua the anonymous play, *Ollanta. An Ancient Ynca Drama* (London: Trübner, 1871). For further information on Markham’s contributions to Andean studies, see Jeffrey Quilter and Gary Urton, eds., *Narrative Threads: Accounting and Recounting in Andean Khipu* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002), 149, and Gordon R. Willey and Jeremy A. Sabloff, *A History of American Archaeology* (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1980), 68. Since Markham’s works were historical and unillustrated, they are not particularly pertinent to this dissertation.

²⁴⁹Mariano Eduardo de Rivero y Ustáriz, *Colección de memorias científicas, agrícolas é industriales publicadas en distintas épocas*, 2 vols. (Bruselas: H. Goemaere, 1857).

²⁵⁰Johann Jakob von Tschudi also published two travel accounts: *Travels in Peru during the Years 1838-1842: On the Coast, in the Sierra, across the Cordilleras and the Andes, into the Primeval Forests*, trans. Thomasina Ross (New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1847) and *Travels in Peru: On the Coast, in the Sierra, Across the Cordilleras and the Andes, into the Primeval Forests*, trans. Thomasina Ross (New York: A.S. Barnes/Cincinnati: H. W. Derby, 1854). These tomes focused on descriptions of Peru’s natural features—including faunal samples—and did not include illustrations of pre-Columbian ruins.

²⁵¹Mariano Eduardo de Rivero y Ustáriz and Johann Jakob von Tschudi, *Peruvian Antiquities*, trans. Francis L. Hawks (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1853). The original publication, *Antigüedades Peruanas*, was published in Vienna in 1851.

Inka site in the Sacred Valley area of Peru near Cuzco) and a detail of the adobe designs at Chan Chan (called Chimu-Canchu) on Peru's North Coast.

A book that enjoyed more widespread popularity in the United States than the earlier archaeological accounts was Ephraim George Squier's *Peru: Incidents of Travel and Exploration in the Land of the Incas* (1877). An explorer, excavator and diplomat, Squier²⁵² was born in Bethlehem, New York, and began his adult life as a journalist and newspaper editor in Ohio.²⁵³ Fascinated by the mounds and earthworks made by indigenous inhabitants of that area, he decided to pursue seriously his archaeological interests. In the 1840s, he and E. H. Davis co-authored, *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley* (1848),²⁵⁴ a major work that garnered national attention—in scientific circles, at least. After Squier published another book on native North American monuments,²⁵⁵ William H. Prescott urged him to focus upon Latin America; Squier was well positioned to do so, having been appointed *charge d'affaires* in Nicaragua in 1849.²⁵⁶

²⁵²Ephraim George Squier, *Peru: Incidents of Travel and Exploration in the Land of the Incas* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1877).

²⁵³The biographical information on Squier here comes from Gordon R. Willey's "introduction" to Squier, *Peru* (1877; repr., New York: AMS/Cambridge: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 1973), vii-x.

²⁵⁴Ephraim George Squier and E. H. Davis, *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley* (New York: Bartlett/Cincinnati: J.A. & U.P. James, 1848).

²⁵⁵Squier, *Aboriginal Monuments of the State of New-York* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1850).

²⁵⁶Manthorne, 47; Squier spent many months in the 1850s and 1860s in Nicaragua, San Salvador, Honduras and Panama in Central America. Accompanied on his travels by three artists—James McDonough (1849-50), Wilhelm Heine (1851) and DeWitt C. Hitchcock (1853)—Squier was able to illustrate his publications on Central America with detailed renderings of indigenous monuments. For further discussion of the artists that accompanied Squier, see Manthorne, 32. His books on this region include: *Nicaragua: Its People, Scenery, Monuments and the Proposed*

Most relevant to this dissertation, however, are Squier's publications on Peru, which derived from two years' residence there (1863-65) as U.S. purchasing agent to that nation.²⁵⁷ After a bout of illness, Squier went to Peru—the pre-Columbian ruins of which he longed to see—upon the advice of his physician who recommended a sea voyage and complete change of scene.²⁵⁸ Although his first six months in the Andes were devoted to his official duties, Squier spent most of his time thereafter traveling to archaeological sites in Peru and Bolivia, many of which had not been described prior to the publication of Squier's *Peru: Incidents of Travel and Exploration in the Land of the Incas* (1877), which includes numerous drawings of Inka buildings and stonework at Pachacamac, Ollantaytambo, Pisac and Cuzco (Figure 3.19), as well as illustrations of the “Great Pyramid” at Moche (now known as the Huaca del Sol), various structures and decorative elements from Chan Chan (Figure 3.20, which Squier called “Grand Chimu”) and the “Great Monolithic Gate-way” (Sun Gate) at Tiwanaku (Figures 3.21 and 3.22). Most of Squier's illustrations are, according to Willey, fairly accurate, though the plans included in his book are “only approximate.”²⁵⁹

Another illustrated Andean travel account, Charles Wiener's *Pérou et Bolivie*.

Récit de voyage suivi d'études archéologiques et ethnographiques et de notes sur

Interoceanic Canal (New York: D. Appleton, 1852); *Notes on Central America, Particularly the States of Honduras and San Salvador: Their Geography, Topography, Climate, Population, Resources, Productions, etc., etc., and the Proposed Honduras Inter-Oceanic Railway* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1855); *The States of Central America; Their Geography, Topography, etc. ... Chapters on Honduras, San Salvador ... the Bay Islands, the Mosquito shore, and the Honduras Inter-Oceanic Railway* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1858); *Honduras: Descriptive, Historical, and Statistical* (London: Trübner, 1870).

²⁵⁷Willey, “introduction,” vii.

²⁵⁸*Ibid.*

²⁵⁹*Ibid.*, ix.

l'écriture et les langues des populations indiennes (1880)²⁶⁰—resulted from a commission by the French government in 1875.²⁶¹ Wiener, a collector as well as an explorer, provides copious drawings of Andean textiles and the tools used to make them, other portable objects such as ceramics, jewelry (Figure 1.20) and other metalwork and architectural details from pre-Inka and Inka sites, including Pachacamac (walls and foundations), Tiwanaku, Ollantaytambo (stonework), and Copacabana (Figure 5.29). He grouped works by medium rather than location or culture, so that the reader may draw visual comparisons among varied examples of stonework, ceramics or cloth—an approach to non-Western material culture paralleled in nineteenth-century museum displays.

German scientists Wilhem Reiss and Alphons Stübel investigated various natural features and archaeological sites throughout Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and Colombia, from 1868 to 1876. Their travels resulted in a number of published studies, the most popular of which (in the United States, at least) was the three-volume *The Necropolis of Ancon in Peru* (1880-87).²⁶²

²⁶⁰Charles Wiener, *Pérou et Bolivie. Récit de voyage suivi d'études archéologiques et ethnographiques et de notes sur l'écriture et les langues des populations indiennes* (Paris: Hachette, 1880).

²⁶¹The more than 4,000 objects Wiener collected for the French government were exhibited at the Universelle Exposition held in Paris in 1878. Barbara Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art and the Post-Columbian World: Ancient American Sources of Modern Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1993), 30-31. See also, Elizabeth A. Williams, "Collecting and Exhibiting Pre-Columbiana in France and England, 1870-1930," in *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past*, ed. Boone, 133.

²⁶²Wilhelm Reiss and Alphons Stübel, *The Necropolis of Ancon in Peru: A Contribution to Our Knowledge of the Culture and Industries of the Empire of the Incas Being the Results of Excavations Made on the Spot*, 3 vols., trans. Augustus Henry Keane (Berlin: A. Asher, 1880-87). This book was surely the source of the reconstructed Ancón mummies and mummy bundles exhibited at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition (see below).

Max Uhle, an innovative researcher who used stratigraphic analyses as well as cultural identifications to lay the foundations of Andean chronology, is known as “the father of Andean archaeology.”²⁶³ He spent over forty years excavating sites in Bolivia, Peru, Argentina and Ecuador, beginning at Tiwanaku in 1892. His study of Tiwanaku, *Die ruinenstaette von Tiahuanaco im hochlande des alten Perú; eine kulturgeschichtliche studie auf grund selbstaendiger aufnahmen* (1892), co-authored with Alphons Stübel, includes detailed illustrations of the Sun Gate there (Figure 3.23).²⁶⁴ In Peru, Uhle worked at a wide range of sites, including Pachacamac, Chan Chan, Moche and Nazca, though he failed to publish many of his findings.²⁶⁵

American Archaeology: History and Methodologies

American archaeology began as a discipline in the last years of the nineteenth century²⁶⁶ with the earliest investigators concerned mainly with identifying and linking pre-Columbian material remains, establishing chronologies and determining the origins

²⁶³Comparatively speaking, much has been written about the life and contributions of Max Uhle. See John Rowe, *Max Uhle, 1856-1944: A Memoir of the Father of Peruvian Archaeology* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California, 1954), 1-16; See also, Willey and Sabloff, 68-74.

²⁶⁴Alfons Stübel and Max Uhle, *Die ruinenstaette von Tiahuanaco im Hochlande des alten Perú; Eine Kulturgeschichtliche Studie auf grund Selbstaendiger aufnahmen*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Verlag von Karl W. Hiersemann, 1892).

²⁶⁵John Rowe observes: “It is probably no exaggeration to estimate that Uhle’s failure to publish his full reports at this time set Peruvian archaeology back at least ten years. Uhle’s full reports might have had something of the impact that [Alfred L.] Kroeber’s did between 1924 and 1927” (15).

²⁶⁶Herbert J. Spinden, an anthropology student at Harvard University, earned the first Ph.D. with a pre-Columbian focus in 1909 (see below). His dissertation, “A Study of Maya Art: Its Subject Matter and Historical Development,” was published as a book of the same title in 1913 (see *Memoirs of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. 6, Cambridge, Peabody Museum, 1913).

of indigenes.²⁶⁷ Much more scholarly focus was given to Mesoamerica than the Andes—and this lopsided interest is reflected in later pre-Columbian appropriations—in which the vast majority of motifs is derived from Mesoamerican cultures (especially Maya, Zapotec and Mexica)—although more references to the Andes occur than previous scholarship has revealed.

The Andes were much less easily traveled than Mesoamerica. The art of Mesoamerican cultures—particularly that of the Maya and Mexica—was, moreover, more naturalistic than that of most Andean cultures, which (with the exception of Moche ceramics) tends toward the conceptual and abstract. Mesoamerican material culture was, therefore, generally more accessible, comprehensible and appealing to Euro-Americans than that of the Andes. The Maya's particular appeal resided in their perceived sophistication, which was affirmed early on by reports on the Maya's stone architecture and complicated writing system (neither of which, we now know, was exclusive to the Maya). From an early date, epigraphers set about deciphering glyphs on Mesoamerican monuments, as well as those in the illustrated books known as codices²⁶⁸—many of which were housed in European libraries, and some of which were published as copies

²⁶⁷For brief historiographies of American archaeology, see Willey and Sabloff, *History of American Archaeology*. See also, Brian Fagan, *Elusive Treasure: The Story of Early Archaeologists in the Americas* (New York: Scribners, 1977).

As Manthorne notes, the question of the origins of the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas went beyond archaeology or national identity, as it called into question the very roots of Christian doctrine, such as the validity of monogenesis, the belief that humanity originated from a single point of origin. This forced explanations, she writes, of “how, when, and where a group of people now inhabiting the New World diffused from the Old” (95).

²⁶⁸The pre-Columbian cultures of the Andes did not have a writing system in the strictest sense, although a number of recent scholars have raised the question of what constitutes writing, given evidence of other physical or symbolic modes of communication (e.g., Inka and pre-Inka quipus or the Teotihuacan “glyphs”). This issue was discussed, for example, at the “Writing and Iconography in the Pre-Columbian World” symposium held at the Library of Congress, Washington, DC (September 10, 2005).

and facsimiles.²⁶⁹ A final obstacle to early scholars of the Inka was the contradictory nature of Peru's early Colonial histories (written by native authors as well as Spanish chroniclers), the narratives of which often were muddied by Inka rulers' tendency to recast past events in self-serving ways.

While Maya sites saw the most archaeological excavations and glyphic studies, early investigations also were undertaken at Monte Alban,²⁷⁰ by various investigators, including Marshall Saville of the American Museum of Natural History, German Eduard Seler (1849-1922)²⁷¹ and Mexican Leopoldo Batres (1852-1926).²⁷² As a result, sculptor Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney (1875–1942) incorporated take-offs on Monte Alban glyphs into a fountain she designed for the Pan-American Union Main Building in Washington D.C. (Figures 1.2 and 3.24), built shortly after the turn of the twentieth century.²⁷³ Unlike the glyphic writings upon which they are based, Whitney's variants

²⁶⁹Alexander von Humboldt included illustrations from eight pre-Columbian “manuscripts” in *Researches*. Abbé Charles Etienne Brasseur de Bourbourg published several glyphs and texts—including a section of the Madrid Codex—in *Manuscrit troano; études sur le système graphique et la langue des Mayas* (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1869-70). Lord Edward Kingsborough included copies and facsimiles of eleven codices in *Antiquities of Mexico*.

²⁷⁰Despite a century of work on Zapotec glyphs, most remain undeciphered.

²⁷¹Seler also studied Maya glyphs; his publications on Mesoamerican glyphic and iconographic studies are too numerous to list here. See Spinden, 1913, 273-74.

²⁷²See Leopoldo Batres, *Civilización de algunas de las diferentes tribus que habitaron el territorio, hoy Mexicano, en la antigüedad* (Mexico, 1888). See also, *Exploraciones de Monte Alban* (Mexico, 1902). Although Batres was a major early contributor to Mesoamerican archaeology, the distribution of his (mostly Spanish) sources to a general public in the United States, however, was probably small.

²⁷³Whitney received her commission for the Pan-American Union fountain in 1909. See Chapter Six for a more comprehensive description of the fountain. See Folder “Building Additions/Renovations,” Organization of American States, Columbus Memorial Library, Archives & Records Management Center, PRO 1-2-1 Unit of Building Maintenance [formerly Building and Grounds], Washington, DC. Whitney was a prolific supporter and collector of American art as is evidenced in the gallery she set up in Greenwich Village in the 1910s and, in

are arranged in neat columns—a layout not normally found in the Zapotec region.²⁷⁴ In addition to the Zapotec-derived glyphs, figures inspired by those seen on Zapotec urns (Figures 3.12 and 3.25)—ceramic containers featuring cross-legged figures with elaborate headdresses and often disproportionately large hands resting prominently on their knees—were widely used in early-twentieth-century U.S. architecture and are, in fact, among the most common designs seen in pre-Columbian-appropriated structures in the United States. Such figures are seen, for instance, at the Aztec Theatre in San Antonio (Robert Kelley, 1926), the Mayan Theater in Denver (Montana Fallis, 1930) and the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles (Figure 3.26).

Toetihuacan, in central Mexico, was another much-explored site. It was believed, through the 1930s, to have been constructed by either the Mexica or Toltec culture, but turned out to have predated both by several centuries, having flourished between the first and seventh centuries AD. Teotihuacan, which spreads out over 31 square miles, is filled with hundreds of structures, including two large pyramids: the Pyramid of the Sun and Pyramid of the Moon (both are modern appellations). The site is well known for its extensive mural decoration—fresco paintings that feature a good deal of repetitious imagery including a female deity that scholars call the “Great Goddess,” an unnamed goggle-eyed supernatural, thought to be associated with rain and water, and feathered serpents. The last are also seen in other areas of the site, most notably on the building dubbed Temple of the Feathered Serpent (Figure 3.27). Imagery derived from

1931, the establishment of the Whitney Museum of American Art. See Flora Miller Biddle, *The Whitney Women and the Museum They Made: A Family Memoir* (New York: Arcade, 1999).

²⁷⁴Epigrapher and archaeologist Dr. Shannon Plank pointed out the similarities between the Zapotec glyphs on Whitney’s fountain and Monte Alban’s Stela 1 (personal communication, May 2004). For further discussion of these glyphs, see Chapter Six.

Teotihuacan murals, while relatively rare in U.S. structures, does appear in the second-floor lounge at the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles, where a feathered serpent, fish and stylized seashells similar to those found on the Temple of the Feathered Serpent are painted on the stepped supports in the bar (Figure 3.28).²⁷⁵

The early investigators of pre-Columbian cultures recorded what they found in a variety of media, drawing and photographing objects and monuments, making papier mâché and plaster molds of objects and architectural remains too cumbersome to remove, and creating models of buildings or parts of buildings. An increase in scholarly studies resulted in several late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century exhibits of pre-Columbian materials in Europe and the United States—especially at world’s fairs and in anthropological museums—which usually aimed to contextualize the unfamiliar objects on view.

Pre-Columbian Exhibits: World’s Fairs and Museums

The earliest world’s fair or exposition to display pre-Columbian material was the 1867 Exposition Universelle in Paris. The Mexican government’s pavilion there housed a replica of Xochicalco’s Temple of the Feathered Serpent that was elaborated with a row of skulls hanging from the cornice—a feature not found on the actual building. A cast of

²⁷⁵It is not clear, however, if the Teotihuacan-style serpent at the Mayan Theatre was part of the original décor or a recent addition. It appears today to be newly painted and seems to be rendered in a style different from the other paintings within the building (personal observation, August 2003), but its current appearance may be the result of a restoration.

the famed Coatlicue statue produced by the Mexica (a cast of which had been shown at Bullock's Egyptian Hall in 1824) stood in the pavilion's central portal.²⁷⁶

The first fair to feature pre-Columbian exhibits in the United States was the well-attended 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, celebrating the four hundred-year anniversary of Columbus's discovery of the New World.²⁷⁷ There, anthropologists Frederick Ward Putnam and Franz Boas²⁷⁸ grouped displays devoted to pre-Columbian, Native American, African and Pacific Island cultures together—in and around the Anthropology Building, located in the South Grounds (Figures 3.29 and 3.30).²⁷⁹ These exhibits portrayed living indigenes as well as peoples of the past.

²⁷⁶Hugh Honour, *The New Golden Land: European Images of America from the Discoveries to the Present Time* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1975), 184-85.

²⁷⁷Hugh Bancroft discusses the pre-Columbian exhibits at this fair in *The Book of the Fair*, vol. 7 (Chicago: Bancroft Company, 1893), 636. See also Braun, 139-142, and Dennis B. Downey, *A Season of Renewal: The Columbian Exposition and Victorian America* (Westport, CT/London: Praeger, 2002), 46. Over twenty-seven million people visited the more than sixty-five thousand exhibits arranged in the Columbian Expo's four hundred buildings and pavilions during its six-month run (May to October, 1893).

According to Anthony Alofsin, Frank Lloyd Wright, who was living in Chicago at the time, was among the Columbian Exposition's attendees. See *Frank Lloyd Wright, The Lost Years, 1910-1922: A Study of Influence* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 223.

²⁷⁸Putnam came to the Columbian Exposition from Harvard University, where he served as curator and Director of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology. When the 1893 Exposition closed, he helped found the Field Columbian Museum (now Field Museum of Natural History), the Department of Anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley, and the Anthropology Department of the American Museum of Natural History (see Willey and Sabloff, 45). The "Guide Leaflet to Collections in the American Museum of Natural History" (no. 3), Supplement to the American Museum Journal 2, no. 1 (January 1902) lists Putnam as "Advisory Curator" (inside cover). Names of staff were not listed in prior issues of the guide, but Franz Boas is listed as Curator of the AMNH's Department of Ethnology in the same "Guide Leaflet" that names Putnam as Advisory Curator (January 1902).

²⁷⁹Although the building was sometimes called the Ethnological Building or the Educational Building, the inscription on its façade read: "Anthropology—Man and His Works." See *Official Guide to the World's Columbian Exposition In the City of Chicago, State of Illinois, May 1 to October 26, 1893 By Authority of the United States of America: Containing A Brief Historical Review of American Development, An Account of Legislation Relating to the Exposition, Its Form*

Under the rubric of “Pre-historic America,” pre-Columbian objects, casts and photographs were displayed at the Chicago fair in a manner intended “to encourage visitors to draw comparisons between the various indigenous cultures of North, Central and South America.”²⁸⁰ The Maya and Mexica were the main representatives of Mesoamerican cultures.²⁸¹ Just north of the Anthropological building, full-scale reproductions of sections of Maya building fragments and stone carvings were on view. These included several stelae from Copan, as well as that site’s Altar Q; panels from Palenque and Yaxchilan; replicas of the arch at Labna and portions of the Serpent House and Nunnery Quadrangle at Uxmal; and a corbel vault from the Governor’s Palace (also called House of the Governor) at Uxmal. The exhibit area dedicated to the Andes featured a reproduction of Ancón, a pre-Inka burial ground on the South Coast of Peru (just north of Lima)—complete with mummies, textiles, ceramics and other small artifacts—recalling illustrations from Reiss and Stübel’s book on Ancón.²⁸² Hugh Bancroft notes that additional works from Bolivia and Peru (and “other points in South

of Organization and Government, And Full Information Respecting All Features of the Exposition, Including Classification of Departments, The Grounds and Main Buildings, The State and Foreign Buildings and Pavilions, The Notable Exhibitions, etc. etc. With Illustrations from Original Drawings. Compiled by John J. Flinn. Issued Under Authority of the World’s Columbian Exposition, Hand Book Edition (Chicago: Columbian Guide Company, 1893), 37.

²⁸⁰ *Official Guide*, 39.

²⁸¹ Similar to terminology in Stephens’s books, the literature and labels throughout the exhibit, however, did not use the term “Maya,” but provided names of specific sites or language groups. Also, the “Mexica” were labeled “Aztec.”

²⁸² As previously discussed, Ancón was one of the earliest Andean sites to be excavated by Western investigators.

America”) were included in the South American display, though he does not provide specifics.²⁸³

The Columbian Exposition’s exhibits included hundreds of photographs by Teobert Maler (1842-1917) and Alfred P. Maudslay (1850-1931).²⁸⁴ Maler, an Austrian, first traveled to Mexico in 1864 as a volunteer in the military expedition, supporting the imperial claims of Archduke Maximilian.²⁸⁵ After Maximilian’s defeat and execution in 1867, Maler remained in Mexico, traveling for the next decade, and making numerous photographs of pre-Columbian ruins. Maler returned to Europe in 1878 to resolve legal issues regarding the inheritance of his father’s estate and was detained for eight years until it resolved in his favor. He returned to Mexico in 1885, visiting the Yucatan for the first time, and decided to settle at Ticul, near Mérida, to set up a photographic studio. The following year (1886) he embarked once again on serious explorations of pre-Columbian sites, this time in the Yucatan, which continued through 1894. To fund his ventures and boost his reputation in academic circles, Maler sold large mounted prints, site plans, and other documentary materials he compiled, to museums and universities. It was thus that his work came to the attention of curators at Harvard University’s Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, and Maler was hired to conduct three major expeditions in Mexico for that museum between 1898 and 1905.²⁸⁶ His headstrong and

²⁸³Bancroft, 635-36.

²⁸⁴Braun, 140.

²⁸⁵For further information on Maler and his photos, see Graham, “Exposing the Maya: A Remarkable Set of Prints, Made at the Turn of the Century, Surface in Shreveport, Louisiana,” *Archaeology* 43, no. 5 (September/October 1990): 36-43.

²⁸⁶Mention should also be made here of Charles Pickering Bowditch (1842-1921), a trustee of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology who took a special interest in the Maya—and

reportedly cantankerous personality may have hastened the termination of his association with Harvard (by 1909). Maler's photographs (Figure 3.16, which remain valuable documents on numerous pre-Columbian sites) not only were seen at turn-of-the-century world's fairs, but in a number of publications, including architect George Oakley Totten's *Maya Architecture* (1926).²⁸⁷

Englishman Alfred P. Maudslay is credited with bringing scientific field methods to American archaeology—not only through his hundreds of photographs (e.g., Figure 3.31) of such Mesoamerican sites as Copan, Palenque, Yaxchilan, Quirigua, Tikal and Chichen Itza—but through compilations of accurate site plans, detailed architectural data, careful records of sculptures and other monuments, as well as hieroglyphic inscriptions.²⁸⁸ Maudslay made over 400 casts and molds of stand-alone objects and architectural details, which he transported to the British Museum. His six-volume *Archaeology* (1889-1902), originally an appendix to what archaeologist and Maya epigrapher Sylvanus G. Morley (1883-1948) classified as “the first scientific publication

particularly in the decipherment of glyphs. Bowditch helped fund many expeditions to Mexico and Central America, aiding the Peabody's endeavors to collect pre-Columbian materials (mainly molds and casts of original monuments) at the turn of the twentieth century. See Alfred M. Tozzer, “Charles Pickering Bowditch,” *American Anthropologist* 23, no. 3 (July 1921): 353-59.

²⁸⁷George Oakley Totten, *Maya Architecture* (Washington, DC: Maya Press, 1926, see discussion below).

²⁸⁸Maudslay was accompanied by artist Anne Hunter (who signed herself Anne Maudslay after the two were married), who was mainly responsible for the drawings of the buildings, monuments and objects that accompanied his studies. Maudslay's journals, field notes, photographs, casts and objects are housed in the British Museum's Department of Ethnography. For a list of the objects he collected—including stone sculptures from Copan and lintels from Yaxchilan—see Ian Graham, *Alfred Maudslay and the Maya: A Biography* (Norman/London: University of Oklahoma Press/The British Museum Press, 2002), 315.

about the Maya civilization,²⁸⁹ *Biologia Centrali-Americana; or, Contributions to the Knowledge of the Fauna and Flora of Mexico and Central America* (1889-1902), was the result of thirteen years' work.²⁹⁰

Another major figure associated with the World's Columbian Exposition and at times working under the auspices of Harvard's Peabody Museum was American Edward H. Thompson (1856-1935). A proponent of the theory that proposed the lost continent of Atlantis as the place of Mesoamericans' origin, Thompson attracted the attention of Stephen Salisbury, president of the American Antiquarian Society of Worcester, Massachusetts (Thompson's home town),²⁹¹ who engineered Thompson's appointment as U.S. Consul in Mérida, where Thompson was able to pursue fieldwork. Salisbury already had commissioned a plaster copy of the Labna façade from Thompson, a replica that so impressed Frederick Putnam (at that time—the 1880s—director of Harvard's Peabody Museum), that he asked Thompson to prepare several replicas (some papier mâché, some staff²⁹²) of building façades from Uxmal, Labna, Chichen Itza, and

²⁸⁹Sylvanus G. Morley, as paraphrased in Robert Sharer, *The Ancient Maya* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), vi.

²⁹⁰Alfred P. Maudslay, *Archaeology*, 6 vols. in 5, originally an appendix to the 63-volume Frederick Du Came Godman and Osbert Salvin, eds., *Biologia Centrali-Americana; or Contributions to the Knowledge of the Fauna and Flora of Mexico and Central America* (London: R.H. Porter/Dulau, 1889-1902).

²⁹¹Graham, *Maudslay*, 161. The biographical information in this paragraph comes from this source.

²⁹²Staff is composed of powdered gypsum, alumina, glycerine, and dextrine mixed with water without heat. It can be cast in molds in any shape and allowed to harden. *Official Guide*, 21-22, 39. For more information on Thompson's contributions to the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition, see Sharer, 382; Graham, *Maudslay*, 160-161; Braun, 32; and R. Tripp Evans, *Romancing the Maya: Mexican Antiquity in the American Imagination, 1820-1915* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 155-56.

Kabah.²⁹³ Six of Thompson's casts of architectural components from Uxmal and Labna were displayed at the 1893 Exposition. Among Thompson's other exploits in the Yucatan—conducted under the auspices of the Peabody Museum—was the dredging of the Sacred Cenote at Chichen Itza.²⁹⁴

With the closing of the 1893 Exposition, the newly formed Field Columbian Museum (now Field Museum of Natural History) became the repository for much of the pre-Columbian material that had been on exhibit at the exposition,²⁹⁵ including Maudslay's and Maler's photographs.²⁹⁶ Frederick Putnam and archaeologist William H. Holmes (1846-1933) of the U.S. National Museum (now the National Museum of Natural History) of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., helped with this transfer. Holmes was named Curator of Anthropology at the Field Columbian Museum in 1894, but remained in that position just three years before returning to the Smithsonian.

Holmes had begun his career in the 1870s as an artist who sketched specimens for scientists at the National Museum. He soon became interested in archaeology, and by the early 1880s, was named Honorary Curator for the Department of American Aboriginal Pottery of the Bureau of Ethnology at the Smithsonian.²⁹⁷ During this time, Holmes

²⁹³Evans, 155.

²⁹⁴Willey and Sabloff, 60.

²⁹⁵Well into the twentieth century, pre-Columbian objects were included only sparingly in the exhibits of fine arts institutions in the United States. The first U.S. exhibition devoted solely to the arts of Mexico was the Museum of Modern Art's "Twenty Centuries of Mexican Art," 1940 (see Braun, 42).

²⁹⁶Braun, 140 and 180-81, n. 16.

²⁹⁷*Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1886. Report of the U. S. National Museum* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1888), 38. (The annual reports for the Smithsonian were always published, at this time, two years after the year

traveled to Mexico, visiting many Mesoamerican sites to survey and visually record them,²⁹⁸ including Cholula, Monte Alban, Mitla and Teotihuacan.²⁹⁹

After becoming curator at the Field Museum in 1894, Holmes traveled, in 1895, to a number of pre-Columbian sites in Guatemala and Mexico, including Quirigua, Mitla, Monte Alban, Xochicalco, Tulum (on the Yucatan Peninsula) and Chichen Itza. After this second sojourn, Holmes published *Archeological Studies among the Ancient Cities of Mexico* (1895-97), which included photographs and drawings of buildings, including elevations and panoramic reconstructions of ancient cities.³⁰⁰ Braun calls this book the “first systematic archaeological treatment of ancient American architecture,” and notes that Frank Lloyd Wright, then resident in Chicago, probably saw it.³⁰¹

When Holmes returned to the Smithsonian in 1897, he was named Head Curator of the newly formed Department of Anthropology.³⁰² Under his direction, the collection of pre-Columbian materials at that museum became one of the most substantial on the East Coast; display cases with pre-Hispanic objects and casts from Mexico and Central and South America were erected there in 1899. In 1902, Holmes was named Chief of the

reviewed.) Studies of pre-Columbian materials were supervised by The Bureau of Ethnology until 1897 when the Department of Anthropology was formed. See *Annual Report . . . for the Year Ending June 30, 1898*, 19.

²⁹⁸Holmes traveled to Mexico for the first time in 1884, accompanied by photographer William H. Jackson.

²⁹⁹“An Artist’s View: William Henry Holmes,” www.mnh.si.edu/anthro/laexped/ch4ns.htm (June 2005) and Willey and Sabloff, 49.

³⁰⁰

³⁰¹Braun, 33, 140.

³⁰²Holmes is listed as “Head Curator” and authored the “Report on the Department of Anthropology for the Year 1897-98” in *Annual Report . . . for the Year Ending June 30, 1898. Report of the U. S. National Museum* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900), 19-33.

Smithsonian's Bureau of American Ethnology,³⁰³ but remained involved with the exhibition of pre-Columbian materials and, for instance, helped to organize the anthropology exhibits at the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition in Saint Louis (Figures 3.32 and 3.33).³⁰⁴ There, Holmes sought to present pre-Columbian art and monuments as they might have looked when first constructed—via polychromed models—but also included photographs of sites in their ruined state.³⁰⁵ Among the numerous architectural models and full-scale casts on view at the St. Louis fair were a model of the Castillo at Chichen Itza; reconstructions of the Temple of the Feathered Serpent at Xochicalco; buildings or sections of buildings from Mitla, Palenque (probably Temple of the Cross) and Uxmal (probably portion of Nunnery Quadrangle); a low-relief panel with geometric designs from a building at Palenque; and a Puuc-style ornamental mask. Casts of Maya stelae from Copan and of the Mexica Coatlicue statue also were displayed, along with a few dozen portable objects from modern Tabasco and Veracruz, Mexico.

Another exposition for which the Smithsonian submitted pre-Columbian materials was the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair, held in Portland, Oregon, in 1905. Models of the Castillo at Chichen Itza, Temple of the Cross at Palenque and a portion of the Nunnery Quadrangle at Uxmal, as well as a Mitla building were also displayed there, along with accompanying photographs.³⁰⁶

³⁰³*Annual Report . . . for the Year Ending June 30, 1903*, 51.

³⁰⁴Frank Lloyd Wright attended this exposition. More discussion on Wright's exposure to pre-Columbian sources occurs in Chapter Five of this dissertation.

³⁰⁵The National Anthropological Archives of the Smithsonian Institution has many photographs of the pre-Columbian exhibits from this exposition. See Photo Lot 82-31, plates 1 through 9.

³⁰⁶James Krakker, Collections Management, Department of Anthropology, National Museum of Natural History, Suitland, MD, showed me photographs from this exhibit (no negative numbers,

Once Holmes resigned his position as Bureau Chief and accepted joint curatorial appointments with the Department of Anthropology and the National Gallery of Art in 1910, he was able to oversee the re-organization of the Mesoamerican exhibition halls in the National Museum,³⁰⁷ where, by 1911, a hall was devoted to Mesoamerican works (Figures 3.34 and 3.35). Its displays included casts of a Maya stela from Copan, the Mexica Sun Stone, and the Stone of Tizoc, as well as enlarged copies of a number of codices. That Holmes was again interested in providing audiences with an image of what Maya buildings and monuments looked like when first made is evident in this hall's inclusion of painted architectural models of the Castillo at Chichen Itza, the House of the Governors at Uxmal, the Temple of the Cross at Palenque and a Mitla palace.³⁰⁸ Additionally, Holmes ordered full-scale polychromed replicas of a pair of feathered serpent columns from Chichen Itza for display at the National Museum.³⁰⁹ These columns were as yet unfinished when they were published in a 1914 article in which Holmes specifically notes that the replicas had been designed to appear "as it is assumed they would appear when newly carved" (Figures 3.36 and 3.37).³¹⁰ Similar columns, also

June 29, 2005). I am unaware of any written documentation on the Portland exposition, but I was able to identify, from these photos, the sites represented there, if not specific structures.

³⁰⁷References to "South American" pottery appear in the *Annual Reports* beginning in 1886, yet these collections were not given the same amount of attention as their Mesoamerican counterparts.

³⁰⁸Many of these were created for world's fairs and expositions and became part of the permanent collection when these impermanent exhibitions closed.

³⁰⁹One of these feathered serpent columns can be seen in a photograph dated 1911. Smithsonian Institution Archives. Washington, DC, Arts and Industries Building, Record Unit 95, Box 44, Folder 20: "Natural History Building: Latin American Archaeology."

³¹⁰William Henry Holmes, "The Feathered Serpent Column of Chichen Itza," *Art and Archaeology* I, (1914): 83. See Chapter Four of this dissertation for further discussion on the display of pre-Columbian objects as ruins versus reconstructions.

brightly colored, appear throughout the interior foyer of the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles, CA (Figure 3.38, Morgan, Walls and Clements, 1927³¹¹).

Another museum housing substantial collections of pre-Columbian materials was the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, which began exhibiting Mesoamerican and Andean materials in 1899. Marshall Saville (1867-1935) was the museum's first curator of Mexican Archaeology³¹²; under his direction, the museum emphasized Maya and Mexica monuments,³¹³ but by 1911, the museum not only had a hall devoted to "Ancient Monuments, Mexico and Central America" (Figure 3.39) but also a hall representing "Indians of South America."³¹⁴ Both displayed dozens of portable objects, including ceramics, textiles, stonework and metalworks, as well as casts of objects too large to remove from their sites.

³¹¹The architectural firm of Morgan, Walls and Clements designed the shell of the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles, but Mexican archaeologist, Francisco Cornejo was responsible for the pre-Columbian decorative elements that cover its façade and interior (see below). The Huntington Library in Los Angeles holds the archives for Morgan, Walls and Clements, but the firm's correspondence files no longer exist, making it impossible to reconstruct the details of the relationship between the architects, Cornejo, and the theater's manager. For a detailed discussion of the building of the Mayan Theatre, however, see Marjorie Ingle, *The Mayan Revival Style: Art Deco Mayan Fantasy* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith/Peregrine Smith Books, 1984), 45-47.

³¹²No curator of Andean archaeology was named.

³¹³See *New York Tribune Illustrated Supplement*, "The Mayan Civilization: An Unprecedented Chance to Study It: All the Available Monuments of It, with Much Aztec Material, Now Shown at the Museum of Natural History for the First Time," 17 December 1899, 10-11 (contained in a folder, "The Mayan Civilization: Opening of the Mexican Hall Installed under the Direction of Marshall H. Saville at the American Museum of Natural History. *New York Tribune*, December 17, 1899" at the Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History).

³¹⁴As Assistant Curator under Frederick Putnam, archaeologist Marshall Saville was responsible for the initial installation of the Mesoamerican material in 1899. See "Mayan Civilization," 10-11. See also, *General Guide*, no. 35, ed. Mary Cynthia Dickerson, November 1911.

The Maya, Mexica and Zapotec civilizations as well as two West Mexican cultures (Jalisco and Colima) were represented in the Mesoamerican exhibits at the AMNH. More than a dozen casts of stelae and “altars” from Copan and Quirigua were on view, as were casts of the Oval Tablet from Palenque as well as a decorative wall panel from the Temple of the Cross also from Palenque. Three colossal Mexica casts—two of which were also on display at the National Museum—likewise graced the hall: the Sun Stone, the Stone of Tizoc and the Coatlicue statue. Additionally, facsimiles of several codices were displayed around the hall, and motifs from some were painted on its walls.³¹⁵ As previously mentioned, the AMNH’s Mexican restaurant in the basement also featured a three-dimensional representation of a Mesoamerican structure; billed as “an exact reproduction of temple ruins at Mitla, Mexico”³¹⁶; it featured walls covered in geometric patterns rendered in low-to-medium relief (Figure 3.18).

The AMNH’s “Indians of South America” hall (an expanded and separate version of the section devoted to South America in earlier exhibits) opened (coincidentally) in the same year Bingham first saw Machu Picchu. It displayed gold, silver and copper objects, Peruvian mummy bundles, and a mummy from Chuquicamata, Chile, along with ceramics, coca and *chica* jars, “charms and medicines,” and various kinds of corn.³¹⁷ By

³¹⁵Also on display at the AMNH were facsimiles of the Vaticanus 3773, Tonalamatl Aubin and the Telleriano-Remensis codices, which were described as the “only post-Columbian work in the collection.” All four books—thought to be Maya—had been made at the behest of the Duke of Loubat, who ordered “two hundred copies of each of these [manuscripts] for distribution among institutions devoted to archaeological research, in the hope that students may be inspired to wrestle with the problems presented thereby, and by the carvings with which he associates them.” See “Mayan Civilization” in *New York Tribune Illustrated Supplement*, 10-11.

³¹⁶*General Guide*, 1911, inside cover, n.p.

³¹⁷*Ibid.*, 67.

1914, Nazca ceramics had been added, along with cases of Andean textiles, looms and shuttles.³¹⁸

The pre-Columbian exhibits at the National Museum and American Museum of Natural History were directly responsible for the use of indigenous American imagery in at least one U.S. building; Albert Kelsey, architect (along with Paul P. Crét) of the Pan-American Union Building, perused the exhibits at both museums while doing research for that building's ornament. Kelsey had a plaster cast made of a Xochipilli sculpture he called "The Sad Indian"—and had an enlarged replica of the statue (four times the size of the original) placed at the eastern end of the pool in the Pan-American Union's "Aztec Garden,"³¹⁹ where it remains today (Figures 3.40 and 3.34).

Pre-Columbian materials were displayed—if impermanently—on the West Coast, at the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego's Balboa Park.³²⁰ Archaeologist Edgar L. Hewett (1865-1946), organizer of that exposition and director of the American Institute of Archaeology,³²¹ wrote a description, "Ancient America at the Panama-

³¹⁸*General Guide*, 1914, 86-87.

³¹⁹"Specs: Building Construction, August 18, 1911," Columbus Memorial Library, Archives & Records Management Center. This document specifies: "The statue of 'The Sad Indian' including base, shall be in one piece, true, unwarped and free from blemishes and . . . shall be an exact enlargement, four times the size of model in the Smithsonian Museum, a cast of which will be furnished by the Owner."

³²⁰For further discussion of the exhibits at this exposition, see Ingle, 14-15.

³²¹Ingle notes that artist Henry Lovins (1883-1960) "began painting and completing interiors in the Mayan Revival style after studying about the Aztecs, Mayas, and Incas with archaeologist Dr. Edgar Hewett of the San Diego Museum about 1916, just after the Panama-California Exposition" (9).

California Exposition,”³²² in which he notes that visitors to the fair’s California Building (which housed its pre-Columbian exhibit) were greeted with the building’s date (January 1, 1915) rendered in “Maya” hieroglyphic characters over the doorway. Entering the exhibit, one saw six bas-relief sculptures from Palenque³²³; a doorway from Chichen Itza flanked by serpent columns; examples of stone sculpture found at Quirigua³²⁴; a carved wooden “altarpiece” from Tikal; and architectural models from Chichen Itza (“Temple of Sacrifices”) and Uxmal (Governor’s Palace). Also included was a case of sixty-five vases from Chiriqui, Panama (an area outside the Mesoamerican region) and, possibly, Andean materials.³²⁵ Accompanying these exhibits devoted to ancient cultures were modern friezes rendered in mostly European styles such as a frieze by Sallie James Farnham (1876-1943), the same sculptor who had also designed a frieze illustrating the

³²²Edgar L. Hewett, “Ancient America at the Panama-California Exposition” (repr., *The Theosophical Path*, February, 1915). Architect Robert B. Stacy-Judd had a copy of this article in his files, now housed at the Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives.

³²³Stacy-Judd had a one-page typed paper entitled, “Works of Art Relating to Ancient America in the California Building” in his file on this exposition. This list is my source for this and the following two footnotes detailing the exhibits.

The bas-reliefs sculptures from Palenque included: “The Magician” (pier tablet from the Temple of the Sun), “The Priest” (pier Tablet from the Temple of the Sun), altarpieces from the temples of the Cross and Sun; hieroglyphic tablets from the Temple of the Inscriptions and a panel from the Temple of the Inscriptions.

³²⁴The monuments from Quirigua included: “The Great Turtle” (representing a woman in the mouth of a mythic animal); a depiction of a bearded man with a “figure of a death god” on the reverse; the “Leaning Shaft” (probably a stela), depicting a “priest-ruler”; “The Queen” depicting a “woman ruler or priestess”; “The Dragon” (a bearded man in the mouth of a mythic animal); an animal head; a depiction of a “priest-ruler,” described as a “sculptured shaft” (probably a stela); and a “great seal.”

³²⁵Architect Robert B. Stacy-Judd kept materials related to this exposition in his files and although Andean works are not noted, if one can believe the proclamations of a website related to San Diego history, Hewett, or a scientist commissioned by him, had traveled to Peru and Guatemala, presumably to collect Andean materials, see “Panama-California Exposition, San Diego, 1915-16: Chapter Two: The Exposition Gets Underway,” <http://www.sandiegohistory.org/pancal/sdexpo33.htm> (November 2006).

