

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
Certification of Final Version of Dissertation

Dissertation Title:

Byzantium in Bavaria: Art, Architecture and History
between Empiricism and Invention in the Post-Napoleonic Era

I attest that the text of this electronic document is the final version of my dissertation, incorporating all corrections and other emendations requested by my Ph.D. Supervising Committee during or before the Final Oral Examination.

Signature of Author: Jeanne-Marie Whate
Date: 10 Dec. 2007

I confirm that this electronic document is the final version as described above.

Signature of Dissertation director: W. McKinney
Date: July 22, 2008

Byzantium in Bavaria:
Art, Architecture and History between Empiricism and Invention
in the Post-Napoleonic Era

by

Jeanne-Marie Musto

December, 2007

Submitted to the Faculty of Bryn Mawr College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**Byzantium in Bavaria:
Art, Architecture and History between Empiricism and Invention
in the Post-Napoleonic Era**

Jeanne-Marie Musto

Chapter One. Introduction

1. Byzantiums Tangible and Transcendent	6
2. Overview of the Corpus of Bavarian Byzantium	18
3. Methodology and Primary Sources	23
4. Interpretive Approach	27
5. Secondary Sources	31
6. Geopolitical and Confessional Framework	36
7. Imitation vs. Emulation	43
8. Stylistic Terminology	49
9. Organization	80

Chapter Two. Historical Framework

1. Ludwig as Crown Prince of the New Kingdom of Bavaria	85
2. Restoration Bavaria and the Greek War of Independence	88
3. The July Revolution and a Bavarian on the New Greek Throne	92
4. German Byzantium between the Classical and Gothic ideals	93
5. Enlightenment vs, Byzantium	95
6. Romantic Byzantium	98

7. Art and Architectural History as Geography	107
8. The Brotherhood of St. Luke	108
9. The Stability of Early Nineteenth-Century Byzantiums	111
Chapter Three. Byzantium between Ancient and Modern	
1. Ludwig in Italy: From Classical Greece to Byzantium	113
2. The German Search for Byzantium	117
3. An Italo-German Byzantium	122
4. The First Bavarian Byzantine Renovation: Speyer Cathedral	124
5. Ludwig and the Palatine Chapel in Palermo	135
6. Ludwig inherits the Bavarian Throne	138
7. Art from the East: The Pinakothek Loggias	140
8. A Bavarian Byzantine Revival Begins: the Allerheiligenhofkapelle	146
9. Heß's, Schraudolf's and Schwarzmann's Byzantine Revival Frescoes	160
10. Reception of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle	168
11. Klenze's Model Byzantine Church: St. Michael and John the Baptist, Eltmann	166
12. Klenze's Western Byzantium: St. Salvator, Donaustauf	172
Chapter Four. Byzantine vs. Gothic Polychromy: Ludwig's Restoration of Bamberg's Cathedral of St. Peter and St. George	
1. Ludwig I's Program to Undo Bamberg's Post-Medieval Polychromy	181
2. Early Nineteenth-Century Appreciation of Medieval Polychromy	192
3. Ludwig's Early Fascination with Classical Polychromy	203

4. Crown Prince Ludwig's Early Explorations of Medieval Polychromy in Tandem with Late Classicizing Renovations at Bamberg Cathedral	208
5. Byzantine Bamberg 1. Rupprecht Discovers Traces of Medieval Paint	218
6. Byzantine Bamberg 2: The Restoration under Heideloff	234
7. Byzantine Bamberg 3: Gärtner Takes Over	245
8. <i>The Little Byzantine</i>	250
9. German Style Stained Glass and Classical Purity	255
10. Byzantine vs. German to Romanesque vs. Gothic	257

Chapter Five. Eastern vs. German Byzantine

1. Ludwig of Bavaria and his Crusading Patron Saint: Louis IX of France	261
2. The Ludwigskirche (1828-1844): the Commissions	264
3. The Byzantine Style: Orthodox or Pre-Reformation Catholic?	266
4. Friedrich Wilhelm III of Prussia and the New Greek Chapel of St. Alexander Nevsky, Potsdam (ca. 1826-28)	270
5. Ludwig's Catholic Philhellenism: Klenze Renovates St. Salvator, Munich, as a New Greek Church (1828-30)	273
6. Ludwig, Gärtner and the Purified Byzantine Style	275
7. Cornelius's Christian Vision: Byzantine?	277
8. Cornelius's Christian Vision and Confessional Polarization	284
9. Bavarian Byzantine Glazing	287
10. The Evolution of Gärtner's Architectural Ideas	290
11. The Ludwigskirche on the Ludwigsstraße: A Byzantine Heart for Bavaria's New Political and Intellectual Establishment	295
12. Gärtner Approaches Byzantium	296

13. Klenze Evaluates Gärtner's Plans: Style as Confessional Politics	301
14. Parallels between Gärtner's Ludwigskirche and Klenze's Byzantine Style	304
15. Gärtner's Purified Byzantine Style and Winckelmann's Call to Imitation	308
16. Gärtner's Changes to the Approved Ludwigskirche Façade	310
17. The Ludwigskirche's Ornamental Fresco Program	314
18. Reception of the Ludwigskirche as Byzantine	329
Chapter Six. Conclusion and Significance of Bavarian Byzantium	
1. Bavarian Byzantium in the 1830s: Confessional Politics in Greece and the Emergence of Competing Byzantiums	334
2. From the Bavarian Byzantine to the Russian Byzantine Revival Style	343
3. Ludwig's Creation of a Second Historicizing Style for Synagogues and its Impact on the Spread of the Byzantine Revival Style	357
4. Semper's and Rosengarten's Byzantine Synagogues in Dresden and Kassel	374
5. Ludwig's Last Essay in the Byzantine Revival: The Interior of Speyer Cathedral (and Mannheim Synagogue)	378
6. The Transition to Romanesque: Hübsch's Westwork at Speyer Cathedral	389
7. Conclusion. Ludwig I's Byzantium: Between Empiricism and Invention	394
Bibliography	399
List of Plates	
1. Maps	425
2. Illustrations	426

... I think that if I could be given a month of antiquity and leave to spend it where I chose, I would spend it in Byzantium a little before Justinian opened St. Sophia and closed the Academy of Plato. ... I think that in early Byzantium, and maybe never before or since in recorded history, religious, aesthetic and practical life were one, that architect and artificers... spoke to the multitude and the few alike. The painter and the mosaic worker, the worker in gold and silver, the illuminator of Sacred Books were almost impersonal, almost perhaps without the consciousness of individual design, absorbed in their subject matter and that the vision of a whole people. They could copy out of old Gospel books those pictures that seemed as sacred as the text, and yet weave all into a vast design, the work of many that seemed the work of one, that made building, picture, pattern, metal work of rail and lamp, seem but a single image; and this vision, this proclamation of their invisible master had the Greek nobility, Satan always the still half divine Serpent, never the horned scarecrow of the didactic Middle Ages.

—Book 3, *A Vision*,
W.B. (William Butler) Yeats (1865-1939),
privately printed in 1925¹

Of Colored Glass

I am very moved by one detail
in the coronation at Vlachernai of John Kantakuzinos
and Irini, daughter of Andronikos Asan.
Because they had only a few precious stones
(our afflicted empire was extremely poor)
they wore artificial ones: numerous pieces of glass,
red, green, or blue. I find
nothing humiliating or undignified in those little pieces of colored glass.
On the contrary, they seem
a sad protest against
the unjust misfortune of the couple being crowned,
symbols of what they deserved to have,
of what surely it was right that they should have
at their coronation—a Lord John Kantakuzinos,
a Lady Irini, daughter of Andronikos Asan.

— C. (Constantine) P. Cavafy (1863-1933),
privately printed, Feb. 27th, 1925;
translated from Greek by Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard²

¹ William Butler Yeats, *A Vision: An Explanation of Life Founded upon the Writings of Giraldus and upon Certain Doctrines Attributed to Kusta ben Luka* (London: privately printed for subscribers only by T. Werner Laurie, 1925), 190-91; reprinted in *A Critical Edition of Yeats's A Vision (1925)*, ed. George Mills Harper and Walter Kelly Hood (London: MacMillan, 1978), 190-91.

Chapter One Introduction

1. Byzantiums Tangible and Transcendent

In the 1920s the Anglo-Irish poet William Butler Yeats, a senator in the newly established Irish Free State, wrote of a Byzantium where art and artifice conspired to elevate individuals to oneness with their society and their god.³ This depiction of Byzantium suggested a model for rebuilding peace and harmony in his country, which had just emerged from a brutal civil war. Yeats's contemporary, Constantine P. Cavafy, who had retired from more mundane government service in Alexandria, Egypt, looked back through his Ottoman Greek heritage to a troubled Byzantium which he nevertheless described with equivalent admiration and longing. His depictions of Byzantium brought to life the post-classical Graecophone empire to which the regions that constituted the

² Constantine P. Cavafy, *Collected Poems*, trans. Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard, ed. George Savidis, rev. ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 133.

³ It is interesting to note in regard to the intersection of poetic, scholarly and political interpretations of Byzantium at this moment that Yeats relied on the work of Joseph Strzygowski (1862-1941), and specifically incorporated Strzygowski's interpretation of Iconoclasm as a breath of wisdom from the East into his discussion: "If Strzygowski is right we may see in the destruction of images but a destruction of what was Greek in decoration accompanied perhaps by a renewed splendour in all that came down from the ancient Persian Paradise, an episode in some attempt to make theology more ascetic, spiritual and abstract.... The return of the images must, as I see things, have been the failure of synthesis... and the first sinking in and dying down of Christendom into the heterogeneous loam. Europe grew animal and literal..." Yeats, *A Vision*, 193. Strzygowski's interpretation of the flow of culture from the East into Germany revived the anti-Latin themes of the early nineteenth century, while incorporating an overt anti-Semitism into them that presaged his embrace of Nazi cultural politics towards the end of his life (as will be addressed in Chapter Six).

modern Greek nation (which Cavafy never visited) had been largely peripheral.⁴ Many Greeks understood it nevertheless as the modern nation's rightful inheritance, and as recently as 1919 the Greek army had landed at Smyrna on a mission that had raised Greek hopes of the resurrection of the Byzantine Empire. This mission, which intolerably threatened the new Turkish nation, resulted in the brutal expulsion of the Greeks from Anatolia and the destruction of Byzantine monuments; this brutality was answered by the expulsion of Turks from modern Greece and the destruction of Ottoman monuments. It is in the immediate aftermath of the bloodshed and destruction that closed the door forever on the dream of a physical resurrection of Byzantium that Cavafy sought to revive it incorporeally through the glimmer of false gemstones. Both Yeats and Cavafy provided paradigmatic, although radically different, representations of a Byzantium whose walls and surfaces offered transcendent experiences of the world beyond mere material substance.

In these passages, as for so many depictions of Byzantium, the physical and spiritual core of the empire was Hagia Sophia (St. Sophia, Holy Wisdom) in Istanbul, once the church of both Patriarch and Emperor [**fig. 2.2 a-d**]. Yeats imagined himself present while Emperor Justinian rebuilt the church from 532 to 537, following its destruction due to civil unrest. Cavafy more obscurely referred to a time eight centuries later, when the state was so poor it could not afford to repair Hagia Sophia: in 1347 the royal couple had to be crowned at nearby St. Mary's in Blachernai instead. Byzantium's core had been displaced and its treasury was bare. Some five and three-quarter centuries after this coronation, shortly before Yeats and Cavafy wrote their lines, Kemal Ataturk

⁴ With the notable exception of Thessaloniki, important to both the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires, which modern Greece wrested from Ottoman control in 1912.

(1881-1938), founder and first president of the Turkish Republic, transformed Hagia Sophia into a museum from the mosque it had been ever since the Ottomans took Constantinople in 1453. Expanded access to this, the paradigmatic monument of the once powerful Byzantine Empire, helped art historians to pursue the study of Byzantine art and architecture with renewed vigor and to establish the subject's parameters in terms that remain recognizable to scholars today.

Byzantium's surviving physical remains continue to be explored in ever-greater depth and extent. As a result, we now have easy access to detailed knowledge of a broad range of Byzantine works, including centrally-planned churches with their mosaics and icons, secular and sacred enamels, jewelry, ivories, manuscripts and luxurious silks. We also have works in humbler materials. In using archaeological investigations and scientific analyses to inform our understandings of Byzantium, today's art historians are the heirs of Atatürk and the objective frameworks he helped to institutionalize. His transformation of Byzantium's focal monument into a museum did not, however, succeed in diffusing the former empire's ideological significance for peoples of many backgrounds and persuasions. In the ways in which Byzantium continues to be interpreted – for instance, as the rightful inheritance of one nation or confession, or as a multicultural precedent for the modern Western world – we remain equally the heirs of the ideologically-informed visions of Yeats and Cavafy.

In the eighteenth century, Enlightenment luminaries such as Voltaire had interpreted Byzantium as the unenlightened counter-pole to classical antiquity. With the early nineteenth-century re-interpretation of Byzantium in a positive light came the integration of claims to a Byzantine inheritance into modern political and confessional

identities. These claims inspired the empirical investigation of Byzantine art and architecture and the two have functioned in an opposed and mutually-reinforcing dialectical relationship ever since. As echoed by Yeats, early nineteenth-century intellectuals freed Byzantium from the taint of irrationality, decay, and other negative associations of the Middle Ages in the West and redefined it as the bearer of classical Greece nobility into the post-Classical world. This re-interpretation originated in German lands, and among these, none pursued it more vigorously or broadly than the Kingdom of Bavaria. This turning-point, when Byzantine art and architecture gained much of the resonance that they retain today, forms the focus of this dissertation.

Specifically, the following chapters examine the significance of Byzantium in Bavaria during the 1820s and 1830s, when Ludwig I (1786-1868), King of Bavaria from 1825 to 1848, commissioned the first major Byzantine revival buildings and renovations in Western Europe: the Allerheiligenhofkapelle and the Ludwigskirche in Munich, and the renovation of the Cathedral of Sts. Peter and George in Bamberg. Ludwig drew on scholarship from the preceding two decades that had defined “Byzantine” as the style not only of the Byzantine Empire itself but also of German lands until the thirteenth century. Ludwig’s Byzantine projects served as more than expressions of his aesthetic taste. They also served as vehicles for his complex understanding of Bavaria’s confessional and national identity, and as resources for exploring his deep intellectual commitment to objects as evidence of the past and as bearers of the sacred.⁵ Inasmuch as their goals did

⁵ Ludwig’s approach to material objects mirrored the commitment to the sacramentality of objects that had been a defining characteristic of medieval Catholicism. For discussion of this sacramentality, which had been re-asserted by the Catholic Church in response to the Protestant Reformation, see Richard P. McBrien, *Catholicism*, rev. ed. (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1994), 10 and 1199.

not contradict Ludwig's, the different constellations of artists and architects who carried out his projects incorporated their own interpretations and researches into the commissions. While Ludwig at times grew irritated with proposals that did not reflect his desire to re-valorize Byzantium, the patience and support he provided for efforts to research commissions that did reflect this goal were considerable. As a result, each project interpreted Byzantine art and architecture differently: as transmitters of Europe's classical Greek inheritance; as keys to defining and reviving medieval architectural polychromy; as bridges or barriers between Eastern and Western cultures.

In developing their interpretations of Byzantium Ludwig and his artists and architects made use of emerging ideas about how art and architectural styles embody cultural, confessional and political identities. What is more, they examined historical monuments and read the most up-to-date scholarship for clues to how past cultures, confessions and polities had influenced one another across time and place. The Bavarian artists and architects working for Ludwig thus did not develop the Byzantine style in a vacuum: they were responding to, challenging and extending the larger matrix of historical and geographical interpretations of art and architecture. They did so in order to provide creative solutions to Ludwig's own unique constellation of cultural, confessional and political loyalties, though they had, by today's standards, almost no information about what Byzantine art and architecture actually looked like. The multiple renditions of Byzantium they nevertheless created help us to better interpret the difference between our approach to the subject and theirs, and to better understand the post-Napoleonic era in which their renditions made sense. Their Byzantium reveals our disciplinary forebears' approach to the historiography of art, and so brings our relationship to our own cultural

and disciplinary environment into relief. By extension, because Bavarian Byzantium so little resembles our own, it requires careful analysis to perceive the extent to which its highly situated articulation influenced subsequent revival-style art and architecture, and revival-style renovations of existing works. An understanding the scope of this influence is key to interpreting the later works, whether we wish to integrate it into our analyses or we wish to exclude it from them.

It is not my goal to extract from nineteenth-century Bavarian Byzantine monuments a story of progress towards scientific, empirically grounded taxonomies, but instead to demonstrate the ways in which stylistic categories are important. While I am investigating stylistic categories largely in terms of the external pressures and possibilities that shaped them, I wish to suggest that stylistic categories per se, and their associated terminology, were not merely artificial constructs imposed upon the objects they purported to describe, and that stylistic categories as such have not ceased to be relevant or useful. The effort to establish an abstract framework of stylistic categories so absolute that works that did not fit it could be determined not to have a style is already evident in Winckelmann, the first scholar to bring questions of style to the foreground of art historical analysis.⁶ Stylistic categories have continuously shifted and changed in response to new ways of looking and to new works. This shifting is due to the inevitably context-dependent nature of these categories. While dependence on context is immediately evident when one looks back on early nineteenth-century Bavarian interpretations of what was Byzantine, context dependence is equally fundamental to any other effort to pinpoint a style.

⁶ E.g., according to Winckelmann the Romans were a people with no style of their own: Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 284-85.

Among the most recent generation of art historians, the hermeneutic problems raised by working with such a mutable concept as style – one for which there remains no absolute definition – have led some to advocate for greatly limiting stylistic analysis or eliminating it altogether.⁷ But this is to place theoretical imperatives above concerns for the visual evidence of history. By contrast, the people working for Ludwig gave a clear indication of how content and meaning inhere in a work by virtue of its formal relationships to other works, whether its form has been consciously manipulated in reference to these other works or not.⁸ Without denying the validity of approaching artworks as incomparable or transcendent and so outside any stylistic (or other) context, early nineteenth-century Bavarian sources negotiated between grounding their Byzantine styles, to the best of their ability, on the available evidence, and deducing Platonic categories from this evidence. Arguably, the perception of a work's incomparability or transcendence itself implies a similarly abstracted knowledge of relationships to which it

⁷ An early history of the concept of style in art history, Willibald Sauerländer, "From Stylus to Style: Reflections on the Fate of a Notion," *Art History* 6 (1983): 253-70, concluded that as long as stylistic analysis "is limited to the description and the classification of the formal aspects of artifacts and as long as this analysis is handled with rational control it will continue to serve as a properly effective tool," but for all other purposes its use is problematic at best (267-68); this was followed by further critiques that proposed to banish the analysis of style from art history altogether. Presumably on this basis, the first edition of Robert Nelson and Richard Schiff, eds., *Critical Terms for Art History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), had no entry for style at all. An attempt to come to terms with the failure to rid stylistic analysis from the discipline may nevertheless be found in Jas Elsner, "Style," *Critical Terms for Art History*, ed. Nelson and Schiff, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 98-109.

