It is significant that the proposed test was not a verbal criticism but a visual comparison. The suggestion was in some ways akin to the provision by the emerging museums of the late 18th and early 19th century for special artists' days in which painters could copy, and be inspired by, the masterpieces on display.

Once architects were encouraged to look for verities in the past rather than follow the master to whom they were apprenticed and were, moreover, to replicate the discovered typology, it became increasingly necessary to work on the basis of some theory. This was particularly true in the period of the Enlightenment when reason was seen as the proper foundation of action.

The two theories which held sway were that perfection resided in some earlier period. In the case of 18th-century France it was 5th century B.C. Greece. The second theory was that buildings have particular characteristics depending on their purpose. Stylistically the result was neo-classicism. The basic argument was, however, no different from Pugin's illogical thesis that the Gothic represented true Christian architecture and was therefore to be imitated. He totally discounted the fact Rome, untouched by Gothic, was intimately associated with Christianity and that the Byzantine was linked to the Eastern Church for centuries and indeed pre-dated Gothic.

What was not made clear was how to find the particular appropriate model or how to choose between possibly competing models. Ledoux had built a series of *barriers* around Paris and was taken to task by Quatremère 'for the indiscriminate mingling of antique types, none of which seemed to answer the requirements of monumental gateways ... A correct "type" for imitation, that of the triumphal arch, he implied, would have led to a more suitable architecture for entrances to the city' (Vidler, 1987, p.168).

Both Quatremère and Pugin favoured continuity to innovation. Both had a discernible effect on what was built: in one case neo-classicism, in the other Victorian Gothic:

the Houses of Parliament, law courts, and a proliferation of churches.

The teaching at the Bauhaus was based on quite different assumptions. Students were not encouraged to look for precedents but to create designs from the nature of materials and the technology of production, the constraints of function and the compositional patterns of abstract art. Continuity tended to be derided while innovation was fostered. But that innovation remained within certain limits which represented the approved visual vocabulary so that we can today recognise a Bauhaus style.

Below
Architecture de C.N. Ledoux, Edition de Ramee 1847; plate 27 showing one of the *Propylées de Paris*