New World's struggles for independence at the Main Building of the Pan-American Union in Washington, D.C. (1910).³²⁶ Another frieze at the exposition, "The Return of the Oracle" by Jean Cook-Smith, stands out for its combined use of both European and Maya imagery based on monuments at Palenque (Figure 3.41). The California Building also featured panoramic paintings by Carlos Vierra (1876-1937) that depicted the pre-Columbian sites from which many of the portable objects came.³²⁷

The pre-Columbian exhibits at the Panama-California exposition were especially helpful for disseminating information about pre-Columbian cultures and their material remains, and had a clear impact upon pre-Columbian appropriation in later U.S. architecture; as Ingle writes, "There is little doubt that the Expo's goal of establishing a regional vernacular drawing on Spanish, Mexican and Indian heritages helped also to establish the Mayan Revival style in Southern California."³²⁸ Yet its influence was not confined to Southern California since visitors, including Frank Lloyd Wright,³²⁹ traveled from all over the country to see the fair.

³²⁶Hewett spells the artist's name "Sallie" and refers to her work for the San Diego exposition as a "historical frieze" in a section of his pamphlet entitled, "Works of Art Relating to Ancient America in the California Building" n.p. Ingle (7) spells the artist's first name "Sally" and refers to Farnham's work in the upstairs board room at the Pan-American Union Building as a "mural frieze."

³²⁷Among the pre-Columbian sites painted by Vierra at this exposition were Copan, Quirigua and Tikal, to accompany the pre-Columbian exhibits in the California Building of the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego. For more discussion on Carlos Vierra's depictions of Mesoamerican subjects and their effects on U.S. thinking, see Peter D. Harrison, "Carlos Vierra: His Role and Influence on the Maya Image," in *The Maya Image in the Western World: A Catalog to an Exhibition at the University of New Mexico*, ed. Peter Briggs (Albuquerque: Regents of the University of New Mexico, 1986), 21-32.

³²⁸Ingle, 8.

³²⁹Frank Lloyd Wright, *A Testament* (New York: Horizon Press, 1957), 111. See Chapter Five for more discussion on Wright's exposure to pre-Columbian sources.

Some of the most extensive displays of pre-Columbian art and architecture were mounted in the 1930s—well after the appropriation of such forms peaked in Southern California. Elsewhere, however, pre-Columbian appropriations were on the rise. The Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago, held in 1933-34, marked the centenary of the founding of that Midwestern city and took as its theme “Science in Industry.”³³⁰ Frans Blom (1893-1963), Maya archaeologist, epigrapher and director of Middle American Research at Tulane University, was hired as a consultant for the architectural reproduction of a portion of the Nunnery Quadrangle at the Maya site of Uxmal that was used as an exhibition hall.³³¹ Ingle describes it as “a rather drab hall,” but notes that it showcased Mayan artifacts from the Tulane University collections, as well as a full-scale reproduction of a mural from the Temple of the Warriors at Chichen Itza.³³²

Only one of the many architectural reproductions of Maya structures made for nineteenth- and twentieth-century world’s fairs remains standing today: Federal Hall in San Diego’s Balboa Park (Figure 3.42, now San Diego Hall of Champions Sports Museum, Richard S. Requa), which was based on a portion of the Governor’s Palace at Uxmal³³³ and erected for the 1935 California-Pacific International Exposition, held on the

³³⁰Patricia Bayer, *Art Deco Architecture: Design, Decoration and Detail from the Twenties and Thirties* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2001), 41.

³³¹Ingle, 67-69.

³³²*Ibid.*, 69.

³³³Richard S. Requa describes it as a “free interpretation” of the Governor’s Palace, noting, “For our purposes, modifications had to be made in the reproduction of the design, and the structure adapted to modern exposition needs, but the main features have been retained, such as the great triangular entrance portal with its pylons and broad frieze treatment supported on plain walls of rectangular blocks.” *Inside Lights on the Building of San Diego’s Exposition, 1935: The Dramatic Story of the Organization, Planning and Construction of the California-Pacific International Exposition, May 29 to November 11, 1935* (1937; repr., San Diego: Parker H. Jackson, 1997), 56.

site of the 1915 Panama-California Exposition.³³⁴ According to its architect Richard Requa, the figural scene rendered in the triangular-shaped glass panel over Federal Hall's entrance door was based on stucco figures adorning the interior walls of a building in Mayapan, on the Yucatan Peninsula. Requa back-lit this panel in order to "reproduce the effect of glowing colors which are still in evidence in these monuments of antiquity." He also aimed to emulate the "famous original" Governor's Palace on the exterior walls of Federal Hall, choosing stone that, he wrote, had a "rich, brown color very beautifully and harmoniously polychromed."³³⁵

Federal Hall was one of three buildings that Requa designed in the "Mayan and Aztec" styles for the California-Pacific International Exposition. The others were the nearby Palace of Water and Transportation, and the Standard Oil Building. Requa describes how he attempted to depart from, yet complement, the Spanish Colonial architecture of the renovated 1915 Panama-California exposition buildings with the buildings designed for the 1935 exposition:

In my search for a style that would combine novelty, beauty and authenticity and yet remain in historical harmony with the old buildings, I turned, for ideas and inspiration, to the prehistoric and native architecture of the Southwest, studying the Indian Pueblos and the architecture developed to such a wonderful state of perfection in Mexico and Yucatan by those mysterious early inhabitants, the Aztecs and Mayas.³³⁶

³³⁴Ibid., 31.

³³⁵Ibid., 56.

³³⁶Ibid., 51.

Requa goes on to stress his belief that the “rebirth of this [pre-Columbian] art is inevitable and whatever may be done to foster it will be a step well taken, for surely this great classical architecture, the only true American style, cries out for life.”³³⁷

That indigenous American art forms of Mexico, Central America and South America were considered to be truly American is a sentiment expressed again and again by those who sought out pre-Columbian forms and motifs as inspiration in their U.S. designs. All at once nationalistic, proprietary and anti-European, these sentiments can be seen as part of the broader pan-Americanism that claimed a hold for the United States on the whole of the Western hemisphere (including its pre-Hispanic heritage).³³⁸

Mesoamerica: Twentieth-Century Scholarly Studies

In addition to the excavations and surveys of various sites throughout Mesoamerica by archaeologists such as Maler, Maudslay and Holmes, the early twentieth century brought an increase in illustrated scholarly studies of pre-Columbian material culture—particularly that of the Maya. Sylvanus G. Morley, who was associated with the Carnegie Institution of Washington, was one of the earliest specialists in Maya glyphs; he worked in Guatemala, at Quirigua (with Edgar L. Hewett), Naranjo and Tikal, in the early years of the twentieth century. Morley’s studies of inscriptions resulted in *An Introduction to the Study of Maya Hieroglyphs* (1914), in which he provides numerous examples of glyphs and a summary of the decipherment of Maya writing up to that time.

³³⁷Ibid., 52.

³³⁸See below (and Chapter Two) for further discussion. See also the more detailed treatment of the approaches of Robert B. Stacy-Judd, Francisco Mújica, Alfred C. Bossom and Frank Lloyd Wright, as representative examples of the desire to develop an American architectural example, in Chapter Five.

This publication helped make Maya glyphs easily accessible for those architects and designers who incorporated them into their U.S. architectural programs (such as at the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles, Figure 3.43)³³⁹—though these take-offs often are so fanciful as to make identification of specific sources difficult.

American Herbert J. Spinden (1879-1967), another early twentieth-century scholar of note, completed the first Ph.D. in pre-Columbian studies in the United States. His *Study of Maya Art: Its Subject Matter and Historical Development*, produced as a dissertation at Harvard University in 1909, was published in book form in 1913.³⁴⁰ Shortly thereafter—while a member of the curatorial staff of the Department of Anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History—Spinden wrote one of the first illustrated surveys of Mesoamerican material culture, *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America* (1917).³⁴¹ Both Spinden’s volumes include easily legible drawings (of glyphs, figures and other design motifs) that proved influential; Julius Dietzmann’s design for a metal fireplace panel in the Charles Ennis-Brown house (Frank Lloyd Wright, Los Angeles, 1924), for example, closely resembles the drawing of a relief from Yaxchilan’s Lintel 39 from Structure 16, which is illustrated in Spinden’s *A Study of Maya Art* (Figures 6.4, 6.5 and Appendix E).³⁴²

³³⁹Glyph-like forms appear in a number of other U.S. buildings, including the Pan-American Union (Main Building), the Aztec Theater in Eagle Pass, TX, the Ennis-Brown house, the Mayan Theater in Denver and the Aztec Theatre in San Antonio.

³⁴⁰Spinden, *A Study of Maya Art: Its Subject Matter and Historical Development* (1913; repr., New York: Dover, 1975).

³⁴¹Spinden, *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America* (New York: Anthropological Handbook Fund, American Museum of Natural History, 1917).

³⁴²For further discussion of the fireplace panel, see Chapter Six and Appendix F.

Andes: Twentieth-Century Scholarly Studies

An early enthusiast of pre-Columbian Andean culture, physician W. Golden Mortimer (whose interest was born of his research on coca), conducted extensive archival research on early Colonial chronicles for his book, *Peru: History of Coca, "The Divine Plant" of the Incas* (1901),³⁴³ which provides a lengthy history of the Inka that identifies many of the early primary sources and includes drawings Mortimer himself made of Andean art. Mortimer's illustrations of Moche ceramics and several pre-Inka earspools and textiles are (along with drawings of Inka architecture, textiles and portable objects) uniformly described as "Inka" in *Mortimer's Peru*—a reflection of early failures to distinguish between the Andes's last great culture and those that predate it.³⁴⁴

While Mortimer's oddly skewed study is rarely consulted by archaeologists today,³⁴⁵ it clearly was the source³⁴⁶ for the Andean imagery at the Pan-American Union's Main Building (1910), the patio of which features running bird figures based on those on the Sun Gate at Tiwanku as well as certain pre-Inka earspools (Figures 3.44, 3.45 and 1.20).³⁴⁷

³⁴³W. Golden Mortimer, *Peru: History of Coca "The Divine Plant" of the Incas: With an Introductory Account of the Incas, and of the Andean Indians of To-day* (New York: J. H. Vail, 1901).

³⁴⁴The remnants of other cultures often were misattributed to the Inka in this early period of exploration and excavation, although some scholars, such as Squier, did correctly identify the Chimu and Tiwanaku.

³⁴⁵Mortimer is not even mentioned, for example, in Willey and Sabloff's *A History of American Archaeology* (San Francisco, CA, 1980).

³⁴⁶Mortimer based his drawing on a photograph (Pl. 11) in Stübel and Uhle (Figure 3.23).

³⁴⁷The reasons that Mortimer's book may have been the chief source cited in the patio designs may merely reflect happenstance, as it was a book that had fallen into the collection of the Pan-

Within a year of the completion of the Pan-American Union's Main Building, American explorer Hiram Bingham (1875-1956) brought the Andes to the forefront of Western consciousness with his "discovery" of the now-famous Inka site, Machu Picchu, in Peru. Bingham, who first came upon Machu Picchu in 1911, returned there in 1912 and 1915 to conduct excavations and to photograph the site.³⁴⁸ His photographs and findings were featured in popular journals—including *Harper's Magazine* and *The National Geographic Magazine*—in the midst of Bingham's work there (Figures 1.21 and 3.46).³⁴⁹ Bingham later detailed his experiences in *Machu Picchu, a Citadel of the Incas: Report of the Explorations and Excavations Made in 1911, 1912 and 1915 under the Auspices of Yale University and the National Geographic Society* (1930), and in *Lost City of the Incas, the Story of Machu Picchu and Its Builders* (1938).³⁵⁰

American Union's library. As such, Dr. John Barrett, Director of the Pan-American Union, loaned Mortimer's *Peru* to J. H. Dulles Allen of Enfield Pottery and Tile Works, as indicated in a letter of February 24, 1910, in which Dulles writes:

Dear Mr. Barrett: I beg leave to forward under separate cover the book on Peru, which you so kindly loaned me. The large tiles on either side of the Patio were taken from this, as you will recall. I am enclosing a small pamphlet of some of our little stock designs, which I trust you will look at (John Barrett correspondence files, Columbus Memorial Library, Archives & Records Management Center).

The "large tiles" to which Dulles refers must be the bird-human (Tiwanaku) figures as these are the only figures that appear on both sides of the patio floor, whereas the "little stock designs" possibly were derived from the Chancay earspools, although this cannot be confirmed as the pamphlet to which the letter refers no longer exists.

³⁴⁸Some in Peru knew about Machu Picchu prior to Bingham's arrival and so the "discovery" refers to its coming to the attention of the West. Bingham, who was not a trained archaeologist, was an adjunct professor in the History of Latin America at Yale from 1907 to 1915, and materials he collected on his expedition to Machu Picchu are now housed at Yale's Peabody Museum.

³⁴⁹Hiram Bingham, "The Discovery of Machu Picchu," in *Harper's Magazine* 126, no. 755 (April 1913): 709-714 and "In the Wonderland of Peru: The Work Accomplished by the Peruvian Expedition of 1912, under the Auspices of Yale University and the National Geographic Society," in *The National Geographic Magazine* 24, no. 4 (April 1913): 387-573.

³⁵⁰Bingham, *Machu Picchu, a Citadel of the Incas: Report of the Explorations and Excavations Made in 1911, 1912 and 1915 under the Auspices of Yale University and the National*

Although the flurry surrounding Bingham's exploits brought great attention to the Andes in the early twentieth century, there was no corresponding rise in the Andean inspirations in the U.S. buildings. Andean structures were perhaps less appealing because of their simple surfaces, which were not so blatantly "exotic" as those of Maya structures in the Yucatan or the Zapotec buildings at Mitla. Nonetheless, it seems that Frank Lloyd Wright subtly referenced the Andes by incorporating Inka building techniques in his architectural designs.³⁵¹ Wright's 1920s concrete block designs—seen throughout the Los Angeles area—for instance, were fitted together without using mortar, recalling the mortarless stonework of the Inka, which was emphasized as far back as Prescott (as discussed above). Another Inka tendency that apparently appealed to Wright (and illustrated by several of Bingham's photographs of Machu Picchu) was the combination of "natural" and manipulated stone as part of a broader effort to integrate parts of the surrounding landscape into a building's design. A similar inclination on Wright's part manifests itself in several of the houses he designed, including Fallingwater (Mill Run, PA, 1935-39).

Some pre-Columbian appropriations in U.S. architecture were overseen by specialists. Mexican artist and archaeologist, Francisco Cornejo, for example, designed the copious Mesoamerican and Andean designs decorating the Mayan Theatre in Los

Geographic Society (New Haven/London: National Geographic Society, Yale University Press/H. Milford/Oxford University Press, 1930) and *Lost City of the Incas, the Story of Machu Picchu and Its Builders* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1938).

³⁵¹For more discussion on the connections between Wright and Inka architecture, see Chapter Five.

Angeles,³⁵² and American archaeologist and epigrapher Sylvanus G. Morley consulted on the Mesoamerican features of the Fisher Theatre in Detroit (Graven and Mayger, 1928).

Many other archaeologists and scholars played an indirect role in the designs of pre-Columbian-inflected modern buildings, as the exhibitions they organized and illustrated publications they produced provided U.S. architects and designers with food for thought.³⁵³ As discussed in Chapter Two, pattern books such as Owen Jones's *The Grammar of Ornament*³⁵⁴ were another source of ancient American motifs, and by the early twentieth century prefabricated exotica was available—for instance, in the form of tiles bearing (fairly accurate) Maya designs (sold by the Batchelder-Wilson Company and by Malibu Pottery throughout the 1920s).³⁵⁵

Architects' Advocacy: The Pre-Columbian and an American Style

By the 1920s, several U.S. architects promoted the use of pre-Columbian forms and motifs in professional journals.³⁵⁶ Robert B. Stacy-Judd's "Maya Architecture" of

³⁵²For more discussion of this theater, see Chapter Six.

³⁵³Ingle, 74. Although Spinden's book, *A Study of Maya Art* (1913, discussed above) is a scholarly treatment of the subject, it was used as a sort of pattern book by some U.S. architects and designers who wished to incorporate Maya artforms.

³⁵⁴Owen Jones, *The Grammar of Ornament: Illustrated by Examples from Various Styles of Ornament. One Hundred Folio Plates, Drawn on Stone by F. Bedford; and Printed in Colours by Day and Son*, 2 parts (London: Day & Son, 1856). This book was reprinted many times through the early twentieth century.

³⁵⁵Ingle, 43-44.

³⁵⁶Articles on pre-Columbian subjects began appearing in trade magazines in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As discussed in Chapter Two, *American Architect and Building News*, for example, published sections of Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc's *Habitations of Man in All Ages* (1878) with an illustration of a Puuc-styled Maya structure. See "Originality in American Architecture," in *American Architect and Building News* 3 (5 January 1878): 3.

1926, for instance, describes his knowledge of the Maya taken from years of archival and field research³⁵⁷ and, viewing himself as the prototype, implores others to seek out indigenous architecture for inspiration in U.S. designs without directly copying the forms and motifs.³⁵⁸ In the following year, 1927, architect Rexford Newcomb described Maya and Inka forms in his “Aboriginal American Architectural Types,” then drew parallels between ancient New World architecture and a selection of contemporary U.S. buildings.³⁵⁹

Edward Lloyd Hampton’s article of 1927, “Rebirth of Prehistoric American Art” recounts the structures already built in the “Mayan style” throughout the United States calling these the “first modern adaptations . . . the work of courageous pioneers, who have opened what may become a new era in American art.”³⁶⁰ Another article by him appearing a year later, “Creating a New World Architecture,” is equally enthusiastic about pre-Columbian appropriation as a means of making architecture truly American.³⁶¹ The Aztec Hotel, Hampton writes, “is the only structure standing on the earth today that embodies exclusively the art, architecture and decorative designs of our prehistoric past.

³⁵⁷In his “Autobiography” (chap. XXXII, p. 352), Stacy-Judd explains that he studied intensively for eight years issues of the origin and background of the Maya and other pre-Columbian cultures but found that the “authorities do not agree.” This frustration with the material prompted him to put together and embark upon an “exploring expedition in the jungles of Central America [really, Mexico].” For further discussion of this expedition and Stacy-Judd’s research, see Chapter Five.

³⁵⁸Robert B. Stacy-Judd, “Maya Architecture,” *Pacific Coast Architecture* 30, no. 5, (November 1926): 26-31, 53.

³⁵⁹Rexford Newcomb, “Aboriginal American Architectural Types” *The Western Architect: Architecture and Allied Art* 36, no. 7 (July 1927): 106-13.

³⁶⁰Edward Lloyd Hampton, “Rebirth of Prehistoric American Art,” *Current History* 25, no. 5 (February 1927): 634.

³⁶¹Edward Lloyd Hampton, “Creating a New World Architecture,” *Southern California Business* (April 1928): 16-17, 38, 45, 48.

In other words, it is the only building in the United States that is 100 per cent American."³⁶² Citing examples of pre-Columbian-inspired designs in Los Angeles, its environs and beyond, he proclaims, "Los Angeles has created a new type of American architecture which the rest of the world is now beginning to adopt."³⁶³

Still another written testimony that calls for the use of pre-Columbian architecture for U.S. designs can be seen in the 1928 article, entitled "New Styles in American Architecture: And What We Might Learn from the Mayas," by Alfred C. Bossom and Estelle H. Ries.³⁶⁴ Here the authors discuss pre-Columbian-inflected modern architecture (including the Aztec Hotel by Robert B. Stacy-Judd, Monrovia, California, 1925) and advocates further usage of indigenous American forms and motifs in a new American architecture.

U.S. Buildings as Sources of Pre-Columbian

Another important, obvious, yet potentially overlooked source of inspiration to those U.S. architects engaged in pre-Columbian appropriation during the 1920s were earlier examples of that practice in the United States—buildings that may be said not only to reflect but contribute to the vogue of pre-Columbian motifs' and forms' incorporation by modern architects and their buildings. As anthropologist Jerry D. Moore writes, "Architecture is more than a passive product of potential labor investment; it reflects

³⁶²Ibid., 38.

³⁶³Ibid., 48.

³⁶⁴Alfred C. Bossom and Estelle H. Ries, "New Styles in American Architecture: And What We Might Learn from the Mayas" *World's Work* 56, no. 2 (June 1928): 189-95.

other dimensions of public life and, in turn, helps shape the nature of social interaction.”³⁶⁵

Robert B. Stacy-Judd, for example, kept writings and illustrations of examples of pre-Columbian appropriation in U.S. architecture. Included in his files were the above-cited articles by Newcomb, Hampton, Bossom and Reiss, as well as a pamphlet on Requa’s 450 Sutter with Stacy-Judd’s handwritten notes in the margins.³⁶⁶ That other architects looked to extant examples of pre-Columbian appropriation is borne out in Francisco Mújica’s mention of the use of indigenous American elements at the Pan-American Union complex in his *History of the Skyscraper* (1930).³⁶⁷

Another indication that architects and designers looked to other buildings that made use of pre-Columbian forms and motifs is in replications of the same or similar motifs from building to building. Though they served quite different functions, on opposite coasts, and were built seventeen years apart, the Pan-American Union building in Washington, D.C., and the Mayan Theatre of Los Angeles resemble each other in several ways. The red-tiled floor of the Patio in the Pan-American Union’s Main Building—ornamented with loose replications of Maya figures from Copan (Figure 2.18) and Palenque (Figures 3.47 and 3.48) as well as a Tiwanaku Sun Gate bird-human, Chancay and other pre-Inka motifs (Figure 3.45)—is echoed, to some degree, by the red-tiled front foyer floor of the Mayan Theatre that also features Maya scenes. The latter

³⁶⁵Jerry D. Moore, *Architecture and Power in the Ancient Andes: The Archaeology of Public Buildings* New Studies in Archaeology (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 3.

³⁶⁶William I. Garren (AIA), “Four-fifty Sutter: Impressions” in Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives.

³⁶⁷Francisco Mújica, *History of the Skyscraper*, vol. I (New York: Archaeology and Architecture Press, 1930), 17.

features a figural scene not from Palenque, however, but from the Dresden Codex (Figures 3.49 and 3.50). The Mayan Theatre's foyer walls, moreover, are covered with multiple Tiwanaku Sun Gate bird-human take-offs (Figure 3.51), as well as other characters and designs from the Sun Gate. It would seem that Francisco Cornejo, the designer of the pre-Columbian decoration at the Mayan Theatre, was familiar with the decor of the Pan-American Union complex, but did a self-conscious variant upon it that relied on slightly different sources. The Pan-American Union buildings had received some press coverage,³⁶⁸ which Cornejo may have seen; alternately, he may have traveled to Washington, D.C., and visited the Pan-American Union firsthand (details of his biography are sketchy).

Another apparent reminiscence of the Pan-American Union building is seen in the replication of the Xochipilli figure that presides over the Pan-American Union's Aztec Garden (Kelsey's "Sad Indian") in the foyer of the 1928 Fisher Theatre in Detroit (Figures 3.40 and 3.52). Ingle asserts still another possibility of cross-pollination in a comparison she draws between the same "Mayan warrior" figure at both the Mayan Theater in Denver (Figure 3.53) and in the theater of the same name in Los Angeles

³⁶⁸One example is Herbert E. Angel's article, "Pre-Columbian Architecture Comes Back: Principles of Art and Architecture of Aborigines Used as Motifs for Modern Structures," in which he included illustrations from the patio of the Pan-American Union Main Building, in *Pan-American Magazine* (after 1928, Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives): 91-107. The very fact that this article was in the files of an architect who not only moved to the United States in the 1920s, a decade after the building was completed, but lived in California, far from the Pan-American Union buildings demonstrates the possibility that Cornejo could have seen images of the building in articles.

(Figure 2.2), where, in the latter, according to Ingle, it is enlarged and appears repeatedly on the façade.³⁶⁹

More general references that may reflect influence from one building to another are numerous (both the Aztec Theatre in San Antonio and 450 Sutter, for example, illustrate the same motifs from panels on the Temple of the Foliated Cross at Palenque) yet, in the absence of documentary evidence making specific links, it is difficult to know if the architects and designers obtained ideas from other buildings or from the popular sources outlined in this and the next chapter.

³⁶⁹Ingle, 49. While I was able to find two similar Zapotec figures at both theaters (Figures 3.53 and 2.2), I was not able to locate exact replicas from one theater to the other.

Chapter Four: Culture, Spectacle and the Occult: The Appeal of Pre-Columbiana

The surprising similarity between many elements of Egyptian and related architectures, and elements of primitive American architecture goes to prove that these civilizations were not alien to one another.

--Francisco Mújica, *History of the Skyscraper*³⁷⁰

As academic and other elite audiences enthusiastically tracked discoveries of new pre-Columbian sites and materials, and eagerly consumed archaeological and epigraphic reports, a broader U.S. audience thrilled to the mysterious and exotic aspects of ancient American civilizations, as portrayed in popular media. As early as the end of the eighteenth century, but through the early twentieth century, pre-Columbian peoples (and often fictionalized art forms) were featured in a variety of media, including novels, operas, plays, radio broadcasts and traveling sideshows. Paintings, and some “decorative” arts related to pre-Columbian subjects, also fostered interest in the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas—and all provide a backdrop against which pre-Columbian-inspired architecture should be viewed.

As discussed in Chapter Two, pre-Columbian peoples, especially in their popular appearances, were alternately portrayed as savage and violent or naive and exotic. The motivations behind such portrayals were often economic—business owners exploiting the

³⁷⁰Francisco Mújica, *History of the Skyscraper* (New York: Archaeology & Architecture Press, 1930), 15.

excitement surrounding the idea of ancient American cultures with the average citizen in mind as the intended audience. The height of such excitement played out in those “themed” pre-Columbian appropriations that utilized lavish applied ornament, especially some theaters and hotels such as the Aztec Theatre in San Antonio (Robert Kelley, 1926) and the Aztec Hotel in Monrovia, California (Robert B. Stacy-Judd, 1926). While the last chapter reviewed more academic treatments of pre-Columbian subjects, this chapter focuses on works that helped foster notions of pre-Columbian exoticism.

Novels, Operas and Plays

Mesoamerican and Andean peoples became the subjects of many works of fiction, which generated a good deal of interest in the Americas. Most of these works took as their setting the early Contact period between the Spanish and the New World. An early and influential work in this vein, for instance, was Jean-François Marmontel’s *Les Incas, ou la Destruction de l’Empire du Perou* (1777),³⁷¹ a novelistic treatment of European conquest in South America. Marmontel (1723-1799) took Spanish chroniclers’ accounts of the Conquest of Peru as the inspiration for a remarkably sympathetic portrayal of the Inka, which paints the Spanish conquerors and Catholic authorities of the sixteenth century as cruel and overly zealous in their attempts at converting the indigenous peoples. The book—translated into English immediately—was very popular in both Europe and the United States, with numerous editions appearing throughout the late eighteenth and

³⁷¹Jean-François Marmontel, *Les Incas, ou, la destruction de l’empire du Perou*, 2 vols. (Paris: Chez Lacombe, 1777).

nineteenth centuries.³⁷² It inspired a number of librettos, all entitled *The Virgin of the Sun*,³⁷³ as well as additional operas and plays dealing with the Americas, such as Thomas Morton's, *Columbus: or, A World Discovered: An Historical Play. As It Is Performed at the Theatre-Royal, Covent-Garden* (1792).³⁷⁴

Although Christopher Columbus never had direct contact with pre-Columbian cultures, his story, a particularly American one, was increasingly popular in the performing and fine arts beginning in the 1820s³⁷⁵ as the political climate in the United States began to focus on the Western Hemisphere as a whole.³⁷⁶ Honour attributes Columbus's increasing popularity to a "more general nineteenth-century cult of the explorer and man of action,"³⁷⁷ and surely anticipation of the 400th anniversary of his voyage to the Americas helped fuel the "cult of the explorer," as representations of

³⁷²The English translation of this novel was published as *The Incas: Or, the Destruction of the Empire of Peru*, 2 vols. (London: J. Nourse/P. Elmsly/E. Lyde/G. Kearsly, 1777). For more discussion on the popularity and wide influence of this book, see Hugh Honour, *The European Vision of America* (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1975), 266.

³⁷³See, for example, Frederick Reynolds (overture and music composed by H.R. Bishop), *The Virgin of the Sun: An Operatic Drama* (London: C. Chapple, 1812). For more discussion on this and similar sources, see Honour, *European Vision*, 266.

³⁷⁴Thomas Morton, *Columbus, or, a World Discovered: An Historical Play. As It Is Performed at the Theatre-Royal, Covent-Garden* (London: Printed for W. Miller, 1792). This play was reprinted and performed repeatedly throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. See same title (Boston: William Spotswood, Philadelphia: H. & P. Rice, 1794). In 1823, for example, the play was performed at Covent Garden in London as well as Philadelphia and Baltimore (Washington, DC: Davis & Force, 1823).

³⁷⁵Manthorne pushes this date forward to the 1850s, linking it to sentiments relating to the Monroe Doctrine (1823) that were subsequently made evident in an increased appreciation of subjects relating to the discovery and exploration of America. Those who, she writes, "took up their pens to celebrate the achievements of Raleigh, Cortés, Balboa and Pizarro. . . . became the heroes of the era of Manifest Destiny" (12).

³⁷⁶Honour, *European Vision*, 304.

³⁷⁷*Ibid.*

Columbus and his encounters with indigenous Americans burgeoned in and around 1892.³⁷⁸

The nineteenth century also saw a rise in treatments of the exploits of the Spanish conquistadors, especially Cortés (conqueror of Mexico) and Pizarro (conqueror of Peru), though French artist Louis Hersent's *The Illness of Las Casas*, (c. 1808),³⁷⁹ takes up the Dominican priest, Bartolomé de las Casas (1484-1566), who had written sympathetically of Mexican indigenes and their plight.³⁸⁰

English author Henry Rider Haggard (1856-1925), who sought out “exotic” subjects, wrote two popular novels set in ancient Mesoamerica: *Montezuma's Daughter: A Romance* (1893) and *Heart of the World* (1895).³⁸¹ In the first, the Mexica heroine falls in love with an Englishman who has ventured to Mexico shortly after the Conquest. Her suicide prompts the hero's return to England, where he marries a “proper” Englishwoman. Haggard's later book was based on tales of the “lost cities” of Central America; its protagonists visit pre-Columbian ruins. Both books were reprinted multiple times through the early twentieth century.

³⁷⁸See, for example, M.M.A. Hartnedy, *The World's Fair Drama. Christopher Columbus. A Drama in Three Acts, with Tableau, Directions to Amateurs on Points of Experience, Scenery, Costumes, etc. Written for the Quadricentennial Celebration of the Discovery of America* (Steubenville, Ohio: Columbus Club/New York: P. J. Kenedy/Chicago: W. H. Sadlier, 1892) and Henry Peterson, *Columbus* (Cincinnati: Walter Peterson, 1893). For more information on Columbus's appearance in Western arts, see Honour, *European Vision*, 303-05.

³⁷⁹This painting is illustrated in Honour, *European Vision*, fig. 240. The details are: oil on canvas, 21 1/4 x 25 1/2 in. (53.8 x 64.6 cm), New York, Collection of Robert Rosenblum.

³⁸⁰Bartolomé de las Casas's major work was *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* (Seville: en Casa de Sabastian Trugillo, 1552). For more discussion of the writings and views of Las Casas, see Benjamin Keen, *The Aztec Image in Western Thought* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990), 92-94.

³⁸¹Henry Rider Haggard, *Montezuma's Daughter: A Romance* (1892; New York: McKinlay, Stone & Mackenzie, 1909) and *Heart of the World* (London: Longmans, Green, 1895).

Another novelist of the “exotic,” Englishman George Alfred Henty (1832-1902), turned his attention to the conquest of Mesoamerica in *By Right of Conquest; or, With Cortez in Mexico* (1899). Based in large part on Prescott’s history of Mexico’s conquest, Henty’s action-packed adventure follows a young Englishman who is shipwrecked in Campeche, Mexico. After meeting a slave girl, marrying an “Aztec” princess and fighting with the Spanish, the hero narrowly escapes human sacrifice before finally returning to England.

A somewhat later work, D.H. Lawrence’s *Plumed Serpent* [*Quetzalcoatl*] (1926),³⁸² probably is the best-known novel of ancient Mexico. Lawrence (1885-1930) wrote *The Plumed Serpent* after making several trips to Mexico between 1919 and 1925, and visiting both Teotihuacan and Mitla.³⁸³ The novel explores the interlocked themes of primitivism versus civilization and Western versus non-Western through the eyes of Kate Leslie, an Irish woman who travels to Mexico after the death of her husband and becomes involved in an “Aztec” religion centered around Quetzalcoatl, “the plumed serpent.”³⁸⁴

Just as scholarship devoted to the pre-Columbian Andes was less abundant through the early twentieth century than that devoted to Mesoamerica, so popular treatments of Andean subjects were less numerous than those inspired by Mesoamerica. Charles Bradford Hudson’s *The Crimson Conquest: A Romance of Pizarro and Peru* (1907) is a pseudo-history that recounts the last year (1534) of Peruvian conquest. *The*

³⁸²D. H. Lawrence, *The Plumed Serpent* [*Quetzalcoatl*] (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926).

³⁸³Hugh Honour cites Lawrence’s writings on Mitla and Teotihuacan, without providing their source(s) (*European Vision*, 187).

³⁸⁴For analysis of this novel as it relates to notions of “primitivism,” see Marianna Torgovnick’s chapter 8, “‘Oh Mexico!’ D.H. Lawrence’s *The Plumed Serpent*” in *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

Gold Fish of Gran Chimu (1896)³⁸⁵ by American explorer, author, journalist and photographer Charles F. Lummis (1859-1928),³⁸⁶ was inspired by Lummis's trip to Chan Chan (aka "Grand Chimu," a site of the North Coast, pre-Inka Chimu culture) which he photographed while traveling through Peru and Bolivia in 1892 to join an expedition with archaeologist Adolph Bandelier.

Fine Arts Treatments of the Pre-Columbian

Paintings of pre-Columbian subjects (focusing mainly on the period of early Contact between the Spanish and Mexico) were also on the rise in the nineteenth century as nationalistic sentiments in the United States as well as tensions between the United States and Mexico increased. This focus on the indigenous cultures of the Americas also coincided with the appearance of a number of popular publications, such as those by William H. Prescott, John Lloyd Stephens and Frederick Catherwood (as discussed in the previous chapter).³⁸⁷ One Philadelphia painter, Peter F. Rothermel (1812-1895), obscure today, but quite well known in the nineteenth century,³⁸⁸ looked to Prescott's *The History*

³⁸⁵Charles F. Lummis, *The Gold Fish of Gran Chimu* (Boston: Lamson, Wolfe, 1896).

³⁸⁶Lummis's main professional focus was the Pueblo Indian culture of the U.S. Southwest.

³⁸⁷See, for example, William H. Prescott, *History of the Conquest of Mexico & History of the Conquest of Peru* (1843: Mexico; 1847: Peru; New York: Cooper Square, 2000), John Lloyd Stephens, *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and the Yucatan* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1841) and Frederick Catherwood, *Views of the Ancient Monuments in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan* (New York: Barlett & Welford, 1844).

³⁸⁸Kimberly Orcutt highlights Rothermel's fame in her Ph.D. diss., "'Revising History': Creating a Canon of American Art at the Centennial Exhibition," Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York, 2005, 63. She places Rothermel's *The Battle of Gettysburg* (c. 1870) as the "defining" work of the Park Art Gallery of the Centennial Exhibition (63). Orcutt also states that "though he is not widely known today, Rothermel was intensely admired in Philadelphia as a traditional history painter in the grand manner" (64).

of *the Conquest of Mexico* (1843) to depict his series of five paintings dedicated to Cortés's early exploits with the Mexica.³⁸⁹ The (second version of the) first of this series, *Cortés before Tenochtitlan* [*Cortés's Invasion of Mexico*] of 1846³⁹⁰ (Figure 4.1) depicts a fairly quiet scene with two groups in the foreground (a mixture of indigenous people, including Malinche, Cortés's translator and mistress, Spanish conquistadors including Cortés, and Catholic priests). In the distance, on the same level as Cortés's head, is presumably the (nondescript) burning Templo Mayor of Tenochtitlan (Mexica capital), signifying Spanish victory over the Mexica. With the exception of one male figure (perhaps a soldier) on the left who gazes and points at the smoking building, the others, drooping and dejected, appear exhausted and emotionally spent. According to Mark Thistlewaite, this somewhat unexpected reaction to a military success reflects a passage in Prescott that describes the sobriety of the Spanish upon the realization that the Mexica were "far superior to anything they had yet encountered."³⁹¹

Another well-known painter of the mid-nineteenth century, Emanuel Leutze (1816-1868)³⁹²—a German who also lived in Philadelphia and was known for his history

³⁸⁹The information in this paragraph on Rothermel and his paintings is from Mark Thistlewaite, *Painting in the Grand Manner: The Art of Peter Frederick Rothermel (1812-1895)* (Chads Ford, PA: Brandywine River Museum, 1995), 11-27, 41-46.

³⁹⁰This work is an oil on canvas, 37 1/2 x 48 in./95.3 x 121.9 cm, Lowe Art Museum, University of Miami, museum purchase through Harry and Sonja Zuckerman funds.

³⁹¹Prescott, *History of the Conquest of Mexico and History of the Conquest of Peru* (1936), 16, as quoted in Thistlewaite, 41.

³⁹²The information in this paragraph on Leutze and the details of the commission of *The Storming of the Teocalli* by Amos Binney is from William H. Truettner, "Storming the Teocalli—Again: Or, Further Thoughts on Reading History Paintings" *American Art* 9, no. 3 (Fall 1995): 56-95. For further discussion of the painting and its role in American history painting see, Jochen Wierich, "The Domestication of History in American Art, 1848-1876," Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, 1998, 152-60.

paintings—turned his attention to the pre-Columbian, *The Storming of the Teocalli by Cortez and his Troops* of 1848³⁹³ (Figure 4.2). Bostonian Amos Binney, a close associate of Prescott's, commissioned this painting from Leutze in about 1846. The painting depicts a gory battle scene, based loosely on Prescott, between the Spanish and Mexica on top of a stepped pyramid (what Prescott terms “teocalli”). Unlike Rothermel, Leutze looked also to Catherwood's illustrations of Maya art and architecture, as he included a Copan stela (cut off at top) and Puuc-style architecture of the Yucatan Peninsula with its abundance of low-relief designs, definitive hooked-nose corner protuberances and giant open-mouthed feathered serpent heads. Unlike Yucatec Maya buildings, however, Leutze's structure is stepped, again matching Prescott's description.

One notable European painter of an Andean subject was the German Christian Mayr (c.1803-1851), whose *Conquest of Peru: King Atahualpa Filling a Room with Gold to Purchase His Freedom from Pizarro* of 1849³⁹⁴ (Figure 4.3), portrays the last Inka ruler surrounded by attendants after being captured by Pizarro. According to Spanish chroniclers, Atahualpa had been promised release if he could fill a large room with gold, but was put to death shortly after fulfilling the Spanish demands. The artist's choice of subject, as well as the manner in which he depicts the Spanish and Inka antagonists betrays his empathy for the native populace. Atahualpa and his supporters, positioned at left, appear serene and sophisticated. The king, shaded by a white parasol, is dressed in white pants and dark cape; the two attendants closest to him are also in white. The draping clothes of Mayr's Inka figures resemble Roman togas rather than the actual

³⁹³This work is an oil on canvas, 84 3/4 x 98 3/4 in./215.4 x 250.9 cm, Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, CT, Ella Gallup Sumner and Mary Catlin Sumner Collection.

³⁹⁴This work is an oil on canvas, 40 x 54 in./101.6 x 137.2 cm, Kennedy Galleries, New York.

costumes of elite Inka, and the female's attendant's bare breasts—like the “native” dress of the man to her right—lend an “exotic” note. The Spanish at right—armored and dark—appear tense; one Spanish soldier stares at the Inka with his left arm raised in a menacing fashion, a finger pointed in their direction. Atahualpa, with arms crossed, regards the Spanish soldiers calmly. Between these opposed groups are a Spanish soldier with a large black hat and, to his left, a Catholic priest in a white robe, who watch as more Inka men, dressed in loin cloths and bathed in light, carry an enormous and beautifully crafted gold ornament through a doorway. In front of this opening, a Spaniard, dressed in black with a white collar, sits at a table with a writing instrument, presumably recording each passing gold piece of Atahualpa's ransom.

A number of artists in Mexico whose works may have been seen in the United States also turned their attention to scenes from the pre-Columbian past. José María Obregón's *Discovery of Pulque* was made in 1869³⁹⁵ and Rodrigo Gutiérrez painted *The Deliberation of the Senate of Tlaxcala* in 1875.³⁹⁶ These works, however, would have

³⁹⁵The details of this painting are oil on canvas, 189 x 230 cm, Museo Nacional de Arte, Mexico City, Mexico.

³⁹⁶The Metropolitan Museum of Art's catalog, *Mexico: Splendors of Thirty Centuries* (New York/Boston: Metropolitan Museum of Art/Bulfinch, 1990) records the information on this painting as oil on canvas, 191 x 232 cm, Museo Nacional de Arte, Mexico City. Dawn Ades writes, however, that the painting is not dated, sizes it at 76.5 x 102 cm and locates it in the “Collection of Luis Felipe del Valle Prieto.” See *Art In Latin America: The Modern Era, 1820-1980* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1989), 34. Other artists, mainly living in Mexico, Central and South America through the early twentieth century, produced works related to the pre-Columbian past. Some examples from Mesoamerica include: Saturnino Herrán (1887-1918) *Coatlicue transformada* from *Nuestros Dioses* series, 1918, crayon and watercolor on paper, 39.4 x 31.5 cm, Museo Nacional de Arte, Mexico City (INBA); Roberto Montenegro (1885-1968) *Maya Women*, 1926, oil on canvas, 80 x 69.8 cm, MoMA, New York, Gift of Nelson A. Rockefeller. From the Andes: Francisco Laso, (dates unknown) *The Indian Potter* (or *Dweller in the Cordillera*), 1855, oil on canvas, 135 x 86 cm, Municipalidad de Lima Metropolitana; and José Sabogal, (1888-1956) *Indio*, 1926, woodcut for cover of *Amauta* 9 (September 1926), Lima, Peru.

been available predominantly to those visiting Mexico, unlike the paintings of Carlos Vierra (1876-1937), whose panoramic vistas and paintings of pre-Columbian art and architecture (as noted in the previous chapter) accompanied the pre-Columbian exhibits at the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego.

While many of these paintings of the indigenous American past often included (fanciful) reconstructions of art and architecture, some artists depicted, more or less accurately, pre-Columbian ruins. American painter Frederic Church (1826-1900), for example included small ruins, from the Andes, in the left foreground of his painting, *Cayambe of circa 1858*³⁹⁷ (Figure 4.4). Church, who traveled throughout the pre-Columbian regions of Mexico and Central and South America³⁹⁸ in the mid-nineteenth century and generally painted panoramic landscapes,³⁹⁹ also collected Mexican textiles and Mesoamerican and Andean (mainly, Maya, Mexica, Moche and Chimú⁴⁰⁰) ceramics and other portable objects. He displayed these objects at Olana, his upstate New York mansion that overlooked the Hudson River, in a room specially designed with pre-Columbian motifs.