⁸ On the significance of style as integral to content and meaning (cf. Sauerländer, "From Stylus to Style," 267), but as a nevertheless hermeneutically problematic concept in art-historical "stylistic analysis," see Irene Winter, "The Affective Properties of Styles: An Inquiry into Analytical Process and the Inscription of Meaning in Art History," in *Picturing Science, Producing Art*, ed. Caroline A. Jones and Peter Galison, with Amy Slaton (New York and London: Routledge, 1998), 55-77.

is external or which it transcends.⁹ The perspective-dependent nature of such relationships can be considered as a tool rather than a liability.

For grappling with formal characteristics as evidence for historical context, I would suggest that Meyer Schapiro's contention that "style is an essential object of investigation" still rings true, and that his now classic definition of style applies to the early nineteenth century.¹⁰ While his thinking on the matter is complex, in brief he describes style as:

a motive or pattern, or ... some directly grasped quality of the work of art, which helps... to localize and date the work and to establish connections between groups of works or between cultures. Style here is a symptomatic trait, like the non-aesthetic features of an artifact.¹¹

Ludwig's Bavarian Byzantium was, however, not merely symptomatic, nor could it be segregated from aesthetic concerns. In her nuanced reevaluation of Schapiro's definition, Irene Winter has noted that

What Schapiro did not fully account for, however, was the element of agency in the manipulation and organization of form; nor did he engage in the issue of the necessity of style in the materialization of content. What is more, neither Schapiro's basic definition nor his extended discussion takes on the question of whether style in fact inheres in a work, or rather is made to adhere to the work as a product of description, comparison, and classification undertaken by an external analyst.¹²

In this light it could be said that the phenomenon of the Bavarian Byzantine revival style both inheres in the works themselves as physical expressions of a particular intellectual and aesthetic environment, and was made to adhere through external analysis. The

⁹ Cf. Carlo Ginzburg, "Style as Inclusion, Style as Exclusion," in Jones and Galison, *Picturing Science, Producing Art*, 47.

¹⁰ Meyer Schapiro, "Style," in *Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory*, ed. A.L. Kroeber, International Symposium on Anthropology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 287.

¹¹ Schapiro, "Style," 287.

¹² Winter, "The Affective Properties of Styles," 56.

necessity of producing style in “the materialization of content,” whether as a conscious or unconscious manipulation and organization of form, leads Winter to collapse the traditional distinction between style as relating to form and iconography as relating to content and meaning.¹³ In addition to its significance for localization and dating, the integral relationship between style and meaning is a key reason why, in my estimation, analysts of visual culture have not and will not abandon stylistic analysis. As a solution to the question of distinguishing what is intrinsic to the work from what is extrinsic, Winter further proposes

consistently referring to post-hoc determinations as the products of “stylistic analysis.” In that way, style is a function of a period, place, workshop, or hand; it is inherent in the work, and it is thus what is apparent to the perceiver. Stylistic analysis then introduces the conscious observation, selection, and articulation of manifest properties to the act of perception.¹⁴

I would argue, however, that while it is important to consider the question of whether “style in fact inheres in a work, or rather is made to adhere to the work” as a product of analysis, this solution is of limited utility without external documentation from the context in which the work originated because distinguishing the work from our perception of it is impossible: the more rigorous the effort to perceive the work objectively, the more difficult this distinction becomes.

One instance in which the distinction between past and present perceptions of style can clearly be applied is provided by works that were explicitly devised as representations of historical styles. The construction or renovation of works as Byzantine, as occurred in the nineteenth century, had never occurred in Byzantium (which didn’t know itself as “Byzantine”). From commission to creation to reception, the interpretation

¹³ Winter, “The Affective Properties of Styles,” 70-71.

¹⁴ Ibid.

of the early nineteenth-century monuments as Byzantine can be clearly established. Defining these works as, for example, “Romanesque” in style on a post-hoc basis (as has been standard) denies the context in which they were created in favor of later perspectives and is thus appropriate only inasmuch as the early-nineteenth century context has become irrelevant. If there are instances in which it has become irrelevant, however, I would argue that, on the whole, to move beyond a solipsistic approach it is essential to take the historical context of production and reception into account. The framework of stylistic terminology to which this early nineteenth-century Byzantine style belonged may have been far less extensive and sophisticated than that in use today. Those who created and employed the early nineteenth-century framework of art-historical styles were nevertheless similarly attempting to understand and put into practice visual evidence of production, content and reception as part of an integrated process of relating the present to the past. Terminology is an essential clue to their understanding of this relationship.

Ludwig’s Byzantium has been obscured by the intervening ways in which Byzantium has been re-imagined by poets and artists as well as by scholars, and by the new and equally powerful desires and aspirations associated with these interventions. It is a goal of this study to explore Bavarian Byzantium in its own terms and as a product of art historiography and cultural politics — like the Byzantiums of the 1920s and those of today, an uncertain mix of the real and the imaginary. Even though it was a definition of Byzantium that held sway for only a couple of decades and corresponds poorly to the likewise interrelated creative and scholarly Byzantiums of today, Bavarian Byzantium responded to and affected the interpretation of not only Byzantine, but also of ancient

Greek, Islamic and medieval German art and architecture, all of which were understood as connected to one another through the larger umbrella of Byzantium. These shared Byzantine connections provided geographical and historical points of orientation that were arguably of more interest to those who studied, constructed and later emulated Bavarian Byzantium than what we today would define as the “historical” Byzantium.

During the Napoleonic era, increasing numbers of Germans looked back to the eighteenth century, and further back to what is now often termed the Northern Renaissance, as eras when Latin (*welsche*) fashions and values had been imposed on German lands by their neighbors to the south and west (i.e., Italy and France), to the detriment of German culture. Investigating Bavarian Byzantium in its own terms will demonstrate how the primacy of German ties to Greece and the East, both interpreted at this time as wellsprings of Western culture, offered a means of reversing this process. Byzantium provided alternatives to the Latin influences that were held responsible for what was perceived as Germany’s post-medieval decline. Establishing Byzantine architecture as a style of bold polychromy, meanwhile, linked it not only with new understandings of the polychromy of classical Greek art and architecture, itself associated with the polychrome architecture of the East, but also with new ideas about how art, painting and sculpture could be integrated so as to represent and enhance the integration of society. Where Yeats and Cavafy would look to Byzantium to transcend the painful turmoil of their time and place, these earlier visionaries sought to (literally) reorient German culture through making the German connection to Byzantium, and all the further connections it represented, present and tangible.

2. Overview of the Corpus of Bavarian Byzantium

Forging connections with Byzantium was not terribly difficult because, as will be seen, both architects and architectural historians ignored distinctions between Byzantine and Western medieval building practices that have since become integral to art-historical discourse. German and Italian basilicas that would now be ascribed to the Romanesque style of the Latin West (or an earlier style), and even some that would now be considered Gothic, were united within the category of Byzantine. Paintings today described as German Gothic were similarly incorporated into the corpus of Byzantinizing art: the gold backgrounds common to these paintings were considered conclusive evidence of their Byzantine style. Those interested in the Byzantinizing paintings of Germany paid limited attention to how these works actually compared with what were considered the most characteristic Byzantine paintings, painted-panel icons. This is because the icons of the Orthodox Church were believed endlessly to repeat established and simple imagery without originality, and so were little collected. As icons were, moreover, extrinsic to the Western liturgy, there were few available for study. In 1805 Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829) professed an admiration for Byzantine icons that was contrary to general opinion. But even he considered Russian and Ottoman Greek icons as absolutely identical to Byzantine ones, and interchangeably representative of the entire tradition.¹⁵

¹⁵ Schlegel, "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde," 104-05. Schlegel based his observations on an image of the Virgin he had seen reproduced in Marie Alexandre Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français; ou description historique et chronologique des statues, ... bas-reliefs et tombeaux des hommes et de femmes célèbres, pour servir à l'histoire de France et à celle de l'art*, 5 vols. (Paris 1800-06), citing specifically no. 8 on p. 101, as well as three Russian miniatures in the collection of antiquities at the Bibliothèque nationale and an image of the Virgin from San Luigi in Rome (presumably meaning San Luigi dei Francesi), which he had seen in the conservation room at the Louvre.

Byzantine miniatures, though even less accessible, were perceived much the same as icons. The brothers Franz (1786-1831) and Johannes (1787-1860) Riepenhausen, scholarly artists from Göttingen living in Rome, published some items from the Vatican collections in 1810 as examples of Byzantine painting. Like Schlegel, they conflated Russian work with Byzantine.¹⁶ The printed edition (Urbino, 1727) of a Vatican manuscript now known as the Menologion of Basil II (ca. 985) provided Schlegel's former student Sulpiz Boisserée (1783-1854) with black and white engravings of miniatures with which to illustrate the Byzantine origins of German painting.¹⁷ Boisserée

¹⁶ As had Friedrich Schlegel in examining icons in Paris a few years earlier, the Riepenhausens conflated medieval Russian and Byzantine art in their use of miniatures from a Menologion (a book of saints' lives organized according to the liturgical calendar) that they took to be an example of "the earliest Russian monastic production," and thus representative of the art of Cimabue's teachers. The Riepenhausens took the miniatures to be Russian work of the eleventh century; only in the twentieth century were the miniatures re-attributed to a Russian painter of the late 17th century. Birgitte Kuhn-Forte, cat. nos. IV.1 and IV.2 in Kunze, ed., *Zwischen Antike, Klassizismus und Romantik*, 131-32, where she cites Riepenhausen, *Geschichte der Malerei in Italien nach ihrer Entwicklung, Ausbildung und Vollendung. Aus den Werken der besten Künstler anschaulich dargestellt und mit kurzen Erläuterungen und Lebensbeschreibungen begleitet von F. und J. Riepenhausen* [2 vols.: text and plates] (Tübingen: J.G. Cotta, 1810), [text vol.]:1-2.

¹⁷ "Am wichtigsten aber bleibt die durch unseren Sammlungs-Eifer gemachte Entdeckung einer bis zur Zeit Joh. von Eyks fortlaufenden, durchaus die Spuren *griechischer* Bildung verrathenden Art der Malerey, wie man sie uns vor Raphael in Italien beschreibt, und die man nach den bisherigen Meynungen in Deutschland garnicht erwartete; bei den jüngsten Werken aus der letzten Hälfte des 14^t und dem Anfang des 15^t Jahrhunderts erscheint diese Art in großer Schönheit der Köpfe und Gewänder, ungefähr wie Sie die Propheten auf der *perspectivischen* Darstellung des Innern Doms sehen, welche nach wirklichen Statuen gebildet die den gleichzeitigen Gemälden ganz ähnlich sind—; die Behandlung in Gestalt und Farbe ist durchaus verschieden und gefälliger, als was wir gewöhnlich von der deutschen die Natur und in vielen Theilen ziemlich ungeschickt nachahmenden Kunst kennen, es liegen dort offenbahr *ideklische* [!] Grundzüge unter, und die früheren Werke reihen sich immer mehr an die rohen Bildungen der aus den *Menologio* und alten Handschriften bekannten *byzantinischen* Miniaturgemälden [italics retained from source]." Sulpiz Boisserée, letter to Goethe of 8 May 1810, published in Eduard Firmenich-Richartz, *Sulpiz und Melchior Boisserée als Kunstsammler. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Romantik*, v. 1 [only volume published] (Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1916),

included them in a letter to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) also written in 1810. Seroux d'Agincourt's (1730-1814) posthumous *Histoire de l'art par les monuments* (1823), was the first major survey of medieval art and architecture and was widely influential during the 1820s and 30s. He made perhaps the most extensive use of manuscript images at this time, including those of this same Menologion.¹⁸ To illustrate the history of medieval painting he returned to the original manuscript for his images; he drew on the Urbino edition, however, for illustrations of the decline of Byzantine architecture.¹⁹

The use of icons and miniatures as evidence of the Byzantine style in art (or architecture) appears to have declined after this brief spate of investigations. Instead, it was largely the mosaics of the Palatine Chapel in Palermo [**fig. 3.3 c-d**] that inspired Ludwig I's revival of the Byzantine style. The mosaics of San Marco [**fig. 2.3 d**], also widely admired, would provide another model for his artists. These mosaics could only be studied in situ. It seems surprising, nevertheless, that they were not studied more carefully, at least among the Bavarian artists and architects who were reviving and

122-26, esp. p. 125. Boisserée must have been referring to Cardinal Albani's edition of the Menologion of Basil II in the Vatican Library published in Urbino in 1727, which was illustrated with engravings based on the richly illustrated original. Ernst Gombrich, "The Values of the Byzantine Tradition: Goethe's Response to the Boisserée Collection," in *The Documented Image: Visions in Art History*, ed. Gabriel P. Weisberg, and Laurinda S. Dixon (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1987), 294-95; his fig. 15.2 illustrates one of the engravings in the 1727 edition.

¹⁸ Jean Baptiste Louis Georges Seroux d'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'art par les monuments, depuis sa décadence au IV^e siècle jusqu'à son renouvellement au XVI^e*, 5 vols. (Paris: Treuttel et Würtz, 1810-23).

¹⁹ Seroux d'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'art par les monuments*, vol. 3 (1823), *Texte. Description des planches*, "Architecture," 25-27, and "Peinture," 41-42; vol. 4 (1823), *Planches. Architecture et Sculpture*, plate 27, "Tableau général de la décadence de l'Architecture, dans les contrées orientales," figs. 15, 16 and 21; vol. 5 (1823), *Planches. Peinture; première partie*, plates 32 and 33.

building on the interest that Schlegel and others had generated in the Byzantine style.²⁰ The overall effect of mosaics, not their details, was appreciated. The belief that all Byzantine – even all Orthodox – imagery was essentially the same suppressed inclinations to investigate their style, their subjects, or other aspects of them more closely. This belief complemented the desire to find in the religious and artistic traditions that traced their roots to Byzantium a modern means to access a timeless and unchanging, pure if primitive Christianity. This desire echoed the efforts of early anthropologists to discover noble, timeless primitives in other parts of the world, who might provide the civilized West with glimpses of its original, uncorrupted state as postulated by eighteenth-century philosophers such as Rousseau.²¹ In this sense, the positive reinterpretation of Byzantium did not escape the parameters of Enlightenment thought as fully as Schlegel or his followers had intended.

Compared with architecture and painting, there was little interest in the study and creation of specifically Byzantine-revival church plate and other liturgical arts. Though ivories, textiles, enamels and other luxury objects belonging to today's corpus of Byzantine works would have been accessible in various German church treasuries and

²⁰ There is no evidence that any serious study of mosaic programs was carried out by the artists and architects for Ludwig's Byzantine projects. Even the presumably accessible illustrations of mosaics in Seroux d'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'art par les monuments*, vol. 5 (1823), plates 13-18 – among the few published studies of medieval mosaics at this time – do not appear to have influenced their work. Perhaps in part this is because Seroux d'Agincourt begins with ancient Roman mosaics and depicts the later examples as part of a continuous Roman tradition (e.g., plates 14-15: "Peintures en mosaïque de l'église de S^{te} Marie majeure à Rome, mises en parallèle avec des bas-reliefs de la colonne Trajane, v^e siècle". The people working for Ludwig were interested in the Greek and Eastern connections sought in Munich.

²¹ For the impact of such ideas on architectural historiography see Joseph Rykwert, *On Adam's House in Paradise: The Idea of the Primitive Hut in Architectural History*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981), 47-48.

private collections, and could have influenced early nineteenth-century interpretations of Byzantium, they were not yet integrated into the art-historical literature and, at least in German lands, inspired no serious attempts to copy them or their style. Instead, scholars, patrons, artists and architects focused on architecture, paintings, and furnishings such as altars and pulpits. For these, they relied primarily on direct knowledge of the German and Italian churches and paintings they considered Byzantine, on a limited range of prints depicting such buildings and artworks, and on descriptions in unillustrated histories.

Art forms that are no longer considered definitive of Byzantine art and architecture – e.g., frescoes and stained glass – were integral to the nineteenth-century effort to distinguish the Byzantine style, especially the Byzantine revival style, from what is now called the Gothic. During the second decade of the nineteenth century, artists working for Ludwig took a leading role in reviving the largely forgotten art of stained glass, because the foremost German scholars interpreted it as the Western translation of the Byzantine mosaic tradition. Moreover, these scholars attributed the development of this art not to France, but to Germany and specifically to tenth-century Bavaria during what was then considered the Byzantine period of German art. They did this specifically to contradict the eighteenth-century French scholarship that was then standard.

But this was a later development: initially stained glass played no part in the Bavarian commissions in a Byzantine revival style, probably because glazing played little role in the Palatine Chapel in Palermo, which Ludwig I had intended his first Byzantine commission to recreate. While this project was being developed, the question of whether and how to use stained glass was explored in the other Byzantine projects. In the process, the idea that grisaille glazing was characteristic of Byzantine architecture was introduced.

The limited, if not entirely white, color palette of this Byzantine revival glazing did not interfere with the frescoes that also came to be understood as integral to Byzantine structures at this time. Discovery of paint and gilding on the interior walls and sculpture of Bamberg Cathedral, among the most closely studied German buildings then considered Byzantine, proved the historical accuracy of this practice. At the same time, rejection of polychrome stained glass at Bamberg, which contradicted surviving historical evidence, appears to have been driven by the need to clearly distinguish the Byzantine from the Gothic revival style so as to insure the legibility of each. The opposition between wall paintings and stained glass would have an impact on medieval revival architecture long after the Bavarian revival of the Byzantine style ceased to be recognizable as such. Imaginary relationships and oppositions such as these led to a definition of Byzantium based on the desire to strengthen or weaken already perceived connections as much as on any proof of such connections.

3. Methodology and Primary Sources

In tracing how the Bavarian nineteenth-century definition of Byzantium came to be filtered through a constellation of confessional, regional and geopolitical perspectives, I have focused on contemporary texts, including art historical writings, diaries and letters, and art and artworks as primary sources. All reveal the mindset of those who studied, commissioned and produced what they considered to be Byzantine or Byzantinizing art and architecture, and who renovated what they considered to be Byzantine monuments. The main thrust of my research is toward what Byzantium meant to Ludwig I of Bavaria, the first post-Byzantine Western patron of a Byzantine revival style, and to the artists and

architects he employed to produce this style, and how they arrived at its meaning. It has become standard practice to ignore or re-interpret what these artists (and the scholars they relied upon) wrote, so as to make their works conform with modern art-historical understandings of what is or is not Byzantine.²² This practice erases, however unintentionally, the concerns of the time and place in which the works were renovated or created and, by extension, renders illegible the ways in which these concerns were expressed visually.