³⁹⁷This work is an oil on canvas, 30 x 48 in./76.2x121.9cm, New York Public Library, Robert L. Stuart Collection, on permanent loan to the New-York Historical Society.

³⁹⁸Church, who was interested in early civilizations, also traveled widely throughout New England, Europe, the Arctic, the Middle East and North Africa.

³⁹⁹Manthorne provides a map detailing Church's travels throughout South America in 1853 and 1857 (Map 1) and provides discussion of Church's landscapes. See especially chap. 3. See also, Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art*, 36-37.

⁴⁰⁰Art historian Barbara Braun notes that these objects were "almost entirely fake" adding, "If Church was aware of this, he probably would not have cared, since his only interest was in the way these pieces blended into the interior decor and in their exoticism, not in their authenticity or intrinsic meaning" (37).

The ruins in Church's *Cayambe* consist of a rectangular column topped with a round sphere and decorated by a foliage-enshrouded relief showing a profile bust. Neither the architectural remnant nor its ornament resembles any known monument of the pre-Columbian Andes,⁴⁰¹ although—as Manthorne notes—the form emanating from the mouth of the bust seen in relief vaguely resembles the sound scroll motifs used by numerous Mesoamerican cultures.⁴⁰² Although the ruin may represent a sixteenth-century or early-colonial-period specimen,⁴⁰³ the various styles to which it would seem to allude, suggests that Church inserted an invented motif, rather than paint the scene as he saw it.

American Marsden Hartley (1877-1943), for example, depicted a stepped Mexica structure in his painting *Tollan—Aztec Legend* (1933),⁴⁰⁴ after a Guggenheim fellowship took him to Mexico City and Cuernavaca from March 1932 to April 1933. While in Mexico, Hartley studied pre-Columbian cultures, viewing firsthand objects and reconstructions of buildings at the Museo Nacional de Antropología in Mexico City, as well as actual buildings at Teotihuacan, a site with a number of small, stepped buildings similar to the one in his painting.⁴⁰⁵

⁴⁰¹Manthorne observes, however, that sculptural reliefs dating to the early period of Spanish occupation and depicting both lions and “wild men with leaves coming out of their mouths” are still found in Ecuador (102).

⁴⁰²Ibid.

⁴⁰³See Franklin Kelly, *Frederic Edwin Church* (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1989). A more detailed treatment of these ruins by Kevin J. Avery is forthcoming (personal communication, April 2007).

⁴⁰⁴This painting is reproduced in Oles, 157, and is an oil on canvas, 80 x 99.7 cm, from The Regis Collection, Minneapolis.

⁴⁰⁵Oles, 155-59.

While all of the works described so far treat early-Contact-period or pre-Columbian subjects in oil and canvas, a handful of works rendered in other media, portray pre-Columbian peoples and subjects.⁴⁰⁶ One woodcut by American Lowell Houser (1902-1971), for example, *Maya Corn Harvest, Yucatan* of about 1927,⁴⁰⁷ portrays two male Maya figures (the aquiline noses of the “Maya profile” give away their ethnicities), dressed in loin cloths and sandals, the same attire seen on a number of Classic-period Maya stelae. The figures, however, both wear bowler caps and wield crude-looking axes, neither of which is included in the Maya aesthetic vocabulary. The figures illustrate Western associations of pre-Columbian peoples with the Earth as the men, well ensconced in a maize field, quietly and methodically use their primitive tools to cut down the stalks. Weighted shoulders, downward gazes and the placement of the horizon line above their heads furthers their connection to the land whereas a lone architectural feature lends an exoticism to the scene. A feathered serpent column, like those at Chichen Itza, looms on the horizon to the right compositionally above the figures. Houser, in fact, worked as an artist restoring monuments and painting murals (along with Jean Charlot and Ann Axtell Morris) at Chichen Itza in 1927, under the direction of Sylvanus Morley of the Carnegie Institute of Washington.⁴⁰⁸

Maya figures can also be seen in the sculpture of Octavio Medellín (1907-1999), a Mexican who relocated to the United States during the Mexican Revolution. In his sculpture, *The Spirit of the Revolution* (1932), Medellín used limestone—the prime

⁴⁰⁶For further discussion of both European and U.S. works treating pre-Columbian subjects and/or taking on a pre-Columbian “flavor,” see Braun.

⁴⁰⁷This work is illustrated in Oles, 98. The dimensions are 27.3 x 21.6 cm (image) and it is housed in the Collection of Everett Gee Jackson in San Diego.

⁴⁰⁸Oles, 241-42.

material used by the Maya for architecture, stelae and other portable objects—to depict a kneeling soldier clutching his gun and, behind him, a standing Maya female figure raising her arms as if in supplication. Atypical of Maya depictions of female figures, her breasts are exposed, yet she wears a wrap from the waist down that resembles those depicted in a number of scenes on portable objects; her hairstyle, with a part down the middle, is more modern than Maya. In between the figures is a coiling serpent—a Mexica sculptural manifestation of the deity, Quetzalcoatl. The figures are placed on a square base, carved in low relief on at least one side with a jumble of shapes and figures, one with Olmec features and another, possibly Mixtec, with an emanating sound scroll seen in a number of pre-Hispanic codices. Medellín, like Houser, studied and worked with Maya art while visiting Mexico in the late 1920s.⁴⁰⁹

While there is no indication that these works of art themselves stimulated appropriation of pre-Columbian forms and motifs in U.S. architecture, the very fact that they deal with indigenous American subjects would have promoted greater awareness of these pre-Columbian peoples and their art forms. These works can also be seen as gauges for comparisons between the kinds of pre-Columbian imagery adopted for U.S. fine arts versus those co-opted in U.S. architecture.

Ruins vs. Reconstructions: Romantic Nostalgia or Evidence of Decay?

When depicting or displaying pre-Columbian monuments (in scholarly publications, world's fair and museum displays, and/or the fine arts), artists and illustrators sometimes show them as they exist today (damaged or dilapidated, lacking

⁴⁰⁹Ibid., 249.

their original polychrome, and often sporting foliage) or as they were imagined to have looked when first erected. Church was inclined toward ruins, and Manthorne asserts that the nexus, in *Cayambe*, of architectural remnant, moon above and rising mountain “emphasizes the association between this noble scenery and the unique and indigenous art to which it gave rise.”⁴¹⁰ While the ruins of Romantic painting are typically intended to connote the fragility and ephemeral quality of humanity and its constructs—as opposed to the powerful and permanent hand of God or Nature⁴¹¹—Manthorne asserts a relationship between the indigenous inhabitant and Nature in the presence of ruins in Church’s (and other artists’ of the Americas) paintings, writing:

The use of this label [Romanticism] to describe the endeavors of American artists demands further qualifications, for this mode of thought never enjoyed the support and the vogue of a movement on these [American] shores, as it did in Europe.⁴¹²

Titian Peale’s *Ancient Mounds near Lima, Peru* of circa 1838 is another nineteenth-century painting of pre-Columbian ruins.⁴¹³ Peale probably was painting Pachacamac, a long-lived pre-Inka site just south of Lima. In his picture’s foreground, a female figure on horseback—dressed in European clothes and hat—regards a man on foot dressed in indigenous festival garb.⁴¹⁴ Here, the ruins—which appear as little more than

⁴¹⁰Manthorne, 103.

⁴¹¹Christopher Woodward traces the traditional association of ruins with human and individual frailty back to the Middle Ages in *In Ruins* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2001), 93.

⁴¹²Manthorne, 136.

⁴¹³The details of this painting are oil on panel, 10 x 12 1/4 in./25.4 x 31.1 cm, American Philosophical Society.

⁴¹⁴In providing the background to the painting, Manthorne points out that “Peale made his sketches in the valley of Almancaes, about three miles north of the city, where the expedition staff attended a festival.” She suggests that the “gaily clad” figure may be a reference to that event (103).

two light-colored hills, one with a deep gully—are hemmed in by a modern brick wall and two rows of trees, suggesting the overwriting of the pre-Columbian by the modern. Peale was associated with the Philadelphia-based American Philosophical Society, which studied pre-Columbian ruins; perhaps the composition of his painting reflects his attitude toward the ruins as a scientific specimen, to be framed and categorized by modern science.

Surely depictions of pre-Columbian ruins in other settings, such as the artificially weathered and aged casts of Maya building sections at the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition, were designed to stress their antiquity and to veil them in that degree of mystery afforded by the mists of time.⁴¹⁵ Conversely, the decision to represent monuments as they were then newly minted, suggests an attempt, and even an aggrandizement of that which archaeologist George Vaillant, of the American Museum of Natural History, called the “majesty of bygone times.” Vaillant noted that “a thoughtful person, contemplating these models, can richly savor the past as he peoples the temples according to his fancy and equips the imagined ceremonials with the objects in the cases.”⁴¹⁶

Photography as Pre-Columbian Source Material

Photography played a key role in enabling comparisons of ruins and reconstructions beginning in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Photographs that

⁴¹⁵R. Tripp Evans, *Romancing the Maya: Mexican Antiquity in the American Imagination, 1820-1915* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 156. See also, Woodward, 104-05.

⁴¹⁶George C. Vaillant, “Enlivening the Past,” *Natural History* 31 (1931): 531.

documented buildings' and monuments' modern states, serving not only as tools of reconstruction, but as base lines against which to measure such reconstructions. By the end of the nineteenth century, photography was one of the most important sources of visual information on pre-Columbian art and architecture, and as such, photographs—since they were portable, cheap and eminently reproducible—proved highly influential in the dissemination of pre-Columbian imagery. Thousands of photographs of pre-Columbian sites were made in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the majority of them documentary, rather than aspiring to artfulness.

The photographs of Edward Weston (1886-1958), however, can be counted among the exceptions,⁴¹⁷ as he devoted a number of his Mexican works (1923-26)⁴¹⁸ such as *Pirámide del Sol, Teotihuacan* of 1923 (Figure 4.5), to pre-Columbian ruins.⁴¹⁹ As the largest-known standing structure in the Americas, the “Pyramid of the Sun” stands alone in the photograph, grand in its size in the frame—filling and overtaking the boundaries of the photograph—and somewhat mysterious through the low lighting, which throws deep shadows both in the foreground and on the left side of the pyramid.

⁴¹⁷Peruvian Martín Chambi (1891-1973), although obscure in the United States until recently, may have impacted the United States through photographs (many reproduced as postcards) of Inka ruins (especially in and around Cuzco and Machu Picchu), as well as of Peruvian people and contemporary scenes. In addition to the postcards, U.S. visitors to Cuzco in the 1920s and '30s may have encountered his works, as he was quite well known throughout Peru at this time. See Martín Chambi, *Fotografías del Perú, 1920-1950* (Bogotá, Colombia: Banco de la República, 1988).

⁴¹⁸See Amy Conger, *Edward Weston in Mexico, 1923-1926* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press for San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, 1983) and Oles, 159.

⁴¹⁹The photograph is a vintage gelatin silver print (19 x 23.7 cm) in the Collection Center for Creative Photography, The University of Arizona, Tucson. Copyright 1981 Center for Creative Photography, Arizona Board of Regents.

American photographer, Laura Gilpin (1891-1979) also chose pre-Columbian art and architecture as the subject of some of her works. Her photograph, *Steps of the Castillo, Chichen Itza* of 1932,⁴²⁰ captures the light trick intended by the builders of this structure whereby on the equinoxes sunlight and shadows create an undulating serpent body which terminates at the sculpted, open-mouthed head at the base. Like Weston's composition of the Pyramid of the Sun, Gilpin has chosen to overtake her frame with the building. The absence of people, deep shadows and dark, billowy clouds also lend a grandeur, if not mysticism, to her subject. Similarly, *Sunburst, Kukulcan, Chichen Itza, Yucatan* of 1932,⁴²¹ features a cloud formation with the sun's rays streaming out, as a double flaring cornice and vertical "frieze" of the Castillo sneaks into the picture on the left (Figure 4.8), marrying nature and ancient structure.

Aerial photographs of pre-Columbian sites were especially prominent in the 1920s and '30s. When Charles Lindbergh flew over the Yucatan Peninsula in the famed "Spirit of St. Louis" in 1928, looking for as-yet undiscovered ancient sites, interest in pre-Columbian cultures rose.⁴²² Three years later (1931), American geologist Robert Shippee and U.S. Navy Lieutenant George Johnson conducted a photography expedition

⁴²⁰This photograph is reproduced in Oles, 162. It is a silver bromide print on gevaluxe paper, 35.4 x 26.7 cm and is held in the collection of the Amon Carter Museum in Fort Worth (P1964.130).

⁴²¹The photograph is a silver bromide print on gevaluxe paper, also part of the Laura Gilpin Collection at the Amon Carter Museum in Fort Worth. It was a gift of Laura Gilpin (P1979.95.13).

⁴²²Arthur J. Hansen mentions this flight in his article, "A Most Unusual Baptist Church," from an unidentified source, probably 1932 (one page). The article was in Robert B. Stacy-Judd's files, now housed in the Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.

to Peru (The Shippee-Johnson Expedition)⁴²³ that yielded thousands of vertical, oblique and ground photographs of topographical and archaeological features of regions once dominated by the Moche, Chimu, Nazca, Paracas, Wari and Inka cultures.⁴²⁴ While it is unlikely that those interested in appropriating pre-Columbian forms and motifs in U.S. architecture would have collected these photographs or otherwise been directly influenced by them, such photographic expeditions were highly publicized and helped to create a general stir around things pre-Columbian.

Pre-Columbian Exotica: Remnants and Freaks

The pre-Columbian past's frequent (if farfetched) evocation in traveling sideshows and circuses that toured the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is further indication of its popular vogue. Such shows routinely boasted living specimens of pre-Columbian peoples, especially so-called "Aztecs,"⁴²⁵ who were billed as remnants of ancient American cultures. Some sideshow oddities were displayed as exotic carryovers from the past based on their (questionable, but non-white) ethnicities, while other "pre-Columbian" specimens were deemed "freaks" by virtue of some physical anomaly, such as diminutive size.

⁴²³The author learned of the Andean details of the Shippee-Johnson Expedition while viewing the Yale University exhibition, "Machu Picchu: Unveiling the Mystery of the Incas," Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, August 2003.

⁴²⁴A large part of the Shippee-Johnson photograph collection is housed today at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City. For details of the expedition and collection, see William M. Denevan, "The 1931 Shippee-Johnson Aerial Photography Expedition to Peru," *The Geographical Review* 83, no. 3 (July 1993): 238-51.

⁴²⁵The notion of a surviving pocket of unassimilated indigenes, living an "innocent" lifestyle, was grounded in John Lloyd Stephens's claim to have heard of a "living city, large and populous" that no outsider had seen. *Travel in Central America*, vol. II, 195-198.

One long-running popular display showcased the “Aztec Children,” a girl and boy named Bartola and Maximo (who are believed to have been sold by their parents, Innocente Burgos and Marina Espina, of Decora, San Salvador). Dressed in costumes adorned with “Aztec suns,” the two were described as the “Last of the Ancient Aztecs of Mexico” by the forty-eight-page booklet, *Life of the Living Aztec Children*, that was hawked in conjunction with their appearances (Figure 4.6).⁴²⁶ Beginning in the early 1850s, Bartola and Maximo were exhibited throughout the United States and Europe. Bogdan writes that their original “owner,” a Mr. Morris, showed them in London in 1853, and from there took them on a tour of the Continent, stirring up much scientific debate regarding their origin and ethnic identity. When they returned to the United States, the “Aztec Children” were exhibited in Barnum’s American Museum in New York.

It seems that there may have been more than one set of “Aztec Children,” for a pair, also of quite diminutive stature, are mentioned in the literature as being part of Phinaeus T. Barnum’s New York exhibits beginning in the early 1850s.⁴²⁷ Barnum’s Aztec Children, like the original pair, are described in a forty-page booklet entitled *Memoir of an Eventful Expedition in Central America*,⁴²⁸ as well as in a flyer that

⁴²⁶Robert Bogdan, *Freak Show: Presenting Human Oddities for Amusement and Profit* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 128. Bogdan dates this booklet to 1860, and cites its publisher as New York: American Museum (i.e., the museum run by circus owner P.T. Barnum).

⁴²⁷Marjorie Ingle, *The Mayan Revival Style: Art Deco Mayan Fantasy* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith/Peregrine Smith Books, 1984), 3-4. See also, Evans, 85-87.

⁴²⁸The full title is *Memoir of an Eventful Expedition in Central America; Resulting in the Discovery of the Idolatrous City of Iximaya, in an unexplored region; and the possession of two Remarkable Aztec Children, Descendants and Specimens of the Sacerdotal Caste (now nearly extinct) of the Ancient Aztec Founders of the Ruined Temples of That Country; Described by John L. Stevens (sic), Esq., and Other Travellers*, trans. Pedro Velasquez (Publisher unknown, c. 1850). For more discussion regarding this pamphlet and other examples of this kind, see Ingle, 3-4 and Evans, 85-87 and 172, n. 105. See also, Victor von Hagen, *Maya Explorer: John Lloyd*

portrays them as “active, sprightly, intelligent little beings,” and gives their ages as twenty for the “young man,” and eleven or twelve for the “young lady.” When Barnum’s Aztec Children were displayed in New Brunswick, New Jersey, in 1852, a promotional flyer enjoined, “Sound the tonjoring! Beat the fuzeguzy! Blow the huzagh!” in anticipation of this “wonderful display of Aztec children dressed in full bloomer costume.”⁴²⁹

Yet another abnormally small boy and girl pair, Aurora and Natali, were advertised as “Ancient Aztecs” by the Sells-Floto Circus Sideshow that exhibited them in 1910 (Figure 4.7).⁴³⁰ This pair was apparently mentally challenged, as were many of those presented as remnants of ancient American humanity. As Robert Bogdan observes, many of the people thus displayed suffered from such physical abnormalities as microcephaly and dwarfism.⁴³¹ Putative “pre-Columbians” continued to be exhibited as freaks—in sideshows and later, in cinema—through the 1920s and ‘30s.⁴³² Tod

Stephens and the Lost Cities of Central America and Yucatan (Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 1947), 140-41.

⁴²⁹Printed Ephemera Collection; portfolio 100, folder 20; Dimensions: 1 p.; 36 x 20.5 cm; Language: English; Broadsides; Created 1852 by Rutgers’ college in U.S. NJ; Collection: Part of *Three Centuries of Broadsides and Other Printed Ephemera*, Contributed by Library of Congress. Washington, DC 20540 United States, Library of Congress, Rare Book and Special Collections Division; Object ID: DCLCrpbe15903400.

⁴³⁰Bogdan, 133. Princeton library has a pamphlet from this circus in their records entitled, “Life of the Living Aztec Children,” see libweb.princeton.edu/libraries/firestone/rbpc/aids/mccaddon/mccaddon3.html (November 2006).

⁴³¹See Bogdan, “The Exhibition of People We Now Call Retarded,” in *Freak Show*, 119-146.

⁴³²For discussion of such “freaks” as “The Wild Girl of the Yucatan,” “The Mexican Wild Boy,” “Tik Tak, the Aztec Pinhead,” and “The Original Aztec Indian Midgets from Old Mexico,” see Bogdan, 132-134.

Other performances or displays that featured pre-Columbian subjects include the Valencia Orange Show (1931), with a man dressed like the Aztec ruler “Montezuma” as well as an “Aztec pyramid.” See photograph captions “Man Dressed as Aztec Emperor Montezuma with

Browning's 1932 film, *Freaks*, for example, featured Schlitzie, an "Aztec" woman who had previously been exhibited as "Maggie, the Last of the Aztecs."⁴³³

Radio Broadcasts and the Pre-Columbian

Radio broadcasts, an influential popular medium, frequently took up pre-Columbian topics in the 1920s and '30s.⁴³⁴ Some such broadcasts—like Robert B. Stacy-Judd's interviews on the Maya⁴³⁵—were fact-driven responses to public interest, whereas other programs tapped popular perceptions of the pre-Columbian Americas' more esoteric dimensions. A woman who called herself Rose Dawn, for example, had a weekly show on XERA (a station on the Mexican border that broadcast a signal so powerful that people throughout much of the continental United States could tune in), on which she—the purported Patroness of the "Sacred Order of Maya"—pitched metaphysical self-help lessons by mail-order, imploring her listeners to "let the Mayans help you find yourself."⁴³⁶ The Maya and other ancient Americans were routinely marketed, in this era, as beings imbued with special, mystical powers.

Two Women Flanking Him at 1931 Valencia Orange Show," and "City of Fullerton's Valencia Orange Show Exhibit Featuring an Aztec Pyramid," UCLA Digital photograph collection. See http://unitproj1.library.ucla.edu/dlib/lat/display.cfm?ms=uclalat_1429_b3720_G3486 and unitproj1.library.ucla.edu/dlib/lat/display.cfm?ms=uclalat_1429_b3720_G3492 (November 2006).

⁴³³Frederick Drimmer, *Very Special People* (New York: Amjon, 1973), as cited by Bogdan, 134.

⁴³⁴Schedules printed in the *New York Times*, for example, list frequent lectures and personal interest stories based on pre-Columbian subjects, especially during the 1920s and '30s.

⁴³⁵Stacy-Judd retained transcripts of many of these interviews. One such example indicates that James Vandiveer interviewed "Robert B. Stacy-Judd on the Mayan Ruins of Yucatan," on Thursday, February 28, 1935, on KFAC at 7:45 p.m. See Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives.

⁴³⁶Gene Fowler and Bill Crawford, *Border Radio: Quacks, Yodelers, Pitchmen, Psychics, and Other Amazing Broadcasters of the American Airwaves*. rev. ed. foreword by Wolfman Jack.

While the fictional, fanciful and otherwise occult evocations of pre-Columbian peoples (along with their art and architecture) discussed in this chapter do not appear to have provided direct source material for those interested in borrowing from indigenous American art forms in their U.S. architectural designs, their presence bespeaks a general fascination with the pre-Columbian in the United States that began in the late eighteenth century and increased throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The novels, operas, plays, paintings, radio broadcasts and traveling sideshows that touted pre-Columbian subjects both serve as markers of public interest in the indigenous cultures of the Americas throughout this period and would have helped spawn borrowings of pre-Hispanic forms and motifs in U.S. art and architecture.

(Austin: University of TX Press, 2002), 57. The Sacred Order of Maya had a 1936 pamphlet, "The Revelation Secret [of] the Mayans [of] Del Rio, Texas," available from Rose Dawn for one dollar. The pamphlet promised step-by-step instructions for "obtaining your desires," a guaranteed way to increase your income, an order form for a course on developing personal magnetism (just \$4.98), and an application blank for membership in the Mayan Order.

Chapter Five: Pre-Columbian Inclination: Reasons for the Appropriation of Pre-Columbian Aesthetics in U.S. Structures

All architecture is naturally eclectic, revealing the long march of civilization. And if we can produce a style of architecture more truly American, why should we not glory in it?

--Robert B. Stacy-Judd, "A Most Unusual Baptist Church"⁴³⁷

The appropriation of pre-Columbian forms and motifs in U.S. architecture during the early decades of the twentieth century can be traced, in part, to dominant political and social trends. Nationalism, patriotism and ideas of progress were heightened during this period while, as discussed in Chapter One, many took idealistic attitudes toward non-Western peoples and their "exotic" or "primitive" arts production. Entrepreneurs exploited fascination with this exoticism as well as the public's desire for knowledge of the Other through architectural programs using pre-Columbian and other non-Western forms. Other movements in Europe and the United States that encouraged the mixing of forms from a variety of cultures and contexts, such as the Arts and Crafts and Art Deco movements—paralleled this vogue of the non-Western.

The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw a plethora of exhibits toting progress at world's fairs and expositions, as the United States vied with other nations for

⁴³⁷Quoted in Arthur J. Hansen, "A Most Unusual Baptist Church," article from an unidentified journal, c.1932, n.p. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.

global prestige and power. Increasingly territorial toward the Western hemisphere, the United States—through policy and diplomatic initiatives launched through the early decades of the twentieth century—established its stance that European nations were not to claim further territory in the Americas. As nationalistic and competitive attitudes emerged between the United States and Europe, a “pan-Americanist” view of the hemisphere took hold, as art historian Katherine Manthorne has observed:

Looking back to the early years of the [nineteenth] century, we discover a slowly emerging sentiment of pan-Americanism. These vague feelings of hemisphere brotherhood were not long in metamorphosing, in the late 1840s and 1850s, into more aggressive, proprietary attitudes, with which Humboldt’s researches conveniently meshed.⁴³⁸

U.S. investments, especially in Mexico but throughout all of Latin America, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, events surrounding the Spanish-American War of 1898, the United States’s emergence, around 1900, as an international, economic and military power, the opening of the Panama Canal in 1914 and U.S. isolation from Europe during World War I all pushed the United States’s relations with its southern neighbors to the forefront of national consciousness.⁴³⁹ This attitude of fraternalism extended to pre-Columbian peoples, who were regarded as forerunners of living Americans. By extension, indigenous American art and architecture was regarded as historically connected to modern America, and as such, offered potential inspiration for modern practitioners, especially those eager to break away from European modes and pursue a

⁴³⁸Katherine Manthorne, *Tropical Renaissance: North American Artists Exploring Latin America, 1839-1879*. New Directions in American Art (Washington/London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989), 3.

⁴³⁹See Helen Delpar, *The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican: Cultural Relations between the United States and Mexico, 1920-1935* (Tuscaloosa, AL/London: University of Alabama Press, 1992) and Holly Barnet-Sanchez, “The Necessity of Pre-Columbian Art in the United States,” in *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past: A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks*, ed. Elizabeth Hill Boone (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1993), 177-207.

fresh aesthetic that, at the same time, was historically grounded and geographically appropriate. With the increased cultural and artistic reciprocity that accompanied the political and economic interconnections between the United States and Latin America, and as wide-ranging pan-Americanism substantially increased after 1920,⁴⁴⁰ pre-Columbian appropriations reached their height in Southern California. Then, as Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy was implemented in the 1930s, pre-Columbian-inflected architecture cropped up in larger numbers throughout much of the remainder of the United States.

Ongoing archaeological discoveries throughout the regions once occupied by pre-Columbian Americans, particularly during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, expanded the corpus of visual materials relating to these indigenous groups, and provided “proof”—through large buildings, carefully conceived site plans, and monumental and impressively detailed stone carvings—that indigenous Americans were more sophisticated than those non-Western peoples commonly branded barbarians or savages.⁴⁴¹ In her book *Pre-Columbian Art and the Post-Columbian World*, Barbara Braun describes the correlation of Western attitudes toward a people and the West's concurrent co-option of their art forms:

The conviction that monumental forms and great architectural ruins are the expression of great states was also conducive to Pre-Columbian art figuring prominently in revival styles of a nationalist and anticolonialist

⁴⁴⁰Delpar, *Enormous Vogue*.

⁴⁴¹For a more in-depth discussion of Western attitudes toward non-Western peoples, see Brian Fagan, *Clash of Cultures*, 2d ed. (Walnut Creek, CA/London/New Delhi: Altamira Press, 1998), 24-25 and 160-61, in particular.

complexion on the American continent and its relevance to certain European nationalist imperatives.⁴⁴²

Partly because pre-Columbian peoples produced impressive monuments and structures, these same monuments became serious models for a handful of architects working in the United States.

Architectural historian Mary Woods found, through her survey of early American architectural journals, that a number of articles demonstrated a desire to develop a new architectural aesthetic in the United States based in art forms of the past. She points out, for example, that the editors of *Architects' and Mechanics' Journal* “clearly hoped that a novel American architecture would gradually evolve as new materials and new building types were melded with past styles.”⁴⁴³ While the majority of architects clearly turned to European prototypes—particularly Greek and Roman—a number found pre-Columbian art and architecture to be viable source material. This is evidenced in Elisabeth Blair MacDougall’s examination of publications from the 1790s to 1870s for which she concludes, “American publications frequently devoted space to pre-Columbian and pre-Revolutionary architecture,” adding that this focus “seems to have been inspired by nationalist sentiment.”⁴⁴⁴ She mentions one particularly early article of 1849 that relates pre-Columbian aesthetics to architecture in the West: Cary R. Long’s, “The Ancient

⁴⁴²Barbara Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art and the Post-Columbian World* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1993), 301.

⁴⁴³Mary N. Woods, “History in the Early American Architectural Journals,” in *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, Studies in the History of Art, vol. 35 (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990), 79.

⁴⁴⁴Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, “Before 1870: Founding Fathers and Amateur Historians,” in *Architectural Historian*, ed. MacDougall, 18.

Architecture of America: The Historical Value and Parallelism of Development with the Architecture of the Old World.”⁴⁴⁵

The early-twentieth-century vogue of pre-Columbian appropriations in U.S. architecture owes a great deal to those U.S. architects who both rejected the dominance of European paradigms and actively sought and promoted uniquely American architectural alternatives. The most boisterous among them were Robert B. Stacy-Judd, Francisco Mújica and Alfred C. Bossom—all vocal proponents of pre-Columbian appropriation. Though each aimed for the development of a uniquely American architectural style—a goal that a number of others who appropriated pre-Columbian forms and motifs shared—these three pursued that goal in slightly different, yet representative, ways.

Robert B. Stacy-Judd: Nationalism and an American Aesthetic

Robert B. Stacy-Judd (1884-1975) was born and raised in England. His burgeoning interest in architecture in early adulthood led him to apprentice with practicing architect James Thompson at West-Cliff-on-the-Sea, Sussex, England.⁴⁴⁶ Architectural historian David Gebhard characterizes Stacy-Judd’s developing architectural style as something of a hybrid, in which “Queen Anne, enriched by references to the Arts and Crafts vocabulary,” commingled with “classical Beaux-Arts

⁴⁴⁵Cary R. Long, “The Ancient Architecture of America: The Historical Value and Parallelism of Development with the Architecture of the Old World.”⁴⁴⁵ *New-York Historical Society Proceedings* (1849), as cited in MacDougall, 18-19.

⁴⁴⁶David Gebhard, *Robert Stacy-Judd: Maya Architecture and the Creation of a New Style* (Santa Barbara, CA: Capra Press, 1993), 5. The biographical information in this and the next paragraph is taken from this source (10-31).

revival.”⁴⁴⁷ Stacy-Judd also experimented with non-Western forms at this early stage in his career—via renovations of and additions to several Egyptian-styled English theaters, including the Mansell Theatre (1909-10), Marylebone Electric Palace (1910) and the Electric Picture Palace (1910-12).

After four years’ study with Thompson, Stacy-Judd applied for a job with a British architectural firm in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Though he failed to win the position, he resolved to move to Argentina anyway, aiming to set up his own practice there. He left England in 1911 with the intention of visiting Canada and the United States on his way to Argentina, but in fact never made it to South America. Instead, he lived briefly in Canada, Minnesota and North Dakota before settling in Los Angeles in 1922. Through the early 1920s, most of his designs were rendered in the English Tudor, Tudor Revival or classical Beaux-Arts revival styles,⁴⁴⁸ although his continuing taste for non-Western forms reveals itself in the Islamic-inspired aspects of a temporary exhibition space Stacy-Judd designed for an auto show in Minot, North Dakota.⁴⁴⁹

Unlike many of his contemporaries, Stacy-Judd was not averse to mixing forms drawn from a variety of cultures and time periods. He believed that “knowledge gathered from the ancient fountains of art grant us the language whereby we compose poems and prose according to our inventive ability.”⁴⁵⁰ That some of the forms to which he was

⁴⁴⁷Ibid., 5.

⁴⁴⁸Ibid., 14-17.

⁴⁴⁹Ibid., 22. According to Gebhard, Stacy-Judd established an “exotic Islamic theme” with arches, domes and a Moorish courtyard in a temporary stage-set for the Northwestern North Dakota Auto Show of 1916, in Minot, ND.

⁴⁵⁰Ibid., 29. Gebhard cites Robert B. Stacy-Judd, “Buildicus,” in “Chats on Practical Architecture,” *Calgary Daily Herald* (March 1922). This article was the fourth in a series, and

drawn were not widely recognized as “art” in the Western world did not deter him. Stacy-Judd’s willingness, from the start, to draw inspiration from non-European monuments forecasts his later embrace of pre-Columbian forms and motifs as major components of the new American aesthetic he worked to forge in his artistic maturity.

Stacy-Judd was first introduced to Maya art and architecture in 1923, when he encountered Frederick Catherwood’s illustrations for John Lloyd Stephens’s *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan*.⁴⁵¹ In an unpublished autobiography,⁴⁵² Stacy-Judd describes his first impressions:

The illustrations appeared in profusion, strange illustrations showing the most extraordinary looking buildings I had ever seen. Some were of plain, simple design, yet of dignified and classical proportion. Others bore elaborate and very original carvings. In all instances the buildings were shown surrounded and overgrown with dense jungle. I stared at each picture, fascinated. It was the most interesting, most entrancing subject imaginable. I turned to the title page and read ‘Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan.’ By John L. Stevens [sic], 1841. For some unaccountable reason, I suddenly knew I wanted those books more than anything on earth. I purchased them on the spot.⁴⁵³

The enthusiasm for Mesoamerica that was sparked by Stacy-Judd’s exposure to Stephens’s and Catherwood’s volumes was stoked by his acquaintance with T.A. Willard, whom he describes, in his autobiography, as “one of the greatest amateur Maya archaeologists,” noting,

—given the (established) dates of the third and fifth articles therein, it would seem to have been published in early March 1922 (137, n. 54).

⁴⁵¹John L. Stephens, *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1841).

⁴⁵²Robert B. Stacy-Judd, “The Autobiography of an Architect” 1944 (?), chap. XXXII, p. 348. Stacy-Judd recalls there that a traveling book salesman introduced him to Stephens’s book. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives.

⁴⁵³*Ibid.*, chap. XXXII, pp. 348-349.

His [Willard's] expeditions into Yucatan and his many books on the Maya civilization, including original translations from Maya Heiroglyphs (sic), have contributed conspicuously to the subject. It was through Mr. Willard, my close friend for many years, that I learned considerable of Maya history.⁴⁵⁴

Stacy-Judd later designed Willard's residence using Maya-derived corbel vaults and other Mesoamerican forms, but the plan was never realized.

Once won over to the beauties of Maya architecture, Stacy-Judd delved passionately into research about Maya origins and history.⁴⁵⁵ By the late 1920s, he considered himself something of an expert on the Maya, writing in his autobiography:

Among other prominent leaders in the Maya archaeological field, whom I had the pleasure of meeting at that time, were Herbert Spinden, anthropologist at the American Museum of Natural History, and later, the Peabody Museum; Frans Blom, a wonderful friend, leader of Tulane University expeditions into Central America, and at whose invitation I spent two weeks at his encampment in the ruins of Uxmal in Yucatan; Dr. Sylvanus Morley, the then head of Carnegie Institute for exploration work in Yucatan, who kindly entertained me at his Chichen-Itza camp.⁴⁵⁶

Having met and seemingly been taken under the wings of some of the most prominent Maya archaeologists of his time, Stacy-Judd began to write what would eventually be numerous articles on Maya topics. He also delivered dozens of

⁴⁵⁴Ibid., chap. XXXVII, p. 1.

⁴⁵⁵Many of the books in Stacy-Judd's library were donated to the University of California at Santa Barbara on Nov. 14, 1973. These include: Alfred C. Bossom, *An Architectural Pilgrimage in Old Mexico* (New York: Scribner, 1924), Eduard Seler, E. Förstemann, Paul Schellhas, Carl Sapper and E. P. Dieseldorff, *Mexican and Central American Antiquities, Calendar Systems, and History: Twenty-Four Papers*, trans. from the German under the supervision of Charles P. Bowditch, Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin, no. 28 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904); Federico Mariscal, *Estudio arquitectónico de las ruinas mayas* (Mexico City: Talleres gráficos de la nación, 1928); Ignacio Marquina, "Estudio arquitectonico comparativo de los monumentos arqueologicos de Mexico," in *Contribucion de Mexico al XXIII Congreso de americanistas* (Mexico City: Talleres gráficos de la nación, 1928); and George Oakley Totten, *Maya Architecture* (Washington, DC: Maya Press, 1926).

⁴⁵⁶Stacy-Judd, "Autobiography," chap. XXXVII, p. 1.

lectures—for both live and radio audiences—and in 1930, made an “expedition” to the Yucatan with Willard, during which he shot hundreds of feet of film and made many still photographs of Maya ruins, which today are housed in the Stacy-Judd archives at the University of California at Santa Barbara. Stacy-Judd also published three books on the Maya: *The Ancient Mayas: Adventures in the Jungles of Yucatan* (1934), *Atlantis: Mother of Empires* (1939), and *Kabah: Adventures in the Jungles of Yucatan* (1951).⁴⁵⁷ He also wrote an introduction to the facsimile edition of the Codex Merida, a then newly discovered “Maya” manuscript.⁴⁵⁸

Stacy-Judd’s promotion of the “Atlantis theory”⁴⁵⁹—which held that the Maya were descendants of the doomed island city of Romantic myth—has led many modern scholars to dismiss the bulk of his writings on the Maya and other pre-Columbian cultures.⁴⁶⁰ His allegiance to a theory that is widely disparaged as farfetched may also

⁴⁵⁷Stacy-Judd, *The Ancient Mayas: Adventures in the Jungles of Yucatan* (Los Angeles: Haskell-Travers, 1934); *Atlantis: Mother of Empires* (1939; repr., Kempton, IL: Adventures Unlimited Press, 1999); and *Kabah: Adventures in the Jungles of Yucatan* (Hollywood: House-Warven, 1951).

⁴⁵⁸*A Maya Manuscript* (Codex Merida) (Los Angeles: Philosophical Research Society, 1940). Though Stacy-Judd believed the manuscript to be authentic, modern scholars reject the Codex Merida.

⁴⁵⁹See Stacy-Judd, *Atlantis*. The theory that pre-Columbian cultures originated from Atlantis is based on a conviction that art styles follow a uniform developmental trajectory from abstract to naturalistic, which inversely coincides with the relative sophistication of the culture to which the artist belonged: the more abstract the art, the less “developed” the culture and vice versa. Since the Maya have a somewhat naturalistic and fluid style and there is no evidence in Mexico or Central America of an earlier, more abstract Maya style, Atlantis theorists concluded that the less “developed” ancestors of the Maya must have originated outside the Maya area, and a “lost continent” theory provided an easy explanation.

⁴⁶⁰Swedish anthropologist Knut Hjalmar Stolpe (1841-1905) published one of the earliest scholarly articles, “Utvecklings-företeelser i Naturfolkens Ornamentik: Etnografisk Undersökning,” *Ymer* (1890): 193-250, positing—among other things—that art has an evolutionary progression from abstract to naturalistic, and attributing this idea to English collector Augustus Henry Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers (1827-1900). See also, Pitt-Rivers, *The Evolution*

account for scholars' tendency to view his realized designs as little more than "off-beat" or "kitsch," and to undervalue Stacy-Judd's thoughtful attempts to develop and promote a truly and appropriately American architectural idiom inspired by Mesoamerican designs.

Stacy-Judd's ideas relating to the development of an "All-American" architectural style coincided, in fact, with dominant trends in U.S. architecture through the 1920s and '30s (as discussed in Chapter Two). Like others inspired by pre-Columbian forms and motifs as inspiration, he aimed to avoid European modes as he mined the aesthetics of the past.

As with a great many architects in the past, I, too, had long dreamed of being able, in some small way, to help establish an All-American architectural style, one that would be recognized as purely American. In the past, we have repeatedly turned to all the known foreign arts for inspiration, mostly plain copy. An army of these monstrosities marched across the country, but little attempt was made to utilize the prototype theme from which to create new form and decorate design.⁴⁶¹

Believing that Maya forms, in particular, could be profitably adapted "not only to modern American structures, but for the use of manufacturers in a variety of lines,"⁴⁶² Stacy-Judd stressed the concept of "adaptation," as opposed to purely imitative re-creation.

Casting himself as a leader in the quest for an All-American style, Stacy-Judd offered typological examples that other architects could imitate.

of Culture, and Other Essays, by the Late Lt.-Gen. A. Lane Fox Pitt-Rivers (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), which includes his 1875 essay "On the Evolution of Culture." Stolpe's article was later published as a book and translated into English by Mrs. H. C. March with the title, *On Evolution in the Ornamental Art of Savage Peoples: Ethnographical Researches* (Rochdale, England: J. Clegg, 1903). The article appeared again in Stolpe's *Collected Essays on Ornamental Art* (Stockholm: Aftonbladets Tryckeri, 1927), 1-57.

⁴⁶¹Stacy-Judd, "Autobiography," 351 (p. 355).

⁴⁶²Ibid.

The work of adapting (not copying) ancient Mayan motifs to all classes of modern American building structures and decorative ornament is a colossal undertaking, far beyond the puny efforts of a single individual. My dream, however, is that I may express the possibilities for each branch of design so that others, far more capable than (sic) I, may raise the standard to a classic level. In the past ten years I have made many, what I call, solutions covering public buildings, residences, office blocks, theatres and a host of the decorative arts, but the days and years are all too short. The task is merely begun.⁴⁶³

Although the majority of Stacy-Judd's renderings remained unbuilt, a number of his pre-Columbian inspired plans were realized, in buildings of varying function. These include the Aztec Hotel (Figure 5.1, Monrovia, CA, 1925), the First Baptist Church (Figure 5.2, now Ventura County Church of Religious Science, Ventura, CA, 1928-31), and a number of residences (Appendix A).

Although the Aztec Hotel's pre-Columbian-inspired aspects are mostly Maya in derivation, Stacy-Judd dubbed it "Aztec," in the conviction, according to Edgar Lloyd Hampton, that "it [the term] is better known."⁴⁶⁴ The building's façade is overrun with geometric and scroll-like designs as well as human and animal forms, all of which loosely replicate motifs found in Maya art and architecture (Figure 1.11). One of the building's corners is marked by a mini-stepped structure reminiscent of Maya or Mexica architecture (Figures 5.3 and 3.15). That the structure has no superstructure or doorways is, to Hampton, a symbol of the fate of the pre-Columbian peoples:

As a final and highly poetic touch, the architect constructed a flight of steps on top of the hotel—a flight of steps which ascends and terminates abruptly, thus symbolizing the lost purpose of a great and now extinct race and the fact that life inevitably ends with the task unfinished.⁴⁶⁵

⁴⁶³Stacy-Judd (?), three-page typed manuscript, n.d., p. 2. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives.

⁴⁶⁴Edgar Lloyd Hampton, "Rebirth of Prehistoric American Art," *Current History* 25, no. 5 (Feb. 1927): 633. Braun writes that he named it "Aztec" because "it was a catchier name." (170).

⁴⁶⁵*Ibid.*, 633.

The interior ornament is equally abundant and “Maya” in derivation, its highlights including ceiling lights that sport heads with aquiline noses in the “Maya profile” mode (Figure 5.4), corbel vault cutouts adorning a double door (Figure 5.5), and scrollwork patterns that surround the entrance to the women’s restroom (Figure 5.6).

The year after the building went up, Stacy-Judd described the way in which he drew inspiration for the Aztec Hotel’s ornament from Maya reliefs, explaining, in an article in *Pacific Coast Architecture* (1926):

In designing the general scheme, decorative detail, and mural paintings for the Monrovia Hotel, care was taken that only what might be termed the principles of Maya design were used. In some cases, such as the ornament surrounding the entrance to the ladies’ room in the lobby, a decorative unit from a date tablet was used as the theme. In other cases, such as the multiple column grouping, the unit was faithfully employed. As it is not entirely clear what the exact reason was for the peculiar medley of carved pieces, cubes, and the many quaint shapes forming some of the Maya panels, I did not duplicate any particular original panel of the temples, but assembled the curious units to my own fancy.⁴⁶⁶

Contrary to his admonishments to others to avoid copying sources, Stacy-Judd here implies that had he understood the meaning of the “Maya panels” (that occur at Palenque and elsewhere), he might well have duplicated one; or perhaps more likely, Stacy-Judd relished the incomprehensibility of the Maya motifs and, feeling liberated, felt no obligation (or desire) to replicate accurately the “curious units.”

The First Baptist Church in Ventura, California, also employs a mixed bag of Maya motifs, although the indigenous American forms are more restrained and isolated in this “ecclesiastical” context than they are at the Aztec Hotel and in other of Stacy-Judd’s designs (Figure 5.2). Most obviously, while the Aztec Hotel exhibits an over-all

⁴⁶⁶Stacy-Judd, “Maya Architecture” *Pacific Coast Architect* 30, no. 5 (Nov. 1926): 27.

coverage of pre-Columbian forms on both exterior and interior, the use of indigenous elements throughout the First Baptist Church is much less proliferate in its approach. The main entranceway of the church, vertical and stepped, with a prominent punctured corbel vault above the doorway, recalls a Maya temple, such as Temple II at Tikal (Figure 1.5).⁴⁶⁷ This rising stepped element is repeated in several places on both the north and east sides of the building. Several more corbel vaults pierce the east façade.

The north and east sides of the building are adorned with exterior “friezes”—rendered in blue-green and yellow, in stark contrast to the brilliant white of the exterior (e.g., Figure 5.7). The blue-green elements are Puuc-like, attached cylindrical forms (Figure 3.9), which Stacy-Judd described as reminiscent of “saplings placed tightly together and bound top and bottom.”⁴⁶⁸ The yellow areas of the frieze contain geometric, glyph-like and scrolling forms. The corner frieze on the northwest corner (Figure 5.7) exhibits a Palenque-style quetzal-feathered headdress, similar to those illustrated by Catherwood (e.g., Figure 3.14), whereas the eastern frieze consists of a zigzag pattern (Figure 5.31) similar to the one found on the House of the Masks at Kabah, Mexico (Figure 1.12). The cornice, angled out on both sides, resembles those of similar

⁴⁶⁷Its Gothic-style splayed doorway also has affinities with faceted, crystalline forms of German Expressionist architecture from the 1920s. For more discussion on this architectural style and its relationship to Art Deco architecture, see Rosemarie Haag Bletter, “The Art Deco Style,” in *Skyscraper Style: Art Deco New York*, Cervin Robinson and Rosemarie Haag Bletter (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), 39.

⁴⁶⁸Quoted in Hansen, n.p.

shape in a number of Yucatan structures, such as is illustrated in Laura Gilpin's *Sunburst, Kukulcan, Chichen Itza, Yucatan* of 1932 (Figure 4.8),⁴⁶⁹ discussed in Chapter Four.

The church's interior comprises an elegant mixture of pre-Columbian elements, echoing many elements of the façade. In the sanctuary, stained-glass windows and side doorways are shaped like corbel vaults; mirror images of this form, with openwork and low-relief outlines, reach up to the ceiling from the doors. The stepped ceiling and walls recall the stepped forms of the exterior.

A wooden pulpit designed by the architect is shaped like a mini-structure sporting high relief scrolling forms rendered in the Palenque style, like the motifs on the north exterior frieze. Puuc-like motifs and Maya "glyphs" rendered in dark red, blue-green, yellow and brown adorn a second-floor balcony. These same glyphs appear at the tops of the attached columns on the walls and in the corners of the stepped ceiling. Cylindrical forms similar to those on the exterior frieze, adorn the low guard wall of the balcony. Light fixtures, hanging from the ceiling, have the same zigzag pattern seen on the eastern frieze of the façade.

From the time the Ventura church design was announced through its construction and reception, some questioned the use of "heathen" art forms for a Baptist church.⁴⁷⁰

One magazine article, commenting upon the "strange mixture of the pagan and the Christian" in the church, quotes Stacy-Judd as saying, "It took many battles and weeks of

⁴⁶⁹Illustrated in Oles, 163. The photograph is a silver bromide print on gevaluxe paper, also part of the Laura Gilpin Collection at the Amon Carter Museum in Fort Worth. It was a gift of Laura Gilpin (P1979.95.13).

⁴⁷⁰Stacy-Judd explains: "In this, the first attempt ever made to adapt ancient Maya architectural motifs to modern (sic) ecclesiastic design, it is only natural that endless difficulties arose. . . . I was asked, 'Was I not adapting motifs from the works of heathens to incalcate (sic) in a design for a modern Christian structure?'" Stacy-Judd (?), three-page typewritten manuscript, n.d., 1-2.

grief to tear down the wall of ignorance and prejudice that opposed this architectural venture.” An unpublished manuscript indicates that he himself wrestled with the issue, justifying his appropriation by stressing the beauty of Maya art and supremacy of the Maya race, and excusing it by asserting the Maya’s monotheism and rejection of human sacrifice.⁴⁷¹ Elsewhere, Stacy-Judd noted that it “will prove just about as difficult to break with the Gothic architecture in church building as to depart from the King James version of the Bible”⁴⁷²—a remark that sheds light on the fact that the Ventura church’s façade has a Gothic, as well as Maya, look.

Like his Gothic forebears, Stacy-Judd was interested in devising church ornament that communicated meaning, but—eschewing European traditions—he sought a novel symbolic language for his new American architecture and, to that end, put pre-Columbian forms to evocative use. He told one interviewer, for example, that the Maya-temple-derived stepped form of his Ventura church’s exterior “symbolizes step by step in spiritual endeavor.’ It also suggests strength of character which was betokened by the massive pyramids of Egypt as well as those now being restored in Central America.”⁴⁷³

Regarding his use of blue-green (today blue) on the exterior, Stacy-Judd explained:

Sea and forest and, most of all, the gorgeous plumage of the sacred quetzal bird, which is the national emblem of Guatemala, accounts for this dominant color. Blue and green were the most sacred colors among these ancient Americans, as black and white seem to be ours. Blue was used to designate sacrifices.⁴⁷⁴

⁴⁷¹Ibid., 1.

⁴⁷²Quoted in Hansen, n.p.

⁴⁷³Ibid.

⁴⁷⁴Ibid.

The bound “saplings” on the east cornice symbolized, to Stacy-Judd’s mind a “unity of purpose” that was appropriate in this context since “religion loses its root meaning when it fails to bind.”⁴⁷⁵ On the interior, Stacy-Judd used what he considered to be Maya-style glyphs on the ceiling to signify the year (1931) the building was constructed (Figure 5.8).⁴⁷⁶

Stacy-Judd’s buildings, architectural initiatives and design philosophy garnered a fair amount of press attention in their day. Upon its completion in 1925, the Aztec Hotel was featured in many articles⁴⁷⁷ that portrayed it as the first building in the United States to use pre-Columbian art forms and touted it as an example of “All-American” design.⁴⁷⁸ Other commentators were less enthusiastic about the sorts of pre-Columbian appropriations Stacy-Judd promoted; in 1935, Gerhardt Krammer of the Department of Middle American Research at Tulane University, remarked in the *Architect and Engineer*:

Particularly in the West—hotels, country clubs, and yacht-club buildings, as well as theaters and even homes have been built in this [Maya] style, or rather claim to be representative of this style because of the weirdness of their designs. In most cases, however, the adaptation has been very unsuccessful and in many cases should not and justly cannot be called Maya.⁴⁷⁹

⁴⁷⁵Ibid.

⁴⁷⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷⁷Stacy-Judd kept a list of the “Books, Journals, Papers and Magazines which have published the Aztec Hotel”; by January 2, 1930, his had reached fifty-six, typewritten document, Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives.

⁴⁷⁸Examples include: Rex Newcomb, “Aboriginal American Architectural Types,” *The Western Architect: Architecture and Allied Arts* 36, no. 7 (July 1927): 106-13; Alfred C. Bossom and Estelle H. Ries, “New Styles in American Architecture: And What We Might Learn from the Mayas,” *World’s Work* 56, no. 2 (June 1928): 189-95; and, Edward Lloyd Hampton, “Creating a New World Architecture,” *Southern California Business* (April 1928): 16-17, 38, 45, 48.

⁴⁷⁹Gerhardt T. Krammer, “Maya Design,” *Architect and Engineer* 122 (Sept. 1935): 21.

Pointing specifically to Stacy-Judd's Aztec Hotel, Krammer wrote:

Ornament, neither Maya nor Mexican in either feeling or character, has been unscrupulously strewn over the wall surfaces of the building. On the exterior of the Aztec Hotel in Monrovia, California, an assortment of scrolls have been tossed together and placed on bare wall surfaces where decoration was thought necessary. The designer has failed utterly in interpreting the symbolism or the craftsmanship of the original.⁴⁸⁰

Stacy-Judd wrote an article, also in the *Architect and Engineer*, in response to Krammer, defending his "first experiment" in the use of pre-Columbian forms and motifs, yet adding that at the time (more than ten years' prior since the Aztec Hotel was constructed in 1925) the architect "knew practically nothing concerning the symbolic meaning of Maya motifs."⁴⁸¹ He goes on to say that a number of prominent Mayanists (including George Oakley Totten) and architects (mentioning Alfred Bossom) alike, had responded positively to his design and ends by stating that Krammer's "inexperience in the practical field of architecture has led him to speak too hastily."⁴⁸²

Francisco Mújica: "Neo-American" Style

Like Stacy-Judd, and in much the same time frame, Francisco Mújica (1889-c. 1979)⁴⁸³ sought to develop a unique U.S. architectural style inspired by pre-Columbian forms and motifs, "a new creative work which requires profound study of the primitive

⁴⁸⁰Ibid., 25.

⁴⁸¹Stacy-Judd, "Maya Architecture: Architect-Explorer Replies to Critic," *Architect and Engineer* 124 (Feb. 1936): 20.

⁴⁸²Ibid., 22.

⁴⁸³Dr. Daniel Schávelzon (personal communication, August 2006).

American architecture and of the geometrical and mechanical elements of the nature of the region.”⁴⁸⁴ Born in Peru and educated at the University of Chile, the University of Mexico, and the Sorbonne in Paris, Mújica spent most of his professional life in Mexico, although he worked in the United States from time to time.⁴⁸⁵ In his *History of the Skyscraper* (1930)—one of the earliest examinations of that architectural form—Mújica rejects Greco-Roman aesthetics in conceptualizing a tall modern building appropriate to the United States, calling instead for a “Neo-American” style with roots in pre-Columbian design (Figures 5.9). To prepare himself for that endeavor, he conducted research and fieldwork at various ancient sites throughout Mexico and Central America and worked out abstracted motifs for his own use based on elements he saw in pre-Columbian architecture (Figure 5.10).⁴⁸⁶

Mújica’s friend, John Sloan (1871-1951)—a painter who was a prominent member of New York’s Ashcan School—wrote the foreword to *History of the Skyscraper*, in which he lauds Mújica’s desire to create a uniquely American aesthetic:

Dr. Mújica presents the interesting suggestion that we apply the work of the primitive peoples on the American continent to this product which is purely American. He seeks to re-create an architectural style truly American in spirit and indistinguishable from those native to other lands. . . the younger school of American artists is now conscious, whether as a result of the War or because of the country’s gradual economic growth, or both, of the fact that an American art must perforce express those phases

⁴⁸⁴Mújica, *History of the Skyscraper* (New York; Archaeology and Architecture Press, 1930), 20.

⁴⁸⁵Patricia C. Phillips, “Francisco Mújica,” in *Macmillan Encyclopedia of Architects*, vol. 3 (New York/London: Free Press/Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1982), 249. Phillips writes that Mújica earned degrees in architecture from the University of Chile and the University of Mexico and studied city planning at the Sorbonne. An article published in the *New York Times* in 1930 highlights Mújica’s desire to build “hundred-story” buildings. See “Plans 100-Story Buildings: Mexican Architect Asks City To Help Erect Huge Skyscrapers” (20 August 1930): 37.

⁴⁸⁶Mújica, n.p.

of American life that have been expressed more fluently through economic processes. A commercial Renaissance in America is now in progress, and an art must develop to accompany it.

The publication of Dr. Mújica's work at this time, when America is groping to express itself in all forms of artistic endeavor, is most opportune.⁴⁸⁷

Mújica's rendering entitled "The City of the Future: Hundred Story City in Neo-American Style"—the plate with which he concludes *History of the Skyscraper*—provides a glimpse of the Neo-American style's potential in an urban environment (Figure 5.11): rectangular skyscrapers with flat roofs and geometricized surface ornament—vaguely reminiscent of that which adorns Maya structures on the Yucatan Peninsula or at Tikal—dominate the skyline (Figures 3.9 and 1.5). Like Stacy-Judd, Mújica shunned literal replication of pre-Columbian forms and motifs, in favor of innovative adaptations put into the service of a new modern aesthetic. In response to those who deemed ancient inspirations incompatible with the modern and/or the innovative, and with an eye to heading off those sorts of objections among his readers, Mújica writes,

Some narrow spirits have imaged [sic] that our theory was retrogressive, believing that our idea was either to go back to the last phases of a dead art, or to hitch on to our present civilization from the far-off recesses of primitive America some mummified archaeological remains incapable of expressing our modern times.

Neither of those interpretations is correct.

What I propose is simply this: Without taking a single step back, to move about freely in the circle of the century in which we live, take up our stand on the radius of my theory and from this point, while applying modern standards, observe the sources of inspiration with which both nature and the art history of America furnish us; then assimilate all the elements peculiar to ourselves, and finally direct all our efforts towards filling in the gaps produced by our former inaction.⁴⁸⁸

⁴⁸⁷John Sloan, "foreword" to Mújica, n.p.

⁴⁸⁸Mújica, 17.

Mújica was convinced that indigenous American forms were more congenial to the development of a new U.S. architecture than were forms borrowed from ancient Greece or Rome, since the former were devised within the same natural conditions and occupied the same land as modern North Americans. Moreover, he writes:

Independent civilizations flourished [in the Americas] using an architecture that was completely different from that prevailing in Europe and which met the material and spiritual needs of the American peoples with admirable sincerity.⁴⁸⁹

Insistent in his view that the inhabitants of the Americas and the architecture they produced were fundamentally different from those of Europe, Mújica argues that the skyscraper—a brand new, American-devised building type—demands a fresh and American-inflected aesthetic. Attentive to parallels between ancient and modern modes, he noted that indigenous Americans had built tall (the pyramids at Teotihuacan and Tikal stood, for more than a millennium, as the highest structures in North America, up until the skyscraper’s advent) and presented the stepped profiles common to ancient American pyramids as useful paradigms⁴⁹⁰ for architects working under New York City’s zoning laws of 1916 which required skyscrapers to be set back at the top to allow the maximum amount of light and air to the street. As Sloan observed in his foreword to *History of the Skyscraper*:

Happily, the bold, rugged and virile beauty of these ancient monuments is strikingly adaptable. The temples and palaces are rich in archaeological material. The ancient ‘setbacked’ and terraced monuments are by coincidence strangely appropriate to the zoning restrictions which so control the bulk and mass in our American cities.⁴⁹¹

⁴⁸⁹Ibid., 16.

⁴⁹⁰Ibid., 32–35.

⁴⁹¹Sloan, “foreword,” in *Skyscraper*, Mújica, n.p.

Alfred C. Bossom: Inherent “Americanness”

Such parallels also were apparent to New York-based architect Alfred C. Bossom (1881-1965). Born and raised in London, England, he had been trained at Regent Street Polytechnic and at the Royal Academy schools⁴⁹² before traveling (in 1903) to the United States to design a housing scheme for the Carnegie Steel Mills in Pittsburgh. Bossom thereafter relocated to New York, where, in the mid-1920s, he established offices at 680 Fifth Avenue. His practice centered on commercial buildings—primarily banks and large office buildings—and he, like Mújica, was particularly interested in skyscrapers.

Bossom’s *Building to the Skies: The Romance of the Skyscraper* (1934) outlines his belief that physical conditions dictate a building’s design. Pursuant to this notion, he argued that, since similar physical conditions (e.g., light and atmosphere) prevail throughout the Americas—from North America to South America, thus encompassing the Central American regions in which the Maya held sway—tried and true pre-Columbian forms were eminently applicable to modern North American buildings.

Now in North America the light is particularly hard and white and the shadows uninteresting. The Mayans in Mexico accordingly evolved an architecture of simple surface decorations with no cornices but with a strong emphasis on ornamented angles to form a towering silhouette. The designers in Chicago and New York, working under identical conditions of light, did the same. It was almost a law of architectural necessity that the Americans in stretching their buildings skywards should come to use the same treatments of flat surfaces, set-backs and ornamented silhouettes.⁴⁹³

⁴⁹²The information in this paragraph is from Dennis Sharp, ed., *Alfred C. Bossom’s American Architecture, 1903-1926* (London: Book Art, 1984).

⁴⁹³Alfred C. Bossom, *Building to the Skies: The Romance of the Skyscraper* (London: Studio, 1934), 15.

Bossom's perception of "identical" light conditions in both Mexico and Chicago parallels nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century political elisions of vastly different entities under the influence of an idealistic pan-Americanism.

In addition to calling for modern surface treatments that, in emulation of ancient buildings, made the most of light conditions he considered uniquely American, Bossom asked readers to consider the role that atmospheric conditions played in both indigenous and modern forays into "verticality":

A pertinent inquiry is frequently put to learn what things, in climate or tradition, the United States has in common with Mexico that would cause a certain architecture to be adaptable in both places. The answer is, vertical architecture. . . . It may be due to the clear climate that on the American continent we have aspiring tendencies.⁴⁹⁴

Although he credits the indigenous cultures of the Americas with having designed the first skyscrapers, that which Bossom calls the "law of architectural necessity" casts the high-rise structure as an inevitable building type for the Americas. In *Building to the Skies*, he accompanies a drawing of a Maya stepped structure at Tikal with a caption that reads:

The Original American Skyscraper—The first hint of a skyscraper in America built in Tikal, Guatemala. 230 ft. high, and from that time it would appear that conditions over which man had no control may have inspired the inhabitants of North America.⁴⁹⁵

His reference to "conditions over which man had no control" indicates an environmental force so powerful that architects' "natural" responses were virtually preordained—whether they were working in eighth-century Tikal or twentieth-century

⁴⁹⁴Ibid., 190-91.

⁴⁹⁵Ibid., 18.

Chicago. Tapping the trope of the “primitive’s” attunement to nature, Bossom casts the American architect’s quest for verticality as the result of pure instinct. As such, it is pan-historic as well as pan-American.

Bossom’s polemical writing often takes a strongly nationalistic tone. In *Building to the Skies*, for instance, he insists that European “architectural importations” not only fail to “express America,” but are furthermore unworthy of a universally recognized “world power [that] stands preeminent in the eyes of great nations.”⁴⁹⁶ The United States, as a newly emerged world leader, is most aptly represented, he suggests, by architecture that—while rooted in New World traditions and in tune with its environment—is nonetheless novel:

In the skyscraper America has invented and developed a wholly new and revolutionary form and type of building that is absolutely and characteristically her own. Search for foreign inspiration or example and you will search in vain. The skyscraper is as indigenous as the Red Indian.⁴⁹⁷

Bossom expands upon this notion of American ownership of the skyscraper when he insists that skyscrapers have no place in his native land:

I have designed skyscrapers in America and profoundly believe in them—for America. I should hate to see them in Britain. There they would be an architectural incongruity and with no relation to social and business needs.⁴⁹⁸

Presenting “Americans” as a single people, fundamentally different from Europeans, Bossom preached architectural distinctions that mirrored that divide.

⁴⁹⁶Bossom and Ries, 189-90.

⁴⁹⁷Bossom, *Building to the Skies*, 9.

⁴⁹⁸*Ibid.*, 10.

At the same time, he wrestled with divisions among Americans, as the essay he co-authored with Estelle H. Ries for *World's Work* (1928) makes clear:

A customary feeling is that there exists in this country a certain antipathy toward Mexicans that would make for an unsympathetic attitude toward the adoption of Mexican architecture here. I believe it is not necessary to reckon with this, for the reason that this antipathy is not toward Mexican architecture.⁴⁹⁹

Bossom's suggestion that modern American architects draw inspiration from indigenous forms is, in *Building to the Skies*, more implicit than direct; clearly, though, the book's illustrations are arranged and captioned to provoke that train of thought. A photograph of Bossom standing beside a model for his Liberty Bank Building in Buffalo, New York (Figure 5.12, 1925)—a building that consists of twin stepped towers topped by replicas of the Statue of Liberty—is positioned, for instance, next to a photograph of the Castillo at Chichen Itza and accompanied by text that reads, “The Author studying the possibilities of different cresting designs for the Liberty Bank, Buffalo.”⁵⁰⁰ Like Stacy-Judd and Mújica, Bossom claimed to reject literal re-creations of pre-Columbian forms and motifs, and held instead that ancient source materials should be springboards to new design. In the *World's Work* article, for instance, he observes:

It has seemed to me that America, with her rare gift of inventiveness, should be able to devise something in architecture that would be compatible with the American temperament and needs. We cannot copy another country's architecture for its beauty alone.⁵⁰¹

⁴⁹⁹Bossom and Ries, 190.

⁵⁰⁰Bossom, *Building to the Skies*, 17.

⁵⁰¹Bossom and Ries, 192.

Nonetheless, the “cresting design” at Bossom’s Liberty Building seems a fairly direct copy of detailing at Chichen Itza’s Castillo. Indeed, Bossom’s promotion and use of the pre-Columbian prompted an irritable Frank Lloyd Wright (1867-1959) to write:

Poor Bossom is an incorrigible ass—He offers Mexico to copy as better “copy.” It has not entered his consciousness yet that architecture is essentially *human* and its origins and affects a matter of human character and heart. In that respect we are no nearer Maya than Egyptian or any other primitive race.⁵⁰²

Frank Lloyd Wright: Innovation, Digestion and European Rejection

Reiteration verging on mimicry (i.e., the sort of pre-Columbian appropriation he discerned in Bossom’s work) was distasteful to Wright, who had a true knack for synthesizing varied influences. As Alofsin writes,

The process by which these sources were absorbed cannot be described by the vague term “influence” or by the specific term “imitation.” Wright claimed to have “digested” his sources. He himself suggested a way out of the problematic of influence: not imitation, but emulation and transformation.⁵⁰³

In Wright’s later autobiography, *A Testament* (1957), he recalls “how, as a boy, primitive American architecture, Toltec, Aztec, Mayan, Inca, stirred my wonder, excited my wishful admiration.”⁵⁰⁴ In a subsequent passage he adds, “The Incas, the Mayans

⁵⁰²Frank Lloyd Wright quoted in Anthony Alofsin, *Frank Lloyd Wright, The Lost Years: A Study of Influence* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1993, 304 and 373, n.49, this letter is cited as “FLW to DDM [Darwin D. Martin] [c.1927], ms 355, Box 3, 15, ST.”

⁵⁰³Alofsin, 305-306 and 374, n. 63, cited as: “FLW TO CRA [Charles Robert Ashbee], 26 Sept. 1910, quoted in Alan Crawford, ‘Ten Letters,’ 69. Wright’s statement followed in a postscript.” See Alan Crawford, *C. R. Ashbee: Architect, Designer and Romantic Socialist* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

⁵⁰⁴Frank Lloyd Wright, *A Testament* (New York: Horizon Press, 1957), 111.

[sic], even the Japanese—all were to me but splendid confirmation. . . . At that early day I was thrilled by Mayan, Inca and Egyptian remains, loved Byzantine.”⁵⁰⁵

Growing up in Wisconsin, Wright became interested in architecture at an early age,⁵⁰⁶ and, because it was “the nearest to architecture within his reach,”⁵⁰⁷ he studied civil engineering at the University of Wisconsin. In 1887 he moved to Chicago and, after a short employment with the conservative and traditionally inclined architect Joseph Lyman Silsbee (1848-1913),⁵⁰⁸ worked as a draftsman in the prestigious firm of Adler and Sullivan, where he developed a particular rapport with principal Louis Sullivan, whose innovative nature-based ornament helped inspire Wright’s rejection of Classical Renaissance architectural prototypes.⁵⁰⁹

Wright likely saw illustrations of Mesoamerican art and architecture in popular publications such as John Lloyd Stephens’s *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatan* (1841),⁵¹⁰ and Alofsin notes that Wright checked out Viollet-le-

⁵⁰⁵Ibid., 205.

⁵⁰⁶Biographical information on Wright in this paragraph comes from his two autobiographical works, *An Autobiography*, 3d ed. (1932; New York: Horizon Press, 1977) and *A Testament*. See also, Braun, 136-146.

⁵⁰⁷Wright, *Autobiography*, 72. Wright refers to himself in the third person throughout this book.

⁵⁰⁸Braun, 138. Kevin Nute makes a connection between Wright and his relationship to Japanese art and architecture through Silsbee who he says collected Far Eastern art and whose first cousin, Ernest Francisco Fenollosa (1853-1908), was one of the leading Western authorities on Japanese art and architecture. See *Frank Lloyd Wright and Japan: The Role of Traditional Japanese Art and Architecture in the Work of Frank Lloyd Wright* (London/Glasgow/New York: Chapman & Hall, 1993), 20-22.

⁵⁰⁹Ibid.

⁵¹⁰Citing personal communication with David Gebhard in 1987, Braun writes (180, n. 9), “Architects customarily acquired vast libraries, and Wright was no exception. According to his son Lloyd Wright, Frank Lloyd Wright’s library had a copy of Stephens and Catherwood, Herbert Spinden’s *A Study of Maya Art: Its Subject Matter and Historical Development*. *Memoirs of the*

Duc's, *The Habitations of Man of All Ages* (1874-75)—which includes (as discussed below) illustrations of Puuc-style architecture—from a public library in Madison, Wisconsin.⁵¹¹ Braun mentions that Viollet-le-Duc's *Habitations of Man* and Owen Jones's *The Grammar of Ornament* (1856)—which cites pre-Columbian examples in its recommendation that primitive and exotic motifs be used as the basis for new designs—were “basic references” for the Chicago School—a loosely allied but like-minded group of architects that included both Sullivan and Wright.⁵¹² Wright doubtless saw both Mesoamerican and Andean art and architecture at the World's Columbian Exposition, held in Chicago in 1893, the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St. Louis⁵¹³ and the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego⁵¹⁴ all of which he attended.

Wright's interest in design was both philosophical and formal,⁵¹⁵ and informed by complex beliefs about architecture's role in society. Like those who adhered to Arts and

Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 6 (Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum, 1913), and several Smithsonian publications on the Maya and Mexico. Since Wright's original library was burned in the fire at Taliesin in 1914, there is no record of his holdings in the early years.”

Alofsin notes that Wright obtained at least seven volumes of the *Orbis Pictus* series (c. 1922) “that documented in a brief but scholarly manner, exotic sources from around the world.” These included, according to Alofsin (304; 373, n. 46), Walter Lehmann's *Altmexikanische Kunstgeschichte: Ein Entwurf in Umrissen* (Berlin: E. Wasmuth, 1921), with illustrations of sculpture and architecture.

⁵¹¹Alofsin, 325, n. 11. See Chapter Two of this dissertation for further discussion of Viollet-le-Duc.

⁵¹²Braun, 139.

⁵¹³Alofsin, 12-13, 223-25.

⁵¹⁴See Wright, *Testament*, 111.

⁵¹⁵Writings on Frank Lloyd Wright's design philosophies are numerous. Alofsin's examination of the ways in which Wright's ideas were shaped by contact with European designers from 1909

Crafts principles, he assigned moral value to “good” design, and believed that the choice of materials was an integral component of a design’s worth.⁵¹⁶ He saw concrete as a “humble” material, for example, until the addition of patterns elevated it.⁵¹⁷ A proponent of integrating human constructs with the landscapes they occupied, Wright consistently used the land and features on the land in his designs.

While Wright denied the impact of outside influences (including pre-Columbian aesthetics) on his work, a number of scholars have argued convincingly for the presence of indigenous American elements in several of Wright’s buildings.⁵¹⁸ His Albert Dell Cold Storage German Warehouse in Richland Center, Wisconsin (designed 1915), for instance, often is cited as his earliest U.S. example of pre-Columbian-inspired architecture, in that its flat roof and geometricized surface treatment (Figure 5.13) recall both the well-known Zapotec buildings at Mitla and several Puuc-style Maya buildings

to 1911 is well organized, clearly written, and addresses pre-Columbian influences. See Alofsin’s introduction and chaps. 5 and 10.

Robert L. Sweeney also discusses Wright’s use of pre-Columbian aesthetics and provides a detailed description, with illustrations, of Wright’s mortarless concrete block designs. *Wright in Hollywood: Visions of a New Architecture* (New York/Cambridge /London: Architectural History Foundation/MIT Press, 1994), especially chaps. 1-3 and 8.

⁵¹⁶Sweeney traces some of Wright’s attitudes toward the Arts and Crafts movement (an influence, he notes, that Wright acknowledged in early writings), citing Bruce Brooks Pfeiffer, ed., *Frank Lloyd Wright: Collected Writings*, vol. 1, 1894-1930 (New York: Rizzoli/Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, 1992-95), 58. See Sweeney, xvii and 240, n. 9.

⁵¹⁷Sweeney, xvii.

⁵¹⁸Dimitri Tselos wrote the seminal article that discusses the presence of pre-Columbian form in Wright’s designs: “Exotic Influences in the Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright,” *Magazine of Art: The American Confederation of Arts* (April 1953): 160-69, 184. Among those most relevant to this study are: Vincent J. Scully, *Frank Lloyd Wright* (New York: George Braziller, 1960); Marjorie Ingle, *The Mayan Revival Style: Art Deco Mayan Fantasy* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith/Peregrine Smith Books, 1984); David Gebhard, *Romanza: The California Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1988); Alofsin, *Frank Lloyd Wright*; Braun, *Pre-Columbian Art*; and Sweeney, *Wright in Hollywood*.

on the Yucatan Peninsula (Figures 3.17 and 2.5). Even earlier (though much more subtle) intimations of Wright's attraction to Zapotec and Puuc-style buildings exist, however, in his 1914 design for Chicago's Midway Gardens and some of his Prairie Style houses (such as the 1898 addition to his own Oak Park, Illinois, home and studio, Figure 5.14)—the flat roofs and small vertical openings of which recall common Maya architectural features such as those at Palenque (Figure 5.15).⁵¹⁹

One of the Wright houses that most clearly suggests pre-Columbian architecture is the Frederick C. Bogk residence in Milwaukee (Figure 5.16, 1916), built just one year after Wright designed the Richland Center warehouse. The Bogk house's conglomeration of surface motifs, corbel vault shapes (Figure 5.17, located between the feet of the "figures"), hatching (a motif common to Puuc-style Maya art and architecture), meandering stepped ornament, and other geometric details recall Puuc-style buildings of the Yucatan Peninsula (Figures 1.12, 3.9 and 3.29). Alofsin highlights other comparisons—such as to a Mexica corn goddess in the abstracted face on the house and, most compelling, to a building at Hochob in Campeche, Mexico (Figure 5.18) illustrated in Spinden's *A Study of Maya Art* (1913)—that incorporates a blocky and abstracted human figure that literally embodies parts of the building.⁵²⁰

⁵¹⁹For further discussion on Wright's building at Midway Gardens, see Gebhard, *Romanza*, 3; Braun, 146; and Alofsin, 137-40.

Another building of Wright's that is often described as having a pre-Columbian feeling is the Unity Temple in Oak Park, (1906). While some of the renderings are reminiscent vaguely of some Maya structures on the Yucatan Peninsula, the author did not see any such resemblances during a visit to the temple in May 2000.

⁵²⁰Alofsin, 252. Alofsin cites a photograph (by Maler) in Spinden, *Maya Art* (1913) for the Hochob building, Pl. 11, figs. 1-2.

Wright's concrete or "textile-block" houses in the Los Angeles area (e.g., Figures 2.9 and 3.2)—built in the 1920s—constitute the aspect of his *oeuvre* that most often has been connected to pre-Columbian source materials (again, Zapotec and Maya).⁵²¹ Scholars point to these houses' heavy massing, flat roofs, geometricized surface treatment and/or narrow windows and doors as evidence of Mesoamerican inspiration. The stepped outline of the Ennis-Brown house (Figures 2.9 and 2.10), for example, vaguely resembles Zapotec or Maya temples (Figure 1.9) and its flat roof and relief ornament is reminiscent of Mitla or Yucatec buildings (Figure 3.17). A point not mentioned by any other scholar, however, is the similarity in concept between Wright's interlocking, mortarless textile-blocks (Figure 5.19)⁵²² and elite Inka stonework, which was touted, in even the earliest sources, as fitting together internally without the use of mortar.⁵²³

Barbara Braun claims that Taliesin West—Wright's home and studio in Scottsdale, Arizona (1937-59)—is marked by forms drawn from a variety of

⁵²¹The predecessor to the textile-block houses in its use of concrete and molded concrete is the Aline Barnsdall or Hollyhock House in Hollywood, California (1917-20). The textile-block houses are: the Charles Ennis-Brown House in Hollywood (1924), Freeman House in Hollywood (1924), Storer House in West Hollywood (1923), and the Alice Millard House or La Miniatura in Pasadena (1923).

⁵²²Sweeney, especially chaps. 2 and 3.

⁵²³Some early sources that describe or illustrate Inka stonework are: William H. Prescott, *History of the Conquest of Mexico and History of the Conquest of Peru*, (1843: Mexico; 1847: Peru; repr., New York: Cooper Square Press, 2000), 740; Ephraim George Squier, *Peru: Incidents of Travel and Exploration in the Land of the Incas* (1877; repr., New York: AMS Press/Cambridge: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 1973); and Charles Wiener, *Pérou et Bolivie: Récit de voyage suivi d'études archéologiques et ethnographiques et de notes sur l'écriture et les langues des populations indiennes* (Paris/Lima: Librairie Hachette; Institut Francés de Estudios Andinos y Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, 1880), 502-09. For more discussion on these early sources, see Chapter Three of this dissertation.

Mesoamerican cultures, though her analysis is, for the most part, impressionistic.⁵²⁴ On a visit there in 2002, this author noted that the particular combination of slanting *talus* and vertical *tablero* (Figure 5.20) forms—seen throughout the Taliesin complex—is, as Braun observes, reminiscent of the trademark profile of the ancient Mesoamerican metropolis of Teotihuacan (Figure 1.15).⁵²⁵

Though several scholars have compared Wright’s works to Mesoamerican sources, Wright’s possible reliance upon Inka and Mesoamerican designs—most notably at the Edgar Kaufmann House—popularly known as Fallingwater (Figure 5.21, Mill Run, PA, 1935-39)—has been overlooked.⁵²⁶ Like Wright, Inka builders tended to work with, rather than on, the landscape, leaving large boulders in place (to function as parts of a building’s foundation or as interior surfaces or for spatial articulation) and often using complex hydraulic systems to manipulate water sources into fountains or “baths.”⁵²⁷ The

⁵²⁴Braun for instance, sees resemblances to Teotihuacan, Zapotec and Mexica buildings in Wright’s use of “rough-hewn stone surfaces, strong, sweeping lines, low-lying forms, *talud-tablero* forms and a monumental sculpture near the entrance” at Taliesin West (179). See also, her chapter on Wright.

⁵²⁵Wright could have seen illustrations of Teotihuacan, a well-known site (even in the 1920s) and a common tourist destination located outside Mexico City, in a number of places. The Mexican government went to great lengths to prepare the ruins at Teotihuacan for its 100-year anniversary celebration, 1910, of its Independence from Spain. Edward Weston took photographs of the site in 1923. Mújica illustrated several structures at Teotihuacan during the 1920s. See Daniel Schávelzon and Jorge Tomasi, eds. *La Imagen de América: Los dibujos de arqueología Americana de Francisco Mújica Diez de Bonilla* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Fundación CEPPA/Fundación para el avance de los estudios mesoamericanos (FAMSI), 2006).

⁵²⁶Documentary remains either from Wright’s sketches (despite reputed claims that he sat down and produced the house’s plans in one sitting), biographical information on the Kaufmann’s or correspondences between the Kaufmann’s and Wright that may have revealed specific pre-Columbian connections to Fallingwater’s design no longer exist. Kaufmann’s papers are particularly scant. See Franklin Toker, *Fallingwater Rising: Frank Lloyd Wright, E. J. Kaufmann, and America’s Most Extraordinary House* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005), 8.

⁵²⁷Many fountains, for example, have been found at Inka sites, particularly in the “Sacred Valley” region near Cuzco. Tiwanaku’s Akapana structure employed a similar hydraulic system, which

Inka routinely used “living” rock⁵²⁸ in conjunction with cut stones of various sizes, fitting them together with a precision that eliminated the necessity of mortar.

Wright’s Fallingwater incorporates visually living rock as well as the waterfall and stream that distinguish the house’s site (Figure 5.22). At the Kaufmann House—as at many Inka sites (Figure 1.21)—large boulders that appear to have been left *in situ* punctuate the exterior; as at the so-called Observatory at Machu Picchu (Figure 5.23) they are used in conjunction with smaller stones in the house’s foundation (Figure 5.24). Indigenous stone crops up in Fallingwater’s interior spaces as well—around the fireplace and in the kitchen (Figures 5.25 and 5.26)—just as such natural protrusions occur in Inka interiors (Figure 5.27).

As at Machu Picchu and many other Inka sites that incorporate water, the sound of rushing water is as much a part of the Kaufmann house as it is of the site itself. More particularly, a rectangular fountain near Fallingwater’s main entrance (Figure 5.28), constructed of small stones, bears notable resemblance to an Inka fountain illustrated in Wiener’s 1880 account of his travels in Peru and Bolivia (Figure 5.29).⁵²⁹ Certain aspects of the house, in fact, also point to Mesoamerican architecture.⁵³⁰ The stepped

drained into the surrounding moat. The difference between these Andean examples and Fallingwater is that the former constructed the water paths, rather than incorporating extant natural waterways. For a discussion of the fountains (and baths) at Machu Picchu and other Sacred Valley sites, see Ann Kendall, *Aspects of Inka Architecture: Description, Function and Chronology*, part I (BAR International Series 242, 1985), esp. pp. 42, 103-04. For Tiwanaku hydraulic systems, see Alan L. Kolata, *Valley of the Spirits: A Journey into the Lost Realm of the Aymara* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1996), 135-37.

⁵²⁸By “living” rock, I mean large rooted stones or boulders that appear to be untouched.

⁵²⁹Wiener, 467.

⁵³⁰Scully likened some elements at Fallingwater to the Maya but no one has recognized the Andean characteristics. Scully writes: “The densely pyramidal composition [of Fallingwater] is Mayan, now transformed from solids to sliding voids, from masses to spaces, and made

interior ceiling, for example, recalls similarly shaped Mesoamerican structures, such as the Castillo at Chichen Itza, while the neutral-colored, organic-looking stucco of both exterior and interior is reminiscent of the limestone typically used for elite buildings throughout the Maya region.

The responsibility for the use of pre-Columbian forms at Fallingwater may lie, at least in part, with the Kaufmann's. Having made several trips to Latin America, including a visit to Panama in 1912 and numerous trips to Mexico between 1912 and 1937,⁵³¹ the Kaufmann's may have discussed their admiration of pre-Columbian art and architecture with Wright. A possible testament to such approbation being the collection of Mesoamerican and Andean ceramics⁵³² on display in the living room of Fallingwater's guesthouse,⁵³³

structurally integral to the material as, for example, had not been done in the Barnsdall House.” Scully, *American Architecture and Urbanism* (Washington, DC: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), 159.

⁵³¹Franklin Toker, *Fallingwater Rising: Frank Lloyd Wright, E. J. Kaufmann, and America's Most Extraordinary House* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005), 71, 320.

⁵³²The pre-Columbian ceramics at Fallingwater include eight from Mesoamerica and six from the Andes: accession numbers 1985.231, 1985.232, 1985.233, 1985.234, 1985.235, 1985.252, 1985.261, 1986.262.1, 1985.262.2, 1985.263, 1985.264, 1985.270, 1985.289 and 1985.290. Cara Armstrong, Curator of Buildings and Collections and Curator of Education, Fallingwater, Western Pennsylvania Conservancy (personal communication, November 2006). Despite the Andean ceramics on display at the house today, Dr. Franklin Toker confirms that there is no evidence in the archival records that the Kaufmann's visited Peru, although such a trip also cannot be discounted due to the scant remains of Kaufmann's personal and business papers (personal communication, April 2007). Toker details the difficulties in ascertaining when and from where the objects on display at Fallingwater today were obtained, noting that Edgar J. Kaufmann, Jr. added some works after his parents died (320-21).

⁵³³Toker notes the sketchy remains of Edgar Kaufmann, Sr.'s personal and business papers, making this assertion difficult to confirm. Still, their trips to Latin America make it likely that at least some of the ceramics were collected by the senior Kaufmann or his wife.

Just as the Kaufmann's could have contributed to the pre-Columbian concepts at Fallingwater, it is equally likely that such elements were solely Wright's contribution. Given the architect's self-proclaimed interest in the Inka (discussed above), it is probable that he would have read with much interest Hiram Bingham's highly publicized "discovery" of Machu Picchu in and around 1912.⁵³⁴ Bingham took hundreds of photographs of Machu Picchu's architecture (with particular focus to the integration of natural and manipulated rock)—many of which were published in popular magazines and in newspaper articles.⁵³⁵ Shortly before Wright began his design of Fallingwater, Bingham's *Machu Picchu: Citadel of the Incas* (1930) was published with more photographs of large boulders infiltrated into buildings.

Pre-Columbian Appropriations: A Sliding Scale

The pre-Columbian aspects of Fallingwater—and all such subtle pre-Columbian-inspired designs—represent near-complete assimilations of indigenous American sources by the architect, insofar as one cannot point to the use of specific indigenous sources; yet the pre-Columbian feeling of these buildings is unmistakable. Such designs represent one end of a sliding scale of use in the pre-Columbian-inflected architectural style of the

⁵³⁴Hiram Bingham, *Machu Picchu, a Citadel of the Incas: Report of the Explorations and Excavations Made in 1911, 1912 and 1915 under the Auspices of Yale University and the National Geographic Society* (New Haven: Yale University Press for the National Geographic Society, 1930). An obituary on Bingham notes that he made some 12,000 photographs in Peru. See "G. M. W.," "Hiram Bingham," *Geographical Review* 46, no. 4 (October 1956): 581.