Teasing out the evolving ideas and agendas of those analyzing and producing Byzantine art and architecture during the first half of the nineteenth century in Bavaria required giving equal weight to different kinds of literary products, including letters, diaries, and published works. I have done this, even though they were not uniformly accessible in Germany during the first half of the nineteenth century. They provide valuable evidence for the range of ideas associated with Byzantine art and architecture when they were written. In certain respects this project echoes those undertaken in regard to the Gothic style by W.D. Robson-Scott and Paul Frankl nearly two generations ago. They too looked to a broad range of sources to explore the changing meanings of the architecture they studied as well as the evolving knowledge of that architecture.²³

Mitchell Benjamin Frank's study of German Romantic painting provides a more recent methodological precedent for my project, since he focused on Romanticism as it was

²² A brief look at the early nineteenth-century concept of "Byzantine" may be found in Henrik Karge, "Zwischen Naturwissenschaft und Kulturgeschichte. Die Entfaltung des Systems der Epochenstile im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Stilfragen zur Kunst des Mittelalters. Eine Einführung*, ed. Bruno Klein and Bruno Boerner (Berlin: Reimer, 2006), 44-47.

²³ Paul Frankl, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations through Eight Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960) and W. D. Robson-Scott, *The Literary Background of the Gothic Revival: A Chapter in the History of Taste* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

defined at the time, rather than on how it has come to be defined in retrospect. His historically situated approach, while unusual in the established literature on Romanticism, helped me to define and explore my questions here.²⁴ Henrik Karge's researches on nineteenth-century art-historical scholarship have provided methodological inspiration, in particular, through their finely nuanced approach to the integral relationship between historicizing architecture and art-historical research in structuring the discipline.²⁵

As my work focuses on the historical imaginary, modern evaluations of whether a work was in any respect authentically Byzantine have not played a role in my choice of examples. It is precisely the discrepancies between Bavarian Byzantium(s) and those of today that provide windows into how this imaginary was constructed. In taking this approach I have been inspired by scholars such as Sumathi Ramaswamy, who has analyzed the changing meaning of the lost continent of Lemuria for the historiographies and geopolitical identities of a range of interlocutors.²⁶ She has demonstrated that ideas which might seem patently false or even ridiculous according to modern scholarship, if explored in their own terms, can open up new perspectives on how a sense of rightful place is not only imagined but reified. It is equally true for early nineteenth-century

²⁴ Mitchell Benjamin Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined: Nazarene Tradition and the Narratives of Romanticism* (Aldershot, UK, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001): see especially his introduction, pp. 1-7.

²⁵ In this regard see especially Henrik Karge, "Renaissance. Aufkommen und Entfaltung des Stilbegriffs in Deutschland im Zuge der Neorenaissance-Bewegung um 1840," in *Neorenaissance: Ansprüche an einen Stil. Zweites Historismus-Symposium Bad Muskau*, ed. Walter Krause, Heidrun Laudel and Winfried Nerdinger, Muskauer Schriften 4 (Dresden: Verlag der Kunst, 2001), 39-66, and Karge, "Das Frühwerk Karl Schnaases. Zum Verhältnis von Ästhetik und Kunstgeschichte im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Johann Dominicus Fiorillo: Kunstgeschichte und die romantische Bewegung um 1800*, ed. Antje Middeldorf Kosegarten (Göttingen: Wallstein, 1997), 402-19.

²⁶ Sumathi Ramaswamy, *Lost Land of Lemuria: Fabulous Geographies, Catastrophic Histories* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004).

conceptions of Byzantium that the very falseness of their historical and geographical foundations illuminates this process of place-making. Pursuing these ideas even though current mainstream scholarship has discredited them therefore repays any intellectual risk involved.

The Bavarian representations of Byzantium drew on a different range of sources from those available today. They expressed historical and geographical perspectives unique to their time and place, and not simply because of the greater difficulty of travel and more limited availability and quality of relevant imagery. That difficulty necessarily shaped my choice of evidence. When a work would have been known from printed sources rather than from direct experience (e.g., Hagia Sophia in Istanbul), I have attempted to determine as far as possible what the printed sources were. In these cases, I have preferred to illustrate my discussion with images from the printed sources rather than, or in addition to, current photographs. Attending not only to what works were perceived as Byzantine but to what was accessible, and how it was accessible (through direct experience, or through prints or other sources), has helped to establish the range of visual information on which nineteenth-century artists and architects based their work. I have also paid close attention to ideological conditions ranging from wishful thinking and conscious manipulation, to accidental, unwitting limitations. A certain blindness to what might seem self-evident today reflects the different ways of knowing these buildings and shaped nineteenth-century assumptions about them. The observers of the 1820s and

1830s did not possess eyes any more innocent than ours, and similarly constructed what appeared to them as evidence on the basis of a blend of perceptions and preconceptions.²⁷

4. Interpretive Approach

With far more evidence at our disposal, we logically expect to achieve more accurate interpretations of Byzantium than did people of the first half of the nineteenth century. Whether our interpretations are truer to Byzantium is nevertheless not as certain as that they are truer to our evolving preconceptions. My goal in exploring the Byzantium of early nineteenth-century Bavaria is not to determine what is true or false, or to claim anything about the truth or falsehood of our present state of knowledge. The struggle to define evidence and to interpret it might seem familiar to us. But the objectives of the early nineteenth-century intellectuals who turned their interest to Byzantium were radically different. In light of this, my goal is to decipher how and why this Byzantium was produced, so that we can better understand the contribution of its monuments and texts to the art historical and the broader cultural dialogues of their day. Insofar as these dialogues might also inform the dialogues of our own day, I am convinced that they do this most effectively when we focus on their difference from rather than on their conformity with our expectations and theories and the continuities that might be derived from this.

If from today's perspective the early nineteenth-century understanding of Byzantine art, architecture and its influence can look so flawed as to be amusing,²⁸ it

²⁷ On this subject see the classic essay by Ernst Gombrich, "The Evidence of Images: I. The Variability of Vision," in *Interpretation: Theory and Practice*, ed. Charles S. Singleton (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969), 35-68.

provided a foundation on which to build. Those who created this foundation were similarly not without a sense of humor – but to grasp the lively world of their Byzantium we have to move beyond our own understanding of what can be described as Byzantine to value early nineteenth-century thought and art on their own terms. Byzantium was a highly productive category then, just as today, possessing hermeneutic power and logic both despite and because of its ideological ramifications. To recover the story of early nineteenth-century Byzantium, I have ignored repeated assertions by modern-day art historians that the use of the term “Byzantium” in ways that no longer conform to recognized art-historical scholarship was a mistake, and should be ignored or translated into more acceptable terminology. As my starting point I have taken the contention that to ignore what was actually said, in order to rewrite the historiography of art in terms acceptable to the present, is to reject genuine disciplinary introspection.

The origins of this practice of correcting or overlooking may, ironically, be found within the discipline’s own efforts at self-examination. In celebrating the contributions of late nineteenth-century scholars as foundational, art historians have discounted the value of most earlier contributions to the field as lacking objectivity. In his discussion on mid-nineteenth-century art historians, Karge commented:

It is above all the positions of Riegl, Wölfflin, Panofsky and Warburg in which one generally sees modern art history to be grounded. The essential terms and methods with which art historians still work today were admittedly already developed earlier, in the middle decades of the nineteenth century. That the great art-historical works of this time – Burckhardt represents an exception here – remain virtually unknown to today’s art historians despite their undisputed pathbreaking significance is to be ascribed above all to the weight of German art historical writing of the early twentieth century: the epoch of the genesis and development of the field in the nineteenth century was declared to be merely the

²⁸ As noted, for instance, in Karge, “Zwischen Naturwissenschaft und Kulturgeschichte,” 45.

prehistory of the autonomous discipline of art history. The autonomy of art history has created its own tradition.²⁹

Those enshrined as the founding fathers of our discipline, as pursued in the United States (and elsewhere) today as much as in Germany, rejected the scholarly contributions of the 1820s and 30s as thoroughly as those of mid-century. Subsequently, these contributions have been as little examined as those of mid-century, even though they were likewise integral to the genesis and development of the field: they set the stage for the mid-century institutionalization of the discipline.³⁰ In this project I confine my discussion to these two decades and will not trace the evolution of their terms and methods to those of today.

Later in this introduction, I outline the early nineteenth-century organization of art-

²⁹ “Es sind vor allem die Positionen von Riegl, Wölfflin, Panofsky und Warburg, in denen man die moderne Kunstgeschichte gemeinhin begründet sieht. Die wesentlichen Begriffe und Methoden, mit denen Kunsthistoriker(innen) noch heute arbeiten, wurden freilich schon früher, in den mittleren Jahrzehnten des 19. Jahrhunderts, entwickelt. Daß die großen kunsthistorischen Werke dieser Zeit – Burckhardt stellt hier eine Ausnahme dar – trotz ihrer unbestrittenen bahnbrechenden Bedeutung einem heutigen Kunsthistoriker kaum noch präsent sind, ist vor allem dem Eigengewicht der deutschen Kunstgeschichtsschreibung des frühen 20. Jahrhunderts zuzuschreiben: Die Epoche der Entstehung und Entfaltung des Faches im 19. Jahrhundert, wurde nun zur bloßen Vorgeschichte der autonomen kunsthistorischen Wissenschaft erklärt. Die Autonomie der Kunstgeschichte hat sich ihre eigene Tradition geschaffen.” Karge, “Das Frühwerk Karl Schnaases, 402.

³⁰ The institutionalization of art history as an academic discipline is normally dated to the creation of a permanent chair dedicated to “more recent art history” (*neuere Kunstgeschichte*) at the University of Bonn in 1860 (a chair first held by Anton Springer). By this date, positions for professional art historians at schools of art and architecture had been standard for several decades. The designation “more recent art history” (a term which will be discussed below, under “Stylistic Terminology”) indicates the degree to which the concept of art history was still intimately linked with archaeology, philology, etc. There had been individual appointments in art history both at Bonn and at other universities, starting with Johann Dominic Fiorillo at the University of Göttingen in 1813, as well as professorships at professional schools, such as Franz Kugler’s at the Art Academy (Akademie der Künste) in Berlin in 1835: how these individual instances reflected the degree to which art history was generally conceived of as integral to the ongoing discourses on culture and history, rather than as outposts of an independent field of inquiry, is discussed in Heinrich Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte als Institution. Studien zur Geschichte einer Disziplin* (Frankfurt a/M: Suhrkamp, 1979), 173-206.

historical periods, and in the succeeding chapters I discuss other terms and methodological issues as they arise. My primary focus, however, will be on how, during a relatively brief span of time, art-historical ideas informed and were informed by the unfolding process of establishing a since-forgotten category of historical and historicizing works – those at the time considered Byzantine. In so doing, I hope to draw attention to how writing about art was a means of investigating, synthesizing and expressing the cultural and geopolitical positions and aspirations of another time with different values. That this art historical scholarship interpreted monuments in terms of ethnic, confessional and political affiliations made it integral to public debate. Even though so much of what was said has been forgotten, its continued relevance in succeeding decades culminated in the professionalization of the discipline.

Whether or not one accepts the premise that the discipline subsequently functioned more or less autonomously and, as such, became less integral to public debates, it is the frank lack of that autonomy during the 1820s and 1830s that is of special interest here. Even if one begins at the end of the nineteenth century, however, the history of art history is more than a series of intellectual milestones that mark our distance from the questions and the ideas that preceded them. While celebrating the current state of knowledge, historiography that focuses on such milestones can hinder our ability to perceive in past scholarship a meaningful dialogue with the broader intellectual and artistic world that produced it. The richness of the ideas that were filtered through the seemingly unsophisticated Byzantine lens of early nineteenth-century Bavaria contributes to a deeper understanding not only of the historiography of Byzantium and of Bavaria but

also of the scholarship, art and architecture that were powerful components of the intellectual dialogues of the day.

5. Secondary Sources

To recover the earlier, Bavarian Byzantium required bringing nineteenth-century texts, restorations, and revival-style monuments together, and then working to respect the depth and complexity of each. In this I have been inspired, guided, and assisted by a range of contemporary art historians and historians, whose work which I have come to appreciate deeply. Even beginning this project would not have been possible without the quantity and quality of recent investigation and publication of primary sources in varied and scattered archives. While my footnotes record my indebtedness, I would like to highlight here a few key publications. Major exhibitions on Bavaria under Ludwig I have occasioned scholarship and documentation without which a theme such as Byzantium in Bavaria would have been most difficult. Particular topics have been Ludwig's patronage of art and architecture, and the cultural and artistic connections between Bavaria and Greece.³¹ The architectural careers of two of the key architects who worked for Ludwig, Friedrich von Gärtner and Leo von Klenze, have also been subjects of exhibitions. The accompanying catalogues included edited editions of their letters to key correspondents.³²

³¹ Winfried Nerdinger, ed., with Antonia Gruhn-Zimmermann, *Romantik und Restauration. Architektur in Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I. 1825-1848* (Munich: Hugendubel, 1987), and Reinhold Baumstark, ed., *Das neue Hellas. Griechen und Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I.* (Munich: Hirmer, 1999).

³² Winfried Nerdinger, ed., *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben 1791-1847, mit den Briefen an Johann Martin von Wagner* (Munich: Klinkhardt und Biermann, 1992), and Nerdinger, ed., *Leo von Klenze. Architekt zwischen Kunst und Hof 1784-1864* (Munich: Prestel, 2000).

Frank Büttner's scholarship about Peter Cornelius, the artist most responsible for the revival of fresco painting, and specifically his studies of both Cornelius's and Gärtner's work at the Ludwigskirche, provides the starting point for any further research into that monument.³³ Adrian von Buttlar's scholarship about Leo von Klenze is fundamental to interpreting the art and architecture of this time and place.³⁴ Günther-Alexander Haltrich's dissertation on Klenze's Allerheiligenhofkapelle brings together a great deal of information on that building that allowed me to discuss it here.³⁵ The recent publication of Christine Hans-Schuller's work on the restoration of Bamberg Cathedral under Friedrich Karl Rupprecht has proven an unexpectedly rich resource for this project. Hans-Schuller has shed new light on a key moment in the history of Bamberg's renovations and furnishings that several earlier studies had treated only in much broader terms.³⁶

These secondary sources focus on the oeuvres of the artists and architects in and of themselves more than on the themes that might connect them. Drawing out the

³³ In addition to works already cited, studies important to this dissertation include Frank Büttner, "The Frescoes of Peter Cornelius in the Munich Ludwigskirche and Contemporary Criticism," in *Art in Bourgeois Society, 1790-1850*, ed. Andrew Hemingway and William Vaughan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 229-51; Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche in München." *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, 3rd ser., 35 (1984): 189-218; Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken und Freskenprojekte*, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden and Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1980-99).

³⁴ In addition to contributions to works already cited, studies important to this dissertation include Adrian von Buttlar, Introduction to Leo von Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architektur des Christlichen Kultus, Faksimile-Neudruck* (Nördlingen, Dr. Alfons Uhl, 1990), 5-27; Buttlar, "Klenzes Beitrag zur Polychromie-Frage," in *Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, Ein griechischer Traum. Leo von Klenze der Archäologe* (Munich: Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, 1985), 213-225; Buttlar, *Leo von Klenze. Leben – Werk – Vision* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1999).

³⁵ Günther-Alexander Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche in München* (Munich: Kommissionsverlag UNI-Druck, 1983).

³⁶ Christine Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine 'Restauration' unter König Ludwig I. von Bayern (1826-31)* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2000).

Byzantine thread from the documentation and analyses of primary sources that these scholars provide has allowed me to link these oeuvres with one another. Until now, this thread has been largely ignored, explained away, or addressed as an isolated phenomenon. Both Buttlar and Haltrich, for instance, treat Klenze's Allerheiligenhofkapelle commission as a unique example of Byzantinism that Klenze went to great lengths to achieve despite his dislike of the Byzantine style, but having no larger import.³⁷ Below I will argue, by contrast, that Klenze's struggles with this commission both informed, and stand in sharp relief against the other Byzantine projects which Klenze and his colleagues undertook after the Allerheiligenhofkapelle commission was underway. Frank Büttner is almost the only scholar to take seriously the question of what Bavarian artists and architects, and Ludwig himself, meant by "Byzantine." Surprisingly, he reserves a full exploration of this question for his analysis of Cornelius's frescoes at the Ludwigskirche. As I will show below (Chapter Five), this is one aspect of the building for which the Byzantine intention of artist and patron is purely conjectural, and evidence of the reception of the work as Byzantine is absent. A consideration of the Byzantine corpus as interpreted in Cornelius's day may, however, help to strengthen the thesis that Cornelius's frescoes were in some sense Byzantine in conception.

In her study of Bamberg Cathedral, Hans-Schuller provides a brief discussion about why the building was called Byzantine. She focuses on broad shifts in terminology, concluding that no innovation in the understanding of Byzantine style was involved on

³⁷ Buttlar, *Leo von Klenze. Leben – Werk – Vision*, 232; Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 98.

the part of Friedrich Karl Rupprecht, the first restorer.³⁸ While bringing to light Rupprecht's conscientiousness as a conservator in other respects, she maintains that even after Rupprecht had discovered traces of medieval polychromy at Bamberg, and he and Ludwig had demonstrated deep interest in these traces, they preferred to continue with the original plan to remove all polychromy from the building; this is not, however, confirmed by her sources.³⁹ Hans-Schuller notes that Ludwig's early enthusiasm for classical art and architecture had expressed itself in part through his early and ardent interest in researching and reviving classical Greek polychromy. She maintains, though, that medieval architectural polychromy had not been considered before the Bamberg renovation was underway.⁴⁰ Examining Bamberg Cathedral in the context of Ludwig's other Byzantine projects offers new perspectives on the significance of Rupprecht's renovation.

As I will discuss in Chapter Four, interest in medieval polychromy was already evident during the first decade of the century. This interest arose in reaction to Napoleon's secularization of major properties of the Catholic Church in 1802-03, in consequence of which medieval buildings and artworks had been auctioned off, abandoned, destroyed, or threatened with destruction. There was particular interest in what were considered Byzantine-German panel paintings (easily collected and compared), and growing interest in the wall paintings of what were considered the Byzantine churches of the Rhineland (and elsewhere), although these were more difficult

³⁸ "Alle Gedanken, die ... auch Friedrich Karl Rupprecht so selbstverständlich waren, finden sich bereits bei Friedrich Schlegel...." Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine 'Restauration,'* 32.

³⁹ Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine 'Restauration,'* 31-33.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 33.

to access and research. In addition, efforts to collect, study and recreate stained glass proliferated. Shortly before Ludwig's renovation of Bamberg Cathedral, the project to replicate Byzantine-style mosaics had begun at Klenze's Allerheiligenhofkapelle. All of these provided precedents for the renovations at Bamberg Cathedral. As will also be addressed in Chapter Four, the interpretation of this cathedral as Byzantine was closely tied to specific cultural and political circumstances, and Rupprecht used his work there as an opportunity not simply to investigate medieval polychromy in a general sense but specifically to develop new ideas concerning Byzantine art and architecture and its history.