⁵³⁵Most notable, perhaps, are Hiram Bingham's photographs and articles on Machu Picchu published in *Harper's Magazine* ["The Discovery of Machu Picchu,"] 126, no. 755 (April 1913): 709-14, and *The National Geographic Magazine* ["In the Wonderland of Peru: The Work Accomplished by the Peruvian Expedition of 1912, under the Auspices of Yale University and the National Geographic Society,"] 24, no. 4 (April 1913): 387-573.

first four decades of the twentieth century. This sliding-scale concept is not simply a question of how the architect or designer employed the pre-Columbian designs, however, as it also considers design motivations, intended audience, building typology and regional variations.⁵³⁶

On the opposite end of the scale are those pre-Columbian appropriations that employ exuberant, over-all ornament of the sort seen at the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles (Morgan, Walls & Clements, 1927).⁵³⁷ As opposed to the more high-minded goals of pan-Americanism or the development of an innovative American aesthetic, these over-the-top confections of pre-Columbian aesthetics were intended to generate excitement and signify an escapist entertainment venue. Even so the applied ornament of this more lavish type often makes claims to authenticity, an aspect that clearly was regarded worthy of the extra time, effort and money extended in that regard.

While Fallingwater and the Los Angeles Mayan Theatre represent opposite ends of the sliding scale of pre-Columbian appropriation, buildings that employ indigenous American imagery for reasons that relate to building function fall within a solid middleground. One such example can be seen in the Pan-American Union complex in Washington, D.C. (Albert Kelsey and Paul P. Crét, 1910)⁵³⁸ with its scattered “direct” replications of Maya, Tiwanaku and other Mesoamerican and Andean imagery in otherwise Beaux-Arts and Spanish Colonial building styles.

⁵³⁶For further discussion on formal considerations of the use of pre-Columbian imagery in U.S. architecture as well as an analysis of the style as it relates to building typology and geographic region, see Chapter Six.

⁵³⁷See Chapter Six for a more comprehensive description of the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles.

⁵³⁸For a more comprehensive discussion of the Pan-American Union complex, see Chapter Six.

Architecture as Advertisement

In Rosemarie Haag Bletter's description of King Solomon's Temple and Citadel (Helmle & Corbett, c. 1925), designed for the 1926 Sesquicentennial Exhibition in Philadelphia, she describes the building as "an eye-boggling and exotic (yet educational) environment open to the public."⁵³⁹ The same could be said of many pre-Columbian appropriations, especially those on the Los Angeles Mayan Theatre and, to a lesser degree, the Pan-American Union parts of the sliding scale. Such Pre-Columbian appropriations, like Art Deco architecture as described by Bletter, were "created mostly for big business," and represent "good advertising, meant to entertain and draw in the public."⁵⁴⁰ Rather than applying forms and motifs that half-heartedly referenced pre-Columbian aesthetics—a choice that certainly would have been much easier and cheaper—most who wanted to entertain through the use of pre-Columbian imagery also wanted to provide authenticity. "Truth" in exotic form and motifs, then, somehow dazzled a U.S. public, making the research efforts and outside consultants that were so often a part of these pre-Columbian appropriations apparently well worth the investment.

Architecture as Power

Anthropologists Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine discuss motivation factors in the presentation of alterity in their book, *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, noting that "decisions about how cultures are presented reflect deeper

⁵³⁹Bletter, "Art Deco Style," 12.

⁵⁴⁰Ibid., 40.

judgments of power and authority and can, indeed, resolve themselves into claims about what a nation is or ought to be, as well as how citizens should relate to one another.”⁵⁴¹

While these remarks are aimed at museum displays, they can be seen to shed light on pre-Columbian co-optations in U.S. architecture. Appropriation raises issues of power and control, and recourse to ancient American forms seems tied to the sense of nationalism that may be detected—to varying degrees—in the writings of Robert B. Stacy-Judd, Francisco Mújica, Alfred C. Bossom and Frank Lloyd Wright. Associations of the pre-Columbian with the exotic and primitive also come into play in the use of pre-Columbian art forms, even for the “higher brow” appropriations of these individuals examined here, although this exploitation is more deliberate and pronounced in the escapist venues that were intended to entertain.

⁵⁴¹Steven D. Lavine and Ivan Karp, “Introduction: Museums and Multiculturalism,” in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, eds. Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), 2.

Chapter Six: The Choice to Appropriate: Chronological, Geographic and Typological Tendencies

So far do our ideals, our climate, and our temperament differ from those of Europe, that we can no longer continue to believe that these architectural importations express America.

--Alfred C. Bossom, "New Styles in American Architecture"⁵⁴²

Architects and designers of pre-Columbian appropriations employed indigenous American art forms in myriad ways. While the most striking examples of such appropriations are those in which pre-Columbian forms and motifs appear as applied ornament to rather neutral building shells,⁵⁴³ the vast majority subtly reference indigenous American forms or styles in the use of such features as flat mansard roofs, small window and door openings, stepped designs and/or geometric reliefs. Frank Lloyd Wright's Fallingwater (Mill Run, PA, 1935-39) exemplifies this subtle approach in its conjunctive use of organic and manipulated stone as well as in the stepped ceiling of the living room in the main house (see Chapter Five). The floor plans of pre-Columbian buildings were never duplicated, since most Mesoamerican and Andean structures either had no interior spaces or held self-contained two- or three-room designs unsuitable for

⁵⁴²Alfred C. Bossom and Estelle H. Ries, "New Styles in American Architecture: And What We Might Learn from the Mayas," *World's Work* 56, no. 2 (June 1928): 189.

⁵⁴³See discussion below detailing the problems inherent in such binary readings of buildings.

early-twentieth-century usage. This chapter examines the multiple ways in which pre-Columbian forms and motifs were employed in U.S. structures, teasing out the general characteristics of the style and connecting these to more focused typological, geographic and chronological trends. The discussion of ornament highlights two tendencies: that in which designs and motifs exuberantly overrun surfaces, as at the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles (Figure 2.2, Morgan, Walls and Clements, 1927); and that in which pre-Columbian ornament is confined to isolated areas of a building, as at Ennis-Brown house (Figure 2.9, Frank Lloyd Wright, Los Angeles, 1924).

Chronological Tendencies and the Pan-American Union

In general, these data show that the use of pre-Columbian forms and motifs in U.S. architecture tends to occur in isolated areas or as vague references in the 1910s, giving way (in Southern California especially) to more flamboyant and direct borrowings during the 1920s. More restrained and also more vague references are the norm after 1930, especially outside California. The majority of 1930s pre-Columbian appropriations subtly reference their sources through massing or generic motifs (such as geometric designs). Even Southern California architecture, though, tended toward sleeker lines and less ornament during the 1930s, and so this less exuberant approach to pre-Columbian design may be seen also as part of an overall tendency in U.S. architecture during the 1930s.

The story of pre-Columbian appropriations begins in 1910 with the Pan-American Union complex,⁵⁴⁴ as this is the first significant example of the use of pre-Columbian

⁵⁴⁴The Pan American Union complex in Washington, D.C. is located in the northwest quadrant near the Washington Monument in the blocks that span 17th and 18th Streets, Virginia Avenue and

forms and motifs in U.S. architecture. A brief history of the buildings and the organization that commissioned them, as well as a detailed description of the pre-Columbian elements throughout the buildings, provides a background for the impetus of the architectural style at issue in this dissertation. The Pan-American Union buildings were erected as the headquarters for the International Bureau of American Republics, an organization founded in 1889-90 to promote inter-American trade and peaceful relations between member countries of Latin America and the United States.⁵⁴⁵ By 1906, the Bureau members voted to construct a headquarters in Washington, D.C., as a “permanent center of information and of [the] interchange of ideas among the Republics of this Continent.”⁵⁴⁶ They also established the Columbus Memorial Library, still in operation today.

Constitution Avenue. The easternmost building, Main Building, was the first built (1910) while an Annex, originally functioning as the residence for the Director General, followed to the west (1912). A garden and pool were built in between the two buildings. The Main Building originally held materials pertaining to Latin America in a library dedicated to Christopher Columbus as well as administrative offices and a boardroom for the Union. Today the Annex is an Art Museum for the Americas (converted in 1956). A separate Administration Building which includes the Columbus Memorial Library was built in 1949 and is located across the street from the Annex on a triangular lot, enclosed by 18th Street NW, Virginia Avenue and Constitution Avenue. Additionally, a Supporting Services Building was added just north of the garden and art museum. Unless otherwise specified all information regarding the Pan-American Union was obtained at in the building and construction files at the Organization of American States, Columbus Memorial Library, Archives & Records Management Center, PRO 1-2-1 Unit of Building Maintenance [formerly Building and Grounds], Washington, DC, Columbus Memorial Library.

⁵⁴⁵*Organization of American States: A Handbook*, Department of Information and Public Affairs. OAS General Secretariat (Washington, D.C., 1972), 27. See also, a letter dated April 9, 1907 from John Barrett, Director, IBAR to various unspecified U.S. senators in folder “John Barrett Correspondence.”

⁵⁴⁶Letter of Secretary of State, Elihu Root to Andrew Carnegie, dated December 4, 1906, “Pan-American Union Building Correspondence.”

Albert Kelsey and Paul P. Crét won the commission for the building in 1907.

While Crét was largely responsible for the (dominant) Beaux-Arts aspects of the building⁵⁴⁷ it was Kelsey who developed the concept to include pre-Columbian forms and motifs as a way to illustrate, quite literally, the indigenous past of various member countries of the organization.

The pre-Columbian elements of the Main Building, Aztec Garden and Annex consist of both accurate replications and stylized impressions of forms and motifs from the Maya, Zapotec, Teotihuacan and Mexica of Mesoamerica and the Tiwanaku, Chimu, Chancay and Inka of the Andes. In the Main Building, these pre-Columbian references appear mostly in the patio and its immediate surrounding areas, on the front façade and on two large lanterns at the Seventeenth Street entrance. The Aztec Garden, a swimming pool and garden located behind the Main Building, exhibits a near life-size statue of Xochipilli, a Mexica deity of flowers. In the Annex—the Spanish Colonial building on the other side of the Aztec Garden from the Main Building—a hall loggia is devoted to an overall coverage of pre-Columbian designs (Figure 2.8).

The patio in the Main Building is a tiled-floor courtyard, designed with a state-of-the-art retractable roof and elaborate electric-lit fountain in the center. J. H. Dulles of Enfield Pottery designed the pre-Columbian scenes and figures on the patio floor (Figure 6.20); he opted for red and black tiles with mostly Maya figures and scenes derived from Altar Q at Copan and two panels from the Palace at Palenque as well as Tiwanaku Sun Gate figures and Chancay earspool designs. On the western side of the patio floor is a

⁵⁴⁷See Elizabeth Greenwell Grossman, *The Civic Architecture of Paul Crét*. Modern Architecture and Cultural Identity, ed. Richard A. Etlin (Cambridge, England/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996), chap. 3: “The Pan American Union Building Competition: A Lesson in Beaux-Arts Design.”

stylized scene from the Palace at Palenque (Figure 6.18), resembling closely Catherwood's illustration (Figure 3.14) with a standing elite figure holding objects of ceremony, flanked by two seated figures. On the eastern side of the patio is another scene from Palenque (also similar to an image by Catherwood) with the ruler, Kan B'alam I sitting on a double-headed jaguar throne leaning toward his mother at his right who is handing him the headdress of office. Two horizontal groups of Maya "glyphs" flank the figures. Typically in Maya scenes these glyphs would describe the individuals portrayed in the scene as well as the unfolding event; here, however, they are extremely truncated and stylized.

In the center of the patio is a pink, marble fountain designed by Gertrude Whitney Vanderbilt in 1910 (Figure 2.18).⁵⁴⁸ The shaft is adorned with Maya, Zapotec, Teotihuacan and Mexica designs, glyphs and figures in low relief. An octagonal form near the top supports eight protruding feathered-serpent heads with eyes wired to light up, quite an innovative design at the time, and "tongues" for the water to pour out. In between the serpent heads are paired low-relief figures, replicated from various Zapotec, Maya and Mexica sources.

The main shaft of the fountain has three full-length human figures carved in medium relief and topped with two rows of low-relief rayed designs, reminiscent of patterns on the Mexica Sun Stone. The human figures represent a Mexica warrior, a male figure described in the Pan-American Union literature as an "early American as the European explorers found him," and a woman symbolizing the future. In between each

⁵⁴⁸Various sources list Whitney's birth date as either 1875 or 1877. Whitney was the great-granddaughter of Cornelius Vanderbilt and the wife of Henry Payne Whitney. She studied sculpture with Henry Anderson and James E. Fraser both of New York as well as Andrew O'Connor and Rodin in Paris.

figure is a band of glyphs: one derived from the Mexica, another from the Maya and the last from the Zapotec.⁵⁴⁹

Eight scenes between each of the protruding feathered serpent heads correspond (culturally) to the glyphs, with one pair each of Mexica, Zapotec, Maya figures, and one additional scene with one Mexica and one Zapotec figure. The Mexica “glyph” band contains ten day signs: House, Rabbit, Reed and Flint accompanied with coefficients. From top to bottom the Mexica glyphs read as follows: 8 House, 9 Rabbit, 10 Reed, 11 Flint, 12 House, 13 Rabbit, 1 Reed, 2 Flint, 3 House and 3 Rabbit.⁵⁵⁰ This last glyph should have been 4 Rabbit, but it appears that either the source artist or Whitney left off the fourth coefficient.

Proceeding counter-clockwise, the next vertical band of glyphs is from the Maya. This strip also contains ten calendar glyphs, these from the Long Count Maya calendar that corresponds to a date in the Gregorian calendar of December 24, 804 AD. This Long Count date seems to have been copied directly from a monument, but the lunar cycle and description of the event that took place has been omitted. The Zapotec glyphs were copied from Stela 1 at Monte Alban, but are more stylized than the originals and are arranged here in neat columnar texts, an ordering not normally found in the Zapotec region.

Metal drain covers, shaped like Maya deities from the Venus pages of the Dresden Codex, adorn the floor around the fountain. Originally there were eight such

⁵⁴⁹Pamphlet entitled “The House of the Americas (Pan American Union Building: Headquarters of the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States).” See discussion of glyphs in Chapter Three of this dissertation.

⁵⁵⁰All glyphs were analyzed by Dr. Shannon Plank, archaeologist and epigrapher (personal communication, May 2004).

covers but four are missing today. The Andean images on the patio floor consist of Tiwanaku Sun Gate human-bird figures and pre-Inka (possibly Chancay) earspool designs from W. Golden Mortimer's *Peru: History of Coca "The Divine Plant" of the Incas: With an Introductory Account of the Incas, and of the Andean Indians of To-day* (1901) held in the Columbus Memorial Library⁵⁵¹

The exterior of the Pan-American Union also has a few references to the Maya and Mexica. Two lanterns on a copper base and copper and stone pedestals were placed outside the Main Building entrance near Seventeenth Street. These lanterns contain ten glass low-relief panels of two repeating figures rendered loosely in a Maya style, though unidentifiable. At one side of the pool of the Aztec Garden is the Mexica flower deity, Xochipilli (Kelsey's "Sad Indian" described in Chapter Three).

In 1912, two years after the dedication ceremonies took place for the Main Building, the Annex to the Pan American Union was completed. This building is located just east of the Aztec Garden and is Spanish Colonial in style with its stucco façade and red-tiled roof. The pre-Columbian ornament, designed and executed by the same Enfield Pottery of the Main Building patio floor, occurs in lavish profusion in the loggia on the west side of the building. The tilework that covers the floor and walls reads as a mosaic of predominantly dark and light blues interspersed with earth browns, reds, yellows and white with human and animal figures as well as geometric patterns taken from both portable pre-Columbian objects as well as architectural decorations.

⁵⁵¹W. Golden Mortimer's *Peru: History of Coca "The Divine Plant" of the Incas: With an Introductory Account of the Incas, and of the Andean Indians of To-da* (New York: J. H. Vail & Co., 1901). For further discussion, see Chapter Three.

At the top of the wall on all four sides is a medium-relief, brick stepped-fret and wave pattern, reminiscent of the patterns found on both Puuc-style architecture and on the adobe walls at Chan Chan. A strip of light blue and reddish-brown tiles is juxtaposed to two rows of Puuc-style truncated columns, each with visible seams that break the columns into three sections. The capitals and bases of the columns flare out and sport white, circular indentations. Below the columns is a brown row of tiles with some of the same seated figures from those modeled after Altar Q in Copan on the patio floor, arranged in groups of two and facing each other. The border on the eastern wall consists of these same Maya figures arranged in two, but the pattern is broken in three places: In between two of the ceiling beams that cross the width of the room is a Zapotec- or possibly Teotihuacan-style figure flanked by two of the Maya Altar Q figures.

The north and south walls mirror one another. Aside from the brick band, double-row of columns and border of brown-tiled paired figures already described above, these walls also have a window/door in the center near the top and below this, a reclining figure rendered in multi-colored tiles. Flanking the frame around the window near the top are two torch-like sculptural forms. The north wall has a feathered serpent head at the apex of the doorframe. On either side of the doorway are blue tiles interspersed with geometric designs. The main feature of the East wall is a large, Puuc-style face mask.

Many of the pre-Columbian cultures and styles cited at the Pan-American Union are the same ones repeatedly used in later pre-Columbian appropriations. Whether or not these citations are a result of the building's influence or a matter of architects and designers borrowing from the limited cache of imagery readily available to a general public is up for debate. That Stacy-Judd kept a pamphlet in his files detailing some of the

pre-Columbian elements of the Pan-American Union buildings and grounds, that Francisco Cornejo (1892-1963) seemed to mimic at least some of the compositional and subjective elements for the Los Angeles Mayan Theatre and that Mújica mentions the buildings' indigenous designs in his 1930 book,⁵⁵² suggests that the Pan-American complex may have enjoyed a much greater (non-Beaux-Arts related) reception than has previously been recognized.

The architectural style that started with the Pan-American Union ended, around 1940, with waning excitement surrounding pre-Columbian cultures as archaeological discoveries slowed and as the Latin American vogue subsided just as the events of World War II escalated. The dominance of Modernism in architecture—with its emphasis on smooth surfaces and rejection of the sorts of ornament integral to pre-Columbian appropriations⁵⁵³—as well as the rise of abstract expressionism—which embraced individuality, emphasized the subconscious, and rejected nationalist sentiments of the sort that nourished the vogue of truly “American” architecture⁵⁵⁴—certainly played a part in the demise of pre-Columbian-inspired design as well.

⁵⁵²See Chapter Three.

⁵⁵³Chapter Six provides a more in-depth discussion of Modernism's role in the decline of pre-Columbian appropriations.

⁵⁵⁴For the role that abstract expressionism played in the decreasing popularity of the work of the Mexican Muralists in the United States around 1940, see Laurance P. Hurlburt, *The Mexican Muralists in the United States* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989).

Ornament and Structure: Overall Coverage of Pre-Columbian Motifs

Ornament based on pre-Columbian prototypes, commonly rendered in polychromed plaster, terra-cotta and other novel materials,⁵⁵⁵ often was applied to the plain surfaces of building shells. While this structure-ornament approach to and readings of architecture, which has dominated the field since the early nineteenth century, is malleable and has a tendency to shift based on the prejudices of the critic,⁵⁵⁶ it is relevant here as the architects and designers in question, too, operated within such a construct. Therefore this binary reading, however flawed, reflects real divisions insofar as those responsible for the appropriation of pre-Columbian forms themselves chose to apply ornament to structural shells. Evidence for this occurs in the building plans, which, with the exception of the Aztec Theatre in San Antonio (Robert Kelley, 1926), fail to include details of the pre-Columbian ornament.⁵⁵⁷

The formal use of (sometimes) elaborate surface ornament and decorative designs, particularly those derived from “exotic” sources, fits into an overall trend in early-twentieth-century architecture. The indigenous American forms and motifs applied to U.S. structures comprise glyphs and imagery from codices, stelae, “altars,” ceramics

⁵⁵⁵For further discussion of architectural materials used during the early twentieth century, see Charlotte Herzog, “The Movie Palace and the Theatrical Sources of its Architectural Style,” in *Exhibition, the Film Reader*, ed. Ina Rae Hark (London/New York: Routledge, 2002), 52. See also, Susan Tunick, *Terra-Cotta Skyline: New York's Architectural Ornament* (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997).

⁵⁵⁶See Anne-Marie Sankovitch, “Structure/Ornament and the Modern Figuration of Architecture,” *Art Bulletin*, 80, no. 4 (Dec. 1998): 687-717.

⁵⁵⁷The building plans for the San Antonio Aztec Theatre are in the Aztec Theatre archives at the San Antonio Historical Society.

and other portable objects from Mesoamerica and, less frequently, the Andes. Features that are, in their indigenous settings, weight-bearing and functional—such as the corbel vault of the Maya—are often more decorative than structural when they appear in U.S. buildings. The corbel vault underneath the large figure on the front façade of the Mayan Theater in Denver, for instance, serves no functional purpose (Figure 6.1, Montana Fallis, 1930).⁵⁵⁸

To illustrate this type of pre-Columbian appropriation that makes use of lavish ornament, a more detailed description of a representative example—the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles (Figure 2.2)⁵⁵⁹—follows. Theater manager, Gerald Davis conceived of the pre-Columbian theme⁵⁶⁰ after reading an article by Mexican artist and archaeologist, Francisco Cornejo who was living in Los Angeles at the time.⁵⁶¹ The building is a two-story structure with plain exterior sides and back, yet the front façade and practically every interior surface is covered in motifs derived from the Zapotec, Maya, Teotihuacan, Xochicalco, Toltec and Mexica cultures of Mesoamerica and the Tiwanaku and Inka of the Andes.

⁵⁵⁸Architect Kurt J. Ludwig (AIA) confirmed this corbel vault's lack of weight-bearing function, as well as the weight-bearing properties of similar elements in other buildings treated by this dissertation.

⁵⁵⁹The Huntington Library in Los Angeles, repository for the papers and plans of Morgan, Walls and Clements, holds neither correspondence files nor records of cost for the Mayan Theatre.

⁵⁶⁰During the soar in popularity of the newly invented movies (and their acceptance among middle- and upper-class audiences) movie theater managers of the 1920s often went to great lengths to best their competitors. See the discussion below of movie theaters and the more lavish movie palaces of the 1920s.

⁵⁶¹Marjorie Ingle, *The Mayan Revival Style: Art Deco Mayan Fantasy* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith/Peregrine Smith Books, 1984), 45. Ingle describes the article as appearing in a Los Angeles newspaper but provides no further details.

While Morgan, Walls and Clements designed the structural components of the building, they hired Cornejo, along with a “decorating contractor and crew” to design and implement the pre-Columbian ornament. Clearly Davis put a high premium on ornamentation, considering the theater’s costly decor a worthy investment. This calculation seems to derive from a sense of the marketability of things “exotic” in 1920s Los Angeles; by invoking “aboriginal” forms, the owners of the theater hoped to draw attention to a building that functioned first and foremost as a venue of escapism. The “editor’s note” appended to Cornejo’s “Description of Architecture and Decorations of the Mayan Theatre,” which appeared in *Pacific Coast Architect* in 1928, describes some of this process:

In designing the Mayan Theatre, the architects, Messrs. Morgan, Walls and Clements, did not attempt to reconstruct the interior or exterior design of a typical Mayan [sic] structure, but borrowing and adapting the wealth of the ancient arts of the American style for their architectural and decorative qualities, applied them to meet modern conditions. Yet the ensemble of the completed work fully carries the exotic spirit of the highest culture reached by the ancient people, the Mayas predominating.

Wherever the eye encounters sculpture, painted decorations, textures and constructions, a fine craftsmanship is evidenced, due to the wonderful cooperation by journeymen and artists, shop managers and others who helped to make this undertaking a success.

Mr. Richard Sobieraj, decorating contractor, received the services of Señor Francisco Cornejo, Mexican artist and student of American archaeology, who for many years has preached and practiced the use of our aboriginal art to decorative purposes.⁵⁶²

The façade is divided into three areas, the top with a geometric Puuc-style design from a building at Chichen Itza (Figures 2.2 and 6.17), the middle with a march of

⁵⁶²Francisco Cornejo, “Description of Architecture and Decorations of the Mayan Theatre,” *Pacific Coast Architect* 33, no. 4 (April 1928): 13. See also, Donald E. Marquis, “Archaeological Aspects of the Mayan Theatre of Los Angeles, California,” *Art and Archaeology* 29, no. 3 (March 1930): 98-111, 124. Much of the information about the Mayan Theatre here was obtained from this article as well as the author’s own observations.

Zapotec figures atop long, narrow corbel vaults and the base (including the marquee), a jumble of Puuc- and other Maya-style designs. Today the façade is brightly colored (the result of a 1960s paint job)⁵⁶³ but it was intended originally to mimic pre-Columbian structures in its “natural warm, grayish tone” juxtaposed with “intense variegated shades of red.”⁵⁶⁴ On the underside of the marquee is a somewhat abstracted version of the Mexica Sun Stone. The floor (just in front of the door) and walls of the entrance foyer (what Cornejo calls the “Hall of Inscriptions,”⁵⁶⁵) are filled with Maya glyphs (Figure 5.30), taken, at least in part, from Quirigua, many of them legible (though taken as a whole they do not form a coherent text⁵⁶⁶). The red-tiled floor just inside the entrance contains scenes and figures in buff taken from a wooden lintel at Tikal⁵⁶⁷ and the Maya

⁵⁶³Ingle, 46-7.

⁵⁶⁴Cornejo, 13.

⁵⁶⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶⁶Dr. Shannon Plank, epigrapher and archaeologist, examined the glyphs on the floor of the foyer, around the foyer ticket window and on the interior lobby ceiling. She reported that those on the foyer floor appear as they would on a sideways stela, with some glyphs oriented inward and others outward. “Some of the glyphs can be read on their own, some contain one actual glyphic element and one kind of fanciful one and others are backwards,” she notes. The glyphs around the foyer ticket window contain a phrase copied from a monument at Quirigua, which reads, “*uch’am k’awiil K’ak’ Tiliw Chan*” (the last element of the name, which would be Yopaat, is missing). This translates as “he takes K’awiil, Fire Peccary Sky [Thunderer]”; Plank explains that “taking K’awiil” meant “accepting a royal scepter carved in the form of the god K’awiil, a god/essence of dynastic power,” and concludes that this is an accession statement for the king K’ak’ Tiliw Chan Yopaat. Plank notes that a block of glyphs on the left side of the ticket window was printed right side up, whereas a nearby block is upside down. The remaining glyphs in this area of the foyer are impressionistic, while the stenciled glyphs on the foyer ceiling are Aztec day signs, including “monkey” and “eagle” (personal communication, May 2004).

⁵⁶⁷Cornejo, 14.

Dresden Codex (Figures 3.49 and 3.50). The entrance foyer is a small, dark corbel-vaulted space that “gives a good illustration of the character of Mayan interiors.”⁵⁶⁸

Once inside, the visitor enters a lobby with a back wainscoted wall of dark Zapote wood that curves with the abutted auditorium. The walls and doors of this space are covered in motifs from Tiwanaku’s Sun Gate as well as Maya feathered serpents similar to those at Chichen Itza (see Chapter Three). The foyer has a corbel-vaulted display case that originally held a “recessed Inka textile design.”⁵⁶⁹ Other highlights of the lobby wall include a repeatedly represented seated Zapotec figure in a frieze, with rows of Puuc-like truncated columnar forms (similar to those in blue on the exterior “frieze” of Stacy-Judd’s 1931 First Baptist Church in Ventura, California) as well as hatching and other geometricized designs.

Highlights of the auditorium, with its ceilings, walls and doors also a rich, dark brown wood, include five double doors lightly etched with a slightly stylized replica of Lintel 25 at Yaxchilan (Figures 6.15 and 6.16) and a number of colossal (approximately 30’ in height) reproductions of Quirigua stelae, forming the proscenium arch. Cornejo describes working from copies of these monuments at a San Diego museum in order to reproduce these “masters of aboriginal art” for the theater:

The replicas, to be found in the museum at San Diego, enabled the architects and sculptors to study their wealth of ornament, feeling of modeling and texture. Slightly redesigned, these enormous figures, the tallest measuring thirty-one feet, frame and separate the three stages of the theatre.⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁶⁸Ibid.

⁵⁶⁹Ibid., 15. The author could not verify the identity of this design as it no longer exists. Cornejo’s knowledge of the Inka was limited as he identified the Sun Gate figures as Inka (15).

⁵⁷⁰Ibid., 18.

The ceiling (above the balcony area of the second floor) features a very large circular form reminiscent of the Mexica Sun Stone, “illustrating an entire Mayan year of 260 days.”⁵⁷¹ Because the ceiling designs are so lightly rendered and the lighting conditions of the theater are quite poor, it is very difficult to discern many more of the motifs on the ceiling from firsthand observations. According to Cornejo, however, the ceiling also has “scales and feathers, as found in the Temple of Xochicalco,” “other Indian motifs of Inca origin,” and “cross arrows on a shield as found on the Temple of the Tigers at the Ball court at Chichen (sic) Itza.”⁵⁷² Underneath the balcony, the ceiling is etched with geometric patterns as well as Palenque-like scroll designs. Light fixtures of colored wood display zigzags and other geometric forms and, in their center, the quintessential Mexica motif of an eagle perched on a cactus.

The second floor is not as lavishly ornamented as the first, although the pre-Columbian imagery is still fairly extensive. A small, low-ceilinged lounge area outside the bathrooms at the top of the stairs has stepped rafters painted with Mesoamerican motifs (including Teotihuacan-style feathered serpent and marine animals and a feathered serpent similar to those at Chichen Itza), two three-dimensional Atlantean figures (originally water fountains on the ground floor lobby, placed beneath a wall painting from the Temple of the Foliated Cross at Palenque⁵⁷³), one of which today holds up a shelf in the small bar (the latter, a modern addition).⁵⁷⁴ A line of light sconces shaped

⁵⁷¹Ibid.

⁵⁷²Ibid., 16.

⁵⁷³Ibid., 15.

⁵⁷⁴Ibid.

like Zapotec- or possibly Mexcia-like heads decorates the wall. The banisters of a small double-sided staircase leading up to an office are adorned with feathered serpents rendered in a Chichen Itza style.

The balcony area on the second floor also has pre-Columbian ornament, much of it etched or carved on the same Zapote wooden walls, doors and ceilings as downstairs. From this vantage point, one can barely make out some of the finely etched or carved glyphs, figures and geometric patterns of the ceiling. Wooden columns and doors reveal Maya-looking figures—some etched, some painted—in profile. The figures, carved in low relief on the doors, are each decked out in fancy regalia with a quetzal-feathered headdress, jade nose plug and serpent bar with the scrolling forms typical of Palenque. The nearby profile figures in paint are humans wearing bird costumes holding round shields. The walls toward the stage resemble the “Cyclopean”-type (possibly Inka) stonework (Figure 3.19), with the back wall, an enormous scene from the Codex Borgia.

Ornament and Structure: Isolated Appearances of Pre-Columbian Motifs

While the overall approach to the application of pre-Columbian ornament, such as at the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles is certainly memorable, a number of pre-Columbian appropriations cite (more or less) directly pre-Columbian forms and motifs in isolated areas. One such example occurs at the Charles Ennis-Brown house in Los Angeles (Figures 2.9 and 2.10).

The house itself, designed by Frank Lloyd Wright is reminiscent of such Maya structures at Temples I or II at Tikal (Figure 1.5) or the Castillo at Chichen Itza (Figure 1.9) with its stepped, slightly canted massing. Wright created texture on the stucco

exterior with his concrete “textile-block” design: receding concentric squares overlapped twice on one corner by more concentric squares. One variation of this motif occurring on the house is a punctured square—with voids in the center and outlining the square—whereby one corner is overlapped twice with solid concentric squares and the opposing corner is overlapped with a solid square. The textured geometric pattern that results resembles Zapotec buildings at Mitla (Figure 3.17) or Puuc-style Maya buildings, such as the House of the Governor (Figures 1.11 and 2.5) at Uxmal. Additionally, the textured concrete block mimics the stone typical of elite structures of Mesoamerica, while the brilliant white color resembles the limestone used for architecture throughout much of the Maya region. The building exudes a pre-Columbian “feeling” and, typical of Frank Lloyd’s Wright’s pre-Columbian-inspired designs, evades direct comparisons to specific examples of pre-Columbian art and architecture.

Isolated instances of pre-Columbian ornament rendered in metal designed by Julius Dietzmann of Iron Craftworks appear throughout both exterior and interior. A large entrance gate punctuated with highly stylized Maya glyphs and scrolling patterns greets the visitor (Figures 2.9 and 2.10). Window and door grilles, covering ground-level openings, also exhibit stylized glyphs, as well as Mexica-like designs. In comparison to Wright’s subtle references to pre-Columbian architecture, Dietzmann’s motifs borrow more directly from indigenous American sources. Indeed, Dietzmann clearly studied illustrations of Maya and Mexica “writing” systems, as some of his replications are legible (or contain parts of actual glyphs),⁵⁷⁵ yet he took liberties in the rendering and

⁵⁷⁵Dr. Shannon Plank, epigrapher and archaeologist, analyzed the glyph-like forms that appear throughout the exterior of this house.

arrangement of most of the glyphs, as an analysis of some of the elements throughout the house indicates.

The focal point of the entrance door grille (Figure 6.11) is a star-like design that resembles the Mexica Sun Stone (Figure 1.17). Below this Sun Stone reference is a scroll-like form that resembles the Mexica day sign “reed” (Figure 6.19). Nine “glyphs” appear on the outer edges of the door. While none of these are “real,” some do have identifiable Maya elements. They also tend to observe, according to epigrapher Dr. Shannon Plank, grammatical conventions of Maya signs: some having prefixes, superfixes, subfixes or main signs. The glyph at the top left is a mock-up of a Maya date indicating the numeral thirteen (two bars and three dots), the sign, *tuun* (“stone”) from the syllable *ku*, as well as several different month glyphs. Continuing in a clockwise fashion, the next glyph has a scroll element that reads *k’ak’* (“fire”) and a non-specific head sign in profile. As a whole the glyph is illegible. Next is another glyph that resembles a Maya day sign indicating the numeral “four” (i.e., four dots). The circular cartouche with three basal dots is possibly taken from one of the Maya day-signs with three basal curliques. Continuing on, the next glyph is a non-specific head sign. In a normal Maya text, Dr. Plank notes, it might read as the feminine prefix, *Ix*, or the syllable, *na*. Next on the entrance grille is an illegible “club”-shaped cutout that bears some resemblance to several Maya glyphs (this glyph is repeated on the entrance gate to the house as well). Dr. Plank notes that the next glyph “would be a good diagram for the way glyph compounds are constructed, with blanks where the syllables or logograms would be,” noting, however, that taken together, it is not legible. The glyph to follow resembles the Maya date, 8 *Muluc*, a day in the 260-day ritual calendar, but is rather impressionistic. The second-to-

last glyph in the entrance sequence incorporates the numeral ten (two bars). However, this is an atypical placement of a number in Maya text, demonstrating Dietzmann followed his own conventions here. Three other elements of the glyph have been left blank. The last glyph on the door depicts a backwards- (right-) facing head sign with a knotted headdress on the forehead and squiggle on the cheek. These last two elements were copied from actual glyphs but, again, the glyph as a whole is illegible. The glyphs on the window near the entrance grille (Figure 6.20) and on the entrance gates are mostly impressionistic, squishy pseudo-glyphs, similar to those on the door.

Inside, Dietzmann's metalwork designs can be seen in a fireplace panel (Figure 6.4) in the sitting room, in some light switches throughout the house as well as in the decorative designs in the space overlooking the stairway just outside the kitchen. The fireplace panel depicts a Maya personage reclining in a half-sitting/half-laying frontal position with head turned to the right, showing off the much-discussed "Maya profile." Etched into the frame at the bottom center is "XIUHTECUTLI=THE GOD OF FIRE" (Figure 6.3) the Nahuatl (Mexican language) name of a Mexica deity. The figure was most certainly replicated from Spinden's illustration (Figure 6.5) in *A Study of Maya Art* (1913) of Yaxchilan Lintel 39, Structure 16 in which Yaxun B'alam IV (previously known as Bird Jaguar), an eighth-century ruler, is engaged in a Vision Rite, a bloodletting ceremony that signified him to be the next ruler.

The Dietzmann fireplace panel shows the Maya figure in the same position and with similar clothing accoutrements as that in Spinden's Lintel 39. Differences between the two depictions, however, reveal Dietzmann's translation of the Maya image. First, in Spinden's drawing, Yaxun B'alam is shown with a jade nose plug (a common ornament

of elite Maya figures) that extends up in front of his face. In the Dietzmann panel, this has been translated into a swirling form emanating from the figure's mouth, as if the figure were breathing smoke. Second, Spinden's drawing depicts a male personage, whereas Dietzmann has transformed Yaxun B'alam into a female figure with breasts (the serpent bar of rulership strategically located across the chest to cover up the most revealing parts). Also, instead of the double-headed Vision Serpent with open mouths and emerging gods flanking the human figure as in the Spinden depiction, Dietzmann has eliminated the serpents and gods altogether, replacing the one to the figure's right with the scroll-like forms that signify smoke. On the figure's left, Spinden shows a serpent head with emerging deity whereas Dietzmann rendered a writhing snake, intertwined around the figure's left leg. Glyphs in an "L" shape adorn the scene.⁵⁷⁶

Ornament vs Structure: Subtle References to Pre-Columbian Art and Architecture

More subtle uses of the pre-Columbian tend to be those that reference building forms rather than design motifs as surface ornament. In such examples, indigenous American architectural features appear in the form of heavy (mansard) rooflines; small vertical wall openings; the use of neutral-colored concrete or stone; and/or the employment of distinctive structural elements such as the corbel vault or trapezoidal

⁵⁷⁶ According to Dr. Shannon Plank (personal communication, May 2004), the glyphs, from left to right and up to down, read as follows: In the left column the top glyph is a plausible-looking day sign with a numerical coefficient of 8, though the day is not legible; The second glyph from the top is an impressionistic rendering of the glyph, *u-b'aah* ("it is the image of"); The third glyph from the top has superfixes of the syllable, *ka* but the rest is illegible. The twined hands is not a glyph. The four glyphs in the upper right corner appear to be a real verb phrase but each glyph is slightly distorted and Dali-esque. For example, the glyph on the left of this group looks almost like the glyph *chuk-aj* ("is seized") used to describe the taking of captives, with almost-appropriate affixes. The Maya texts from which these came were carefully observed but not copied precisely. Overall, the "text" doesn't quite say anything.

doors and windows (common to Tiwanaku and the Inka). Subtle references to pre-Columbian aesthetics also occur in conceptual relationships between structures and their natural surroundings, as at Frank Lloyd Wright's Fallingwater, as discussed in the preceding chapter (Figure 5.21, Mill Run, Pennsylvania, 1935-39).

Ornament and Structure: General Traits of Pre-Columbian Appropriations

While a handful of pre-Columbian-inflected buildings in the United States, such as the Cliff Dweller apartment high-rise by Herman Lee Meader in New York City (Figure 6.2, 1911-14),⁵⁷⁷ blend pre-Columbian forms and motifs with Native American ones, most architects limited their borrowings to elements drawn from pre-Hispanic cultures of Mesoamerica and the Andes—to the exclusion of other non-Western cultures, including “Native American.” Thus, Barbara Braun's assertion that “exotic,” non-Western cultures were melded together and interchangeable in the minds of Western artists (and, by implication, Western society generally) is only partly true.⁵⁷⁸ Euro-American artists did tend to meld together non-Western forms, but only within one category, such as Oceanic, Egyptian or pre-Columbian⁵⁷⁹—groupings that were loosely

⁵⁷⁷For further discussion of this apartment building, see Carla Breeze, *Pueblo Deco* (New York: Rizzoli International, 1990), 108-09.

⁵⁷⁸Braun writes, “Since modern artists by no means confined their interests in non-Western art to one tradition, it is not always easy to distinguish pre-Hispanic from other ethnographic influences. In the age of André Malraux's ‘museum without walls,’ they were eclectic in their gleanings, culling and mixing forms from a variety of sources—exotic styles, popular arts, and the storehouse of Western art history—in a syncretist stew.” *Pre-Columbian Art and the Post-Columbian World: Ancient American Sources of Modern Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1993), 13.

⁵⁷⁹The identifications of individual pre-Columbian cultures continue to be confused in more contemporary popular venues. Art historian Judy Sund, for example, demonstrates how West Mexican pre-Columbian figures featured in Kahlúa ads from the mid-1960s through 1995 were presented as “a collective abstraction rather than a single, identifiable entity.” See “Beyond the

aligned with archaeological designations and that were, themselves, reflected in academic classifications taking shape during this period.

The original source material for pre-Columbian decorative details is in some cases closely replicated, in others stylized, and in still others so far from the original as to evoke a merely pre-Columbian “feeling.” Braun writes that the architects and designers who practiced pre-Columbian appropriation were uniformly “unconcerned with historical accuracy, even when leaning heavily on archaeological data,”⁵⁸⁰ an observation that is not fully borne out by close inspection of their production. While strict historical accuracy is, of course, impossible in a setting that crosses cultural, spatial and temporal boundaries, some architects and designers did, in fact, seek to accurately replicate pre-Columbian originals and made considerable efforts, through research and travel, to achieve that end.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, books and other sorts of publications constituted the most accessible compendium of pre-Columbian imagery, but architects and designers also visited exhibits of ancient American materials (often accompanied by photographs of major sites and monuments) at world’s fairs and museums (some making special trips to do so), and the most daring and dedicated even traveled to pre-Columbian sites for first-hand examination of monuments *in situ*. For example, Albert Kelsey, one of the architects of the Pan-American Union complex (today the Organization of American States, Kelsey and Paul P. Crét, 1910, Washington, D.C.), not only conducted extensive research at the National Museum (Smithsonian Institution) and visited the pre-Columbian exhibits at the American Museum of Natural History in

Grave: The Twentieth-Century Afterlife of West Mexican Burial Effigies,” *Art Bulletin* 82, no. 4 (Dec. 2000): 759.

⁵⁸⁰Braun, 294.

New York City to prepare for his task, but also made at least two trips to the Yucatan Peninsula and Cuba “in quest of ideas and local color—not merely as a tourist but as an architect with a definite purpose. . . . to obtain ideas to be used in the embellishment and completion of the Pan American garden.”⁵⁸¹

As discussed in Chapter Five, some pre-Columbian-influenced projects were overseen by outside consultants who supervised the design and installation of buildings’ pre-Columbian elements, and some of those consulted were well-known specialists of the day.⁵⁸² Noted Maya archaeologist Sylvanus Morley (1883-1948), for example, provided input regarding the indigenous American designs at the Fisher Theatre in Detroit, Michigan (Figure 3.52, Graven & Mayger, 1928).⁵⁸³

In some cases, the use of pre-Hispanic elements in U.S. structures was pragmatic: a way of illustrating the function of a particular building, such as the Pan-American Union complex or some of the world’s fairs or museum buildings that housed pre-

⁵⁸¹ Albert Kelsey, *Yucatecan Scenes and Sounds. An Address Delivered Before the Numismatic and Antiquarian Society of Philadelphia on March 18, 1918*. Published simultaneously with the Proceedings of the Society (Philadelphia: Numismatic & Antiquarian Society, 1919), 11.