Hans-Schuller addresses in some detail the decisions concerning stained glass at Bamberg Cathedral, and compares them to those at Regensburg Cathedral. The restorations and new stained glass commissioned by Ludwig for Regensburg have themselves been the subjects of extensive study.⁴¹ Elgin Vaassen, among others, has situated her work on the Regensburg windows in the larger context of the collection and

⁴¹ Elgin Vaassen, "Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom aus der königlichen Glasmalereianstalt, Gründung König Ludwigs I., aus dem Jahre 1828," in *Diversarum Artium Studia. Beiträge zu Kunstwissenschaft, Kunsttechnologie und ihren Randgebieten. Festschrift für Heinz Roosen-Runge zum 70. Geburtstag am 5. Oktober 1982*, ed. Helmut Engelhart and Gerda Kempter (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert, 1982), 165-84; Gottlieb Leinz, "Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 44 (1981): 407-9; Achim Hubel, *Die Glasmalereien des Regensburger Domes* (Munich: Schnell und Steiner, 1981), 25-26 and 154-55; Veit Loers, "Die Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms und seine Restauration unter König Ludwig I. von Bayern (1827-29)," in Georg Schwaiger, ed. *Der Regensburger Dom. Beiträge zu seiner Geschichte*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg 10 (Regensburg: Verein für Regensburger Bistums-geschichte, 1976), 229-66; Susette Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms im 19. Jahrhundert. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg* 14 (1980): 137-304.

revival of stained glass in the late eighteenth through early nineteenth centuries.⁴² As of yet, though, the growing body of research on revival stained glass has paid scant attention to the relationship between stained glass and other media, and how together they served to increase the differentiation among medieval styles both in scholarship and in revival monuments. Bavarian artists and architects helped to define these styles, not least through their early and intense engagement with questions of what constituted Byzantine polychromy. In considering the answers that these artists and architects provided, I hope that the present study will contribute to broader considerations of early nineteenth-century revivals of media, including frescoes and stained glass, as interrelated elements of a larger project of re-envisioning the past.

6. Geopolitical and Confessional Framework

Geopolitical and confessional concerns were central to the Byzantine thread in Bavarian art and architecture during the 1820s and 1830s. The Byzantiums constructed in these decades had their source in scholarship of the Napoleonic era, when French control over Central Europe prompted many to turn to medieval art and architecture as embodiments of an ideal German nation and its spirit. The rampant destruction of medieval monuments during Napoleonic secularization encouraged a view of these works as the antithesis of the art and architecture of France and its Enlightenment culture. French Enlightenment cultural currents had predominated at German courts through much of the century preceding the arrival of French Revolutionary forces in 1792. Through medieval monuments, German identity could be located, affirmed, investigated

⁴² Elgin Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas. Glasgemälde zwischen 1780 und 1870*, Kunstwissenschaftliche Studien 70 (Munich and Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1997).

and defended. Those, like Ludwig, who looked to Byzantine art and architecture to demonstrate a special German connection with Greece and the East, built on the work of the Romantic writer and theorist Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829). At the same time that Napoleon dissolved the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation in 1806, Schlegel introduced the idea that the Rhenish architecture of the early medieval period exhibited Hellenizing features influenced by the tastes of the Roman Emperor Constantine. Schlegel was particularly concerned about the fate of the Rhineland and of its sacred architecture under French rule. His account suggests that he understood Constantine's Christianity as Rhenish in origin, and that it was in some sense a Rhenish-informed Christianity that Constantine brought with him to the eastern Mediterranean, although it was a Greek-informed architecture that Constantine (according to Schlegel's account) preferred for Christian churches and so would be transferred from the East to the Rhineland. Constantine had not only begun his career in the Rhineland (in Trier), but following his Edict of Milan (313) legalizing Christianity, had become a great patron of the church and, in 330, moved his seat from Rome to Byzantium (Constantinople). This move came to define the transition from Roman antiquity to the post-classical Roman Empire known as Byzantium. Byzantium provided not only a noble, Christian heritage for the now disgraced Holy Roman Empire, but one that since the Middle Ages the West had understood as essentially Greek. This Byzantine Greek heritage was a direct contradiction to the Greece that Enlightenment intellectuals, especially in France, had celebrated as both democratic and pagan.

Other scholars quickly picked up on Schlegel's formulation and by the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815, Germany's (and especially the Rhineland's) Byzantine roots

were firmly established in scholarship that looked not only to the Carolingian period, but equally to the Ottonian. This had the advantage of defining the Holy Roman Empire without reference to the earlier Merovingian dynasty, which was claimed by France. Moreover, it provided Germany with Greek roots and monuments and Eastern sources for its culture. These could vie for prestige with the Roman ones claimed by France and the Latin West, which came to be understood as Germany's age-old and ever-threatening cultural opponents. This belief persisted long after Napoleon's reorganization of the rest of Europe on a Roman Imperial model.

Scholars adapted art-historical scholarship to the post-Napoleonic situation as an important way to explore evolving questions of what constituted German identity and how to express patriotic feeling. This was done in the absence of a single nation state or a single religious confession. On account of the desire to locate a more comprehensive German national identity, the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation (*Heiliges Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation*, as it has been known since the sixteenth century in German-speaking Europe) continued to signify the idea of German nationhood. Despite the acknowledged impotence of this empire in its final years, and perhaps partly because of its complex political, linguistic, ethnic and religious composition, it was the only body that stood for an over-arching German political unity.⁴³ The Holy Roman Empire, ruled

⁴³ On the Holy Roman Empire as a synonym for Germany see discussion “*Reich and Staat*” in James Sheehan, *German History 1770-1866* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 14-24. Maximilian I (1493-1519), the last emperor to be crowned by the Pope (in 1508), instituted the term “Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation” (*Heiliges römisches Reich deutscher Nation*) in 1512, at the same time that he was instituting political reforms that provided forums for the expression of regional concerns: see Peter H. Wilson, *The Holy Roman Empire, 1495-1806* (New York: St. Martin's, 1999), 2 and 20-22. As the empire came to be claimed as a foundation for German nationalist causes, the extended name was projected back onto the medieval empire, which was interpreted as having

by the Habsburgs from Vienna from 1438⁴⁴ remained the primary chronological and geographical context, therefore, for discussing German art and architecture.

Looking back beyond the Western “Holy Roman” Empire, Germans had a Byzantine, Eastern Roman imperial inheritance – one that could still be seen in its art and architecture. This idea helped to fill the present political vacuum and uncertainty about the future by providing a secondary chronological and geographical context for considering German identity. From the fall of Napoleon in 1814 into the 1860s it remained unclear whether Catholic Austria or Protestant Prussia, or even one of the mid-sized German states such as Bavaria, would take the leadership position in a unified German state. When they shifted from rediscovering the Byzantine style to reviving it, Bavarian architects, artists and patrons stressed what they understood as its classical, medieval or Eastern aspects, and they did so to express the nature of the German inheritance and thus to define German identity in their own terms.

During this period between the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire and the proclamation of a politically unified Germany in 1871, patriotism also came into play on the level of the individual German states.⁴⁵ German patriotism lay close to many people’s

been essentially German from its inception. This inception was traced to 800, when the Pope crowned Charlemagne Emperor.

⁴⁴ The one exception to this otherwise uninterrupted period of Habsburg rule was the reign of Charles VII (1742-45), which briefly realized competing Bavarian Wittelsbach aspirations to the imperial throne.

⁴⁵ When I refer to the German “lands” and “states” here, I include those of the Austrian Empire. As John Breuilly has noted, in the course of the transition from the Holy Roman Empire to the proclamation of a German Empire in 1871, “Germany was unified in part through division: the exclusion of Austrian Germany from the new state. There rapidly developed an official historiography which legitimized this new state but it rather uneasily blended themes of Prussian and German identity, national and federal values.” John Breuilly, “Historians and the Nation,” chap. 3 in *History and Historians in the*

hearts, but what it meant beyond the level of any given state or region was ambiguous. It was not just out of a sense of local pride, therefore, that claims about the nature of German culture characteristically set up one state or region as paradigmatic of the whole.⁴⁶ This was as true of the concept of a German Byzantium as it was for other ways of imagining Germany. The focus on the Rhineland among Germans of the Napoleonic era, meanwhile, became less pronounced with the fall of Napoleon. The Rhineland was no longer under French control and the variously re-organized German states began to vie with each other for cultural prominence. For example, Christian Ludwig Stieglitz (1756-1836) of Leipzig, one of the leading architectural historians of the day, by 1820 had defined the Byzantine period of German art and architecture as essentially Saxon and Lutheran. Although his works appear to have informed architects working in the Byzantine style in Bavaria in the ensuing decades, the Byzantium they created was nevertheless essentially Bavarian and Catholic. I will discuss this in some detail below.

In the wake of Napoleon, a most pressing political question was the extent to which Europe's restored monarchies should be limited or replaced by constitutional forms of government. Intellectuals across the political spectrum pointed to Germany's Byzantine inheritance as supportive of their various positions. Schlegel continued to explore the Holy Roman Empire's Byzantine roots even after he moved to Vienna to try to resurrect the Holy Roman Empire as an absolute monarchy – one in which constitutions would play no role. Ludwig while Crown Prince helped to write a

Twentieth Century, ed. Peter Burke (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2002), 69.

⁴⁶ On the relationship of regional to national identity during this period see Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990).

constitution for Bavaria. Examining his Allerheiligenhofkapelle commission, however, it is evident that when he inherited the throne Byzantium would provide him with an image of anti-Enlightenment, state-controlled religiosity. Such a religiosity ideally suited his efforts to use the Church to strengthen loyalty to his regime. These efforts found parallels in Prussia and elsewhere.⁴⁷ Others, such as Stieglitz, regarded German Byzantium as predating the corruption that accompanied the increasing papal authority that prompted the Protestant Reformation. In this view, Byzantium offered a connection between the free (i.e., proto-Protestant) spirit of the late medieval German cities and ancient Greece as the cradle of democracy.

The difference between Ludwig's and Stieglitz's perspectives is only one aspect of the Bavarian Byzantine revival. It contributes to what might be considered the subject here, the art history of nineteenth-century confessionalism. This has been insufficiently studied, because until recently there was a widespread notion that the nineteenth century was the Age of Secularization.⁴⁸ But the confessional interpretations of Byzantium were

⁴⁷ On Ludwig's determination to bring the Catholic Church in Bavaria under his control (specifically insisting on his right to appoint bishops), see Heinz Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern. Königtum im Vormärz – eine politische Biographie* (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1986), 514-15. For this model of church-state relations Ludwig may have drawn on the same Ottonian blueprint that informed his understanding of German Byzantine art and architecture. On the unification of the Lutheran and Reformed churches of Prussia under state control, and opposition to that unification, see Christopher M. Clark, "The Politics of Revival: Pietists, Aristocrats, and the State Church in Early Nineteenth-Century Prussia," in *Between Reform, Reaction and Resistance: Studies in the History of German Conservatism from 1789 to 1945*, ed. Larry Eugene Jones and James Retallack (Providence, RI and Oxford, UK: Berg, 1993), 31-60. (In 1818 the Protestants of Bavaria were given the choice of unifying on the Prussian model, but only those of the Rhine District chose to do so.)

⁴⁸ On the question of the nineteenth century as an era of confessionalization, see Margaret Lavinia Anderson, "The Limits of Secularization: On the Problem of the Catholic Revival in Nineteenth-Century Germany," *The Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 647-70 and

overt in the first half of the nineteenth century and perhaps especially complex because of this. Ludwig intended his cultural policies not only to re-establish the role of the Catholic Church in Bavaria, but also to keep it free of Jesuits. Related to this was Ludwig's desire to cleanse its medieval monuments of renovations that reflected what he understood as the Jesuits' excessive loyalty to Rome. Ludwig thus used German medieval architecture to express his position in the increasingly confessionally-charged dialogue that defined medieval styles against the nascent but already maligned concept of the Jesuit style.

Evonne Levy's recent study *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque* addresses the polemical aspects of Catholic Baroque art and architecture. She also traces how nineteenth-century responses to the Baroque were neutralized or removed from art-historical discourse to the point that neither the seventeenth-century nor the nineteenth-century significance of these polemics can be fully evaluated.⁴⁹ In confronting the polemics of this "Jesuit" style and its historiography, Levy pursues a more nuanced understanding of the confessional strife that has helped to shape the historiography of art and architecture. This confessional strife revived quickly and vigorously once Napoleon's defeat removed from power the man whom many Christians perceived as their common

Olaf Blaschke, „Das 19. Jahrhundert: Ein Zweites Konfessionelles Zeitalter?“, *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 26 (2000): 38-75.

⁴⁹ Evonne Levy, *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004), 2-6; 40-41. Her contribution to the historiography of the Jesuit style was omitted from the publication of the proceedings of the conference at which it was first presented – John W. O'Malley, Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Steven J. Harris and T. Frank Kennedy, eds., *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999) – in favor of an essay not presented at the conference that addressed this same subject: see Levy, *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque*, 245. The neutralizing viewpoint taken in the publication of the conference suggests the strength of the desire to overcome painful histories by treating the misperceptions they expressed as if they could be retroactively corrected from an unbiased perspective.

enemy. Building on Levy, I have focused on an aspect of the nineteenth-century art historical framework that was integral to the confessional politics of the day and which the imposition of updated terminology has obscured. As for the “Jesuit” style, the art-historical categories have changed so much that it no longer rings true that the early nineteenth-century monuments built or renovated as “Byzantine” either imitated or emulated what we understand as Byzantine style. Rather than making these works conform to our categories, it is necessary to try to grasp the earlier framework if we are to understand how these monuments, and how art history, informed the world for which they were constructed. To situate this project, I will need to trace some highlights of this lost history.

7. Imitation vs. Emulation

The varied concepts of imitation represented in Byzantine revival and renovation projects of the first half of the century all responded in some way to the works of Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-68), since his idealization of Greek art had established the classicizing paradigm that Romantic historicism challenged. His seminal formulation of the role of imitation was expressed in 1755 in his *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture* (*Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Mahlerey und Bildhauer-Kunst*, 1755; rev. ed., 1756): “The only way for us to become great or, if this be possible, inimitable, is to imitate the ancients.”⁵⁰

⁵⁰ “Der einzige Weg für uns, groß, ja, wenn es möglich ist, unnachahmlich zu werden, ist die Nachahmung der Alten....” Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture*, trans. Elfriede Heyer and Roger C. Norton (La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1987), 4 and 5. This translation is based on Winckelmann, *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Mahlerey*

Winckelmann's call was at once compelling and ambiguous: he emphasized that imitation of the ancients was to be a foundation for the arts onto which the selective imitation of nature should eventually be added in order, ultimately, to achieve originality. While Winckelmann did not clearly define originality in his *Reflections*, he claimed to find it in the works of Michelangelo, Raphael and Correggio. Moving beyond Italy and into the seventeenth century, he also found it in the work of Rubens and Poussin. The publication, starting in 1762, of James Stuart's and Nicholas Revett's plans and elevations of the classical monuments of Athens made possible even more rigorous study and imitation of the Greeks for the majority of artists and architects who (like Winckelmann) would never make it to Greece.⁵¹ It provided them with a means through which they could try to equal or surpass the Greek models.

Winckelmann's second and more influential work, *History of the Art of Antiquity* (*Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*, 1764), appeared in continuously revised versions into the early nineteenth century. It expanded and in some respects changed the terms of his earlier discussion.⁵² There he identified style for the first time as the subject of art

und Bildhauer-Kunst, 2nd ed. (Dresden and Leipzig: Walther, 1756), the form in which it first became widely available; the work had first appeared in a print run of only 50 or so copies in 1755.

⁵¹ James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, *The Antiquities of Athens, Measured and Delineated*, 3 vols.: 1762, 1787, 1794 (reprint. New York: Benjamin Bloom, 1968). The degree to which Stuart's and Revett's studies remained the standard for German architects into the 1830s is indicated by the Berlin-trained architect Eduard Schaubert's discussions in *Museum* 1, no. 30 (July 29, 1833): 237-38, reprinted on the first pages of Alexander Ferdinand von Quast, *Mittheilungen über Alt und Neu Athen* (Berlin: George Gropius, 1834), 1-2. Here Schaubert directly compared these studies with the actual monuments he encountered in Athens (where he was helping draw up a city plan for building up Athens as the new nation's capital). Schaubert detailed Stuart's and Revett's mistakes, and the evidence of polychromy they had omitted from their publication.

⁵² Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (Dresden: Walther, 1764); translated by Harry Francis Mallgrave as *History of the Art of Antiquity*,

history.⁵³ But even more, he conceived of style as an expression of climate (which he defined as locality, weather, food), ethnicity (for Winckelmann, variously a product of climate and an independent factor) and culture (consisting for Winckelmann above all of education, constitution, government). In short, for Winckelmann, style was an expression of context, whether broadly or narrowly construed.⁵⁴ Only where context conspired to produce the greatest freedom, i.e., in Greece, could artistic perfection be achieved.⁵⁵ He depicted all the styles of antiquity as rising and declining over time (in conjunction with freedom and other determinants).⁵⁶ He further divided the ideal, Greek style into even more chronological stages than others had and traced how the Greek style had been influenced by that of the Phoenicians (for which he admittedly had little evidence) and in

intro. Alex Potts (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2006); on the publication history see Potts, Introduction, 12-15.

⁵³ On the substantial contemporary contributions by the Comte de Caylus and other French intellectuals to the analysis of style as evidence of cultural history see Potts, Introduction to Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 23-26; on *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* as a more problematic “fusion between style and aesthetic historicism” (257) see Sauerländer, “From Stylus to Style,” 257 and 259-61. I would contend, however, that the use of stylistic analysis in the art historical scholarship that evolved from Winckelmann’s work contributed to efforts to understand the past and cannot be reduced to the aestheticization of history. Arguably, efforts to do without stylistic analysis have, in rejecting visual evidence, often resulted in the very aestheticization (that is, falsifying simplification: cf. Sauerländer, 266) of history that they sought to avoid; see the discussion below under the heading “9. Stylistic Terminology.”

⁵⁴ Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 117-23; on his discussion of climate, see also 186-91 and Potts, Introduction, 5, n. 12. The prior evolution of the interpretation of style as an expression of national and historical circumstances and tastes has been traced in Carlo Ginzburg, “Style as Inclusion, Style as Exclusion,” 32-33.

⁵⁵ Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 121-22, 159-60, 187, 232, 317-19; on the context for this emphasis on freedom see Potts, Introduction to Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 26-27, and Sauerländer, “From Stylus to Style,” 261-62.