⁵⁸² During the 1910s and 1920s, “decorators” were commonly hired to provide ornament for the creation of alter-environments. This was especially true of movie palaces, but the practice also extended to hotel, restaurant and department store design. Historian Ben M. Hall writes, “The movie palace architect’s most valuable ally was the decorator, for without him the pleasure domes would have been as barren as dirigible hangars. All through the planning and building stages they worked together to create just the right effect of awe mingled with euphoria on the absorbent ids of moviegoers. The decorator usually moved in after the structure was fairly well completed to deck the hall with boughs of gold leaf and all the other trappings that were his stock in trade.” *The Best Remaining Seats: The Story of the Golden Age of the Movie Palace* (New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1961), 109, 112. This practice is reminiscent of the examples discussed in Chapter Three of this dissertation of archaeologists hired as consultants on a number of pre-Columbian appropriations.

⁵⁸³ Ingle, 47. Ingle includes as an appendix Morley’s pamphlet describing the theater, 81-83.

Columbian exhibits.⁵⁸⁴ In other instances, designers and/or their patrons sought to exploit the public's interest in the exotic and obsession with authenticity. The end result, however, was not always as "authentic" as billed—especially when designers relied on secondary sources rather than pre-Columbian originals. Evidence of such reliance (which does not necessarily bespeak a lack of interest in replication), exists in the duplication of "errors" such as in the fireplace panel at the Ennis-Brown house (described above).

Building Typology and Pre-Columbian Use

Building typology clearly played a role in the ways that pre-Columbian forms and motifs were referenced in U.S. structures. The bold and proliferate "exotic" ornament seen at the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles (Figure 3.43) was common to movie palaces (as they were routinely called by the mid-1920s), and some of the most striking pre-Columbian appropriations occur in entertainment contexts. Theaters, restaurants and hotels were the sites of the most lavish applied ornament, and their interiors often were especially ornate. The escapist functions of these establishments allowed, or even

⁵⁸⁴Buildings designed and constructed for the Pan-American Union, various world's fairs and expositions, and the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles (Allison & Allison, Sumner Hunt & Silas R. Burns, 1912), for example, fall into this group.

One world's fair example is the Federal Building (now San Diego Hall of Champions Sports Museum, Richard S. Requa, San Diego), modeled after Uxmal's Governor's Palace, built for the 1935 California-Pacific International Exposition to house photographic and material exhibits devoted to indigenous American cultures. See Richard S. Requa, *Inside Lights on the Building of San Diego's Exposition, 1935: The Dramatic Story of the Organization, Planning and Construction of the California-Pacific International Exposition, May 29 to November 11, 1935* (1937; repr., San Diego: Parker H. Jackson, 1997), 31, 51-56. For further discussion of this and other buildings at this fair, see Chapter Three of this dissertation.

The Southwest Museum housed pre-Columbian objects as well as photographs of various sites—thus, its Maya-styled tunnel entrance. Charles Fletcher Lummis (1859-1928), journalist, photographer and archaeologist, founded the Southwest Museum in 1907 with members of the Southwest Society (Western branch of the Archaeological Institute of America). The museum, originally in downtown Los Angeles, was moved in 1914 to its current location between downtown and Pasadena. For further discussion of Lummis, see Chapter Three.

encouraged, the creation of a total environment, and one that was at odds with everyday life. By providing spaces of otherness that helped patrons lose themselves, business owners hoped to ignite interest and draw larger crowds. As theater architect Thomas W. Lamb (1871-1942) explained:

To make our audience receptive and interested, we must cut them off from the rest of the city life and take them into a rich and self-contained auditorium, where their minds are freed from their usual occupations and customary thoughts.⁵⁸⁵

Apparently their sumptuous decors did the trick, as movie palaces went up one after the next, only slightly more than a decade after movie technology, as we know it today, was introduced.⁵⁸⁶

The first public showing of a moving image projected onto a screen was at Koster and Bial's Music Hall in New York, on April 23, 1896, using Thomas Edison's newly invented Vitascope.⁵⁸⁷ Makeshift movie theaters quickly cropped up in storefronts and other locations where sufficient seating could be assembled and a sheet for a screen could be hung. Prior to about 1910, moving pictures were shown in ad hoc spaces at penny arcades and at nickelodeons, and were associated with a "sideshow" audience comprised

⁵⁸⁵As quoted in Preston J. Kaufmann, *Fox, the Last Word: . . . the Story of the World's Finest Theatre* (Pasadena, CA: Showcase Publications, 1979), 11. Kaufmann cites *Architect and Engineer* (December 1929). He provides no further information.

⁵⁸⁶Sources that discuss the history of the U.S. movie theater, include Hall, *Best Remaining Seats*; Herzog, "Movie Palace," Kaufmann, *Fox, the Last Word*, John Margolies and Emily Gwathmey, *Ticket to Paradise: American Movie Theaters and How We Had Fun* (Boston/Toronto/London: Little, Brown, 1991), David Naylor, *American Picture Palaces: The Architecture of Fantasy* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1981) and Maggie Valentine, *The Show Starts on the Sidewalk: An Architectural History of the Movie Theatre, Starring S. Charles Lee* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1994).

⁵⁸⁷Kaufmann, 2.

mainly of the lower classes of U.S. society.⁵⁸⁸ Middle- and upper-class audiences were increasingly intrigued by motion pictures once the managers of established Vaudeville theaters—eager to cash in on what some foresaw as a booming business—began to include films in their programs. The earliest films comprised short-action scenes designed to amaze audiences with the new technology. This changed in 1912, when Adolph Zukor (future owner of Famous Players Film Company, which became Paramount Pictures) showed *Queen Elizabeth*, essentially a filmed play, which starred well-known stage actress Sarah Bernhardt, at the Lyceum Theater in New York.⁵⁸⁹ The introduction of such feature-length films fueled construction of more permanent movie houses, and these soon were superseded by opulent “movie palaces,” each of which attempted to outdo the last with seating capacities that ranged from one thousand to more than six thousand people.⁵⁹⁰ According to film historian Charlotte Herzog, a theater was considered a “palace” if it had ushers, doormen and elaborate interior decor.⁵⁹¹ Under the pressure of increasing competition, the “de luxe” palace emerged, and by the 1920s this sort of house—which had “a stage show, an orchestra, a pipe organ, plush ornamentation and a ‘first-class’ (not to be confused with first-run) film”⁵⁹²—dominated. The sense of escape afforded by theaters’ architecture, decor and service were, in “de luxe”

⁵⁸⁸Herzog, 55.

⁵⁸⁹Margolies and Gwathmey, 15.

⁵⁹⁰The Regent Theater in New York (Thomas W. Lamb, 1912) was the first true movie palace.

⁵⁹¹Herzog, 51.

⁵⁹²*Ibid.*

establishments, abetted by air-conditioning, child and pet care, as well as various amusements (such as miniature golf).⁵⁹³

Though the first movie palaces relied upon European-derived classical architecture to establish their respectability in the eyes of the middle and upper classes, Thomas Lamb, for one, sensed “an underlying demand for something more gay, more flashy.”⁵⁹⁴ This hunch apparently was one commonly held, for in the 1920s a whole crop of “exotic” movie palaces went up, conceived with faraway locales in mind, and given names such as the Alhambra, Oriental, Mayan and Aztec. These themed theaters conjured up images of mysterious peoples and places adding to the sense of alter-environment already created by the films themselves.⁵⁹⁵ The 1922 discovery of King Tutankhamen’s tomb sparked the fad of Egyptian-styled theaters,⁵⁹⁶ while the proximity of pre-Columbian sites and the steady stream of discoveries occurring in Mexico, Central America and the Andes fueled a similar interest in American antiquity.

While most of the movie theaters that featured pre-Columbian forms and motifs date to the 1920s, the earliest movie theater to incorporate them, the Aztec Theater in Eagle Pass, Texas (Figure 2.1, Leonard F. Seed), dates to 1915.⁵⁹⁷ While the Aztec’s interior has been remodeled and the initial decor renovated since Sam Schwartz

⁵⁹³Mary Halnon, “Some Enchanted Evenings: American Picture Palaces,” <http://xroads.virginia.edu/~CAP/PALACE/thirties.html> (May 2006).

⁵⁹⁴Hall, 108. Although he quotes Lamb, he does not provide the source.

⁵⁹⁵Margolies and Gwathmey, 10.

⁵⁹⁶Ibid., 16.

⁵⁹⁷The architect of the Eagle Pass theater is sometimes identified as “Seed,” sometimes as “Sneed.” Since the original records were destroyed in a fire, it is difficult to confirm the correct name. In this dissertation, I follow Marjorie Ingle’s spelling.

constructed the building, the current owners (descendants of Schwartz) have preserved the exterior's original appearance. The most striking ornamental detail is a poor copy of the Mexica Sun Stone stuck into the terra-cotta on the theater's exposed side wall (Figures 6.6 and 1.17). Its front façade incorporates paired designs that resemble the Mexica day sign signifying "water" (Figure 6.7), both accompanied by six dots (i.e., "6 Water" in the Mexica calendar). The façade is also ornamented with zigzag and diamond forms that vaguely resemble Mexica and Zapotec or Puuc-style Maya geometric designs (Figures 2.1, 3.3 and 1.10).

Later theaters in the pre-Columbian mode include the Aztec Theatre in San Antonio (Robert Kelley, 1926), the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles, the KiMo Theater in Albuquerque (Boller Brothers, 1927),⁵⁹⁸ the Fisher Theatre in Detroit (1928), the Mayan Theater in Denver (Montana Fallis, 1930) and the Riviera Theatre in Charleston, South Carolina (Charles Benton, 1939). While the majority of these use pre-Columbian forms and motifs in all-encompassing profusion, some—particularly the later examples—contain only isolated references to the pre-Columbian. The only indigenous American elements at the otherwise Native American-themed KiMo Theater, for example, are abstracted Maya-like glyphs on the entrance foyer walls.

Even when pre-Columbian forms and motifs are cited in isolated and faintly restrained ways in movie theaters or palaces, such references tend to be bolder than those seen in pre-Columbian-inspired residences or office buildings. Hotels, restaurants and department stores likewise attempted more flamboyant and direct pre-Columbian borrowings than those seen in residential or office buildings. Robert B. Stacy-Judd's

⁵⁹⁸Carl Boller alone is also sometimes named as the architect of the KiMo Theater.

Aztec Hotel (Figure 6.8), for example, exhibits a cacophony of Maya-like forms—from figures to temples to glyphs—covering both exterior and interior, and the Aztec Ballroom in the President Hotel in Kansas City, Missouri (Shepherd and Wiser, 1926), was adorned with a Coatlicue figure and other Mexica-derived designs.⁵⁹⁹

“Atmospheric” hotels⁶⁰⁰ and themed restaurants and department stores, were, like movie palaces, conceived as alter-environments conducive to escapism. Hotels and restaurants, by their very nature, provide temporary alternative environments for their patrons, and while many early-twentieth-century hoteliers and restaurateurs sought to attract clients through opulent decor and lavish amenities that mimicked those enjoyed by the wealthy, others turned to “exotic” settings that offered escape from quotidian reality. Similarly, department store owners sought to dazzle their clients with magnificent or exotic decor and displays, perhaps as a way to put customers in an acquisitive frame of mind. While most alter-environment buildings made use of applied ornament in copious quantity to achieve an effect of over-allness such as the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles, some featured isolated pre-Columbian forms and motifs.

Judiciously executed pre-Columbian forms and motifs in U.S. structures generally occur in more conservative design schemes for government buildings, schools, churches, houses and office buildings. In general, artists and architects working in Southern California were more daring in their references to pre-Columbian art and architecture, even when employing the isolated approach to ornament. One example discussed in

⁵⁹⁹Rexford Newcomb, “Aboriginal American Architectural Types,” *The Western Architect: Architecture and Allied Arts* 36, no. 7 (July 1927): 112.

⁶⁰⁰One major source on this building type is David Watkin, et al., *Grand Hotel: The Golden Age of Palace Hotels: An Architectural and Social History* (London: J.M. Dent, 1984).

Chapter Five, the First Baptist Church in Ventura, California (now Ventura County Church of Religious Science, Robert B. Stacy-Judd, 1931), has scattered Maya-like forms in its exterior's stepped design (Figure 5.2) and "frieze" (Figure 5.7). These Maya-like designs continue on the inside, particularly on the sanctuary's ceiling (Figure 5.8), walls and pulpit, as well as on some doors and windows. The Ennis-Brown house is another structure that incorporates a mere smattering of Mesoamerican designs in its references to Maya and Mexica glyphs and motifs (Figures 6.9, 6.10 and 6.11).

A number of skyscrapers—most of them constructed in the 1920s—make use of pre-Columbian-style applied ornament, but most usually, in isolated areas. One example is Timothy Pflueger's 450 Sutter Street in San Francisco (Figures 2.11-2.14, 1928-30). Here, the architect adorned the surface of the building with abstractions based on a Mesoamerican-derived feathered serpent motif (its open mouth, as in some pre-Columbian structures, frames the building's entrance (Figure 6.12), and used overall ornament in the entrance foyer and in a single restricted area on one of the upper floors.

Most pre-Columbian-inflected skyscrapers of the 1920s and 30s, however, referenced ancient Mesoamerican architectural forms, such as a stepped or setback crown design echoing those of Maya and Mexica structures (e.g., Figures 1.5).⁶⁰¹ As previously mentioned, scholars such as Marjorie Ingle are quick to point out that such rooflines were a "natural" outgrowth of the 1916 New York City zoning law that required the tops of tall

⁶⁰¹While the sources dealing with early skyscrapers in the United States are too numerous to note here, those most relevant to this study in their mention of pre-Columbian elements include: Francisco Mújica, *History of the Skyscraper* (New York: Archaeology & Architecture Press, 1930); Alfred C. Bossom, *Building to the Skies: The Romance of the Skyscraper* (London/New York: Studio, 1934); Cervin Robinson and Rosemarie Haag Bletter, *Skyscraper Style: Art Deco New York*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975); Tunick, *Terra-Cotta Skyline*; and, Carla Breeze, *American Art Deco: Architecture and Regionalism* (New York/London: W. W. Norton, 2003).

buildings to be narrower than their bases,⁶⁰² and had little to do with the stepped profiles common to pre-Columbian architecture. Pre-Columbian inspiration for set-back buildings cannot be completely discounted, however, as Alfred C. Bossom's 1925 Liberty Bank Building in Buffalo, New York (Figure 5.12), demonstrates.⁶⁰³ The Liberty Bank skyscraper is comprised of two stepped towers, and—as noted in Chapter Five—Bossom himself drew attention to its similarities to the Castillo at Chichen Itza by illustrating the structures side by side in his book, *Building to the Skies* (1934).

The skyscraper was not the only building type, however, to show subtle influences of pre-Columbian architectural modes. Indeed, the majority of pre-Columbian appropriations consist of low-key references to ancient American forms, such influence manifest in massing or other general aspects. A tendency away from overt and extravagant replication of pre-Columbian motifs in applied ornament, and toward more discreet references to architectural forms, increased through the late 1920s and 1930s. Therefore, the decorative use of pre-Columbian motifs can be equated with Art Nouveau and Art Deco (both styles marked by a richness of applied ornament), and its wane related to the advent and vogue of Streamlined Moderne's sleeker, smoother surfaces.

Pre-Columbian Appropriations: Urban vs. Rural

More pre-Columbian appropriations occur in urban than rural settings, regardless of date or place. Obviously, cities see a great number of new constructions as they expand, and as buildings are torn down and replaced. Other reasons for pre-Columbian

⁶⁰²Ingle, 76.

⁶⁰³Bossom, *Building to the Skies*, 17.

appropriation's fluorescence in cities probably include greater access to pre-Columbian imagery through collections and exhibitions at libraries and museums. Additionally, urban settings are sites of greater competition among purveyors of goods and services—competition that prompts innovation aimed at attracting attention and business. The “exotic” forms of pre-Columbian cultures may have been deployed, then, as a form of self-promotion.

Architects, designers and building patrons in the United States chose pre-Columbian art forms for a variety of reasons and employed these forms in a multiplicity of ways. The appearance of the pre-Columbian in U.S. structures ranges from bold and outrageous quotation of exotic-looking motifs, to more subtle and even oblique references to pre-Columbian forms and aesthetics. The former tend to occur in “themed” theaters, hotels and department stores, whereas the latter mainly are discerned in residential architecture, and—to a lesser degree—in office buildings and in such governmental buildings as schools and libraries. Buildings that lie between these two extremes—such as Wright's Ennis-Brown house or Pugh's 450 Sutter—feature isolated references to pre-Columbian forms or motifs.

Pre-Columbian Appropriation: Geographic Distribution

Although the pre-Columbian-inflected architectural style had its beginnings (1910) in the eastern part of the United States, it truly flourished in Southern California in the 1920s, and subsequently spread to other regions of the continental United States (Appendix B). The twenties, in fact, represent the heyday of pre-Columbian appropriations, particularly in Los Angeles and its surrounding region. The style

subsidied there in the 1930s, even as it became increasingly popular elsewhere in the continental United States.⁶⁰⁴

Indeed, pre-Columbian-inflected buildings appear throughout the contiguous United States, with the exception of the northwest corner. The majority of these were constructed in and around the largest cities—Los Angeles, New York and Chicago—although a significant number also occur outside these urban areas. A comparison of the ways in which pre-Columbian appropriations occurred in various geographic regions of the United States highlights regional variations that loosely adhere to overall chronological trends.

Following geographic breakdowns established by architectural historian David Gebhard in his *National Trust Guide to Art Deco in America* (1996), and proceeding from those regions with the greatest to fewest number of known pre-Columbian-style buildings, pre-Columbian appropriations are examined here according to their locations in the West, Mid-Atlantic, Midwest, Southwest, South and New England.⁶⁰⁵ Such structures tend to be clustered in urban areas: in and around Los Angeles in the West, New York in the Mid-Atlantic, Chicago, Kansas City and St. Louis in the Midwest, Phoenix and Albuquerque in the Southwest, and Miami and New Orleans in the South.

⁶⁰⁴David Gebhard and Robert Winter call the whole of Southern California the “Southland.” See *A Guide to Architecture in Los Angeles and Southern California* (Santa Barbara, CA/Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, 1977), 17 and *passim*.

⁶⁰⁵David Gebhard, *The National Trust Guide to Art Deco in America* (Washington, DC: Preservation Press/New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1996). Each category includes the following states: West: California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington; Mid-Atlantic: Delaware, Washington DC, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania; Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin; Southwest: Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas; South: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia; New England: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island; No examples have yet been located in the Pacific Northwest.

There is only one known example of a pre-Columbian-style building in New England (the Grand Theater, which stands in the smalltown (near the resort town of Bar Harbor) of Ellsworth, Maine⁶⁰⁶), and not a single such structure has been located in the Northwest. Because the Southwest borders Mexico, it is perhaps unexpected that the Midwest has a greater number of pre-Columbian appropriations. This is due to the higher numbers of pre-Columbian appropriations in three urban areas of the Midwest (Chicago, Kansas City, St. Louis), as well as the comparatively larger number of states in this region—three times that of the Southwest.

The questions that this data pose and which will be examined in the remaining pages of this chapter include: Why did the pre-Columbian appropriation style flourish in Southern California after beginning in the East? Were there regional attitudes that called for varying uses of pre-Columbian art forms throughout the United States? Were specific regional “personalities” instrumental in the style’s development? Why did urban, as opposed to rural, areas see more pre-Columbian-style buildings?

The first significant example of pre-Columbian appropriation—the 1910 Pan-American Union complex in Washington, D.C.—was intended as a quite literal illustration of the Pan-American Union itself, which sought to promote inter-American trade and peaceful relations between member countries of Latin America and the United States.⁶⁰⁷ While only a handful of pre-Columbian appropriations were constructed

⁶⁰⁶The theater has a narrow vertical stepped design that resembles such Maya stepped structures as Temple I at Tikal.

⁶⁰⁷This organization began in 1889 as the International Bureau of American Republics but was called the Pan-American Union by 1910. See Organization of American States, Department of Information and Public Affairs, OAS General Secretariat, *Organization of American States: A Handbook* (Washington, DC: Dept. of Information & Public Affairs, 1972), 27.

through the remainder of the 1910s, as mentioned above, the style's momentum picked up by the 1920s, particularly in Southern California.

Braun attributes the vogues of both Spanish Colonial and pre-Columbian-appropriated styles in Southern California to the 1915 Panama-California International Exposition in San Diego.⁶⁰⁸ This fair certainly was one of the catalysts for the uses of these styles, but does not explain why pre-Columbian appropriations became so much more prevalent in Southern California than in other regions of the United States, since world's fairs and expositions that included pre-Columbian art and architectural exhibits took place in many locations throughout the United States (as discussed in Chapter Three).⁶⁰⁹ Surely, then, circumstances and attitudes unique to this region made pre-Columbian appropriations especially popular. Another possible reason for greater numbers of pre-Columbian-inflected buildings in Southern California is its proximity to Mexico. Yet Arizona and Texas, also bordering Mexico, have but a fraction of the number of pre-Columbian appropriations of California.

Scholars concerned with this issue often note Californians' competitive attitudes toward other regions of the United States, especially toward the East Coast.⁶¹⁰ In this competitive spirit, Southern Californian building owners, architects and designers sought to develop unique building styles that reflected the region's distinctive heritage,

⁶⁰⁸Braun, 301.

⁶⁰⁹The inclusion of pre-Columbian exhibits with objects and architectural models at world's fairs, especially in St. Louis and Chicago, may help explain the increase in examples of pre-Columbian-inflected architecture in and around these urban centers as well.

⁶¹⁰Barbara Braun describes the Spanish Colonial style in California, for example, as a "defensive reaction to East Coast traditions" (157). For further discussion of regional permutations of California and its architecture, see Kevin Starr, *Americans and the California Dream, 1850-1915* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

which—while quite different from that of the eastern seaboard—was quite venerable, San Diego having been founded before the American Revolution, in 1769. This heritage could, at various points and by different individuals, be portrayed as indigenous and/or Spanish, and was routinely tied to the most adventurous of spirits—those who traveled West in search of land and riches, and threw off the manners and presumptions of more conservative easterners. Frank Lloyd Wright noted this attitude when he wrote of Southern Californian’s “factual and mythical relation of the place to a primitive pre-European past.”⁶¹¹ His engagement with this aspect of the region resulted in many designs that evoke pre-Columbian and Native American art and architecture.⁶¹²

Others turned to the Spanish Colonial style in an attempt to evoke its heritage in the creation of a Southern California style. Gebhard and Winter describe the Spanish Colonial style as having a “storybook romance associated with Californians, one into which Americans, tired of the nastiness of war and modern life, could retreat.”⁶¹³ The pioneering spirit of Californians could be traced back to the California Gold Rush of 1848, which triggered a dramatic influx of new settlers. This Gold Rush also helped feed notions of exoticism and escapism surrounding California. The uniqueness of California—especially in comparison to the eastern and Midwestern portions of the United States—stems in part from its roots⁶¹⁴ and, in part, from a mild climate that has

⁶¹¹Gebhard, *Romanza*, 1.

⁶¹²See discussion below.

⁶¹³Gebhard and Winter, *Architecture in Los Angeles*, 20-21. See also, Braun, 157.

⁶¹⁴Florida in the South and parts of the Midwest are also able to claim Spanish heritage as well, yet neither of these regions contain anywhere near the number of pre-Columbian-appropriated architectural examples as Southern California, making the argument that the Spanish heritage can

long marked it as a place of ease and respite. The Spanish Colonial style—with its emphasis upon patios and balconies—was deemed especially appropriate to weather conditions that set Southern California apart.

Perhaps California’s most distinctive twentieth-century aspect was its identification with the motion picture industry that took off there in the 1920s. The burgeoning entertainment industry of the early twentieth century brought a spirit of extravagance and flamboyance to the region. The movie business not only nurtured, but fed off, a sense of fantasy and exoticism; at the same time, it was grounded in new technologies that made it vibrantly modern.

A flamboyantly escapist spirit—similar to that which prevailed in the motion picture industry—may be seen in much of the architecture in this region (particularly during the Art Deco period of the 1920s) but is perhaps most obvious in residential architecture, which was in some ways more innovative than that seen in other U.S. regions at the time. Architectural historians routinely connect the Southern California vogue of nontraditional residences to the prevalence of the movie industry and its mindset in and around Los Angeles (where several pre-Columbian-style residences were built).⁶¹⁵ Gebhard, for example, compares Wright’s Ennis-Brown house to the “romantic mystery of a Hollywood film set.”⁶¹⁶

only partially be pointed to as the reason that California hosts the largest number of pre-Columbian appropriations during the 1920s.

⁶¹⁵Pre-Columbian-style residences are much more numerous in Southern California than in other regions of the United States, which have few to none.

⁶¹⁶Gebhard, *Romanza: The California Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1988), 26.

Wright was, along with Robert B. Stacy-Judd, one of Southern California's dominant practitioners of pre-Columbian appropriation. As noted in Chapter Five, Wright's textile-block houses in Los Angeles and its environs, along with his commitment to relating building to landscape, are likely connected to pre-Columbian forms and concepts. While his modes of assimilating pre-Columbian aesthetics were quite particular to him, Wright's general intent was similar to those of other architects who sought to put ideas gleaned from architecture of the past into the service of a new American style. Although Gebhard connects Wright's pre-Columbian-appropriated Hollyhock and textile-block houses (which he sees as results of Wright's historicism) to California regionalism,⁶¹⁷ to tie Wright's use of pre-Columbian sources primarily to the style's florescence in this specific geographic area is to ignore his numerous pre-Columbian appropriations outside this region.

While few followed in Wright's architectural footsteps, his son, Lloyd Wright (1890-1978), also produced buildings inspired by pre-Columbian aesthetics⁶¹⁸; art historian Patricia Bayer describes Lloyd Wright's 1926 Sowden House (Figure 6.13), for example, as a "brazen, neo-Mayan concrete-block and stucco structure."⁶¹⁹ Despite their limited legacy, Frank Lloyd Wright's innovative residential designs helped establish Southern California as the heartland of pre-Columbian appropriations.

⁶¹⁷Ibid., 13. Gebhard writes, "In many ways the Hollyhock House, and the Los Angeles group of pre-cast concrete block houses of the twenties, were Wright's personal response, his answer to ideas of historicism and regionalism in California."

⁶¹⁸Anthony Alofsin, *Frank Lloyd Wright, The Lost Years, 1910-1922: A Study of Influence* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 302.

⁶¹⁹Bayer, 76.

Architect Robert B. Stacy-Judd also played a role in making Los Angeles the epicenter of pre-Columbian-style architecture. In a biography of Robert Stacy-Judd, Gebhard writes that the architect's "fascination with the exotic in architecture found a warm and appreciative audience in Los Angeles during the 1920s."⁶²⁰ As discussed in Chapter Five, Stacy-Judd experimented with a variety of non-Western forms both in England and the United States before singling out pre-Columbian art and architecture as his preferred source material for a new American architectural aesthetic. If one were to count his unrealized designs, Stacy-Judd was the most prolific producer of pre-Columbian-appropriated structures in Southern California, as well as in the United States as a whole.⁶²¹ His first pre-Columbian-inspired design was the 1925 Aztec Hotel in Monrovia, California (Figure 5.1) and, unlike nearly all other architects, Stacy-Judd continued to build pre-Hispanic-inspired buildings in Southern California through the 1930s.

Braun believes the Great Depression was the determining factor in pre-Columbian appropriation's demise in Southern California.⁶²² This assertion is undermined to some extent by the fact that, elsewhere in the country, the opposite occurred, as pre-Columbian appropriation burgeoned in the 1930s—perhaps because its exoticism seemed to offer escape from the very circumstances created by the Depression. Indeed, about one-third of the total pre-Columbian appropriations constructed throughout the United States went

⁶²⁰Gebhard, *Robert Stacy-Judd: Maya Architecture and the Creation of a New Style* (Santa Barbara, CA: Capra Press, 1993), 33.

⁶²¹Many of Stacy-Judd's renderings that reflect pre-Columbian influence are held in the Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara.

⁶²²Braun, 175.

up from 1929-1933 (i.e., during the Depression). Gebhard and Winter note, moreover, that the Depression did not curtail the construction of “moving-picture palaces,”⁶²³ and in fact, several pre-Columbian-themed theaters were built in the early 1930s. One of these was the Mayan Theater in Denver, which—while in some ways resembles its namesake in Los Angeles—deploys pre-Columbian-inspired ornament in a more restrained manner (Figure 6.14). While pre-Columbian forms and motifs (more stylized than those at the Mayan Theatre in Los Angeles) appear throughout the Denver theater’s interior, the degree of the overallness of the Los Angeles theater’s ornament is not replicated. While both theaters’ decors derive forms and motifs from a variety of cultures (the Denver theater also includes Native American elements), both incorporate the very same “Mayan warrior” (as discussed in Chapter Three).

Outside the West, the Mid-Atlantic region holds the greatest concentration of pre-Columbian appropriations in the United States. The vast majority of these were built in New York, almost all of them in the New York City metropolitan area. Of the remaining examples in this region, the majority of pre-Columbian-style buildings occur in or near the metropolitan areas of Washington, D.C., Baltimore, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, although Frank Lloyd Wright’s Fallingwater in Mill Run, Pennsylvania—located a fair distance from Pittsburgh—is a notable exception. Apart from Frank Lloyd Wright and Alfred C. Bossom (1881-1965), who contributed just one pre-Columbian appropriation each to this region, no other designers of pre-Columbian appropriations stand out here.⁶²⁴

⁶²³Gebhard and Winter, *Architecture in Los Angeles*, 26.

⁶²⁴Bossom’s Liberty Bank Building is in Buffalo. For further discussion of this building, see Chapter Five.

Pre-Columbian appropriations in the Midwest are fairly evenly distributed throughout eight of the twelve states (Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri and Wisconsin). As in the Mid-Atlantic region, roughly half of the total pre-Columbian appropriations in the Midwest were built during the 1930s, although very early examples exist by Frank Lloyd Wright and fellow Prairie School architect, Walter Burley Griffin (1876-1937). These include: Solid Rock (Griffin, Kenilworth, IL, 1910-11), the J. G. Melson house (Mason City, 1912-14), Midway Gardens (Wright, Chicago, 1914) and the Frederick C. Bogk house (Wright, Milwaukee, 1916). Wright was born in the Midwest (in Richland Center, Wisconsin) and lived and worked in the region's hub, Chicago, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as his architectural career burgeoned. Griffin, who worked in Wright's Oak Park studio beginning in 1901, later contributed (throughout his lifetime) a number of pre-Columbian appropriations in the United States.⁶²⁵

While the Southwest has fewer pre-Columbian appropriations than either the Mid-Atlantic or Midwest, its contributions are chronologically aligned to those in Southern California, since most of its pre-Columbian appropriations were constructed during the 1920s. One notable example is the Petroleum Building of 1926, a stepped skyscraper in Houston that was designed by Alfred C. Bossom, the architect of the Liberty Bank Building in Buffalo. For the Houston high-rise, Bossom added stylized Maya glyphs that were etched into the building's surface.⁶²⁶ The remarkable exception in this region to the

⁶²⁵Other pre-Columbian appropriations by Griffin in this region are the James E. Blythe house (Griffin, Mason City, IA, 1913-14) and Russell L. Blount house (Chicago, 1914). Griffin also designed several pre-Columbian appropriations in Australia, an area outside the purview of this dissertation.

⁶²⁶Gebhard, *National Trust Guide*, 188.

1920s majority, of course, is the 1915 Aztec Theater in Eagle Pass, Texas, which as mentioned above, was the first pre-Columbian-appropriated theater built in the United States. The southwest region also is home to Frank Lloyd Wright's pre-Columbian-inflected home and studio, Taliesin West (Scottsdale, Arizona, 1937-59).⁶²⁷

There are only a few pre-Columbian appropriations in the South, most in Florida, a popular vacation spot and, like California, an escapist destination. Other states with pre-Columbian appropriations in this region include Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina. All examples date to the 1930s, with the exception of the well-known Mar-a-Lago [Marjorie Merriwether Hutton (Post) and Edward F. Hutton House, Joseph Urban; Wyth, King & Johnson, 1927-28)], a luxurious private residence in Palm Beach, Florida,⁶²⁸ which features a tower that appears to owe some debt to the one at Palenque's palace complex—their hip roofs, flaring overhangs and asymmetrical positioning being strikingly resemblant. No other feature of the Mar-a-Lago estate, however, manifests the influence of pre-Hispanic forms or motifs. Mar-a-Lago's tower is typical of pre-Columbian appropriations in the South, which are consistently vague and loose, rather than reiterative of specific motifs.⁶²⁹

⁶²⁷Taliesin West's pre-Columbian aspects are discussed in Chapter Five.

⁶²⁸Donald Trump owns the estate today.

⁶²⁹Gebhard has noted similarities to pre-Columbian aesthetics in the Miami Beach Public Library (now the Bass Museum of Art) built by Russell T. Pancoast in 1930 and in a house built by Robert Law Weed in Miami Beach in 1935, *National Trust Guide*, 80-81.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

This dissertation has examined the U.S. architectural style that, in the early decades of the twentieth century, relied upon appropriation of pre-Columbian forms and motifs.

Relating the impetus for this style to the serendipitous emergence of a set of social and political constructs based in notions of nationalism, pan-Americanism and primitivism, I connect it to the broader Euro-American tendency to appropriate non-European forms.

This practice is guided by notions of the Other and “ours”—distinctions somewhat muddled in the case of pre-Columbian appropriation, wherein a burgeoning and expansive American nationalism laid claim to the Americas’ ancient past. In an increasingly urban and industrialized nation—the United States of the early twentieth century—pre-Columbian-style buildings evoked an idealized, pre-Industrial past by referencing indigenous art and architectural forms—the novelty of which excited and amused U.S. audiences, even as its co-option challenged European supremacy in the arts.

A number of architects working in the Americas in the early twentieth century were intent on developing a uniquely American architectural aesthetic. Their openness, even preference for, non-European inspirations may be linked to trends instigated in the nineteenth century by theorists, including John Ruskin and Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, who promoted a more expansive and inclusive notion of that which constituted “art,” by placing enhanced value upon both the decorative arts and on non-Western

material culture. As nature and the beauty of the everyday were vaunted by scholars and popular publications, the art and architecture of pre-Industrial cultures—including those of the pre-Columbian Americans—provoked interest and praise. Pre-Columbian forms and motifs—especially the complex geometric ornament applied as stone relief to Maya buildings on the Yucatan Peninsula and Zapotec “palaces” at Mitla—were increasingly admired and emulated, and—in the Americas—considered especially apt as inspiration for a new aesthetic.

Source material dealing with pre-Columbian art and architecture increased over the course of the nineteenth century, beginning with the publications of Alexander von Humboldt, but really gathering steam after Spain’s opening of previously closed borders throughout the New World. Explorers and then archaeologists descended on pre-Columbian sites in increasing numbers, and their accounts fueled public interest in pre-Hispanic cultures. The sites that emerged as Mesoamerica’s “greatest hits” (Appendix C) in the United States were Tikal, Quirigua, Copan, Palenque, Yaxchilan, Chichen Itza, Uxmal, Labna, Mitla, Teotihuacan, and Tula, as well as the Mexica capital of Tenochtitlan—which existed in remnants in and around Mexico City as well as in popular imagination (where it was stoked by both historical accounts and imaginative reconstructions). In the Andes, Tiwanaku, Chan Chan and (after its “discovery” in 1911) Machu Picchu, were the featured favorites. Casts and architectural models of pre-Columbian buildings and other monuments were displayed again and again at world’s fairs and museum exhibits, and, by the early twentieth century, a canon of Pre-Columbian buildings and sculptures had been firmly established in the United States. Moreover, pre-

Columbian subjects figured in novels, plays, operas, radio broadcasts and turned up various traveling and sideshow spectacles that tapped tropes of the exotic.

With the presentation and increasing availability of pre-Columbian forms and images in many facets of U.S. culture—visual and otherwise—architects and designers appropriated them apace. Ultimately, the decision to take off on pre-Columbian art and architecture was bound to both individual convictions and tastes, as well as the broader sociopolitical and aesthetic contexts in which such appropriations occurred. Close examination of the ideas and production of four architects—Robert B. Stacy-Judd, Francisco Mújica, Alfred C. Bossom and Frank Lloyd Wright—sheds light on the social, nationalistic and stylistic concerns that guided their pre-Columbian appropriations, and—by extension—on this trend more generally. Stacy-Judd, Wright and (to a lesser degree) Mújica plumbed the esoteric symbolism they perceived in their non-Western sources, and sought to reinvigorate such symbolism in modern applications. Stacy-Judd, Mújica and Bossom celebrated their sources’ “Americanness,” and Mújica, Bossom and (to some extent) Stacy-Judd cited particular physical characteristics of the Americas as an incentive to emulate the ancient forms these physical conditions ostensibly shaped. Wright’s work not only shows the influence of pre-Columbian motifs and Mesoamerican massing, but also that of the Andean practice of playing upon extant landscape elements to create buildings that are irrevocably tied to their natural surroundings. Ultimately, such “high brow” attitudes toward and uses of indigenous American imagery in U.S. architecture contrast greatly with those pre-Columbian appropriations that sought to exploit the exotic in bold and more direct replications of motifs as applied ornament confections, representing opposite ends of a sliding scale. Such a trajectory of pre-

Columbian-inflected architecture ultimately reflects multifarious approaches both within the United States and that inevitably accompany such loaded subject material.

The ways that pre-Columbian appropriation manifested itself in U.S. architecture, in fact, varied from region to region and from building type to building type. The trend also evolved and changed over the course of time. Clustered mainly around urban areas—suggesting that city settings were more conducive and amenable to innovative design—the style inspired by pre-Columbian art and architecture had its beginnings in the East in 1910, but reached its height in Southern California in the 1920s. While the style declined in Southern California in the 1930s, its popularity increased throughout the remaining portions of the United States (with the exception of the northwest). The appearance of pre-Columbian forms and motifs in U.S. structures ranges from bold proliferation to subtle allusion. The most exuberant instances tend to occur in escapist and commercial venues—“themed” theaters, hotels, restaurants and department stores—whereas the pre-Columbian aspects of residential and governmental structures often are restrained, and sometimes vague. Buildings that have isolated, yet direct, references to pre-Columbian forms or motifs may be seen to occupy a middle ground between these two extremes. Whether their allusions to ancient American architectural forms and ornament are direct or discreet, buildings that take inspiration from pre-Columbian forms are comparable to other, contemporaneous manifestations of “exoticism” in U.S. architecture—most notably, Egyptian Revival or Pueblo Deco buildings—since all may be seen to reflect a particular strain of innovation that challenged traditionalism by embracing and promoting non-European alterity.