⁵⁶ On the cyclical pattern of Winckelmann’s chronology, see Potts, Introduction to Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 20-21.

turn influenced the styles of the Etruscans and Romans, among other peoples.⁵⁷

Perfection itself was in that way deeply contextualized.

Winckelmann's emphasis on the determinative aspects of context meant that the use of imitation of the Greeks to achieve perfection beyond one's own climate, ethnicity and culture was effectively limited.⁵⁸ It also meant that all art and architecture had a history, and so suggested the possibility of tracing the progress and interaction of all peoples through the style of their art and architecture.⁵⁹ Schlegel, during his years in Paris and Cologne, was among those who had substantially contributed to such efforts, not least by introducing Byzantium as a historical continuum between Greece and Germany.

⁵⁷ Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 111, 113, 145, 169, 244, 284. On the possibility of Egyptian influence on Greek art, Winckelmann appears to have been undecided: see Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 113 and 327. Winckelmann divided the Egyptian and Etruscan styles into three stages and Greek into four to five; the Romans, he asserted, had no style of their own (Potts, Introduction, 5, n. 11, and Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 131, 170, 227, 284-85).

⁵⁸ See, e.g., Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 173 and 319, and the discussion in Ginzburg, "Style as Inclusion, Style as Exclusion," 33.

⁵⁹ See, e.g., Ginzburg, "Style as Inclusion, Style as Exclusion," 33, and Alex Potts, Introduction to Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 1, 4, and especially his discussion of Winckelmann's *History* on pp. 32-36, where he disputes this work's reputation as presenting a "proto-Romantic sense of organic historical totality" (32), concluding that "the unstable and at times seemingly contradictory conjuncture between the aesthetic and the ethical played out in Winckelmann's writing probably lies closer to our present-day concerns than the more seamless integration of the two achieved in the art historical scholarship that took off from his conception of a history of art. At the least, his perspective suggests that art historical writing need not necessarily be seen as split between an aestheticizing historical nostalgia, on the one hand, and its out-and-out negation in postmodern-style skepticism, on the other" (36). It might be argued in turn that, despite their reputation, Romantic-era histories of style did not simply serve aestheticizing historical nostalgia, but represented complex efforts to discover and integrate growing empirical evidence of the past conditioned by the pragmatic need to explain or justify an ever-changing present: an effort still evident in that post-modernist discourse which does not take empirical evidence to be irrelevant.

This was well before Hegel introduced his “thoroughgoing historicizing of the classical ideal” in his famous lectures of the 1820s.⁶⁰

Throughout the later eighteenth century, esteem for classical, especially Greek forms, as the origin and epitome of taste remained nearly universal in German lands. The rules of harmony and proportion were derived from classical monuments, and the systematization of classical architectural forms within orders was maintained as it had been described by Vitruvius. This challenged artists, especially architects, to express their own ideas and fulfill modern requirements while at the same time demonstrating their thorough understanding and appreciation of classical models. All works were vulnerable to criticism for expressing either too weak a grasp of classical precedents or too little originality. Growing numbers of artists, architects and theorists wondered whether it might not make more sense to find a style that perfectly expressed their own ethnicity, geography, history, and culture rather than trying to fit themselves to a style which perfectly expressed classical Greece. When they turned towards medieval models as a solution, they found themselves, moreover, freer to interpret these models as they saw fit. There was no single publication equivalent to that of Stuart and Revett for the imitation of Byzantine or Gothic architecture. Because almost all the models for these buildings were in Italy or Germany, both personal acquaintance and the availability and quality of published plans and elevations varied considerably. Hagia Sophia, which was known largely through a set of seventeenth-century prints which was frequently republished, was a notable exception.

⁶⁰ Alex Potts, Introduction to Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 4. Hegel’s lectures were first published posthumously as *Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel’s Vorlesungen über die Aesthetik*, ed. Heinrich Gustav Hotho (Berlin: Dunker und Humblot, 1835-38).

What sometimes appears to be a flexible approach to imitation was to some degree necessitated by a lack of documentation, knowledge or skills required to achieve a high degree of stylistic precision. This seeming flexibility was also driven by the desire, equally inspired by Winckelmann, to use medieval art and architectural styles to demonstrate perceived or desired historical connections and developments. Arguably the emphasis on such connections and developments was especially marked in Byzantine revival architecture. These factors complicate the effort to deduce from purely visual evidence the precision with which an artist or architect intended to reproduce a given historical model or its style. The desire to reproduce still competed with the desire to present medieval styles as equivalent to, or even resembling, the classicizing orders, proportions and other characteristics earlier established as the ideal.

The archaeological historicism of medieval revival architecture of the second half of nineteenth century achieved a highly precise level of imitation. This was not yet a possibility during the period covered in this dissertation. The restoration and completion of existing medieval monuments to what was perceived as their original, or originally intended, style did stimulate the development of knowledge and skills that would lead to the later archaeological historicism. By today's standards the level of imitation in Byzantine revival and restoration of the 1820s and 30s was almost always far from convincing. The tension between imitation and emulation can be traced in early nineteenth-century discussions of these works, which sometimes even include phrases derived directly from Winckelmann. Where this tension can be documented, I will pay close attention to whether the artist or architect is praised for accurately recreating a style or model, or for emulating the spirit of the original in a new form. Such discussions

provide a platform for evaluating the reception of works as recreations or reinterpretations of the Byzantine past. At the same time, the development of art-historical knowledge and skills led to Byzantinizing works that combined elements which, based on art-historical conjecture, ought not to have coexisted. Neither full imitations nor emulations, such works of art and architecture functioned as heuristic devices, retroactively reifying art-historical developments, connections and even discontinuities. These were as inspired by Winckelmann's theories as were the most concerted efforts at *Nachahmung*. They therefore provide windows into the reciprocal relationship between historicism and art history that forms an underlying theme of following chapters.

8. Stylistic Terminology

A persistent problem in moving between another language and English is the tendency for foreign words and phrases that are conventionally not translated when used in English to become de-contextualized their English-language usage. This de-contextualization has contributed to the tendency in English-language scholarship to retroactively "correct" nineteenth-century categories for historicizing styles in light of later scholarship.⁶¹ I have tried to avoid this at every stage by situating the terminology of my sources within the larger cultural framework that also informed the monuments and scholars I am studying. A case in point: research on the *Rundbogenstil* (or Round-Arch style) that does not attend to the degree to which round arches were considered indicative of the Byzantine style but rather uses the term *Rundbogenstil* to replace seemingly

⁶¹ My translation of art terms into English does not include the names of those architectural monuments that are best known under their foreign names.

problematic references to Byzantine style. Such efforts obscure the past in order to harmonize it with the present. In focusing on the neglected theme of Byzantium, when and where it was explicitly addressed from a historical perspective, I intend to build productive bridges between scholarship, monuments and media that have attracted (with some exceptions) little attention in English-language scholarship. Even in German-language research, in too many cases these elements have been considered more or less in isolation. More than this, I hope to bring an awareness of how early nineteenth-century German scholars, artists and architects worked together to investigate the past while shaping the present. In so doing, they helped to establish art history as a vehicle for cultural discourse, with its own vocabulary.⁶²

The stylistic terminology used in Bavaria during the 1820s and 30s, while it was subject to open debate and refinement, was shared, debated and refined within the context of a German reading public. The concept of a Byzantine style or manner (*Stil* or *Art*) that I address here had limited currency beyond German lands, where art-historical terms reflected different scholarly, confessional and geo-political perspectives.⁶³ From mid-century, a more fully international art-historical discourse led to the restructuring of terminology so as to reflect broader scholarly opinion but, before that date, terminology

⁶² I am grateful to Elaine M. Beretz for our conversations about the differing roles and definitions of stylistic analysis in art history and history, which is informed by her work on artistic style and urban culture in twelfth-century France.

⁶³ For a discussion of the contemporary evolution of the understanding and terminology of Romanesque architecture in France and England see Tina Waldeier Bizzarro, *Romanesque Architectural Criticism: A Prehistory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). Karge, "Zwischen Naturwissenschaft und Kulturgeschichte," 40, notes the self-referential nature of English architectural historiography despite the surprisingly early and broad-minded contribution of George Downing Whittington, *An Historical Survey of the Ecclesiastical Antiquities of France with a View to Illustrating the Rise and Progress of Gothic Architecture in Europe* (London, 1809).

reflected the greater cultural embeddedness of intellectual discourse, making it a valuable tool for studying the period.⁶⁴ The tendency to examine the early etymologies of art-historical terminology as if they belonged to one universal art-historical discourse has, more often than not, left the German context obscure.⁶⁵ The German context is, however, significant to the historiography of the discipline because it is the one out of which art history was first established as an academic specialization in the second half of the century. In order to better investigate the early nineteenth-century German category “Byzantine” I will, therefore, make use of the terminology of that time and place. I will only use the terminology current today when this seems necessary for the sake of clarity.

i. Egyptian, Greek, Etruscan, Roman, Indian (*ägyptisch, griechisch, römisch, indisch*)

In German lands at the start of the nineteenth century, art and architecture fell into two broad categories: classical and non-classical. The non-classical, termed “Newer,” mainly designated works produced in a chronological and geographical span that began in fifteenth-century Italy and culminated in seventeenth-century France. This category is treated in greater depth below, under its own subheading. The category “Newer” was devised in response to the framework of classical styles already established by

Winckelmann and others during the preceding century. Keeping Winckelmann’s *History*

⁶⁴ Karge, “Zwischen Naturwissenschaft und Kulturgeschichte,” 43, traces the first signs of a more international outlook, and terminology, in German art historical scholarship to articles by Karl Schnaase (his 1828 review of Steiglitz, discussed further below) and Franz Mertens, “Historische Uebersicht der bisherigen Abhandlungen über die Baukunst des Mittelalters,” *Museum* 3 (1835), no. 15, 110-17; no. 17, 129-33; no. 23, 177-180; no. 24, 185-89; no. 25, 193-96; and no. 26, 206-08.

⁶⁵ Henrik Karge, in his study of the term “Renaissance,” has similarly observed that the French and Italian origins of this term have been subject to extensive examination, while the very different German context had gone entirely unexplored. See Karge, “Renaissance. Aufkommen und Entfaltung des Stilbegriffs,” 39.

of the *Art of Antiquity* up-to-date for the nineteenth century was the goal of, among others, Heinrich Meyer, Goethe's collaborator on artistic matters.⁶⁶ Cultures beyond those addressed by Winckelmann – Egypt, the Etruscans, Greece and Rome – tended to be seen as peripheral to the main narrative of art history. In the 1810s and 20s, however, the style of ancient Indian art and architecture came to supplement (or even replace) that of Egypt as a basis for the Western tradition. Assigning this role to the Indian style was inspired less by visual evidence than by the recent discovery that Indian and European languages shared a common ancestor. Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829) demonstrated this in 1808, though he mistakenly identified this ancestral language as Sanskrit.⁶⁷ (This development harmonized with Schlegel's own understanding of his accomplishment; in discovering an Indian heritage, Schlegel believed he had made a contribution to Western culture akin to that which Italian philologists had made in rediscovering its Greek and Roman heritage.⁶⁸) While Schlegel did not link Indian and Byzantine, Byzantium constituted the other significant Eastern source for German culture that Schlegel

⁶⁶ Potts, Introduction to Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, 15.

⁶⁷ Friedrich Schlegel, in *Über die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* (1808), proved that there was a relationship between Sanskrit and European languages by building on ideas first proposed by the English scholar Sir William Jones in 1786. Schlegel's work helped to establish the field of historical philology while introducing it to German scholarship. See William Burley Lockwood, *Indo-European Philology, Historical and Comparative* (London: Hutchinson, 1969), 22-23. Among those explicitly inspired by Schlegel's thesis was Johann Gustav Gottlieb Büsching (1783-1829), who explained the Gothic style as the German interpretation of Indian art and architecture in his review of Bernhard Hundeshagen, *Der alten gothischen Kapelle zu Frankenberg Grundriß, Aufriß und Durchschnitt, nebst Gedanken über die sogenannte gothische Kirchenbaukunst*, in *Museum für Altdeutsche Literatur und Kunst* 2 (1811): 356. Integrating Indian influence more directly into the established tradition as described by Winckelmann was Christian Ludwig Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 6-7.

⁶⁸ Ernst Behler, "Die italienische Renaissance in der Literaturtheorie der Brüder Schlegel," in *Romantik und Renaissance. Die Rezeption der italienischen Renaissance in der deutschen Romantik*, ed. Silvio Vietta (J.B. Metzler: Stuttgart and Weimar, 1994), 180.

proposed during the Napoleonic era. For art and architecture, Byzantium would soon prove the more productive alternative to France (the occupying force) and Rome (disparaged by Winckelmann and an inspiration for Napoleon). Schlegel's idea that Byzantium had influenced German culture informed the charged topic of what constituted the Gothic.

ii. (Old) Gothic, (Old) Germanic; Old Gothic vs. New Gothic

(altgothisch/gothisch: altgermanisch/germanisch; altgothisch vs. neugothisch)

The art and architecture of the Western Middle Ages were designated as Germanic or Gothic. Germanic peoples, and the Goths as a subset of them, were understood as ethnicities with a continuous history into the nineteenth century, so that the basic terms were sometimes qualified as Old Germanic or Old Gothic in order to distinguish a chronological period distinct from the present. The preceding period, Antiquity (*Alttertum*, as defined by Winckelmann et al.), was generally considered to have ended after Constantine had consolidated his position as sole ruler of the Roman Empire, legalized Christianity and, in 330, moved the seat of the empire from Rome to Constantinople.

In the mid-sixteenth century Vasari, in his *Lives of the Most Excellent Italian Architects Painters and Sculptors* (*Vite de' più eccellenti architetti, pittori et scultori italiani*, 1550, rev. ed., 1568), attributed to the Goths the medieval buildings in Italy and France, "the buildings that are called by us to-day German."⁶⁹ At the end of the sixteenth

⁶⁹ Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, 2 vols., trans. Gaston du C. de Vere; ed. David Ekserdjian (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996), 1:40-41 and

century, after most others had stopped building in this style, the Society of Jesus (founded 1534) sponsored architecture that consciously referenced medieval architecture. The Petrikirche in Münster (1590-97; rebuilt), with its slender spires and traceried windows [fig. 1.1] is one example.⁷⁰ By the early seventeenth century, drawing on Vasari, the Society may have been the first to popularize the term “Gothic” for the style of the architecture it was interpreting.⁷¹ At the end of the seventeenth century the French scholar Jean-Francois Félibien des Avaux (1658-1733) was the first to divide the Gothic into phases. Old Gothic (*gothique ancienne*) loosely included all Western European architecture from the fall of the Roman Empire until what would today be called the advent of the Gothic style. He attributed Old Gothic to the cold Germanic North. New Gothic (*gothique nouvelle*), the rough equivalent of what would today be called the Gothic style, he attributed to temperate France.⁷² Félibien also suggested a third, decadent phase, which was largely forgotten by later scholars who used Félibien’s ideas, but seemed not to know them directly.⁷³

58. (This is an abridged version of Vasari, *Vite de' più eccellenti architetti, pittori et scultori italiani*, rev. ed., 1568.)

⁷⁰ On the Gothic style as interpreted in the Jesuits’ first churches of the Rhineland and Westphalia see Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art*, 246-48.

⁷¹ See Robson-Scott, *Literary Background of the Gothic Revival*, 7-8, where he notes the Jesuit use of the Gothic style in the Spanish Netherlands and northern France (and especially Flanders).

⁷² Jean-Francois Félibien des Avaux, *Les Plans et les Descriptions de deux des plus belles maisons de campagne de Pline le consul, avec des remarques sur tous ses bâtiments et une Dissertation touchant l’architecture antique et l’architecture gothique* (1699). See Robson-Scott, *Literary Background of the Gothic Revival*, 44-47; also Frankl, *Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations*, 343-346, and Bizzarro, *Romanesque Architectural Criticism*, 144.

⁷³ During the “third and decadent phase of medieval architecture Gothic degenerated into an inordinate boldness of construction and a confused mass of intricate ornamentation which resembled filigree work.” See Robson-Scott, *Literary Background of the Gothic Revival*, 45; on the transmission of Félibien’s ideas in France and Germany see p. 47.

While the terms “Old Gothic” and “New Gothic” (*Alt-* and *Neugotisch*) became standard designations of art historical styles, the Jesuits came to be dissociated from both styles. By the late eighteenth century, in German lands at least, the Jesuits were exclusively associated with what is now known as the baroque or early modern style (see below under “New Roman”). Gothic, by contrast, came to be considered an ecumenical (because pre-Reformation) German style, antithetical to Jesuit purposes. Representative of this approach is Goethe’s early essay “On German Architecture” (*Von deutscher Baukunst*, 1772), in which he lionized the architect of Strasbourg Minster for magnificently expressing the German spirit through Gothic architecture. This spirit, he claimed, was misperceived by Italians and, especially, by the French.⁷⁴ In this work, published anonymously, Goethe cried out to such unseeing eyes:

... Latins! You scramble over the ruins to cadge a system of proportions, you cobble together your summer-houses out of the blessed rubble, and think yourselves the true guardians of the secrets of art if you can reckon the inches and minutest lines of past buildings.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ The essay was probably written a year after Goethe’s return to Frankfurt, and under the influence of friends who were at that time campaigning against Enlightenment artistic and cultural ideals, which were often condemned simply as “French” (though the accomplishments of French artists and writers who did not conform to Enlightenment ideals were warmly praised without regard to their nationality). See William Douglas Robson-Scott, *The Younger Goethe and the Visual Arts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 36-39 and 45-51.

⁷⁵ “... Welscher! Krochst an den mächtigen Resten Verhältnisse zu betteln, flicktest aus den heiligen Trümmern dir Lusthäuser zusammen, und hältst dich für Verwahrer der Kunstgeheimnisse, weil du auf Zoll und Linien von Riesengebäuden Rechenschaft geben kannst.” Johann Wolfgang Goethe, “Von deutscher Baukunst. D.M. Erwini a Steinbach,” orig. self-pub. (Frankfurt, 1772 [dated 1773]); reprinted in idem, *Schriften zur Kunst*, ed. Christian Beutler, Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche, 28. August 1949, v. 13 (Zurich: Artemis, [1949]), 16-26; here, p. 18. English translation from Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Goethe on Art*, ed. and trans. John Gage (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1980), 105 (I have reinserted the exclamation point as in original, and translated “Welscher” as “Latins” rather than “dagoes”).