Appendix A: Working List of Pre-Columbian Appropriations

Building Title	Architect(s)	Type	Date	City	State	Region	P-C Forms
Studio and Home	Wright, Frank Lloyd	residence and studio	1898	Oak Park	IL	Midwest	resembles (Maya) structures, particularly at Palenque
Alexander Hamilton U.S. Custom House	Gilbert, Cass	government	1902-07	New York	NY	Mid-Atlantic	sculpture group with variety of Pre-Columbian forms, motifs and glyphs
Solid Rock	Griffin, Walter Burley	residence	1910-11	Kenilworth	IL	Midwest	large mansard roof, small vertical openings (Palenque-like, Maya)
Pan-American Union Building	Kelsey, Albert & Paul P. Crét	government	1910	Washington	DC	Mid-Atlantic	Zapotec, Maya, Mexica, Tiwanaku, Chancay, Chimú, possible Teotihuacan replications
American Museum of Natural History - Mexican restaurant	unknown	restaurant (museum)	1911	New York	NY	Mid-Atlantic	replica of Mitla "palace"
Lee House	Gill, Irving	residence	1911	San Diego	CA	West	flat roof and tower somewhat reminiscent of Palenque
Cliff Dweller's Apartments	Meader, Herman Lee	apartment / skyscraper	1911	New York	NY	Mid-Atlantic	mixture of Native Am. (esp. bovine skulls) & Maya (glyphs)
Southwest Museum (Tunnel Entrance)	Allison & Allison; Sumner Hunt & Silas R. Burns	museum	1912; 1919-20	Los Angeles	CA	West	re-creation of Puuc-style (Maya) building
J. G. Melson House	Griffin, Walter Burley	residence	1912	Mason City	IA	Midwest	has textured and relief designs that resemble House of the Doves (Chichen Itza) and other Puuc Maya structures
Abbey Hotel	Hener & Skilling	hotel	1912	Los Angeles	CA	West	see Gebhard & Winter, 1977, p. 54
Cordova Hotel	Neher, Otto and Chauncey Skillings	hotel	1912	Los Angeles	CA	West	see Ingle, p. 8
James E. Blythe House	Griffin, Walter Burley	residence	1913	Mason City	IA	Midwest	flat roof appearance, small vertical openings (Tulum-like, Maya)
Russell L. Blount House	Griffin, Walter Burley	residence	1914	Chicago	IL	Midwest	talud-tablero massing similar to Meso structures (Teotihuacan & Maya)
Midway Gardens (beer garden)	Wright, Frank Lloyd	public	1914	Chicago	IL	Midwest	ornamental band placed above plain masonry surface - Maya or Zapotec
Aztec Theater	Seed, Leonard F.	theater	1915	Eagle Pass	TX	Southwest	simplified Sun Stone (Mexico) on side, Mexica calendar sign on front façade ("6 Water") and geometric relief patterns vaguely Zapotec

Building Title	Architect(s)	Type	Date	City	State	Region	P-C Forms
Albert Dell German Warehouse	Wright, Frank Lloyd	warehouse	1915	Richland Center	WI	Midwest	Zapotec (Mitla) in applied geometric designs, overall shape Maya-like (Palenque)
Frederick C. Bogk House	Wright, Frank Lloyd	residence	1916	Milwaukee	WI	Midwest	frieze on ledge derived from Puuc and Peten reliefs
Hollyhock / Aline Barnsdall House	Wright, Frank Lloyd	residence	1921	Hollywood	CA	West	flat mansard roofs, small vertical openings, canted walls (like some Yucatec and Inka buildings), use of concrete mimicks stone of much pre-Columbian architecture
Ben Hanson House	Stacy-Judd, Robert B.	residence	1923?	Brentwood Hts.	CA	West	see see Ingle, 27, 28
Cameo Theater	Wiseman, Harrison G. [and Hugo Taussig - Comb]	theater	1923	Brooklyn	NY	Mid-Atlantic	Mexica terra-cotta motifs
John Storer House	Wright, Frank Lloyd	residence	1923	Los Angeles	CA	West	textured relief surface (Puuc-like Maya or Zapotec)
Alice Millard House / La Miniatura	Wright, Frank Lloyd	residence	1923	Pasadena	CA	West	vertical format, surface light & shadow like Peten Maya ruins; textured façade & use of concrete mimicks stone of much pre-Columbian architecture
Outdoor Public Storage	unknown	office	1924 (c.)	Colton	CA	West	talud-tablero similar to Teotihuacan, also stepped structure (Maya-like)
Ennis-Brown, Charles House	Wright, Frank Lloyd	residence	1924	Los Angeles	CA	West	stepped pyramidal form; flat roofs; more Maya and Mexica motifs in metalwork by Dietzmann and one prominent fireplace panel that combines Maya and Mexica elements
Samuel and Harriet Freeman House	Wright, Frank Lloyd	residence	1924	Hollywood	CA	West	small vertical openings, flat roofs, use of concrete mimicks stone of much pre-Columbian architecture
Maya Café	unknown	restaurant	1925	New York	NY	Mid-Atlantic	found no images, but name alone suggests pre-Columbian
Madrillon (Restaurant)	Barrington, E. St. Cyr	restaurant	1925	Washington, DC (?)	DC	Mid-Atlantic	has Maya Room covered from head to toe in motifs
Liberty Bank Building	Bossom, Alfred C.	skyscraper	1925	Buffalo	NY	Mid-Atlantic	stepped tower
Aztec Hotel	Stacy-Judd, Robert B.	hotel	1925	Monrovia	CA	West	covered in mostly Maya-like forms and motifs (feathered serpents, "Maya" head, scrollwork patterns, corbeled forms on both exterior and interior)

Building Title	Architect(s)	Type	Date	City	State	Region	P-C Forms
Los Angeles City Hall	Austin, John C., John Parkinson, Donald Parkinson, Albert C. Martin and Austin Whittlesey	government	1926-28	Los Angeles	CA	West	possibly Maya in its stepped pyramidal form
Petroleum Building	Bosson, Alfred C.; Maurice J. Sullivan, and Briscoe & Dixon	skyscraper	1926-27	Houston	TX	Southwest	terraced setbacks, Maya glyphs
Sears, Roebuck & Co.	George C. Nimmons & Co.	department store	1926 (c.)	Los Angeles	CA	West	see Gebhard, "Spanish Colonial Revival," p. 146
Two Park Avenue Building	Kahn, Ely Jacques	skyscraper	1926-28	New York	NY	Mid-Atlantic	applied polychrome ornament reminiscent of Maya (Yucatan) or Mexica buildings
Aztec Theatre	Kelley, Robert; R.O. Koenig	theater	1926	San Antonio	TX	Southwest	interior covered in mostly Maya but also Central Mexican, Mexica and Inka forms and motifs
President Hotel	Shepherd and Wisner	hotel	1926	Kansas City	MO	Midwest	Coatlucue figure and other Mexica; Aztec Ballroom
La Jolla Beach and Yacht Club?	Stacy-Judd?	club	1926	La Jolla	CA	West	corbel vaults (Maya-like)
Derby House	Wright, Lloyd	residence	1926	Glendale	CA	West	see Gebhard, "Spanish Colonial Revival," p. 146
Sowden House	Wright, Lloyd	residence	1926	Los Angeles	CA	West	Yucatan Maya portals, Puuc-like designs, like House of Doves, Chichen Itza (Maya)
Samuels-Navarro House	Wright, Lloyd	residence	1926-28	Los Angeles	CA	West	flat roof line, geometric low-relief patterning (perhaps Zapotec or Maya)
KiMo Theater	Boller, Carl; Boller Brothers	theater	1927	Albuquerque	NM	Southwest	Maya glyph-like forms at entrance foyer in combination with proliferate Native American motifs
Koppers Building	Graham, Anderson, Probst & White; E.P. Mellon	skyscraper	1927-29	Pittsburgh	PA	Mid-Atlantic	abstracted Mexica-like/geometricized forms and motifs
Biltmore Hotel	McArthur, Albert Chase (FLW consultant)	hotel	1927-29	Phoenix	AZ	Southwest	relief ornament adorning interior and exterior surfaces, "heavy" massing and geometric designs allude to Zapotec and Maya buildings
Mayan Theatre	Morgan, Walls & Clements	theater	1927	Los Angeles	CA	West	interior full of Maya, Teotihuacan, Toltec, Mexica and Tiwanaku motifs and forms

Building Title	Architect(s)	Type	Date	City	State	Region	P-C Forms
Union Trust Company Building(Bayer); Union Trust Building	Rowland, Wirt C.(Gebhard, 1996)/Wirt Rowland with Smith, Hinchman & Grylls	skyscraper	1927	Detroit	MI	Midwest	stepped corbeled arches (Maya) both exterior and interior - possible Mexica reference in winged-mask form
Bell Telephone Building	unknown	office	1927	St. Louis	MO	Midwest	stepped, like Tikal (Maya) temple
Mar-a-Lago (Marjorie Merriwether and Edward F. Hutton House)	Urban, Joseph; Wyth, King & Johnson	residence	1927-28	Palm Beach	FL	South	Palenque-like tower
Rye Playland County Recreation Park	Walker & Gillette?	amusement park	1927	Rye	NY	Mid-Atlantic	“stepped” designs reminiscent of Zapotec
Delmar and DeBaliviere Building (the Shank Building)	Bowling and Shank	office	1928	St. Louis	MO	Midwest	Maya-like stepped corbeled arch design scrollwork patterns, high relief geometric stepped designs look Zapotec
Union Carbide and Carbon Building	Burnham Brothers	office / factory?	1928	Chicago	IL	Midwest	Blocklike ornament reminiscent of pre-Columbian Maya or Mexica art
Fisher Building and Theatre	Graven & Mayger (Albert Kahn designed building)	theater	1928	Detroit	MI	Midwest	interior covered in variety of Mesoamerican forms and motifs
Paramount Theatre	Lamb, Thomas W.	theater	1928	Plainfield	NJ	Mid-Atlantic	stepped fret with possible double-headed serpent, cross-legged figure might be Mexica
450 Sutter	Pflueger, Timothy (Miller and Pflueger)	skyscraper	1928-30	San Francisco	CA	West	building itself represents feathered serpent (Maya) with entrance as open mouth and high-rise as body. The lobby and, originally one room on one of the superior floors, was adorned with profuse coverage of feathered serpents and various abstracted Maya, Mexica and Xochicalco designs.
Val D'Armour Apartments	Powers, G. W.	apartment	1928	Los Angeles	CA	West	projecting lintel, V-shaped opening, keystone of opening (Maya-like)
Title Insurance Building	unknown	office	1920s (?)	Los Angeles	CA	West	stepped ceiling (feels Maya-like); generic P-C ornament
Fuller Building	Walker, A. Stewart & Leone Gillette	skyscraper	1928	New York	NY	Mid-Atlantic	setback tower, top zigzag and sun-like Mexica pattern
Pickwick Theater	Zook, Harold and William F. McCaughey (Zook and McCaughey)	theater	1928-29	Park Ridge	IL	Midwest	masonry-clad, stepped tower (like Maya buildings at Tikal or Chichen Itza)

Building Title	Architect(s)	Type	Date	City	State	Region	P-C Forms
The Los Feliz Manor	Grundfor, Jack	apartment / skyscraper	1929	Los Angeles	CA	West	applied stepped shapes, geometric forms similar to Zapotec (Mitla)
Packard Motor Car Company Service Building	Kahn, Albert and Frank S. Parker	warehouse	1929 (c.)	New York?	NY	Mid-Atlantic	terra-cotta masks, Maya-like
Shrine of the Little Flower	McGill, Henry J. and Talbot F. Hamlin; René Paul Chambellan, sculptor	church	1929	Detroit / Royal Oak (Bayer)	MI	Midwest	Exhibits pre-Columbian feeling in applied ornament, corbeled vaults, abstracted and blocky motifs. The tower is reminiscent of Temple I or II at Tikal
Market Street National Bank	Ritter & Shay	bank / skyscraper	1929	Philadelphia	PA	Mid-Atlantic	feathered serpent and more abstract P-C motifs on façade
The Baltimore Trust Building	Taylor & Fisher; Smith & May	bank / skyscraper	1929	Baltimore City	MD	Mid-Atlantic	high-pitched hipped roof reminiscent of Maya or Mexica temple platform
Springer Building	Williamson, George	office	1929	Albuquerque	NM	Southwest	stepped corbel (Maya) around doors, battered profile, key pattern on cast stone frieze (Maya, Mexica or Zapotec)
RCA Victor Building	Cross & Cross	skyscraper	1930-31	New York?	NY?	Mid-Atlantic	zigzag, Mexica-like faces and motifs on façade
Mayan Theater	Fallis, Montana	theater	1930	Denver	CO	West	covered in Maya glyphs and other Puuc-style motifs, Zapotec urn figures - also has some Native American
Tulsa Fire Alarm Building	Kershner, Frederick V. (Smith & Senter)	fire station	1930-31	Tulsa	OK	Southwest	horizontal bands above windows draw inspiration from P-C
Loew's Theater	Lamb, Thomas W.	theater	1930	New York	NY	Mid-Atlantic	corbel vault forms, possibly Mexica motifs (interior)
Triboro Theater (Loew's)	Lamb, Thomas W.	theater	1930	Astoria	NY	Mid-Atlantic	Puuc-style; chac (hook nose) masks at corners, corbeled vaults, geometric reliefs, repetitive truncated "columns"
Blessed Sacrament Church	McGill, Henry J. (McGill and Hamlin); McGill, Henry J. (McGill and Hamlin)	church	1930	Queens	NY	Mid-Atlantic	corbel vault forms and vague applied geometricizing (Mitla-like)
Western Theater (Pellissier Bldg.)	Morgan, Walls & Clements	theater	1930-31	Los Angeles	CA	West	abstracted Sun Stone-like form under awning; relief - geometricized motifs (including chevron)
Miami Beach Public Library	Pancoast, Russell T.	library	1930	Miami	FL	South	Tulum-like (Maya) building. Ornament references pre-Columbian (see Gebhard, <i>National Trust</i> , p. 81)

Building Title	Architect(s)	Type	Date	City	State	Region	P-C Forms
Bloomingdale's	Starrett & Van Vleck	department store	1930	New York?	NY?	Mid-Atlantic	"quasi-Mayan Revival extension"
Denver National Bank	unknown	bank	1930 (?)	Denver	CO	West	Mexica motifs on doors
Kansas City Power and Light Co. Bldg.	Hoit, Price & Barnes	utility	1931	Kansas City	MO	Midwest	sunburst (Sun Stone-like relief) and topped with pyramid
Women's Club Building	Jamne, Magnus	club	1931	St. Paul	MN	Midwest	has corbeled (Maya-like) steplike lintel over entrance
U.S. Post Office Building	Magney & Tusler	government	1931	Minneapolis	MN	Midwest	thick-walled, "heaviness" of many Maya or Mexica buildings
Ardley	Roth, Emery	apartment	1931	New York	NY	Mid-Atlantic	See Bayer, <i>Art Deco Architecture</i> , p. 90.
Allegheny County Airport	Roush, Stanley L. (1936 addition - Henry Hornbostel)	airport	1931	West Mifflin	PA	Mid-Atlantic	Mexica or Zapotec forms (zigzag, calendar stone-like motif)
Atwater Bungalows	Stacy-Judd, Robert B.	residence	1931	Los Angeles	CA	West	strong Pueblo influence with hint of Maya in stepped design on top and slightly corbeled window openings
First Baptist Church	Stacy-Judd, Robert B.	church	1931	Ventura	CA	West	corbel vaults, Palenque-like scrollwork and quetzal headdress motifs as well as Maya-like "glyphs"
Thomas Jefferson High School	Adams & Adams	school	1932	Waco	TX	Southwest	some ornament (such as band around parapet) conveys Pre-Columbian feeling (see Gebhard, Trust Guide, 1996, p. 190)
Church of the Most Precious Blood	McGill, Henry J. (McGill and Hamlin)	church	1932	Astoria	NY	Mid-Atlantic	heaviness to façade reminiscent of pre-Columbian (especially Maya or Mexica) buildings
Kennedy-Warren Apartment Hotel	Younger, Joseph	apartment / high-rise	1932	Washington	DC	Mid-Atlantic	applied ornament (abstracted faces and geometric ornament) vaguely Zapotec or Mexica
Neil E. Monroe House	Stacy-Judd, Robert B.	residence	1933	Lake Sherwood	CA	West	corbel vault forms, mansard roof (Maya)
Southwest Topics Wave (newspaper)	Stacy-Judd, Robert B.	office	1933	Monrovia / Los Angeles	CA	West	See <i>L. A. Times</i> , August 20, 1933, p. 23
Neighborhood Gardens Apartments	Hoener, Baum and Froese	apartment	1935	St. Louis	MO	Midwest	bands of decorated low-relief terra-cotta similar to FLW houses b/w 1920-25 (Yucatec Maya or Zapotec)
Federal Building	Requa, Richard	world's fair	1935	San Diego	CA	West	replication of section of Governor's Palace at Uxmal (Maya)
S. H. Kress Building	Sibbert, Edward / René Paul Chambellan, sculptor	department store	1935	New York	NY	Mid-Atlantic	stylized Maya glyphs

Building Title	Architect(s)	Type	Date	City	State	Region	P-C Forms
Philosophical Research Center	Stacy-Judd, Robert B.	office	1935	Los Angeles	CA	West	corbeled vaults, feathered serpent columns, mansard roof (Maya)
House	Weed, Robert Law	residence	1935	Miami	FL	South	(see Gebhard, Trust Guide, 1996, p. 80)
Fallingwater / Edgar J. Kaufmann House	Wright, Frank Lloyd	residence	1935	Mill Run	PA	Mid-Atlantic	living rock and man-made, stepped ceiling, incorporation of water in building
Oliver P. Morton High School	Elmslie, George Grant and William S. Hutton	school	1936	Hammond	IN	Midwest	U-shaped structure (possible ref. to early Andes)
Church Street Elementary School	Overstreet, N.W. and A.H. Town	school	1936-37	Tupelo	MS	South	Puuc-like (Maya) (see Gebhard, Trust Guide, 1996, p. 94)
Person House	William P.M. McMahon & Sons	residence	1936	St. Louis	MO	Midwest	curved wall similar to Qorikancha nad other Inka buildings
Port Allen High School	Bodman & Murrell	school	1937	W. Baton Rouge	LA	South	high stepped tower resembles Tikal Temple I
Edward L. Bailey School	Overstreet, N.W. and A.H. Town	school	1937	Jackson	MS	South	Maya-like feeling (especially from Palenque)
Taliesin West	Wright, Frank Lloyd	residence / studio	1937-59	Scottsdale	AZ	Southwest	talud-tablero (Teotihuacan); key motif (Maya, Mexica or Zapotec)
Grand Theatre	Krokyn and Browne	theater	1938	Ellsworth	ME	New England	stepped gable that suggests Maya corbel vault
May Company Department Store	Martin, Albert C. & Samuel A. Marx	department store	1938-40	Los Angeles	CA	West	one corner completely rounded like Qoricanha (Inka) and even has reflective gold mosaic tiles covering it
Feibleman House	Weiss, Dreyfous & Seiferth	residence	1938	New Orleans	LA	South	looks streamlined moderne but also has a hint of P-C (see Gebhard, Trust Guide, 1996, p. 89)
Riviera Theatre	Benton, Charles	theater	1939	Charleston	SC	South	Mexica (Sun Stone abstract) & others
Southern Pacific Railroad Passenger Station	Christie, J. H. and William F. Meaney	rail station	1939-40	Casa Grande	AZ	Southwest	principal entrance suggests Maya temple (Palenque or Chichen Itza), columns similar to Mitla
"Streets of All Nations"	Stacy-Judd, Robert B.	?	1939	Los Angeles	CA	West	loosely Maya (see Gebhard, <i>Robert Stacy-Judd</i> , pp. 103,108)
Bankers Life Building	Tinsley, McBroom, Higgins, Lighter & Lyons	bank / skyscraper	1939	Des Moines	IA	Midwest	Combination of references to Native American and Mesoamerican (see Gebhard, <i>Trust Guide</i> , 1996, p. 118)

Appendix C: Most Popular Pre-Columbian Sites in Text and Their Characteristics*

Site	Culture	Description	Main Monument List
Copan	Maya	Located in southwestern Honduras near the Guatemala border (near Quirigua). Flourished c. 420 AD – 820 AD. Stephens and Catherwood made this site famous in the United States (1841).	--number of high-relief stelae, --Altar Q
Chichen Itza	Maya	Located on the Yucatan Peninsula. Flourished c. 900 AD – 1200 AD. A combination of architectural styles including Puuc (a lot of applied geometric ornament) and Toltec (blocky, stiff figures and shapes).	-- Castillo -- Temple of the Warriors -- Temple of the Jaguars
Labna	Maya	Located on the Yucatan Peninsula (near Uxmal). Flourished c. 850 AD – 1000 AD. This is a small site but is famous because a section of one of its buildings was displayed as a cast in the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition. This is a Puuc-style site.	-- "Arch"
Mitla	Zapotec	Located in current-day Oaxaca, Mexico. Flourished c. 1000 AD – 1300 AD.	-- Various temples with long sleek lines and applied low-to-medium relief geometric designs
Monte Alban (I & II)	Zapotec	Located in current-day Oaxaca, Mexico (near Mitla). Flourished c. 6000 BC – 250 AD.	-- funerary (ceramic) urn figures -- stelae with glyphs (still largely undeciphered)

*Bold designates those sites most commonly referenced in U.S. architecture

Site	Culture	Description	Main Monument List
Palenque	Maya	Located in current-day Chiapas, Mexico. Flourished c. 400 AD – 800 AD.	--Palace structure (with tower) -- Temple of the Sun -- Temple of the Cross -- Temple of the Foliated Cross (These structures were decorated with medium relief panels)
Quirigua	Maya	Located in eastern Guatemala near Honduras border. Flourished c. 500 AD – 750 AD.	-- giant stone stelae (up to 35', the largest in the pre-Columbian area) with very high relief
Teotihuacan	Teotihuacan	Located in Central Mexico (just outside current-day Mexico City). Flourished c. 100 BC to 700 AD.	-- Pyramid of the Sun -- Pyramid of the Moon -- Temple of the Feathered Serpent
Tikal	Maya	Located in Peten region of Guatemala (north). Flourished c. 200 AD – 600 AD.	-- large stepped temples (I, II and IV most famous)
Tula	Toltec	Located in Central Mexico. Flourished c. 1200 AD – 1400 AD.	--Atlantean figures --chacmools
Tiwanaku	Tiwanaku	Located in Lake Titicaca region of Bolivia. Flourished c. c. 250 AD – 1000 AD	--Sun Gate -- mortarless stonework -- trapezoidal openings (some double jambed)
Uxmal	Maya	Located on Yucatan Peninsula. Flourished c. 800 AD – 1100 AD. This is predominantly a Puuc-style site (some Chenes with “monster” masks around doorways).	-- Nunnery Quadrangle (four buildings that create a courtyard) --House of the Governor (severe-angled corbel vaults) --House of the Pigeons
Yaxchilan	Maya	Located on the Usumacinta River (near Palenque), Mexico. Flourished c. 600 – 825 AD. The site is best known for its high relief stone lintels.	--Lintel 24 --Lintel 25 --Lintel 39

Appendix D: Mesoamerican Chronology

		CENTRAL MEXICO	OAXACA	GULF COAST	WEST MEXICO	MAYA HIGHLANDS/PACIFIC COAST	LOWLAND MAYA	
							South	North
1519	LATE POSTCLASSIC	<i>Tenochtitlan</i> <i>Tlaxcala</i>	Mixtec independent kingdoms	Totonacs <i>Cempoala</i>	Tarascons	Maya independent city-states <i>Mixco Viejo, Iximché, Utatlán</i>	<i>Tayasal (Itzá)</i>	<i>Tulum</i> <i>Santa Rita</i>
1200	EARLY POSTCLASSIC	<i>Tula</i> <i>Nochicalco</i>	<i>Milla Tugul</i>	Huastecs				<i>Mayapán</i> <i>Chichen Itzá</i>
900	TERMINAL CLASSIC	<i>Cacaxtla</i>	Monte Albán IIIb	Classic Veracruz <i>El Tajín</i>			<i>Tepeu</i> Late Classic Maya	<i>Puuc</i> and Central Yucatán
600	LATE CLASSIC		Monte Albán IIIa	<i>Remojadas</i> <i>Cerro de las Mesas</i>		<i>Cotzumalhuapa</i>	<i>Tzakol</i> : Early Classic Maya	<i>Orkintok</i>
500	EARLY CLASSIC		Monte Albán II		<i>Istlán del Río</i>	<i>Kaminaljuyú</i> <i>Escuintla</i>		
400	PROTO CLASSIC		Monte Albán I					
300	LATE FORMATIVE	<i>Cuicuilco</i>	<i>Dainzú</i>	<i>Tres Zapotes</i>	<i>Chupicuaro</i> Colima	<i>Izapa, Kaminaljuyú, Abaj Takalik</i>	<i>Cerro</i>	<i>El Mirador</i> <i>Nakbé</i>
200	MIDDLE FORMATIVE	<i>Tlatilco</i>	Monte Albán I	<i>La Venta</i>				
100	EARLY FORMATIVE			<i>San Lorenzo</i>				
1200				<i>Olmeques</i>	<i>Tropante-cuanillan</i> <i>Xochipala</i> <i>Capacha</i>			
1500	ARCHAIC					<i>Ocos</i>		

Reprinted from Miller, *Art of Mesoamerica*, p. 6.

Appendix E: Chronology of the Pre-Columbian Andes

TIME SCALE	PERIODS/ HORIZONS	COASTAL PERU			HIGHLAND PERU			TITICACA REGION		
		North Coast	Central Coast	South Coast	North	Central	South	Moquegua	Arica	Titicaca-Altiplano
1500	LATE HORIZON	INCA	INCA	INCA	INCA	INCA	INCA	INCA	INCA	INCA
1250	LATE INTER-MEDIATE PERIOD	CHIMU	CHANCAY							
1000	MIDDLE HORIZON	LAMBAYEQUE		ICA						
750			WARI			WARI	WARI			
500	EARLY INTER-MEDIATE PERIOD	MOCHE	Pachacamac					TIWANAKU		TIWANAKU
250				NASCA	RECUAY					
AD						HUARPA				
500	EARLY HORIZON	GALLINAZO SALINAR		PARACAS	CHAVIN					PUKARA
1000	INITIAL PERIOD	Caballo Muerto Cerro Sechin	Garapay							
2000	COTTON PRE-CERAMIC	Huaca Prieta	Huaca la Florida El Paraiso		Rotosh				CHINCORRUCOS	
4000										
6000	LITHIC PERIOD				Guitarero					
8000										
10,000										

Reprinted from Stone-Miller, *Art of the Andes*, p. 8.

REFERENCES

ARCHIVAL AND OTHER NON-PUBLISHED MATERIAL

- “Aztec Theatre,” San Antonio Conservation Society and Arts Council of San Antonio, June 1978 pamphlet, Aztec Theatre File, San Antonio Conservation Society.
- Barnet-Sanchez, Holly. "The Necessity of Pre-Columbian Art: U.S. Museums and the Role of Foreign Policy in the Appropriation and Transformation of Mexican Heritage, 1933-44." Ph.D. diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 1993.
- Graybill, Jr., Samuel H. "Bruce Price: American Architect, 1845-1903." 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1957.
- Hansen, Arthur J. "A Most Unusual Baptist Church." n.p.: 1932 (?). Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives. Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- Herren, Angela. "Portraying the Mexica Past: A Comparison of Sixteenth-Century Pictorial Accounts of Origin in Codex Azcatitlan, Codex Boturini and Codex Aubin." Ph.D. diss., Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York, 2005.
- Orcutt, Kimberly. “‘Revising History’: Creating a Canon of American Art at the Centennial Exhibition.” Ph.D. diss., Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York, 2005.
- Royhl, Van. "Interview between Mr. Post and Mr. Robert Stacy-Judd." Hollywood, CA: after 1939. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives. Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- Schermerhorn, F. A. “Columbia College. Proposal to Establish a Course in Instruction in Architecture in the School of Mines. Resolution of Inquiry, Adopted by the Trustees, April 7, 1879.” New York: Columbia College, 1879.
- Spinden, Herbert J. "A Study of Maya Art: Its Subject Matter and Historical Development." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1909.
- Stacy-Judd, Robert B. “Works of Art Relating to Ancient America in the California Building [1915 Panama-California Exposition].” c. 1928. One page typed. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.

- _____. "Books, Journals, Papers and Magazines which have published the Aztec Hotel." January 2, 1930. Typed document. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- _____. "First Mayan Motif Church." c.1930. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- _____. "The Truth About the Mayas." 1932. Typed manuscript with handwritten corrections. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- _____. "The Reason Why the Ancient Mayas in Yucatan Resorted to Substitutes in Building Materials Etc., and the Origin of the So-Called Maya Arch. Deductions and Conclusions," 1934. Typed manuscript with handwritten corrections. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- _____. Interview by James Vandiveer. "Interview of Robert B. Stacy Judd on the Mayan Ruins of Yucatan," 28 February 1935. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- _____. Interview by James Vandiveer. "Interview of Robert Stacy Judd on Mayan Ruins in Yucatan." 7 March 1935. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- _____. "The Autobiography of an Architect." c. 1944. Unpublished typed manuscript. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- Webster, Edna Robb. "First Ecclesiastical Structure of the Ancient Maya Architecture." c. 1930 n.p. Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- Wierich, Jochen. "The Domestication of History in American Art, 1848-1876." Ph.D. diss., The College of William and Mary in Virginia, 1998.

ARCHIVES CONSULTED

American Museum of Natural History, Division of Anthropology Archives

Columbia University Libraries, University Archives, New York, NY (early architectural programs and curricula)

Fallingwater, Western Pennsylvania Conservancy

Huntington Library, San Marino, CA (Morgan, Walls & Clements papers)

Los Angeles Conservancy, Los Angeles, CA

Los Angeles Public Library, CA (Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles)

Organization of American States (OAS), Columbus Memorial Library, Archives, Washington, DC (Pan-American Union Building)

Robert B. Stacy-Judd Archives, Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara

San Antonio Conservation Society Library, San Antonio, TX (Aztec Theatre)

Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington, DC

Smithsonian Institution, National Anthropological Archives, Suitland, MD

Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History, Department of Anthropology, Collections Management, Suitland, MD

PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

Barnes, Monica. Archaeologist and Editor, *Andean Past*. 2001-06.

Docter, Catherine. Mayanist. Copán, Honduras. 2003.

Ludwig, Kurt. Licensed Architect. 2002-07.

Pillsbury, Joanne, Dr. Director, Pre-Columbian Studies, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, Washington, DC. 2005.

Plank, Shannon, Dr. Archaeologist and Epigrapher. 2004.

Toker, Franklin, Dr. Architectural Historian, 2007.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

- Ackerman, Gerald M. "American Orientalists." *ACR Édition* 10 (1994).
- Ades, Dawn. *Art In Latin America: The Modern Era, 1820-1980*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Albarracín-Jordán, Juan V. *The Archaeology of Tiwanaku: The Myths, History, and Science of an Ancient Andean Civilization*. La Paz, Bolivia: Impresión P. A. P., 1999.
- Alcock, Deborah. *Under the Southern Cross: A Tale of the New World*. London: T. Nelson, 1874.
- Allen, Grant. *Charles Darwin English Worthies*, ed. Andrew Lang. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1885.
- Alofsin, Anthony. *Frank Lloyd Wright, the Lost Years, 1910-1922: A Study of Influence*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Alzate y Ramírez, José Antonio de. *Nuevo mapa geográfico de la América Septentrional, perteneciente al virreynato de Mexico: Dedicado à los sabios miembros de la Academia Real de las Ciencias de Paris*. Madrid: n.p., 1768.
- _____. *Descripción de las antiguëdades de Xochicalco. Escrita por Don Joseph Antonio Alzate y Ramirez, socio de la Real Academia de las Ciencias de Paris, de la Sociedad Bascongada, y del Real Jardin Botánico de Madrid*. Mexico City: Felipe de Zuñiga y Ontiveros, 1791.
- "An Artist's View: William Henry Holmes," www.mnh.si.edu/anthro/laexped/ch4ns.htm (June 2005).
- Angel, Félix. "The Latin American Presence (Part I)" In *The Latin American Spirit: Art and Artists in the United States, 1920-1970*, 222-264. New York: Bronx Museum of the Arts and Harry N. Abrams, 1988.
- Angel, Herbert E. "Pre-Columbian Architecture Comes Back: Principles of Art and Architecture of Aborigines Used as Motifs for Modern Structures." *Pan American Magazine* (after 1928): 91-107.
- Angrand, Léonce. *Antiquités américaines: Extrait de la Revue Générale de l'Architecture et des travaux publics*. Paris: Imprimerie de J. Clayes, c. 1866.

- Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1886. Report of the U. S. National Museum.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1888.
- Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1898. Report of the U. S. National Museum.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1900.
- Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1903. Report of the U. S. National Museum.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1905.
- Armstrong, Carol. *Odd Man Out: Readings of the Work and Reputation of Edgar Degas.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Bákula, Cecilia, et al., *The Inca World: The Development of Pre-Columbian Peru, A.D. 1000-1534.* ed. Laura Laurencich Minelli. Rev. and updated, English-language ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000.
- Bancroft, Hubert Howe. *The Book of the Fair: An Historical and Descriptive Presentation of the World's Science, Art, and Industry, as Viewed through the Columbian Exposition at Chicago in 1893*, vol. 7. Imperial ed., no. 30. Chicago: Bancroft Company, 1893.
- Barnet-Sanchez, Holly. "The Necessity of Pre-Columbian Art in the United States." In *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past: A Symposium of Dumbarton Oaks*, ed. Elizabeth Hill Boone, 177-207. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1993.
- Batkin, Jonathan. "Pueblo Pottery and the Early Curio Trade." In *Unpacking Culture: Art and Commodity in Colonial and Postcolonial Worlds*, eds. Ruth B. Phillips and Christopher B. Steiner, 282-97. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999.
- Batres, Leopoldo. *Civilización de algunas de las diferentes tribus que habitaron el territorio, hoy Mexicano, en la antigüedad.* Mexico, 1888.
- _____. *Teotihuacan or the Sacred City of the Toltecs.* Monographs of Mexican Archaeology. Mexico City: Talleres de la escuela N. de artes y oficios. Ex-convento de S. Lorenzo, 1889.
- _____. *Exploraciones de Monte Alban.* Mexico, 1902.

- Baudez, Claude, and Sydney Picasso. *Lost Cities of the Maya*. Translated by Caroline Palmer. Discoveries. London: Harry N. Abrams, 1992.
- Bauer, Brian S. *Ancient Cuzco: Heartland of the Inca*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004.
- Bayer, Patricia. *Art Deco Architecture: Design, Decoration and Detail from the Twenties and Thirties*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1992. Reprint, New York: Thames & Hudson, 2001.
- Benson, Elizabeth P. "The Robert Woods Bliss Collection of Pre-Columbian Art: A Memoir." In *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past: A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks*, 15-32. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1993.
- Bernal, Ignacio. *A History of Mexican Archaeology: The Vanished Civilizations of Middle America*. The World of Archaeology, ed. Glyn Daniel. London: Thames & Hudson, 1980.
- Betts, Brooks. "The Fall of Maya: A Tragic Drama of Ancient America, in Five Acts and Ten Scenes, with an Induction and Epilogue." New York (?): 1911.
- Biddle, Flora Miller. *The Whitney Women and the Museum They Made: A Family Memoir*. New York: Arcade, 1999.
- Bingham, Hiram. "In the Wonderland of Peru: The Work Accomplished by the Peruvian Expedition of 1912, under the Auspices of Yale University and the National Geographic Society." *The National Geographic Magazine* 24, no. 4 (April 1913): 387-573.
- _____. "The Discovery of Machu Picchu." *Harper's Magazine* 126, no. 755 (April 1913): 709-14.
- _____. *Machu Picchu, a Citadel of the Incas: Report of the Explorations and Excavations Made in 1911, 1912 and 1915 under the Auspices of Yale University and the National Geographic Society*. New Haven: National Geographic Society and Yale University Press; London: H. Milford and Oxford University Press, 1930.
- _____. *Lost City of the Incas, the Story of Machu Picchu and Its Builders*. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1938.
- Bird, Robert Montgomery. *Calavar, or, the Knight of the Conquest: A Romance of Mexico*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1834.

_____. *The Infidel, or, the Fall of Mexico. A Romance, by the Author of Calavar*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1835.

Bletter, Rosemarie Haag. "The Art Deco Style." In *Skyscraper Style: Art Deco New York*, ed. Robinson Cervin and Rosemarie Haag Bletter. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Blom, Frans and Oliver La Farge. *Tribes and Temples: A Record of the Expedition to Middle America Conducted by the Tulane University of Louisiana in 1925*. 2 vols. New Orleans: The Tulane University of Louisiana, 1926-27.

Bogdan, Robert. *Freak Show: Presenting Human Oddities for Amusement and Profit*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Boone, Elizabeth Hill, ed. *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past: A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1993.

Boone, Elizabeth Hill, and Tom Cummins, eds. *Native Traditions in the Postconquest World: A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1998.

Bossom, Alfred C. *An Architectural Pilgrimage in Old Mexico*. New York: Scribner, 1924.

_____. *Building to the Skies: The Romance of the Skyscraper*. London: The Studio Limited; New York: The Studio Publications, 1934.

Bossom, Alfred C., and Estelle H. Ries. "New Styles in American Architecture: And What We Might Learn from the Mayas." *World's Work* 56, no. 2 (June 1928): 189-95.

Brasseur de Bourbourg, Charles Étienne. *Monumens Anciens du Mexique. Recherches sur les ruines de Palenqué et sur les Origines de la Civilisation du Mexique*. Text publié avec les dessins de M. de Waldeck sous les auspices de S.E.M. le Ministre de L'instruction Publique. Paris: Arthus Bertrand, ed., libraire de la Société de Géographie, 1866.

_____. *Manuscrit troano; études sur le système graphique et la langue des Mayas*. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1869-70.

Braun, Barbara. *Pre-Columbian Art and the Post-Columbian World: Ancient American Sources of Modern Art*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1993.

Breeze, Carla. *Pueblo Deco*. New York: Rizzoli, 1990.

_____. *L.A. Deco*. New York: Rizzoli, 1991. Reprint, Santa Monica, CA: Hennessey & Ingalls, 2004.

_____. *American Art Deco: Architecture and Regionalism*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Co., 2003.

Bressani, Martin. "Notes on Viollet-Le-Duc's Philosophy of History: Dialectics and Technology." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 48, no. 4 (December 1989): 327-50.

Brunhouse, Robert L. *In Search of the Maya: The First Archaeologists*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1973.

Bullock, William J. *Catalogue of the Exhibition, Called Modern Mexico: Containing a Panoramic View of the City, with Specimens of the Natural History of New Spain, and Models of the Vegetable Produce, Costume, etc. etc. Now Open for Public Inspection at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly*. London: Printed for the Proprietor William J. Bullock, 1824.

_____. *A Description of the Unique Exhibition Called Ancient Mexico: Collected on the Spot in 1823 by the Assistance of the Mexican Government, and Now Open for Public Inspection at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly*. London: Printed for the Proprietor William J. Bullock, 1824.

_____. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Exhibition, Entitled Ancient and Modern Mexico: Containing a Panoramic View of the Present City, Specimens of the Natural History of New Spain, Models of Its Vegetable Produce, Habitations, Costumes, etc. etc. And of the Colossal and Enormous Idols, the Great Calendar and Sacrificial Stones, Temples, Pyramids, and Other Existing Antique Remains. The Whole Forming the Rationally Instructive and Interesting Exhibition, Which Is Now Open, for Public Inspection, at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly*. London: Printed for the Proprietor William J. Bullock, 1824.

Bunch, Michael A. *Core Curriculum in Architectural Education*. San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1993.

Burke, Doreen, Jonathan Freedman, Alice Cooney Frelinghuysen, David A. Hanks, Marilyn Johnson, James D. Kornwolf, Catherine Lynn, Roger B. Stein, Jennifer Toher, and Catherine Hoover Voorsanger, with the assistance of Carrie Reborá. *In Pursuit of Beauty: Americans and the Aesthetic Movement*, ed. Polly Horbar, John P. O'Neill, and Amy Cone, with the assistance of Cynthia Clark, Sue Potter, and Mary-Alice Rogers. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1986.

Carrott, Richard G. *The Egyptian Revival: Its Sources, Monuments, and Meaning, 1808-1858*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1978.

- Casas, Bartolomé de las. *Brevísima relación de la destruyón de las Indias*. Seville: Sebastian Trugillo, 1552. Edited and translated by Nigel Griffin as *A Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*. London and New York: Penguin Books, 1992.
- Catherwood, Frederick. *Views of Ancient Monuments in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan*. New York: Bartlett & Welford; London: Vizetelly Bros. & Co., 1844.
- Chambi, Martín. *Fotografías del Perú, 1920-1950*. Bogotá, Colombia: Banco de la República, 1988.
- Charnay, Claude-Joseph Désiré. *Cités et ruines américaines: Mitla, Palenqué, Izamal, Chichen-Itza, Uxmal Recueillies et photographies par D. Charnay. Avec un texte par Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-Le-Duc, suivi du voyage et des documents de l'auteur. With atlas*. Paris: Gide, 1862-63.
- _____. *The Ancient Cities of the New World, Being Voyages and Explorations in Mexico and Central America from 1857-1882*. Translated by J. Gonino and Helen S. Conant. London: Chapman & Hall, 1887.
- Chewning, J. A. "The Teaching of Architectural History During the Advent of Modernism, 1920s-1950s." In *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 35, 101-10. *Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 35. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- "Church Building Working Plans." *Journal of Commerce* (September 11, 1930).
- Cienci, Giovanni, and Peter Nicholls, eds. *Ruskin and Modernism*. Basingstoke, Houndmills, UK and New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Cockcroft, Eva. "The United States and Socially Concerned Latin American Art: 1920-1970." In *The Latin American Spirit: Art and Artists in the United States, 1920-1970*, 184-221. New York: Bronx Museum of the Arts and Harry N. Abrams, 1988.
- Coe, Michael D. *The Maya*. 6th ed. Rev. and exp. London and New York: Thames & Hudson, 1999.
- Coe, Michael D., and Rex Koontz. *Mexico: From the Olmecs to the Aztecs*. 5th ed., Rev. and enl. *Ancient Peoples and Places*, ed. Daniel Glyn. London and New York: Thames & Hudson, 2002.

- Cohodas, Marvin. "Elizabeth Hickox and Karuk Basketry: A Case Study in Debates on Innovation and Paradigms of Authenticity." In *Unpacking Culture: Art and Commodity in Colonial and Postcolonial Worlds*, ed. Ruth B. Phillips and Christopher B. Steiner, 143-61. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999.
- Conger, Amy. *Edward Weston in Mexico, 1923-1926*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press for San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.
- "Conversation with Chief of Exhibitions D. Dodge Thompson," in *Anatomy of an Exhibition: Art Nouveau, 1890-1914*, http://www.nga.gov/feature/nouveau/concept_dodge.shtm.
- "Conversation with Victoria & Albert Curator Paul Greenhalgh, in *Anatomy of an Exhibition: Art Nouveau, 1890-1914*, http://www.nga.gov/feature/nouveau/concept_paul.shtm.
- Cornejo, Francisco. "Description of Architecture and Decorations of the Mayan Theatre," *Pacific Coast Architect* 33, no. 4 (April 1928): 13-30.
- Crawford, Alan. *C. R. Ashbee: Architect, Designer and Romantic Socialist*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Curl, James Stevens. *The Egyptian Revival: Ancient Egypt as the Inspiration for Design Motifs in the West*. Abingdon, England: Routledge, 2005.
- Curtis, William J. R. *Modern Architecture since 1900*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982.
- D'Altroy, Terence N. *The Incas*. The Peoples of America, ed. Alan Kolata and Dean Snow. Malden, MA and Oxford, England: Blackwell, 2002.
- Davis, Keith F. *Désiré Charnay, Expeditionary Photographer*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1981.
- DeLong, David G., ed. *Frank Lloyd Wright: Designs for an American Landscape, 1922-1932*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996.
- DeLong, David G., Helen Searing, and Robert A. M. Stern, eds. *American Architecture: Innovation and Tradition*. Symposium and exhibition vol., Columbia University, 21-24 April 1983. New York: Rizzoli, 1986.
- Delpar, Helen. *The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican: Cultural Relations between the United States and Mexico, 1920-1935*. Tuscaloosa, AL and London: University of Alabama Press, 1992.

- Denevan, William M. "The 1931 Shippee-Johnson Aerial Photography Expedition to Peru." *The Geographical Review* 83, no. 3 (July 1993): 238-51.
- Desmond, Alice Curtis. *Soldier of the Sun: A Story of Peru in the Days of the Incas*. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1939.
- Díaz del Castillo, Bernal. *The True History of the Conquest of Mexico*. Translated from Spanish by Maurice Keatinge. 1568. Reprint, 2 vols. London: J. Wright, 1800
- _____. *The Discovery and Conquest of Mexico, 1517-1521*. Edited by Genaro Garcia and translated with an introduction and notes by A. P. Maudslay. London: G. Routledge & Sons, 1928.
- Dixon, Roger, and Stefan Muthesius. *Victorian Architecture with a Short Dictionary of Architects*. World of Art. New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Dixon, Thomas. *The Sun Virgin*. New York: H. Liveright, 1929.
- Downey, Dennis B. *A Season of Renewal: The Columbian Exposition and Victorian America*. Westport, CT and London: Praeger, 2002.
- Drimmer, Frederick. *Very Special People*. New York: Amjon, 1973.
- Evans, R. Tripp. *Romancing the Maya: Mexican Antiquity in the American Imagination, 1820-1915*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004.
- Fagan, Brian M. *Elusive Treasure: The Story of Early Archaeologists in the Americas*. New York: Scribners, 1977.
- _____. *Clash of Cultures*. 2d ed. Walnut Creek, CA, London, and New Delhi: Altamira Press, 1998.
- Fane, Diana. "Reproducing the Pre-Columbian Past: Casts and Models in Exhibitions of Ancient America, 1824-1935." In *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past: A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks*, ed. Elizabeth Hill Boone, 141-72. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1993.
- Fowler, Gene and Bill Crawford. *Border Radio: Quacks, Yodelers, Pitchmen, Psychics, and Other Amazing Broadcasters of the American Airwaves*. Rev. ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Franch, José Alcina. *Pre-Columbian Art*. Translated by I. Mark Paris. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1983.
- Garren, William I. *Four-fifty Sutter: Impressions*. no pub.: c. 1930.