Goethe emphasized the Germanness of the Gothic by contrasting it with a calculating Latin spirit. Those who trace their cultural heritage to Imperial Rome (i.e., those disreputable foreigners who speak Romance languages, the *Welschen*, translated here as “Latins”) could not perceive its genius. As the epitome of such misunderstanding he pointed to a French Jesuit architectural critic, Marc-Antoine Laugier (1713-69), whom he misread to fit this purpose.⁷⁶ Goethe did not go so far as to call the Gothic style superior to that of Classical Greece, which remained for him the ultimate measure of greatness. But he did celebrate the Germanness of the Gothic and identified a specific Jesuit (on the eve of the dissolution of the Society of Jesus in 1773) as representative of the Latin culture that had misjudged it.

iii. Arabic, Moorish, Saracenic (*arabisch, maurisch, saracenis*)

The idea that the Gothic style was alien to the Jesuits turned out to be more enduring than the idea that Gothic architecture was essentially German. Drawing on British and French scholarship, Goethe, along with the majority of German scholars in

⁷⁶ W.D. Robson-Scott, *The Literary Background of the Gothic Revival: A Study in the History of Taste* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 50-52. Goethe was hardly the only German writer who inveighed against the French and Italians in defense of German culture at this time. At the University of Göttingen, for example, the circle of poets called the Göttinger Hainbund (Brotherhood of the Göttingen Grove, founded in 1772, the year Goethe wrote “Von deutscher Baukunst”), was known for its Pietist Protestant diatribes against the insidious influence of the French and Italians, who threatened to corrupt the pure and noble German (Protestant) soul. See Jost Hermand, “Caspar David Friedrich and the National Cultural Heritage,” in *Searching for Common Ground*, ed. Vaszonyi, 106-24; here, p. 110, and idem, “Back to the Roots: The Teutonic Revival from Klopstock to the Wars of Liberation,” in *From the Greeks to the Greens: Images of the Simple Life*, ed. Reinhold Grimm and Jost Hermand (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 48-62; here, pp. 52-53. Attacks against the *Welschen* on behalf of German culture often combined a defense of Protestantism with an assertion of German patriotism; Goethe, however anti-Catholic he may have been, did not defend Protestantism per se.

the last decades of the eighteenth century, determined that the New Gothic style was actually a result of Saracenic influence on the Old Gothic style, and so not truly German after all.⁷⁷ In an influential account of 1792 Stieglitz dismissed much of the art and architecture of medieval Christian Europe as displaying the further degradation of the classical tradition, and especially of the Greek art and architecture he most admired. At the same time, like the English scholarship he appears to have been following, he greatly admired the Arabic (a term he used broadly, according to standard practice, where “Islamic” is generally used today) and Moorish (i.e., specifically Spanish Islamic) cultures, including their art and architecture.⁷⁸ According to his account, Arabic and

⁷⁷ In the early eighteenth century English and French scholars popularized the theory that Islamic architecture had inspired Christian architects to develop the Gothic style. See Paul Frankl, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations through Eight Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), 363-65, on Christopher Wren’s 1713 assertion that the Gothic style was inspired by Islamic architecture. For the possible influence of John Evelyn on Wren see pp. 359-60 [inexplicably, on p. 376 Frankl dates Wren’s statement back to 1666]. See pp. 375-77 for François de Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon’s statement of the Arabic origins of Gothic in the second dialogue of his *Dialogues sur l’éloquence en général et sur celle de la chaire en particulier*, written before 1715 and published at the latest by 1718; see also p. 390 on Jacques-François Blondel’s elaboration of Fénelon’s theory, published in 1752. Evelyn, Fénelon and Blondel all cited Islamic inspiration as responsible for the faults of the Gothic style; Wren, by contrast, gave a more positive assessment and saw Muslims as providing Europe with the arts and culture it had lost. For later British versions of the theory of Islamic origins see also Tonia Raquejo, “The ‘Arab Cathedrals’: Moorish Architecture as Seen by British Travellers,” *The Burlington Magazine* v. 128, no. 1001 (1986), 555-63 [Raquejo (p. 555) dates public awareness of Wren’s theory to the posthumous publication of his *Parentalia* (London, [1750]), 306, without reference to earlier English or French sources].

⁷⁸ By 1765, with the Gothic Revival in full swing in England, a British architectural historian, Stephen Riou (1720-80), identified the Islamic peoples of North Africa and, especially, Spain (“Moors” or “Saracens”), as the source of this architectural inspiration: see Raquejo, “Arab Cathedrals,” 555, citing Riou, *The Grecian Orders of Architecture* (London, [1768]), 9-10. In France, the theory of the Gothic style’s Islamic origins led to criticism of its inappropriateness for Christian use; in England this theory seems to have contributed to a Protestant re-valorization of the Gothic, which could be dissociated from Catholicism to the extent that it had originated in (likewise revalorized) Muslim arts and

Moorish works had been modeled on those of the Byzantine lands the Arabs had conquered. He distinguished Moorish architecture from Byzantine only by the use of horseshoe, rather than round (Greek, as he believed) arches, and he saw Moorish architecture as the most sophisticated of the Middle Ages.⁷⁹ He accordingly described Old Gothic (*altgothisch*) as crude and clumsy (*plump und schwerfällig*). He also saw New Gothic (*neugothisch*) as the same style improved and refined (*verschönert und veredelt*) in Spain by Greek artists creating works under Arabic influence. That influence seems to have explained for Stieglitz why, despite all its irregularities, the New Gothic still charmed connoisseurs.⁸⁰ Stieglitz noted, however, that buildings built in Saxony under Henry I, a Holy Roman Emperor (r. 919-36) of the Saxon dynasty (also called the Ottonian dynasty, 911-1024), struck a happy middle ground between Old and New Gothic. It was neither too clumsy nor suffering from excessive ornamentation.⁸¹ The New Gothic style, according to Stieglitz's 1792 account, spread from Spain to the rest of Europe, with the exception of Italy. This theory quickly became popular. When lecturing in Berlin in 1801-02 Friedrich's brother, the literary theorist and translator August Schlegel (1767-1845), who, like Friedrich, demonstrated an early fascination with Sanskrit, seems to have accepted the Saracenic theory (using the term broadly, apparently as a synonym for "Arabic"), while already suggesting that Indian sources might also be considered.⁸² In this, August anticipated the enthusiasm that would be generated by Friedrich Schlegel's philological research. Given the continued dominance of the

culture. English, like French, criticism of Spain was highly anti-Catholic, with the added dimension of being pro-Protestant: see Brüggemann, "Spanienberichte," 12-14.

⁷⁹ Stieglitz, *Encyklopädie der bürgerlichen Baukunst*, 191-92.

⁸⁰ Stieglitz, *Encyklopädie der bürgerlichen Baukunst*, 188-90 and 196-97.

⁸¹ Stieglitz, *Encyklopädie der bürgerlichen Baukunst*, 206.

⁸² Frankl, *Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations*, 455-56.

Saracenic theory, imagine Goethe's surprise when he encountered Boisserée. When introducing himself and his research to Goethe in 1810, Boisserée categorically rejected the idea of New Gothic architecture's essentially Saracen (i.e., Arabic, Moorish) character and again celebrated it as German.⁸³ Initially, Goethe remained skeptical: he had not considered the Byzantine question, considered Gothic as originating in Islamic architecture, and had little regard for Boisserée's teacher, Schlegel.⁸⁴

iv. Hellenizing, Greek, Byzantine, rounded arch (*gräzicierend, neugriechisch, byzantinisch, rundbogen*)
vs. German, Romantic, pointed arch (*romantisch, deutsch, spitzbogen*)

Along with his brother Melchior (1786-1851) and their friend (Melchior's partner) Johann Baptist Bertram (1776-1841), Sulpiz Boisserée had studied Greek philosophy and literary history with Friedrich Schlegel in Napoleonic Paris. At the same time, the Boisserées and Bertram turned Schlegel's attention towards medieval architecture and the Catholic Church.⁸⁵ While introducing Schlegel to the Cathedral of

⁸³ In 1823 Hegel still identified the Moorish style as an aspect of the Gothic style (though not as the source of the Gothic). Karge, "Zwischen Naturwissenschaft und Kulturgeschichte," 41, n. 11.

⁸⁴ On 14 May, 1810, shortly after his first meeting with Sulpiz Boisserée, Goethe wrote to his friend Karl Friedrich Reinhard: "strangest of all seems to me now the German patriotism which insisted in claiming this obviously Saracenic plant as a product of our native soil." See Robson-Scott, *Literary Background*, 176, and discussion below. Goethe was hardly alone in his tracing Gothic architecture to Islamic art (as will be discussed further in chap. 5). The Prince of Württemberg, on visiting Boisserée's collection in 1814, was among those whose convictions of the Gothic's Islamic origins had not yet been swayed by German patriots; see the entry dated July 3, 1814, in Boisserée, *Tagebücher* v. 1, p. 162. Like Bavaria, Württemberg had recently been raised to a kingdom by Napoleon, though whether this now delicate political situation influenced the prince's reception of this re-interpretation of Gothic art and architecture is not clear.

⁸⁵ Sulpiz Boisserée, "Fragmente einer Selbstbiographie," in *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, ed. H.-J. Weitz, 5 vols. (Darmstadt: Eduard Roether, 1978-95), 1:21-22. Alexander Hamilton was teaching Schlegel Sanskrit at the time, while Antoine Léon de Chézy was teaching

Notre Dame, his students expressed additional enthusiasm for the many other medieval monuments that they would pass on their return trip to Cologne in the spring of 1804.⁸⁶

The devotion of these young men – in particular, Sulpiz Boisserée – to the damaged and threatened medieval architecture moved Schlegel to join them in their efforts to study, save, and publicize it.

Schlegel accompanied his students on their trip home, and published an influential travelogue in 1806.⁸⁷ This work, “Letters on a Trip through the Netherlands, Rhine Regions, Switzerland, and a Part of France” (*Briefe auf einer Reise durch die Niederlande, Rheingegenden, die Schweiz, und einen Theil von Frankreich*) expressed their shared patriotic sentiments and his own new-found appreciation for medieval

him Persian. Ernst Behler, *Friedrich Schlegel in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1966), 94. Schlegel used these studies to develop his theory of the relationship between Sanskrit and European languages (as discussed above). On philology as providing the methodology for much nineteenth-century historical theorizing about art and architecture see Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down From Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750-1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), esp. pp. 40-51.

⁸⁶ W.D. Robson-Scott, *The Literary Background of the Gothic Revival: A Chapter in the History of Taste* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 131, citing Sulpiz Boisserée, “Lebensbeschreibung,” in *Sulpiz Boisserée*, ed. Mathilde Boisserée, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1862), 1:27-28; reprinted in Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 1:24-25 (where the essay is entitled “Fragmente einer Selbstbiographie”).

⁸⁷ Robson-Scott, *Literary Background of the Gothic Revival*, notes that in its travelogue format, its itinerary, and its focus on Cologne Cathedral, Schlegel’s “Briefe auf einer Reise” echoes the much more extensive account by Georg Forster (1759-94) of his travels with Alexander Humboldt. Forster had published these as *Ansichten vom Niederrhein, von Brabant, Flandern, Holland, England und Frankreich, im April, Mai und Junius 1790*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1791-94). Forster’s work was well known to the Boisserées and Schlegel: Schlegel praised Forster in *Charakteristiken und Kritiken*, written with his brother August (2 vols., Königsberg, 1801), v. 1, p. 93, and certainly Forster informed their travels and ideas (including the Boisserées’ campaign for the completion of Cologne Cathedral). Schlegel’s use of Goethe’s „Von deutscher Baukunst,“ of Fiorillo, and of Warburton (see below) find no place in Forster, however, and is part of Schlegel’s reinterpretation of medieval architecture to support a German patriotic stance absent from Forster’s work.

architecture. It re-introduced the idea that New Gothic was German (*deutsch*).

Incorporating his own philhellenism into this latest field of inquiry, Schlegel introduced as well the idea that the Old Gothic, though less attractive, was Hellenizing or Constantinian-Greek.⁸⁸

Schlegel had derived this idea from English scholars, who for over half a century had argued that Greek influence, via Byzantium, was evident in the earlier Western medieval buildings. The English literary critic and theologian Reverend William Warburton (1698-1779) had published it as a note on medieval architecture in his edition of the works of Alexander Pope.⁸⁹ Although architectural history was not one of Warburton's particular strengths, his note had subsequently been reprinted and repeated as authoritative on several occasions – including as recently as 1803, when Schlegel apparently discovered it at the Bibliothèque nationale.⁹⁰ Many others also shared the

⁸⁸ “Es ist schon bemerkt worden, daß es zwei durchaus verschiedene Epochen in der gotischen Baukunst gebe: eine ältere, welche man wegen einiger Ähnlichkeit mit der konstantinisch-byzantinischen christlichen Bauart die gräzisierende nennen könnte; dann die vollendete spätere, ungleich künstlichere, eigentlich deutsche....” This appears in the first edition of Friedrich Schlegel, “Briefe auf einer Reise durch die Niederlande, Rheingegenden, die Schweiz, und einen Theil von Frankreich,” in *Poetisches Taschenbuch auf das Jahr 1806* (Berlin: Friedrich Unger, 1806), which Schlegel revised and republished as “Grundzüge der gotischen Baukunst,” in *Friedrich Schlegels sämtliche Werke* 6 (Vienna: Jakob Mayer, 1823); both versions are reprinted together in Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst* (page references are to *Ansichten und Ideen*), 180; see also 169-70; 181-82.

⁸⁹ Possibly Warburton was thinking of the scheme once outlined by Lorenzo Ghiberti (1378-1455), in which the period from AD 1000 to 1160 was labeled “the age of the crude *maniera greca*.” See Paul Frankl, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations through Eight Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), 252-53.

⁹⁰ William Warburton was probably the first to argue this. He characterized the influence as the “Greek style corrupted by Byzantine” in a note to his edition of the *Works of Alexander Pope: Esq., in Nine Volumes Complete; with his Last Corrections and Improvements as they were Delivered to the Editor a Little Before His Death* (London: J. and P. Knapton, H. Lintot, J. and R. Tonson, and S. Draper, 1851), vol. 3, *Moral Essays*, 267-68 n., where he discusses the origins of medieval architectural styles. Warburton also

patriotic and (not unrelated) philhellenic sentiments which informed Schlegel's ideas. With the help of charismatic advocates such as Sulpiz Boisserée, even Goethe was soon convinced once again that New Gothic architecture symbolized the greatness of the German spirit, and defined the earlier style as Byzantine or New Greek. Goethe did not, however, accept the new theory concerning the Old Gothic style in the same celebratory spirit: for him, the connection to Byzantium was far from ennobling. It instead demonstrated the abject oppression of arts and culture in a world dominated by the (Catholic) Church.⁹¹

Despite the conviction with which he had written in 1792, Stieglitz was among the many who joined the growing tide of patriotic enthusiasm for New Gothic architecture. In 1820, five years after Napoleon's fall, Stieglitz re-defined the Old German style as New Greek (or Byzantine) in a work on German architecture, *Von*

appears to be the English source for Schlegel's discussion of the terms "Saxon" and "Norman"; Schlegel had come across this source (which he does not directly name) while visiting the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, or so he claimed in a passage he interpolated into the second (1823) edition of "Briefe auf einer Reise." Warburton's ideas gained wide currency and the note was not only reprinted in the many subsequent editions of Warburton's *Pope*, but also in full in Richard Elsam, *An Essay on Rural Architecture* (London, 1803), 13; this is according to Paul Frankl (who states that he never actually saw Warburton's edition of Pope, and so used Elsam as his source: see Frankl, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations*, 391 n. 45), and in *Essays on Gothic Architecture by the Rev. T. Warton, Rev. J. Bentham, Captian Grose and the Rev. J. Milner*, 2nd ed. (London, 1800), 121 f.; this is according to Eichner (see Schlegel, "Briefe auf einer Reise," 198, n. 4).

⁹¹ See the "Heidelberg" sections of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, "Kunst und Alterthum am Rhein und Main," originally published in *Ueber Kunst und Alterthum in den Rhein und Mayn Gegenden* 1, pt 1 (1816) and 1, pt. 2 (April, 1817), reprinted in Goethe, *Biographische Einzelschriften*, ed. Josef Kunz (Zürich: Artemis, 1962), 569-99, Gedenkausgabe der Werke Briefe und Gespräche, 28. August 1949, ed. Ernst Beutler, 12. See also Kunz's discussion on 819-22. Goethe's "Kunst und Alterthum am Rhein und Main" is also discussed in Robson-Scott, *Literary Background*, 201-05.

altdeutscher Baukunst.⁹² (Stieglitz, among others, used the terms New Greek and Byzantine interchangeably.⁹³) Although his title almost duplicated the title of Goethe's then (as now) famous essay, Stieglitz cited Schlegel (1772-1829) as an inspiration.⁹⁴ What is more, he now asserted that the culture under Henry I and the other Saxon Emperors in those regions (including Prussia as well as Saxony) that later became Protestant, had been characterized not only by the use of this Byzantine style but also by Greek learning.⁹⁵ The New Gothic style, he now asserted, was wholly German. While Stieglitz, like Goethe, gave an anti-Catholic twist to his interpretation of the New Greek style, Stieglitz saw it as representing a more enlightened Christian era that pre-dated the abuse of papal power prompting the Reformation.⁹⁶ After a transitional phase during which German and (Stieglitz continued to insist) Arabic influences transformed the New Greek style, a German or Pure Gothic (*deutsch* or *reingothisch*) style emerged of a quality which had previously only been equaled by that of ancient Greece.⁹⁷

Stieglitz's emphasis on the pure, or German, character of this later period seems in part calculated to forestall criticism of his continued interest in an Arabic role in the gestation of the New Gothic style.⁹⁸ Stieglitz wrote that "this connection of the Arabic with the German must not alienate. The skillfulness of the Arabs was treasured in Germany even earlier...." He insisted that German artists then infused this style with the

⁹² Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 9.

⁹³ See, e.g., Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 27.

⁹⁴ Christian Ludwig Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst* (Leipzig: Gerhard Fleischer, 1820), 17 n. 1.

⁹⁵ Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 42-45, and Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume bis in die neuern Zeiten* (Nuremberg: Friedrich Campe, 1827), 293-99 and 318-30.

⁹⁶ Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 56.

⁹⁷ Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 9, 14, 63.

⁹⁸ Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 10 and 63.

Romantic spirit.⁹⁹ Others, such as Friedrich Schlegel, continued to use the term “New Gothic,” asserting that “German” was too narrow a term for a style that flourished in all lands once inhabited by Goths, and at the same time suggesting “Romantic” as the best designation for this style.¹⁰⁰ More than associating the style with the medieval vernacular literature already assigned a Romantic period (*romantische Zeit*),¹⁰¹ Schlegel was likely trying to counter the tendency to interpret German medieval architecture as embodying opposition to Latin culture. That tendency would nevertheless continue during the period covered by this dissertation, and “Romantic” did not find broad acceptance.¹⁰² In the meantime “Rounded Arch” and “Pointed Arch,” initially simply informal descriptors, came to be used as terms that were neither as dated as “Old Gothic” and “New Gothic,” nor as polemically charged as “Byzantine,” “New Greek,” and “German,” which all have ethnic and geographic connotations. Perhaps this is also why they have found continued

⁹⁹ “Diese Verbindung des arabischen mit dem deutschen darf nicht befremden. Schon früher wurde in Deutschland die Geschicklichkeit der Araber geschätzt...” Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 63.