- Gebhard, David. "The Spanish Colonial Revival in Southern California (1895-1930)." *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 26, no. 2 (May 1967): 131-47.
- _____. *Romanza: The California Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1988.
- _____. *Robert Stacy-Judd: Maya Architecture and the Creation of a New Style*. Santa Barbara, CA: Capra Press, 1993.
- _____. *The National Trust Guide to Art Deco in America*. Paperback ed. New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, and Singapore: Preservation Press and John Wiley & Sons, 1996.
- Gebhard, David, Eric Sandweiss, and Robert Winter. *The Guide to Architecture in San Francisco and Northern California*. Rev. ed. Salt Lake City, UT: Gibbs Smith, 1985.
- Gebhard, David, and Robert Winter. *A Guide to Architecture in Los Angeles and Southern California*. Santa Barbara and Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, 1977.
- _____. *Los Angeles: An Architectural Guide*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 1994.
- Goldwater, Robert. *Primitivism in Modern Art*. Rev. ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.
- Graham, Ian. "Exposing the Maya: A Remarkable Set of Prints, Made at the Turn of the Century, Surface in Shreveport, Louisiana" *Archaeology* 43, no. 5 (September/October 1990): 36-43.
- _____. *Alfred Maudslay and the Maya: A Biography*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press; London: The British Museum Press, 2002.
- _____. "Three Early Collectors in Mesoamerica," in *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past: A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks*, ed. Elizabeth Hill Boone, 49-80. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1993.
- Greenhalgh, Paul. "Art Nouveau, 1890-1914." *The Magazine Antiques* (1971) 157, no. 4 (April 2000): 616-25.
- Grossman, Elizabeth Greenwell. *The Civic Architecture of Paul Crét*. Modern Architecture and Cultural Identity, ed. Richard A. Etlin. Cambridge, England, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Gueulette, Thomas-Simon. *Peruvian Tales (Milles et une heures, Contes peruvians): Related in One Thousand and One Hours, by One of the Select Virgins of Cusco, to the Ynca of Peru; to Dissuade Him from a Resolution He Had Taken to Destroy Himself by Poison. Interspersed with Curious and Historical Remarks; Explaining the Religious and Civil Customs and Ceremonies of the Ancient Inhabitants of That Great Empire.* Translated by Samuel Humphreys and John Kelly. London: J. Walker & Other Proprietors, 1817.
- “Guide Leaflet to Collections in the American Museum of Natural History,” no. 3, *Supplement to the American Museum Journal* 2, no. 1 (January 1902).
- Guilbaut, Serge. *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art: Abstract Expressionism, Freedom, and the Cold War.* Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1983.
- Hagen, Victor von. *Maya Explorer: John Lloyd Stephens and the Lost Cities of Central America and Yucatan.* Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 1947.
- Haggard, Henry Rider. *Montezuma's Daughter: A Romance.* New York: McKinlay, Stone & Mackenzie, 1892; Reprint, 1909.
- _____. *Heart of the World.* London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1895.
- Halén, Widar. “Dresser and Japan.” In *Shock of the Old: Christopher Dresser’s Design Revolution*, ed. Michael Whiteway, 127-39. New York: Cooper-Hewett, National Design Museum, Smithsonian Institution and London: V&A Publications, 2004.
- Hall, Ben M. *The Best Remaining Seats: The Story of the Golden Age of the Movie Palace.* New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1961.
- Halnon, “Some Enchanted Evenings: American Picture Palaces,” <http://xroads.virginia.edu/~CAP/PALACE/thirties.html> (May 2006).
- Hampton, Edward Lloyd. “Prehistoric American Art Reborn.” *Current History* 25, no. 5 (February 1927): 624-34.
- _____. “Creating a New World Architecture.” *Southern California Business* (April 1928): 16-17, 38, 45, 48.
- Hartnedy, M. M. A. *The World's Fair Drama. Christopher Columbus. A Drama in Three Acts, with Tableau, Directions to Amateurs on Points of Experience, Scenery, Costumes, etc. Written for the Quadricentennial Celebration of the Discovery of America.* Steubenville, Ohio: Columbus Club; New York: P. J. Kenedy and Chicago: W. H. Sadlier, 1892.

- Heinz, Thomas A. *The Vision of Frank Lloyd Wright*. Edison, NJ: Chartwell Books, 2001.
- Henderson, Rose. "A Primitive Basis for Modern Architecture." *Architectural Record* 54 (1923): 189-96.
- Herzog, Charlotte. "The Movie Palace and the Theatrical Sources of Its Architectural Style." In *Exhibition, the Film Reader*, ed. Ina Rae Hark, 51-65. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Hewett, Edgar L. "Ancient America at the Panama-California Exposition." Point Loma, CA: Aryan Theosophical Press, 1915. Reprint from *The Theosophical Path* (February 1915).
- Hill, S. S. *Travels in Peru and Mexico*. 2 vols. London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1860.
- Hillier, Bevis. *The Style of the Century*. 2d ed. London: The Herbert Press, 1998.
- Hillier, Bevis, and Stephen Escritt. *Art Deco Style*. London: Phaidon Press, 1997.
- Hinsley, Curtis M. "From Skull-Heaps to Stelae: Early Anthropology at the Peabody Museum," in *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr., 49-74. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.
- _____. "The World as Marketplace: Commodification of the Exotic at the World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893." In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, eds. Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine, 344-365. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.
- Hodge, Frederick Webb. "Bandelier's Researches in Peru and Bolivia." *American Anthropologist* (1897): 303-11.
- Hoffmann, Donald. "Frank Lloyd Wright and Viollet-Le-Duc." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 28, no. 3 (October 1969): 173-83.
- Holmes, William Henry. *Archeological Studies Among the Ancient Cities of Mexico*. 2 vols. Field Columbian Museum, Publication no. 16, Archaeological Series 1, no. 1-2. Chicago: Field Columbian Museum, 1895-97.
- _____. "The Feathered Serpent Column of Chichen Itza," *Art and Archaeology* I, (1914): 83.

Honour, Hugh. *The European Vision of America*. Cleveland: The Cleveland Museum of Art, 1975.

_____. *The New Golden Land: European Images of America from the Discoveries to the Present Time*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975.

Hudson, Charles Bradford. *The Crimson Conquest: A Romance of Pizarro and Peru*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1907.

Humboldt, Alexander von. *Voyage aux régions équinoxiales du nouveau continent, fait en 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803 et 1804, par Al. de Humboldt et A. Bonpland; rédigé par Alexandre de Humboldt. Avec deux atlas, qui renferment, l'un les vues des Cordillères et les monumens des peuples indigènes de l'Amérique, et l'autre des cartes géographiques et physiques*, 35 vols. Paris, G. Dufour et Cie., 1805-34.

_____. *Vues des cordillères et monumens des peuples indigènes de l'Amérique*. 2 vols. Paris and London: F. Schoell, 1810.

_____. *Essai politique sur le Royaume de la Nouvelle-Espagne . . . Avec un atlas physique et géographique du Royaume de la Nouvelle-Espagne*. Paris: F. Schoell, 1811-12.

_____. *Researches, Concerning the Institutions and Monuments of the Ancient Inhabitants of America with Descriptions and Views of Some of the Most Striking Scenes in the Cordilleras!* 2 vols. Translated by Helen Maria Williams. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme & Brown, J. Murray & H. Colburn, 1814.

_____. *Aspects of Nature*, trans. Mrs. Sabine (London: H. G. Bohn, 1849);

_____. *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Region of America, during the Years 1799-1804*, 3 vols., Translated by Thomasina Ross. vols. 1-2: London: H. G. Bohn, 1852; vol. 3; London: H. G. Bohn, 1853.

Hurlburt, Laurance P. *The Mexican Muralists in the United States*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987.

Ingle, Marjorie. *The Mayan Revival Style: Art Deco Mayan Fantasy*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith and Peregrine Smith Books, 1984.

Ixtlilxóchtli, Fernando de Alva. *Obras Históricas: incluyen el texto completo de las llamadas Relaciones e Historia de la nación chichimeca en una nueva versión establecida con el cotejo de los manuscritos más antiguos que se conocen*. ed. Edmundo O'Gorman. 3d ed., 2 vols. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, 1975-77.

- Janvier, Thomas A. *The Aztec Treasure-House: A Romance of Contemporaneous Antiquity*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1918.
- Jones, Owen. *The Grammar of Ornament, Illustrated by Examples from Various Styles of Ornament*. 2 vols. London: Day & Son, 1856; London: B. Quaritch, 1868.
- Karp, Ivan and Steven D. Lavine, eds. *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.
- Kaufmann, Jr., Edgar. *Fallingwater: A Frank Lloyd Wright Country House*. New York, London and Paris: Abbeville Press, 1986.
- Kaufmann, Preston J. *Fox, the Last Word: . . . Story of the World's Finest Theatre*. Pasadena, CA: Showcase Publications, 1979.
- Keane, Augustus Henry. *Central and South America*. London: E. Stanford, 1901.
- Keen, Benjamin. *The Aztec Image in Western Thought*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1971. Reprint, 1990.
- Kelly, Franklin. *Frederic Edwin Church*. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1989.
- Kelsey, Albert. *Yucatecan Scenes and Sounds: An Address Delivered Before the Numismatic and Antiquarian Society of Philadelphia on March 18, 1918*. Published simultaneously with the Proceedings of the Society. Philadelphia: Numismatic & Antiquarian Society of Philadelphia, 1919.
- Kendall, Ann. *Aspects of Inka Architecture: Description, Function and Chronology*, BAR International Series 242, 1985.
- Kingsborough, Lord. *Antiquities of Mexico, Comprising Facsimiles of Ancient Mexican Paintings and Hieroglyphs Preserved in the Royal Libraries of Paris, Berlin and Dresden . . . Together with the Monuments of New Spain by M. Dupaix . . . The Whole Illustrated by Many Valuable Inedited Manuscripts*. 9 vols. London: A. Aglio, R. Havell, and H.G. Bohn, 1830-48.
- Kolata, Alan L. *Valley of the Spirits: A Journey into the Lost Realm of the Aymara*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1996.
- Kopper, Philip. *The Smithsonian Book of North American Indians before the Coming of the Europeans*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1896.
- Kornwolf, James D. "American Architecture and the Aesthetic Movement." In *In Pursuit of Beauty: Americans and the Aesthetic Movement*, ed. Burke et al., 341-83. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1986.

- Krammer, Gerhardt T. "Maya Design." *Architect and Engineer* 122 (Sept. 1935): 21-35, 41.
- Kubler, George. "Architectural Historians before the Fact." In *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 35, 191-97. *Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 35. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- Lane, Mills. *Architecture of the Old South*. Savannah, GA: Beehive Press; New York, London and Paris: Abbeville Press, 1993.
- Lange, Charles H., and Carroll L. Riley. *Bandelier: The Life and Adventures of Adolph Bandelier*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1996.
- The Latin American Spirit: Art and Artists in the United States, 1920-1970*. New York: Bronx Museum of the Arts and Harry N. Abrams, 1988.
- Lavine, Steven D., and Ivan Karp. "Introduction: Museums and Multiculturalism." In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, eds. Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine, 1-9. Washington, DC and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.
- Lawrence, D. H. *The Plumed Serpent [Quetzalcoatl]*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926.
- Le Plongeon, Alice Dixon. *Here and There in Yucatan: Miscellanies*. New York: J. W. Lovell, 1889.
- _____. *Queen Moo's Talisman: The Fall of the Maya Empire*. New York: P. Eckler, 1902.
- Le Plongeon, Augustus. *Vestiges of the Mayas, or, Facts Tending to Prove that Communications and Intimate Relations Must Have Existed, in Very Remote Times, Between the Inhabitants of Mayab and those of Asia and Africa*. New York: J. Polhemus, 1881.
- _____. *Queen M6oo and the Egyptian Sphinx*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Tr6ubner & Co., 1896.
- Lehmann, Walter. *Altmexikanische Kunstgeschichte: Ein Entwurf in Umrissen*. *Orbis Pictus, Weltkunstb6ucherei*, vol. 8. Berlin: E. Wasmuth, 1921.

- León y Gama Antonio de, *Descripción histórica y cronológica de las dos piedras que con ocasión del nuevo empedrado que se está formando en la plaza principal de México, se hallaron en ella el año de 1790. Explicase el sistema de los calendarios de los Indios ... Noticia ... á que se añaden otras curiosas ... sobre la mitología de los Mexicanos, sobre su astronomía, y sobre los ritos y ceremonias ... en tiempo de su gentilidad.* Mexico City: Felipe de Zúñiga y Ontiveros, 1792.
- Leoni, Giovanni. "Architecture as Commentary: Ruskin's Pre-Modern Architectural Thought and its Influence on Modern Architecture." In *Ruskin and Modernism*, eds. Giovanni and Peter Nicholls Cianci, 194-210. Basingstoke, Houndmills, UK and New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- "Life of the Living Aztec Children," libweb.princeton.edu/libraries/firestone/rbsc/aids/mccaddon/mccaddon3.html (November 2006).
- Long, Jr., R. Cary. "The Ancient Architecture of America: The Historical Value and Parallelism of Development with the Architecture of the Old World." *New-York Historical Society Proceedings* (1849): 18-19.
- Lummis, Charles F. *The Gold Fish of Gran Chimú.* Boston: Lamson, Wolffe, & Co., 1896.
- _____. *The Enchanted Burro: Stories of New Mexico and South America.* Chicago: Way & Williams, 1897.
- MacDonald, William L. *The Pantheon: Design, Meaning and Progeny.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- MacDougall, Elisabeth Blair, ed. *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians.* Studies in the History of Art, vol. 35. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- _____. "Before 1870: Founding Fathers and Amateur Historians." In *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 15-20. Studies in the History of Art, vol. 35. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- Manthorne, Katherine Emma. *Tropical Renaissance: North American Artists Exploring Latin America, 1839-1879.* New Directions in American Art. Washington, DC and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989.
- _____. "Plantation Pictures in the Americas, circa 1880: Land, Power, and Resistance." *Nepantla: Views from South* 2, no. 2 (2001): 317-53.

- Margolies, John, and Emily Gwathmey. *Ticket to Paradise: American Movie Theaters and How We Had Fun*. Boston, Toronto, and London: Little, Brown and Co., 1991.
- Mariscal, Federico E. *Estudio arquitectónico de las ruinas mayas, Yucatán y Campeche: contribución de Mexico al XXIII Congreso [International] de Americanistas*. Mexico City: Talleres gráficos de la nación, Secretaría de Educación Pública, 1928.
- Markham, Clements R., Sir. *Cuzco: A Journey to the Ancient Capital of Peru; with an Account of the History, Language, Literature, and Antiquities of the Incas. And Lima: A Visit to the Capital and Provinces of Modern Peru; with a Sketch of the Viceregal Government, History of the Republic, and a Review of the Literature and Society of Peru*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1856. Reprint, Millwood, NY: Kraus Reprint Co., 1973.
- _____. *Peru*. London: S. Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington, 1880.
- _____. *A History of Peru*. Chicago: C. H. Sergel & Co., 1892. Latin American Republics. Reprint, New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.
- _____. *The Incas of Peru*. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1910. Reprint, London: J. Murray, 1912.
- Marmontel, Jean-François. *Les Incas, ou la destruction de l'empire du Pérou*. 2 vols. Paris: Chez Lacombe, 1777. Translated as *The Incas, or, The Destruction of the Empire of Peru*. 2 vols. London: Printed for J. Nourse, P. Elmsly, & E. Lyde, & G. Kearsly, 1777.
- Marquina, Ignacio. *Estudio arquitectónico comparativo de los monumentos arqueológicos de Mexico: contribucion de Mexico al XXIII Congreso [International] de Americanistas..* Mexico City: Talleres Graficos de la Nacion, Secretaría de Educación Pública, 1928.
- Marquis, "Archaeological Aspects of the Mayan Theatre of Los Angeles, California," *Art and Archaeology* 29, no. 3 (March 1930): 98-111, 124.
- Martin, Simon, and Nikolai Grube. *Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens: Deciphering the Dynasties of the Ancient Maya*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2000.
- Maudslay, Alfred P. *Archaeology* 6 vols. In *Biología Centrali-Americana, or, Contributions to the Knowledge of the Fauna and Flora of Mexico and Central America*. eds. Frederick Du Came Godman and Osbert Salvin. 63 vols. London: R.H. Porter and Dulau & Co., 1889-1902.

"Mayan Architecture Chosen for Ventura Baptist Church." *Ventura [CA] Free Press*. 23 August 1930, pp. 1, 7.

"The Mayan Civilization, An Unprecedented Chance to Study It: All the Available Monuments of It, with Much Aztec Material, Now Shown at the Museum of Natural History for the First Time." *New York Tribune Illustrated Supplement*. 17 December 1899, 10-11.

"Mayan Style Church Is Designed: Local Architect Uses Old American Themes in Modern Building." *Ventura [CA] Free Press (?)*. 12 May 1930, n.p.

McMillian, Elizabeth Jean. *California Colonial: The Spanish and Rancho Revival Styles*. Atglen, PA: Schiffer Publications, 2002.

Meech-Pekarik, Julia, and Gabriel P. Weisberg. *Japonisme Comes to America: The Graphic Arts 1876-1925*. New York: Harry N. Abrams; New Brunswick, NJ: Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, 1990.

A Maya Manuscript (Codex Merida). Los Angeles: Philosophical Research Society, 1940.

Memoir of an Eventful Expedition in Central America; Resulting in the Discovery of the Idolatrous City of Iximaya, in an unexplored region; and the possession of two Remarkable Aztec Children, Descendants and Specimens of the Sacerdotal Caste (now nearly extinct) of the Ancient Aztec Founders of the Ruined Temples of That Country; Described by John L. Stevens (sic), Esq., and Other Travellers. Translated by Pedro Velasquez. Publisher unknown, c. 1850.

Mexico: Splendors of Thirty Centuries. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art; Boston: Bulfinch Press, 1990.

Middleton, R. D. "Viollet-Le-Duc's Influence in Nineteenth-Century England." *Art History* 4, no. 2 (1981): 203-19.

Miller, Mary Ellen. *The Art of Mesoamerica: From Olmec to Aztec*. 3d ed. London and New York: Thames & Hudson, 2001.

Moore, Jerry D. *Architecture and Power in the Ancient Andes: The Archaeology of Public Buildings*. New Studies in Archaeology. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Morgan, Keith N., and Richard Cheek. "History in the Service of Design: American Architect-Historians, 1870-1940." In *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 61-75. Studies in the History of Art, vol. 35. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- Morris, William. *The Decorative Arts: Their Relation to Modern Life and Progress, an Address Delivered before the Trades' Guild of Learning, December 4, 1877*. London: Ellis and White, 1877.
- Morrone, Francis. *The Architectural Guidebook to New York City*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 1998.
- Mortimer, W. Golden, M.D. *Peru: History of Coca "The Divine Plant" of the Incas: With an Introductory Account of the Incas, and of the Andean Indians of To-day*. New York: J. H. Vail & Co., 1901.
- Morton, Thomas. *Columbus, or, A World Discovered: An Historical Play. As It Is Performed at the Theatre-Royal, Covent-Garden*. London: Printed for W. Miller, 1792; Boston: William Spotswood, Philadelphia: H. & P. Rice, 1794; Washington, D.C.: Davis & Force, 1823.
- Moseley, Michael E. *The Incas and Their Ancestors: The Archaeology of Peru*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1992.
- Mújica, Francisco. *History of the Skyscraper*. 2 vols. New York: Archaeology & Architecture Press, 1930.
- Munroe, Kirk. *The White Conquerors: A Tale of Toltec and Aztec*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1893.
- Murphy, Kevin D. *Memory and Modernity: Viollet-Le-Duc at Vézelay*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.
- Naylor, David. *American Picture Palaces: The Architecture of Fantasy*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1981.
- "New Church to Be of Mayan Architecture." *Los Angeles Times*. 18 September 1930, p. 1.
- Newcomb, Rexford. "Aboriginal American Architectural Types." *The Western Architect: Architecture and Allied Arts* 36, no. 7 (July 1927): 106-13.
- Nicholson, H.B., and Eloise Quiñones-Keber. *Art of Aztec Mexico: Treasures of Tenochtitlan*. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1983.

- Nute, Kevin. *Frank Lloyd Wright and Japan: The Role of Traditional Japanese Art and Architecture in the Work of Frank Lloyd Wright*. London, Glasgow, New York, Tokyo, Melbourne and Madras: Chapman & Hall, 1993.
- Official Guide to the World's Columbian Exposition in the City of Chicago, State of Illinois, May 1 to October 26, 1893 by Authority of the United States of America: Containing a Brief Historical Review of American Development, an Account of Legislation Relating to the Exposition, Its Form of Organization and Government, and Full Information Respecting All Features of the Exposition, Including Classification of Departments, the Grounds and Main Buildings, the State and Foreign Buildings and Pavilions, the Notable Exhibitions, etc. etc. With Illustrations from Original Drawings compiled by John J. Flinn*. Hand Book ed. Chicago: The Columbian Guide Company, 1893.
- Oles, James. *South of the Border: Mexico in the American Imagination, 1914-1947*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993.
- Ollanta, an Ancient Ynca Drama*. Translated from the Quechua by R. Clements Markham. London: Trübner, 1871.
- Organization of American States, Department of Information and Public Affairs, OAS General Secretariat. *Organization of American States: A Handbook*. Washington, DC: Department of Information & Public Affairs, 1972.
- “Panama-California Exposition, San Diego, 1915-16: Chapter Two: The Exposition Gets Underway,” <http://www.sandiegohistory.org/pancal/sdexpo33.htm> (November 2006).
- Parry, Linda, ed. *William Morris*. London: Philip Wilson, 1996.
- Paszatory, Esther. *Aztec Art*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1983.
- Peterson, Henry. *Columbus*. Cincinnati: Walter Peterson, 1893.
- Pevsner, Nikolaus. *Pioneers of Modern Design: From William Morris to Walter Gropius*. 4th ed., Rev. and enl. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Pfeiffer, Bruce Brooks, ed. *Frank Lloyd Wright Collected Writings*. New York: Rizzoli; Scottsdale, AZ: Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, 1992-95.
- Phillips, Ruth B., and Christopher B. Steiner, eds. *Unpacking Culture: Art and Commodity in Colonial and Postcolonial Worlds*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999.

- Pitt-Rivers, Augustus Henry Lane-Fox. "Introduction"; "Principles of Classification" (1874); "On the Evolution of Culture" (1875); "Primitive Warfare I-III" (1867-69); and "Early Modes of Navigation" (1874). In *The Evolution of Culture, and Other Essays*, ed. J. L. Myres. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.
- "Plans 100-Story Buildings: Mexican Architect Asks City To Help Erect Huge Skyscrapers" *New York Times*. 20 August 1930, p. 37.
- Prescott, William H. *History of the Conquest of Mexico and History of the Conquest of Peru*. New York: Cooper Square, 2000.
- Prettejohn, Elizabeth, ed. *After the Pre-Raphaelites: Art and Aestheticism in Victorian England*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999.
- _____. *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Proskouriakoff, Tatiana. *An Album of Maya Architecture*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963.
- Puche, Mari Carmen Serra. "The Role of Teotihuacan in Mesoamerican Archaeology." In *Teotihuacan: Art from the City of the Gods*, eds. Kathleen Berrin and Esther Pasztor, 64-73. New York and San Francisco: Thames & Hudson and The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, 1993.
- Quilter, Jeffrey, and Gary Urton, eds. *Narrative Threads: Accounting and Recounting in Andean Khipu*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Quirarte, Jacinto. "Mexican and Mexican American Artists in the United States: 1920-1970." In *The Latin American Spirit: Art and Artists in the United States, 1920-1970*, 14-69. New York: Bronx Museum of the Arts and Harry N. Abrams, 1988.
- Raimondi, Antonio. *El Perú*. 5 vols. Lima: Imprenta del estado, 1874-80 (vols. I-III); Lima Geographic Society of Lima, 1902 (vol. IV); Lima(?): estudios mineralógicos y geológicos, 1913 (vol. V).
- Ratcliff, Carter. "Aestheticism Then and Now." *Art in America* 75, no. 2 (February 1987): 90-102.
- Raymond, George Lansing. *The Aztec God and Other Dramas*. 4th ed., Rev. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916.
- Reiss, Wilhelm, and Alphons Stübel. *The Necropolis of Ancon in Peru: A Contribution to Our Knowledge of the Culture and Industries of the Empire of the Incas, Being the Results of Excavations Made on the Spot*. Translated by A. H. Keane. 3 vols. Berlin: A. Asher & Co., 1880-87. Reprint, Replica ed., Hannover, Germany: U. Carlson, 1997.

- _____. *Reisen in Süd-Amerika: Geologische Studien in der Republik Colombia*. 3 vols. Berlin: A. Asher & Co, 1892-99.
- Requa, Richard S. *Inside Lights on the Building of San Diego's Exposition, 1935; The Dramatic Story of the Organization, Planning and Construction of the California-Pacific International Exposition, May 29 to November 11, 1935*. San Diego: Frye & Smith, 1937. Reprint, San Diego: Parker H. Jackson, 1997.
- Reynolds, Frederick. *The Virgin of the Sun: An Operatic Drama*. Overture and music composed by H. R. Bishop. 3rd ed. London: Printed for C. Chapple, 1812.
- Rhoads, William B. *The Colonial Revival*. 2 vols. A Garland Series Outstanding Dissertations in the Fine Arts. London and New York: Garland Publishing, 1977.
- _____. "The Discovery of America's Architectural Past, 1874-1914." In *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 23-39. Studies in the History of Art, vol. 35. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- Río, Antonio del. *Description of the Ruins of an Ancient City Discovered near Palenque in the Kingdom of Guatemala . . . Translated from the original manuscript report of Captain Don Antonio del Río: Followed by Teatro Critico Americano, or, a Critical Investigation and Research into the History of the Americans, by Doctor Paul Felix Cabrera*. London: Henry Berthoud & Suttaby, Evance & Fox, 1822.
- Rivero y Ustáriz, Mariano Eduardo de. *Colección de memorias científicas, agrícolas é industriales publicadas en distintas épocas*. 2 vols. Brussels: H. Goemaere, 1857.
- Rivero y Ustáriz, Mariano Eduardo de, and Johann Jakob von Tschudi. *Antigüedades Peruanas*. Vienna: Imperial de la corte y del estado 1851.
- _____. *Peruvian Antiquities*. Translated by Francis L. Hawks. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1853.
- "Robert B. Stacy-Judd, A.I.A." *Town and Country Review*. c. 1930.
- Robinson, Cervin and Rosemarie Haag Bletter. *Skyscraper Style: Art Deco New York*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Root, Deborah. *Cannibal Culture: Art, Appropriation, and the Commodification of Difference*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996.
- Roth, Leland M. *Understanding Architecture: Its Elements, History, and Meaning*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.

- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. "A Discourse on the Origin of Inequality," In *The Social Contract and Discourses*. Trans. and Intro. by G. D. H. Cole. New York: Dutton, 1950.
- Rowe, John Howland. "Inca Culture at the Time of the Spanish Conquest." In *Handbook of South American Indians*, 2: 183-330. ed. Julian H. Steward. 7 vols. Bulletin, Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, no. 143 Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1946-59.
- _____. *Max Uhle, 1856-1944: A Memoir of the Father of Peruvian Archaeology*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954.
- Rubin, William, ed. *"Primitivism" in 20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1984.
- Rushing, W. Jackson. *Native American Art and the New York Avant-Garde: A History of Cultural Primitivism*. American Studies Series, ed. William H. Goetzmann. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995.
- Ruskin, John. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1849.
- _____. *The Stones of Venice*. 3 vols., 4 tomes. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1851-53.
- _____. *Modern Painters*. 5 vols. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1851-60.
- Rykwert, Joseph. *The First Moderns: The Architects of the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1980.
- Sabloff, Jeremy A. *The Cities of Ancient Mexico: Reconstructing a Lost World*. London and New York: Thames & Hudson, 1989.
- Sahagún, Fray Bernardino de. *Florentine Codex: General History of the Things of New Spain*. Translated and edited by Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles E. Dibble. 13 vols. Monographs of the School of American Research, no. 14, pts. 1-13. Santa Fe: School of American Research, 1950-82.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Sankovitch, Anne-Marie. "Structure/Ornament and the Modern Figuration of Architecture," *The Art Bulletin*, 80, no. 4 (Dec. 1998): 687-717.
- Schávelzon, Daniel, and Jorge Tomasi. eds. *La Imagen de América: Los dibujos de arqueología Americana de Francisco Mújica Díez de Bonilla*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Fundación CEPPA and Fundación para el avance de los estudios mesoamericanos (FAMSI), 2006.

- Schele, Linda, and David Freidel. *A Forest of Kings: The Untold Story of the Ancient Maya*. New York: William Morrow, 1990.
- Schele, Linda, and Peter Mathews. *The Code of Kings: The Language of Seven Sacred Maya Temples and Tombs*. New York: Scribner, 1998.
- Schwartz, Sheila, ed. *From Architecture to Object: Masterworks of the American Arts & Crafts Movement*. New York: Hirschl & Adler Galleries, 1989.
- Scully, Vincent J. *Frank Lloyd Wright*. New York: George Braziller, 1960.
- _____. *American Architecture and Urbanism*. New York and Washington, DC: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Seler, Eduard, E. Förstemann, Paul Schellhas, Carl Sapper, and E. P. Dieseldorff, ed. and trans. from the German under the Supervision of Charles P. Bowditch. *Mexican and Central American Antiquities, Calendar Systems, and History*, ed. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin, no. 28.. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904.
- Sharer, Robert. *The Ancient Maya*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Sharp, Dennis, ed. *Alfred C. Bossom's American Architecture, 1903-1926*. London: Book Art, 1984.
- Sherwood, George H. *General Guide to the Exhibition Halls of the American Museum of Natural History*, no. 35, Guide Leaflet Series, AMNH, ed. Mary Cynthia Dickerson. New York: American Museum of Natural History, November 1911.
- Sky, Alison, and Michelle Stone. *Unbuilt America: Forgotten Architecture in the United States from Thomas Jefferson to the Space Age*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Smith, Kathryn. *Frank Lloyd Wright: Hollyhock House and Olive Hill: Buildings and Projects for Aline Barnsdall*. New York: Rizzoli, 1992.
- Smith, Michael E. *The Aztecs*. 1st paperback ed. The Peoples of America, ed. Alan and Dean Snow Kolata. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
- Spinden, Herbert J. *A Study of Maya Art: Its Subject Matter and Historical Development. Memoirs of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. 6. Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum, 1913; Reprint, New York: Dover Publications, 1975.

- _____. *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America*. Handbook Series, American Museum of Natural History, no. 3. New York: American Museum Press, 1917.
- _____. *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America*. Unabridged republication of 3rd and Rev. ed., 1928. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 1999.
- Squier, Ephraim George. *Aboriginal Monuments of the State of New-York. Comprising the Results of Original Surveys and Explorations, with an Illustrative Appendix*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1850.
- _____. *The Serpent Symbol, and the Worship of the Reciprocal Principles of Nature in America*. American Archaeological Researches, no. 1. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1851.
- _____. *Nicaragua: Its People, Scenery, Monuments and the Proposed Interoceanic Canal*. New York: D. Appleton, 1852.
- _____. *Notes on Central America; Particularly the States of Honduras and San Salvador: Their Geography, Topography, Climate, Population, Resources, Productions, etc., etc., and the Proposed Honduras Inter-Oceanic Railway*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1855.
- _____. *The States of Central America; Their Geography, Topography, etc. . . . Chapters on Honduras, San Salvador . . . the Bay Islands, the Mosquito shore, and the Honduras Inter-Oceanic Railway*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1858.
- _____. *Honduras; Descriptive, Historical, and Statistical*. London: Trübner & Co., 1870.
- _____. *Peru: Incidents of Travel and Exploration in the Land of the Incas*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1877.
- _____. *Peru: Incidents of Travel and Exploration in the Land of the Incas*. vol. 9. Antiquities of the New World: Early Explorations in Archaeology. New York: Harper & Bros., 1877. Reprint, New York: AMS Press for Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 1973.
- Squier, Ephraim George, and Edwin Hamilton Davis. *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley*. New York: Bartlett and Cincinnati: J. A. & U. P. James, 1848.
- Stacy-Judd, Robert B. "Maya Architecture." *Pacific Coast Architect* 30, no. 5 (Nov. 1926): 26-31, 53.
- _____. *The Ancient Mayas: Adventures in the Jungles of Yucatan*. Los Angeles: Haskell-Travers, 1934.

- _____. "Maya Architecture: Architect-Explorer Replies to Critic," *Architect and Engineer* 124 (Feb. 1936): 19-23.
- _____. *Atlantis, Mother of Empires*. Los Angeles: De Vorss & Co., 1939. Reprint, Kempton, IL: Adventures Unlimited Press, 1999.
- _____. *Kabah: Adventures in the Jungles of Yucatan*. Hollywood, CA: House-Warven Publishers, 1951.
- Stacy-Judd, Robert B., as told to R. P. White. "Move for True American Architecture Growing: Local Man's Dream of Recalling Mayan Civilization Reflected in New Building Trends." *Los Angeles Times*. 20 August 1933, p. 23, col. 1.
- Starr, Kevin. *Americans and the California Dream, 1850-1915*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Stein, Roger B. "The Aesthetic Craze." *ARTnews* 85, no. 10 (December 1986): 100-105.
- Steinhardt, Nancy Shatzman. "East Asia: Architectural History Across War Zones and Political Boundaries." In *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 35, 177-89. Studies in the History of Art, vol. 35. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- Stephens, John L. *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan*. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Bros., 1841; Reprint, New York: Dover Publications, 1969.
- _____. *Incidents of Travel in Yucatan*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1843.
- Stephens, John L., and Karl Ackerman. *Incidents of Travel in Yucatan*. New ed. Washington DC and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1996.
- Stokstad, Marilyn. *Art History*. New York: Harry N. Abrams and Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995.
- Stolpe, Hjalmar. "Utvecklings-företeelser i Naturfolkens Ornamentik: Etnografisk Undersökning." *Ymer* (1890): 193-250.
- _____. *On Evolution in the Ornamental Art of Savage Peoples*. Translated by Mrs. H. C. March. Reprinted from *Transactions of the Rochdale Literary and Scientific Society*. Rochdale, U.K.: J. Clegg, 1903.
- _____. "On Evolution in the Ornamental Art of Savage Peoples: Studies in American Ornamentation." 1-57. In *Collected Essays in Ornamental Art*, ed. Hjalmar Stolpe, 1-57. Stockholm: Aftonbladets Tryckeri, 1927.

- Stone-Miller, Rebecca. *Art of the Andes: From Chavín to Inca*. 2d ed. World of Art. London and New York: Thames & Hudson, 2002.
- Stübel, Alfons, and Uhle, Max. *Die Ruinenstaette von Tiahuanaco im Hochlande des alten Perú : Eine Kulturgeschichtliche Studie auf grund Selbstaendiger aufnahmen*. 2 vols. in 1. Leipzig: Verlag von Karl W. Hiersemann, 1892.
- Sund, Judy. "Beyond the Grave: The Twentieth-Century Afterlife of West Mexican Burial Effigies." *The Art Bulletin* 82, no. 4 (Dec. 2000): 734-67.
- Sutro, Dirk. *San Diego Architecture: From Missions to Modern, A Guide to the Buildings, Planning, People and Spaces That Shape the Region*. San Diego: San Diego Architectural Foundation, 2002.
- Sweeney, Robert L. *Wright in Hollywood: Visions of a New Architecture*. New York: Architectural History Foundation; Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1994.
- Swenarton, Mark. *Artisans and Architects: The Ruskinian Tradition in Architectural Thought*. Basingstoke, Houndmills, UK and London: Macmillan Press, 1989.
- Taft, Grace Ellis. *Chimalman, and Other Poems*. New York: The Cameo Press, 1916.
- Tello, Julio C. *Introducción a la historia antigua del Peru*. Lima: Sanmarti y Cía, 1922.
- Thistlewaite, Mark. *Painting in the Grand Manner: The Art of Peter Frederick Rothermel (1812-1895)*. Chads Ford, PA: Brandywine River Museum, 1995.
- Toker, Franklin. *Fallingwater Rising: Frank Lloyd Wright, E. J. Kaufmann, and America's Most Extraordinary House* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 2003).
- Torgovnick, Marianna. *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Totten, George Oakley. *Maya Architecture*. Washington, DC: Maya Press, 1926.
- Tozzer, Alfred M. "Charles Pickering Bowditch." *American Anthropologist* 23, no. 3 (July 1921): 353-59.
- Truettner, William H. "Storming the Teocalli—Again: Or, Further Thoughts on Reading History Paintings" *American Art* 9, no. 3 (Autumn 1995): 56- 95.
- Tschudi, Johann Jakob von. *Travels in Peru during the Years 1838-1842: On the Coast, in the Sierra, across the Cordilleras and the Andes, into the Primeval Forests*. Translated by Thomasina Ross. New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1847.

- _____. *Travels in Peru: On the Coast, in the Sierra, across the Cordilleras and the Andes, into the Primeval Forests*. Trans. Thomasina Ross. New York: A.S. Barnes and Cincinnati: H. W. Derby, 1854.
- Tselos, Dimitri. "Exotic Influences in the Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright." *Magazine of Art: The American Confederation of Arts* (April 1953): 160-69, 184.
- _____. "Frank Lloyd Wright and World Architecture." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 28, no. 1 (1969): 58-72.
- Tunick, Susan. *Terra-Cotta Skyline: New York's Architectural Ornament*. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997.
- Upton, Dell. "Outside the Academy: A Century of Vernacular Studies, 1890-1990." In *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 199-213. Studies in the History of Art, vol. 35. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- _____. *Architecture in the United States*. Oxford History of Art. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Urcid Serrano, Javier. *Zapotec Hieroglyphic Writing*. Studies in Pre-Columbian Art and Archaeology, no. 34. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001.
- Vaillant, George C. "Enlivening the Past." *Natural History* 31 (1931): 530-38.
- Valentine, Maggie. *The Show Starts on the Sidewalk: An Architectural History of the Movie Theatre, Starring S. Charles Lee*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Van Zanten, David. "Chicago in Architectural History." In *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 91-99. Studies in the History of Art, vol. 35. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- Varnedoe, Kirk. "Abstract Expressionism." In *"Primitivism" In 20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern*, ed. William Rubin, vol. 2: 614-59. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1984.
- Vidler, Anthony. *The Writing of the Walls: Architectural Theory in the Late Enlightenment*. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1987.

Viollet-le-Duc, Eugène-Emmanuel. *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle*. 10 vols. Paris: B. Bance, A. Morel, 1854-68.

_____. *Entretiens sur l'architecture*. 2 vols. Paris: A. Morel, 1863-72.

_____. *Histoire de l'habitation humaine depuis les temps pré-historiques jusqu'à nos jours*. Paris: Bibliothèque d'éducation et de récréation, 1874-75.

_____. *The Habitations of Man in All Ages*. Translated by Benjamin Bucknall. Boston: J. R. Osgood, 1876; Reprint: New York: Benjamin Blom, 1971.

_____. "Originality in American Architecture," *American Architect and Building News* 3 (5 January 1878).

_____. *Discourses on Architecture*. Translated by Benjamin Van Brunt. 2 vols. Boston: Ticknor and Co., 1889-90.

_____. *The Foundations of Architecture: Selections from the Dictionnaire Raisonné*. Translated by Kenneth D. Whitehead. New York: George Braziller, 1990.

Voltaire [François-Marie Arouet]. *Voltaire's Philosophical Dictionary*. Selected and translated by H. I. Woolf. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1924.

W., G. M. "Obituary: Hiram Bingham." *The Geographical Review* 46, no. 4 (Oct. 1956): 581.

Waggoner, Diane, ed. *The Beauty of Life: William Morris and the Art of Design*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 2003.

Waldeck, Frédéric de. *Voyage pittoresque et archéologique dans la Province d'Yucatan (Amérique Centrale) pendant les années 1834 et 1836*. Paris: B. Dufour & Co., 1838.

_____. *Viaje pintoresco y arqueológico a la Provincia de Yucatán*, ed. Josefina Lusardi Mahía. Translated from the French by Teresa Foucaud de Romero and Ayelen Romero Foucaud. Mexico City Grupo Condumex, 1996.

Waterman, Thomas Talbot. *Bandelier's Contribution to the Study of Ancient Mexican Social Organization*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 12, no. 7. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1917.

Watkin, David, et al. *Grand Hotel: The Golden Age of Palace Hotels; An Architectural and Social History*. London: J. M. Dent, 1984.

- Weisberg, Gabriel P., and Yvonne M.L. Weisberg. *Japonisme: An Annotated Bibliography*. New Brunswick, NJ: International Center for Japonisme, Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey; New York: Garland Publishers, 1990.
- Whiffen, Marcus, and Carla Breeze. *Pueblo Deco: The Art Deco Architecture of the Southwest*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.
- White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- Whymper, Edward. *Travels Amongst the Great Andes of the Equator*. London: J. Murray, 1892.
- Wichmann, Siegfried. *Japonisme: The Japanese Influence on Western Art since 1858*. Translated from the German by Mary Whittall, et al. New York: Thames & Hudson, 1999.
- Wiener, Charles. *Pérou et Bolivie: Récit de voyage suivi d'études archéologiques et ethnographiques et de notes sur l'écriture et les langues des populations indiennes*. Travaux de l'Institut Français d'Etudes Andines, vol. 56. Paris: Hachette & cie., 1880.
- _____. *Perú y Bolivia: Relato de viaje; Seguido de estudios arqueológicos y etnográficos y de notas sobre la escritura y los idiomas de las poblaciones indígenas*. Translated into Castillian by Edgardo Rivera Martinez. Lima: Institut Francés de Estudios Andinos y Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, 1880.
- Willey, Gordon R., and Jeremy A. Sabloff. *A History of American Archaeology*. 2d ed. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co., 1980.
- Williams, "Collecting and Exhibiting Pre-Columbiana in France and England, 1870-1930," in *Collecting the Pre-Columbian Past: A Symposium of Dumbarton Oaks*, ed. Elizabeth Hill Boone, 123-40. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1993.
- Wilson, Richard Guy, Dianne H. Pilgrim, and Dickran Tashjian. *The Machine Age in America, 1918-1941*. New York: The Brooklyn Museum and Harry N. Abrams, 1986.
- Winter, John and Elisabeth West FitzHugh. "Some Technical Notes on Whistler's 'Peacock Room'." *Studies in Conservation* 30, no. 4 (November 1985): 149-54.

- Wöfflin, Heinrich. *The Sense of Form in Art: A Comparative Psychological Study*. Translated from the German by Alice Muehsam and Norma A. Shatan. New York: Chelsea Pub. Co., 1958.
- _____. *Renaissance and Baroque*. Translated by Kathrin Simon. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966.
- Woods, Mary N. "History in the Early American Architectural Journals." In *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 77-89. *Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 35. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- Woodward, Christopher. *In Ruins*. London: Chatto & Windus, 2001.
- Wright, Frank Lloyd. "In the Cause of Architecture." 155-221. *Architectural Record* 23, no. 3 (March 1908).
- _____. *An Autobiography*. New York: Horizon Press, 1932. Reprint, New York: Horizon Press, 1977.
- _____. *A Testament*. New York: Horizon Press, 1957.
- Wright, Gwendolyn, and Janet Parks, eds. *The History of History in American Schools of Architecture, 1865-1975*. New York: The Temple Hoyne Buell Center for the Study of American Architecture and Princeton Architectural Press, 1990.
- Wurster, Wolfgang W., ed. *Max Uhle (1856-1944): Pläne Archäologischer Stätten im Andengebiet/Planos de Sitios arqueológicos en el Área Andina*. Mainz am Rhein, Germany: Verlag Philipp von Zabern; Berlin: Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut Preussischer Kulturbesitz; Bonn: Kommission für Allgemeine und Vergleichende Archäologischen Instituts, 1999.
- Yochelson, Ellis L. *The National Museum of Natural History: Seventy-Five Years in the New National Museum*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1985. Reprint, *The National Museum of Natural History: Seventy-Five Years in the Natural History Building*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990.