¹⁰⁰ An interpolation into Schlegel, “Briefe auf einer Reise” (1806), published in the revised version, “Grundzüge der gotischen Baukunst” (1823); see Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, 161-62.

¹⁰¹ Hans Eichner, “Germany: Romantische – Romantik – Romantiker,” in Eichner, ed., *‘Romantic’ and its Cognates: The European History of a Word* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), 103-04. Eichner regards the entire Renaissance as incorporated within *die romantische Zeit* as, he notes, the concept of the Renaissance as such did not yet exist; Schlegel certainly included the Quattrocento within this period but classicists such as Klenze did not, viewing it instead as the Awakening of Antiquity that marked a break with, rather a culmination of the Middle Ages.

¹⁰² The effort to re-interpret the Gothic style as Catholic would gain momentum in the 1840s under August Reichensperger during the debates concerning the completion of Cologne Cathedral. See Lewis, *The Politics of the German Gothic Revival*, 34-42. It is interesting to note that the first meeting of the society Reichensperger formed for the purpose of supporting completion of the cathedral (April 13, 1841) was held in Cologne’s Jesuit gymnasium (38). It seems possible that in making this choice Reichensperger wished to help undo the then longstanding notion that the Gothic style was antithetical to the Jesuits.

use in modern scholarship about nineteenth-century historicism. Rounded and Pointed Arch played little role, however, in Bavarian discussions of medieval art and architecture during the period under consideration, when ethnic and geographic claims, along with confessional considerations, were paramount and openly addressed.¹⁰³

v. Newer (*neuer(e)*) Art and Architecture and the Awakening/Rebirth of Antiquity
(*Erwachen/ Wiedergeburt des Antiken*)

Those nineteenth-century Bavarian discussions argued for a loosely defined period following the Gothic, which they consistently designated as Newer (*neuer(e)*) art and architecture. This Newer period they understood as international and as continuing more or less to their own day. This period either began with, or after, the turning point that, according to Vasari, had occurred in thirteenth-century Italy and which he had described as a *rinascita*, or rebirth of antiquity: this *rinascita* was, however, not understood by Vasari or by his early nineteenth-century German audience as a period in and of itself.¹⁰⁴ Vasari had not noted when art had ceased to turn towards the ancients, or discussed the relationship of developments in Italy to those elsewhere. In retrospect, scholars building on Vasari agreed that the tradition defined by Vasari's *Lives* had become international when, at some point between the end of the fifteenth century and the early sixteenth, artists and architects in the North began to follow the examples of the artists Vasari had described.

¹⁰³ Arguably the term Rounded Arch, as most famously introduced into the debate on style by Heinrich Hübsch, was intended by Hübsch to cloak his polemical motives in the guise of objectivity; his usage has, nevertheless, been adopted by later scholars as if the objectivity of the term were self-evident. This discussion extends, however, beyond the confines of this dissertation.

¹⁰⁴ Karge, "Renaissance. Aufkommen und Entfaltung," 40-41.

In early nineteenth-century German historiography, Italy from the thirteenth through the fifteenth centuries was still consistently interpreted as a special moment in the development of art and architecture – but whether a new beginning or an endpoint came into question. The established interpretation of it as a new beginning was endorsed by Stieglitz and Johann Dominik Fiorillo (1748-1821), at least in their writings prior to Napoleon’s fall. In 1792, for example, Stieglitz described this period as the revival of good taste after its medieval decline; good taste then spread to other nations.¹⁰⁵ Fiorillo, an artist, curator and teacher of Neapolitan origins working in Göttingen and Brunswick, wrote in 1803 that the Middle Ages had ended with the transplantation of Italian ideas (i.e., the Awakening of Antiquity) into German lands under Holy Roman Emperor Frederick III (reigned 1452-93), when we

finally arrive at the point in time when Germany was to acquire enlightenment concerning the light of a finer culture and its requirements. [...] But the arts that at that time were pursued only in Italy, were now also transplanted to Germany, where we discern painting and sculpture in luxuriant blossom.¹⁰⁶

But if the Italian humanist spirit did inspire improvements in German art, for Fiorillo it was in France that this spirit was most fully grasped and developed.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ Stieglitz, *Encyklopädie der bürgerlichen Baukunst*, 210.

¹⁰⁶ “endlich zu dem Zeitpunkt gekommen, wo Deutschland zu dem Lichte einer feiner Kultur und seinen Bedürfnissen angemessenen Aufklärung gelangen sollte. [...] Aber die Künste die damals nur in Italien betrieben wurden, sind nun auch nach Deutschland verpflanzt worden, wo wir Mahlerey und Bildhauerey in üppiger Blüthe erkennen.” Johann Dominik Fiorillo, “Fragmente zur Geschichte der Mahlerey und Bildhauerey in Deutschland, von den Zeiten Carls des Großen, bis zum Anfang des funfzehnten Jahrhunderts,” in *Kleine Schriften artistischen Inhalts* (Göttingen: Heinrich Dieterich, 1803), 77 and 79.

¹⁰⁷ It was, according to Fiorillo, only after Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV undertook a happy imitation of a French model for his palace in Prague and employed a French architect for the palace church, that Germans began to recognize the superiority of the new style. Fiorillo, “Fragmente zur Geschichte der Mahlerey und Bildhauerey in Deutschland,” 49.

On the heels of these comments, Friedrich Schlegel, writing from Paris, helped to reinterpret the Awakening of Antiquity in Italy not as a new beginning but as the culmination of the Middle Ages before the decline that came with Michelangelo.¹⁰⁸ This period of inspiration was, moreover, paralleled in Germany, which had also been dominated by Byzantine artists and which likewise began to develop a truly national style in the thirteenth century: while Italian artists and architects looked to their ancient roots as a basis for reawakening, German artists and architects were looking back to the Goths. Schlegel drew on the recently established idea of a unique and productive relationship between New Gothic artists working in Germany and their contemporaries in Italy. He cited Dürer as the preeminent example. Dürer had been relatively unappreciated until Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder (1773-1798), drawing on Vasari's *Lives*, elevated Dürer to the status of Raphael's Italian companion and counterpart in his influential *Outpourings from the Heart of an Art-Loving Friar (Herzensergiessungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders, 1797)*.¹⁰⁹ Schlegel, the Boisserées, and others not only

¹⁰⁸ See especially Friedrich Schlegel, "Vom Raffael," *Europa. Eine Zeitschrift*, 1:[2], no. 1 (1803): 3-19, reprinted in Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der Christlichen Kunst*, ed. Hans Eichner, *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe* 4, ed. Ernst Behler with Hans Eichner and Jean-Jacques Anstett (Munich: Thomas, 1959), 48-60.

¹⁰⁹ "– und siehe! da standen, abgesondert von allen, Raffael und Albrecht Dürer Hand in Hand leibhaftig vor meinen Augen und sahen in freundlicher Ruhe schweigend ihre beisammenhängenden Gemälde an. Den göttlichen Raffael anzureden hatte ich nicht den Mut; eine heimliche ehrerbietige Furcht verschloß mir die Lippen. Aber meinen Albrecht wollte ich soeben begrüßen und meine Liebe vor ihm ausschütten; – allein in dem Augenblick verwirrte sich mit einem Getöse alles vor meinen Augen, und ich erwachte mit heftiger Bewegung. // Dieses Traumgesicht hatte meinem Gemüt innige Freude gemacht, und diese ward noch vollkommener, als ich bald nachher in dem alten Vasari las, wie die beiden herrlichen Künstler auch bei ihren Lebzeiten wirklich, ohne sich zu kennen, durch ihre Werke Freunde gewesen und wie die redlichen und treuen Arbeiten des alten Deutschen vom Raffael mit Wohlgefallen angesehen wären und er sie seiner Liebe nicht unwert geachtet hätte. // Das aber kann ich freilich nicht verschweigen, daß mir nachher bei den Werken der beiden Maler immer so wie in jenem Traum zumute war,

rapidly endorsed the new status accorded to Dürer, but also accepted Wackenroder's further comparisons of Nuremberg with Rome and German genius with Italian.¹¹⁰

Some two decades later the architect Leo von Klenze also regarded the Awakening of Antiquity in Italy as neither an endpoint nor a beginning, but as a unique moment of clarity between the decadent Middle Ages and the next period of decline.¹¹¹ According to Klenze, the downfall of art had been heralded by Michelangelo's work at the Vatican (in this respect, echoing Schlegel's judgment of Michelangelo), and subsequently emanated from sixteenth-century Rome to the rest of Europe. Given his distaste for the Byzantine style, he perhaps surprisingly viewed it as the foundation for Italy's reawakening.¹¹² Echoing Stieglitz, Klenze asserted that Byzantine art and architecture had been retained in Italy when the New Gothic had already become standard

daß ich nämlich bei denen des Albrecht Dürer wohl manchmal mich daran versuchte, ihr echtes Verdienst jemanden zu erklären und über ihre Vortrefflichkeiten mich in Worte auszubreiten wage.... // Nicht bloß unter italienischem Himmel, unter majestätischen Kuppeln und korinthischen Säulen; - auch unter Spitzgewölben, Kraus-verzierten Gebäuden und gotischen Türmen wächst wahre Kunst hervor." Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder and Ludwig Tieck, *Herzensergießungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders* (Berlin: Johann Friedrich Unger, 1797); reprinted with an afterword by Richard Benz, Universal-Bibliothek Nr. 7860 [2] (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 1979), 58-59 (page numbers refer to the Reclam edition).

¹¹⁰ "...Lobt Raffael aber auch den immer noch nicht sehr bekannten Albrecht Dürer-- dabei ist Wackenroder einer der ersten, der italienische mit deutschen Kunst auf der selben Ebene setzt, und eine historische Verbindung zwischen Nürnberg und Rome beschreibt": Alfred Neumeyer, "Die Erweckung der Gotik in der deutschen Kunst des späten 18. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der Romantik," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 49 (1928): 2.

¹¹¹ Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur*, 16-17: see also the discussion below under the heading "iv. New Roman (neurömisch)."

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 16. On the excesses of the Byzantine style as products of the empire's decadence and internal strife see, for instance, Klenze, *Aphoristische Bemerkungen gesammelt auf seiner Reise nach Griechenland* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1838), 317-18.

elsewhere. This conjecture may have been based in part on his even greater distaste for the New Gothic than for the Byzantine style.¹¹³

New hope for art and architecture had come only within the last half century, with the advent of artists and architects who were returning to the direct study of classical models as a basis for their work.¹¹⁴ Even in looking at the art and architecture of Italy during the period covered by Vasari, Klenze celebrated not its own virtues but its degree of fidelity to classical models. Early in his career, Klenze turned to commissions for building types better represented in reawakened Italy than in the classical tradition – specifically, palaces such as his first major completed commission, the Leuchtenberg Palais (1817-21) (which until recently has been regarded as the first Renaissance Revival building), built in Munich built for Prince Eugène de Beauharnais, Napoleon’s stepson and Ludwig’s nemesis and brother-in-law, and the Königsbau of the Munich Residence (1823-32), built for Ludwig. But rather than celebrate models such as the Palazzo Farnese in Rome (Antonio da Sangallo the Younger and Michelangelo, 1517-50), or the Palazzo Pitti in Florence (Luca Fancelli, begun 1458), he improved upon them by correcting their classicizing details and adding Hellenizing elements in a manner unrelated to the later interpretation of these buildings as reviving the Renaissance.¹¹⁵ Ludwig would, in fact,

¹¹³ Possibly Klenze had in mind the evident similarities between Byzantine and Italian Renaissance ground plans. On Klenze’s dislike of the Gothic style see, for instance, his “Architektonische Erwiederungen und Erörterungen über Griechisches und Nichtgriechisches von einem Architekten,” section 3, 80-81 and 190-193, a manuscript in the Bavarian State Library reproduced on CD-ROM in Nerdinger, ed., *Leo von Klenze. Architekt zwischen Kunst und Hof*.

¹¹⁴ Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur*, 17.

¹¹⁵ See Karge, “Renaissance. Aufkommen und Entfaltung,” 44-46; Buttler, *Leo von Klenze*, 169-75 and 217-32; and Florian Zimmermann, “Königsbau der Residenz, München, 1823-1832,” cat. no. 34 in *Romantik und Restauration*, ed. Nerdinger with Gruhn-Zimmermann, 209-16.

have been horrified by the French influence suggested by the term “Renaissance,” for he had insisted on using Italian palace architecture as models for the Königsbau specifically to avoid reliance on French ones.¹¹⁶

In contrast to Klenze, by 1827 Stieglitz, who with the fall of Napoleon had begun to describe Newer architecture less positively as foreign to Germany,¹¹⁷ described it as the rejection of Old German and Old Italian art and architecture in favor of a spiritless imitation of ancient Roman models deformed by a strange and unnatural mannerism.¹¹⁸ Building on opinions already voiced by both Schlegel and Klenze, Stieglitz blamed Michelangelo for this decline through his arbitrary (*willkürlich*) approach to classical models; from sixteenth-century Rome the Newer style soon spread through Europe, where its influence continued to their own day.¹¹⁹ In an anonymous review Karl Schnaase, later a prominent art and architectural critic and historian, strongly criticized Stieglitz’s new antipathy towards Newer architecture. In particular, Schnaase wished

¹¹⁶ Buttlar, Leo von Klenze, 224, and Florian Zimmermann, “Königsbau der Residenz,” 214.

¹¹⁷ Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 192-94; Stieglitz published an early version of this work, setting out his change of heart, immediately upon Napoleon’s demise: “Von altdeutscher Baukunst,” *Zeitung für die elegante Welt* (1815), no. 237, columns 1889-1893; no. 238, columns 1902-1904, and no. 239, columns 1909-1911: see Klaus Jahn Philipp, “Christian Ludwig Stieglitz (1756-1836). Der Beginn der Architekturgeschichtsschreibung in Deutschland zwischen Klassizismus und Romantik,” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, Bauhaus-Universität Weimar* 42 no. 2/3 (1996): 117, n. 21. It is interesting that Stieglitz was in such a rush to publicize this change of heart, which suggests the urgency Saxons felt to display their German patriotism as the Congress of Vienna was engaged in their long-dreaded debate as to how much of the Kingdom of Saxony to assign to Prussia as retribution for Saxony’s failure to abandon Napoleon until it was too late (i.e., after Bavaria had abandoned Napoleon), discussed in James J. Sheehan, *German History 1770-1866* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 316-20 and 400-401.

¹¹⁸ Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume*, 451-54 and 459.

¹¹⁹ Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume*, 451-70; see esp. pp. 453-54.

Stieglitz had taken Italian Newer Architecture seriously, and speculated why it had supplanted the preexisting architectural tradition so quickly in ultramontane Europe.¹²⁰ (Schnaase appears to have used “ultramontane” here as a purely geographical designation and not, as was increasingly common, to charge excessive loyalty to the Vatican.)

Schnaase was somewhat precocious in defending Newer Architecture. Perhaps he was responding to the degree to which Winckelmann’s celebration of ancient Greek art and architecture as the perfect expression of human freedom had been transformed by architects and scholars such as Klenze and Stieglitz into an ever-more carefully policed set of rules. It was not until the 1830s that Germans first noted the term *renaissance* as it had come to be used in France during the 1820s; when, in the 1840s, it was finally embraced in the German literature, it connoted individualism and anti-authoritarianism, and was redefined as an international phenomenon originating in Italy, and not in the art and architecture of sixteenth-century France.¹²¹

By 1845, Gottfried Semper (1803-79), the architect most closely associated with the development of the Renaissance revival in Germany, retroactively described a building he had completed in Dresden in 1839 as in the Renaissance style.¹²² That Semper would have embraced this style even before its German re-definition is not surprising, as his training in France under Franz Christian Gau (1790-1854), a Rhenish architect who had retained his Revolutionary sympathies, is well known, as is Semper’s

¹²⁰ [Karl Schnaase], review of C. L. Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume bis in die neuern Zeiten* in *Berliner Conversations-Blatt für Poesie, Literatur und Kritik*, 2 (1828): 259. For the attribution of this work to Schnaase see Karge, “Das Frühwerk Karl Schnaases,” 410 n. 27. This attribution makes it Schnaase’s earliest known publication.

¹²¹ Karge, “Renaissance. Aufkommen und Entfaltung des Stilbegriffs,” 43, 48, 63-66.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 64-66.

own flight to England to escape persecution for his participation in the uprisings in Dresden of May, 1849.

A Munich-trained architect who had trained with Klenze, Johann Gottfried Gutensohn (1792-1851), preceded Semper by several years. In 1841 Gutensohn retroactively published one of his designs as in the Renaissance style – the Kursaalgebäude in Bad Brückenau (1827-31), commissioned by Ludwig I and completed in 1831. The classicizing corrections of its Renaissance elements suggest, however, Gutensohn’s work under Klenze (who viewed Renaissance variations on the classical orders as mistakes), and not precocious French influence (which would have been anathema to Ludwig) as the basis for his design.¹²³ Whatever the original motivation for his design, Gutensohn was the first German to openly embrace the Renaissance as an art-historical period worthy of emulation.¹²⁴ The successful introduction of this term reflects the use of it by Semper and his colleagues in Dresden to describe their more convincing and productive use of the French-inspired style, as well as the utility of foreign terminology as a rhetorical device for fixing a concept in the collective consciousness. As

¹²³ Ibid., 61-62. Karge suggests that, on the basis of this article, the Kursaalgebäude could be regarded as one of the earliest Renaissance Revival buildings; it seems more appropriate, given Karge’s own arguments, to consider it as a building built according to Klenze’s increasingly out-of-date interpretation of the Rebirth of Antiquity – with its emphasis on antiquity and not on its later transformations, and Gutensohn’s article as evidence of his effort to re-interpret his own work as up-to-date. Gutensohn’s knowledge of the sixteenth-century Roman monuments and ornament that provided the basis for the Kursaalgebäude’s interior had, in fact, been gained while in Rome on a travel grant provided by Ludwig at Klenze’s behest, and Gutensohn’s concentration on this material at the time that Ludwig and Klenze were focusing on sixteenth-century Roman models for the Königsbau of the Residence suggests a still more direct relationship between Gutensohn’s project and Klenze’s and Ludwig’s ideas.

¹²⁴ Karge notes that the newness of the term “Renaissance” in the German literature is indicated in part by Gutensohn’s description of his building as “im Style des Renaissance,” i.e., the feminine gender of “Renaissance” had not yet been fixed. Karge, “Renaissance. Aufkommen und Entfaltung,” 62.

a consequence, the earlier ambiguity concerning the time and place of art's rebirth fell away. Semper will make another appearance in this dissertation in Chapter Four, but only in regard to the very start of his career, before his arrival in Dresden in the fall of 1834, when his buildings would begin to transform that city. Gradually, the concept of an Awakening of Antiquity became obsolete, and the shifting shape of architectural historiography along with the new style of revival architecture helped to usher in the end of the first significant Byzantine revival.

The Renaissance was still considered an essentially Italian phenomenon in German art historiography until the identification and celebration of a German Renaissance in the 1870s. Wilhelm Lübke (1826-93), at the time teaching at the polytechnic and art schools in Stuttgart (1866-85) was the one who, through his *Geschichte der deutschen Renaissance* of 1872, invented the idea of a German Renaissance. It was for him an era when reformers and humanists revived German national life and, if its example was followed, it might help the now unified German nation to build up its national life once again.¹²⁵ Lübke's rehabilitation of the architecture

¹²⁵ Wilhelm Lübke, *Geschichte der deutschen Renaissance*, vol. 3 of *Geschichte der neueren Baukunst*, ed. Wilhelm Lübke and Jacob Burckhardt, which is in turn vol. 5 of *Geschichte der Baukunst*, ed. Franz Kugler (Stuttgart: Ebner and Seubert, 1872), was both influential and popular enough to appear in a second, revised edition in 1882 and in a third edition, edited by A. Haupt, in 1914. On Lübke's position as discoverer (*Entdecker*) of the German Renaissance, and the relationship between this endeavor and Jacob Burckhardt's researches on Italian art and culture see Nikolaus Meier, "Wilhelm Lübke, Jacob Burckhardt und die Architektur der Renaissance" *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 85 (1985): 151-212. It was during the decades following the initial publication of Lübke's work on the German Renaissance that celebration of Heidelberg Castle as a national monument came to focus on its German Renaissance ruins: see Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art*, 56. Rather than the late Gothic bell tower emulated by Christian Zais for Karl Freiherr vom Stein at Nassau (as discussed in Chapter Three), it was the Friedrichsbau (1601-07) designed by Johannes Schoch that, in 1895-1903, would be the only part of Heidelberg Castle to be rebuilt—in the by then

associated with this German Renaissance, and his rejection of Gothic as the German national style, drew strong opposition from some prominent fellow Catholics (especially August Reichensperger and Johannes Janssen), who saw in it a new threat to their Ultramontanist positions.¹²⁶

well-established German Renaissance Revival style. This reconstruction was undertaken by Carl Schäfer, professor at the Technische Hochschule, Karlsruhe — ironically, in the face of the concerted opposition of Lübke, among others. See Sigrid Gensichen, “Das Heidelberger Schloss. Fürstliche Repräsentation in Architektur und Ausstattung,” in *Heidelberg. Geschichte und Gestalt*, ed. Elmar Mittler (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1996), 158-60, with bibliography, and Bernd Müller, *Architekturführer Heidelberg. Bauten um 1000-2000*, Sonderveröffentlichungen des Stadtarchivs Heidelberg 10 (Mannheim: Edition Quadrat, 1998), 30, 47, and 122.

¹²⁶ On Reichensperger and Janssen’s diatribes against the heathen German Renaissance and for Gothic art and culture as exemplary for modern (Catholic) Germany, and Lübke’s explicitly anti-Ultramontanist response, see Meier, “Wilhelm Lübke, Jacob Burckhardt und die Architektur der Renaissance,” 193-98. Meier points out (pp. 195-96) that many Catholics did not share Reichensperger’s and Janssen’s views. Interesting in this regard is that the German Renaissance revival style became particularly popular in Munich (see 189 n. 126), as it suggests a continuation of the anti-Ultramontanist Catholic cultural politics initiated by Ludwig I. According to the entry by Thomas Lersch in the *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, Lübke was himself Catholic by confession: in consideration not only of Lübke’s staunch anti-Ultramontanism but also of his strong support for Bismark during the Kulturkampf, it would be interesting to know more about Lübke’s stance towards the cultural (including art-historical) and political significance of his Catholicism, a subject which neither Lersch nor Meier addresses. See Lersch, “Lübke, Wilhelm,” in *Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, ed., *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 15 (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1986), 444-46. Lübke had begun his career as an art historian in Berlin under the influence of two of the leading art historians of mid-nineteenth-century Germany, Franz Kugler and Karl Schnaase— both Protestants who were anti-Catholic in their general outlook [see, for instance, the letter Kugler wrote home to his wife quoted in Leonore Koschnick, “Franz Kugler (1808-1858) als Kunstkritiker und Kulturpolitiker,” (Ph.D. diss., Frei Universität Berlin, 1985), 197; on Schnaase’s anti-Catholicism see Karge, “Das Frühwerk Karl Schnaases, 406-07]. If Lübke understood any open embrace of Catholicism on his part as a potential hindrance to acceptance as a rational and objective art historian, it is perhaps not so surprising that he took what might be considered as reactionary anti-Catholic positions. On the other hand, in “Über Richard Wagner,” written with E. Hanslick in 1869, Lübke publicly defended Jews against Wagner’s diatribes while his friend Burckhardt privately confided to someone else that the coarseness of the German Renaissance style (as opposed to the Italian) was matched by that of the Jews who were suddenly so eager to revive it: see Burckhardt’s letters to his

vi. New Roman (*neurömisch*)

In the early nineteenth century, medieval art and architecture were inspiring Germans of all confessions to admiration and investigation and led to increasingly articulated definitions of medieval styles paralleling those already established for classical antiquity.¹²⁷ There was little corresponding admiration or investigation of Newer art and architecture. This was particularly true of works produced during the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries in styles that would later be designated High Renaissance, Baroque and Rococo. There was, however, a growing tendency to define these works as confessionally charged and foreign. They were seen in opposition to those of classical antiquity and the Middle Ages.

“New Roman” did not correspond with modern notions of the Baroque but also incorporated much of what, since Lübke, has come to be considered German Renaissance in style. Klenze saw the long period of regress from the Rebirth of Antiquity as having begun with the rebuilding of St. Peter’s Basilica, begun under Bramante in 1506. St. Peter’s dome was constructed under Michelangelo between 1546 and 1564 and the basilica was consecrated in 1626:

friend the architect Max Alioth quoted in Meier, “Wilhelm Lübke, Jacob Burckhardt und die Architektur der Renaissance,” 190-91.

¹²⁷ In this vein in 1823 Heinrich Heine, who in the following year would convert from Judaism to Lutheranism, was dreaming “of a future in which ‘people will recognize the incomparable organic cohesion of medieval splendor, and call the Song of the Niebelungen a versified Cologne Cathedral and Cologne Cathedral the Song of the Niebelungen in stone.’” Norbert Nussbaum, *German Gothic Church Architecture*, trans. Scott Kleager (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 10, and Kalman P. Bland, “Anti-Semitism and Aniconism: The Germanophone Requiem for Jewish Visual Art,” in *Jewish Identity in Modern Art History*, ed. Catharine M. Soussloff (Berkeley: UCP, 1999), 44.

...but before this system could develop itself at all, there appeared in the designs for Saint Peters in Rome, which during the long duration of the construction was the steadily worsening model and a great number of later churches that were characterized by the enormous piers of the interior, vaulted ceiling, the pure Greek or Roman cross scheme of the plan, and the dome over the central point. We confess that we consider this scheme to be the worst of all, and at least from the overall concept, diametrically opposed to the sense of the rigorous classical style, from which the individual forms were borrowed. Immense expense without great result. Fragmented effect of the interior, great without greatness, and an exterior behind which the unskillfully arranged interior as it were plays hide-and-seek in the most offensive manner, so that the main façade as a rule becomes only a theatrical decoration, which has nothing at all to do with the rest of the building, and was usually first added much later; domes, which from no standpoint within or without could be seen in proper connection with the entire building; clumsy, dry, insignificant and often entirely inappropriate pilaster orders and main cornices in the interior; these are the crimes of which one must accuse these churches....¹²⁸

For his own part Klenze, in his designs for Ludwig, made a priority of avoiding such errors by reviving a systematic use of the classical orders and attending to the harmony of the whole. Thankfully, Klenze noted, he had predecessors in this work of returning to classical models. During the last few generations,

despite the seductive example of St. Peters in Rome, wherein a colossal scale removes some of the many errors so far from the onlooker, that they gradually

¹²⁸ "...aber ehe sich dieses System nur irgend ausbilden konnte, erschien in dem Entwürfe von Sanct Peter in Rom, das während der langen Dauer des Baues stets noch verschlimmerte Vorbild einer großen Anzahl späterer Kirchen, welche durch ungeheure Pfeiler des Inneren, gewölbte Decken, das reine griechische oder römische Kreuzschema des Planes, und die Kuppel über den Durchschnittspunkt sich charakterisiren laßen. Wir gestehen, daß wir dieses Schema für das schlechteste von allen halten, und wenigstens der ganzen Conception nach, dem Sinne des strengen antiken Styls, von welchem die einzelnen Formen entlehnt worden, diametral entgegengesetzt glauben. Ungeheurer Aufwand ohne große Resultate, zertheilte Wirkung des Inneren, Größe ohne Großartigkeit, und ein Aeüßeres, wohinter das ungeschickt angeordnete Innere auf die widerwärtigste Art gleichsam Verstecken spielt, so daß die Hauptansicht in der Regel nur eine theatralische Dekoration wird, welche mit dem Rest des Gebäudes gar nichts zu thun hatte, und gewöhnlich erst viel später angesetzt ward; Kuppeln, welche sowohl innen als außen von keinem Standpunkte aus in gehöriger Verbindung mit dem ganzen Gebäude gesehen werden konnten; schwerfällige, trockne, unbedeutende und oft ganz unpaßende Pilaster-Ordnungen und Hauptgesimse im Innern; das sind die Gebrechen, welche man diesen Kirchen vorwerfen muß...." Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur*, 16-17.

vanish for him, while the highest degree of splendor and richness hides the others, still gradually the imperfection of this manner of building has been so generally felt, that for the last half century people have attempted to put something better in its place.¹²⁹

According to Klenze's account, the era of St. Peter's detrimental influence extended from the sixteenth to the second half of the eighteenth century. Architecture built during this period received little positive attention under Klenze's or Ludwig's watch. This time frame also corresponds with that designated as "New Roman" (*neurömisch*) in the unusually informative correspondence between Ludwig I and the initial renovator of Bamberg cathedral, Friedrich Karl Rupprecht.¹³⁰ Rupprecht used the term to designate the additions made to the cathedral over the previous 250 years (i.e., since the second half of the sixteenth century), which were to be removed or at least to be made less conspicuous.¹³¹ Rather than opposing the style of these additions to that of Greek and

¹²⁹ "Trotz des verführerischen Beispiels von St. Peter in Rom, worin ein riesenhafter Maaßstab einige der vielen Fehler materiell so weit vom Beschauer entfernt, daß sie ihm nach und nach verschwinden, während der höchste Grad von Pracht und Reichthum die andern versteckt, hat man doch nach und nach die unvollkommenheit dieser Bauart so allgemein gefühlt, daß man seit einem halben Jahrhunderte etwa vielfach versucht hat, etwas Besseres an die Stelle zu setzen." Ibid, 17.

¹³⁰ In 1823 Friedrich Schlegel had suggested *neurömisch* as an alternative to *neugriechisch* as a designation for *altgothisch*, though he now preferred the term *altchristlich* to any of the preceding, according to an interpolation into "Breife auf einer Reise" published in his "Grundzüge der gotischen Baukunst," 162. As with his use of *romantisch* for *neugotisch* (discussed above), he appears to be attempting to undo the opposition between German and Latin cultures embedded in the standard terminology.

¹³¹ E.g., "...da seit 250 Jahren alle Arbeiten welche darinnen angebracht wurden, nicht mehr in diesem [altdeutschen] Style, sondern in dem neurömischen gemacht wurden, und man hier, so wie fast überall durch dieselben die vermeinliche Unförmlichkeit zu verbergen glaubte." and from the same letter: "Da die Kirche noch viele Monumente enthält, welche ihre Errichtung erst den 2 letzten Jahrhunderten verdanken, folglich durchgängig in dem neuen römischen Geschmack, mit mehr oder weniger geschmacklicher Übertreibung gearbeitet sind..." Rupprecht, quoted in Christine Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine 'Restauration' unter König Ludwig I. von Bayern (1826-31)* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2000), 80, citing Archiv des Erzbistums Bamberg, Rep. 2, no. 2310/7, letter of Sept. 16, 1826. Or, a month later: the alterations in

Roman art and architecture, however, Rupprecht opposed it to the Old German style.

Referring specifically to the furnishings by Justus Glesker, a once famed Protestant

sculptor of Frankfurt, Rupprecht assessed these additions as

moreover not Old German but...in the abominable style of Bernini, which one can best see in the folds broken up like waves and as if moved by the wind, the padded limbs with exaggerated anatomy, the twisted stances and the characterless forms.... the opposite of natural, simple German antiquity.¹³²

Arguably the term New Roman implied the style's association with the Jesuit order – an order which had been founded in 1534 and disbanded in 1773 and so corresponded with Klenze's timeframe for St. Peter's detrimental influence. Though recently re-instated by the Church, this order was negatively perceived not only by most Protestants but also by some Catholics, including Ludwig I. This will be discussed further below. It was the Jesuits who were held chiefly responsible for having imposed their exclusive loyalty to Rome on German Catholics, thus stifling their essential Germanness.¹³³ The use of "New Roman" in the 1820s and 30s in Bavaria suggests a significant, if otherwise unremarked, prehistory for the term "Jesuit style" (*Jesuitenstil*) which would become standard during

"neurömischen Styl" were "zum verderblichen Beispiel" for subsequent changes: Rupprecht, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine 'Restauration,'* 79, citing Archiv des Erzbistums Bamberg, Rep. 2, no. 2310/7, letter of Oct. 17, 1826.

¹³² "Zudem sind die Figuren... nicht altdeutsch, sondern... in dem abscheulichen Geschmack des Bernini gebildet, welches man besonders in den wellenartig gebrochenen und wie vom Winde bewegten Falten, den ausgestopften Gliedern mit "betriebener Anatomie, den verdrehten Stellungen und der Characterlosigkeit in den Gestalten am besten sehen kann.... das Gegentheil des natürlichen, einfachen deutschen Alterthums." Rupprecht quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine 'Restauration,'* 37 n.

375, citing Archiv des Erzbistums Bamberg, Rep. 2, no. 2310/7, letter of Sept. 16, 1826.

¹³³ The use of "New Roman" in this negative and post-medieval context is also useful to keep in mind when considering the relatively late point at which the term "Romanesque" became standard in German lands (ca. mid-nineteenth century) as opposed to England and France (ca. 1820s). On the prehistory of "Romanesque" in England and France see Bizzarro, *Romanesque Architectural Criticism*.

the 1840s through the 1880s.¹³⁴ Inasmuch as “New Roman” also served as the antithesis to “Byzantine,” this opposition helped to define the Jesuit style and contributes to the historiography of the term “baroque” (*barock*) that replaced “Jesuit” as the standard term by the late 1880s.¹³⁵

The German art-historical framework of the 1820s and 30s is important to the discussions that follow because it provided the network of conceptual relationships that gave the Byzantine style its wide range of connotations. Sometimes Ludwig’s artists and architects saw Byzantium as primarily an echo of classical antiquity, with its apogee in ancient Greece. At others, they saw it chiefly as a harbinger of the German style that was explicitly contrasted to that of the Newer era, with its nadir in the New Roman art and architecture influenced by St. Peter’s Basilica and the Jesuits. Still another approach emphasized Byzantium as a style of the East that was essentially continuous that of the

¹³⁴ The term first appeared in an entry by Jacob Burckhardt in Brockhaus, *Allgemeine deutsche Real-Enzyklopedie für die gebildeten Stände. Conversations-Lexikon*, 10th ed., 8 (1845): 657-58, s.v. “Jesuitenstil,” according to Levy, *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque*, 29; on its survival into the 1880s see p. 34. Only two years earlier, Leopold von Ranke had introduced the term “Gegenreformation” to describe as a more or less unified Catholic response to the “Reformation” (a term already in use for over a century to indicate the rapid development of Protestantism between ca. 1517 and 1555). See John W. O’Malley, “The Historiography of the Society of Jesus,” in *Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts*, ed. O’Malley et al., 19.

¹³⁵ The historiography and significance of the term “Jesuit style” has recently come under renewed scrutiny in Evonne Levy, “The ‘Jesuit Style,’” in *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque*, 15-41, and Gauvin Alexander Bailey, “‘Le Style jésuite n’existe pas’: Jesuit Corporate Culture and the Visual Arts,” in O’Malley, *Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts*, 38-89. At the same time it seems the term “Baroque” has been returning to general acceptance among art historians as a useful, if imperfect, term: cf. Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, “The State of Research in Italian Painting of the Seventeenth Century,” *Art Bulletin* 49:4 (1987): 494 and Vernon Hyde Minor, *Baroque and Rococo: Art and Culture* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1999), 14-16, as noted in Beverly Louise Brown, “The Birth of the Baroque: Painting in Rome 1592-1623,” in *The Genius of Rome: 1592-1623*, ed. Brown (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2001), 16 n.3.

Islamic world. As will be seen in the following chapters, these perspectives could be played off against each other, but all were ultimately based in the same overarching framework.

9. Organization

The historical context for the revival of Byzantium in Bavaria will be explored in Chapter Two. This provides the background for the following three chapters. Because Ludwig was the initiator and, during the first half of the nineteenth century, the primary patron of Byzantine revival architecture, I have organized these chapters around Ludwig's three most important Byzantine revival and restoration projects, in chronological order. One chapter is dedicated to each project, each of which raised a unique set of questions and themes. Other buildings and artworks thematically related to the three primary projects will be introduced where they best inform the larger discussion. The chapters focus on aspects of the evolving discovery and creation by Ludwig, and his artists and architects, of Byzantinizing art and architecture in Bavaria and the ways in which he, and they, used them to express larger cultural and political concerns. Chapter Three focuses on how the creation of Byzantinizing works made tangible the desirable but distant connections between Bavaria and either ancient Greece or Byzantine Constantinople. Chapter Four examines how the discovery of Byzantine attributes in extant Bavarian monuments helped to link and sharpen connections between the developing understanding of a German Byzantine style and the "truly German" style of later medieval architecture. Chapter Five explores how the Byzantine style came to be framed as an intermediary between classical Greece and the Rebirth of Antiquity in Italy

(understood as ushering in the modern, post-medieval era) or between Classical Greece and the Islamic world (understood as extending, in either more sophisticated or more degraded forms, Byzantine art and architecture). Each theme is organized around a major architectural project that expressed it. The chapters are arranged in the order in which the focal monuments were constructed. Because related projects are addressed within each chapter as appropriate to the theme, they tend to blur the strict chronology.

The primary subject of Chapter Three, the Allerheiligenhofkapelle (All Saint's Court Chapel), was designed by Leo von Klenze with frescoes by Heinrich Heß and Joseph Schwarzmann. The Allerheiligenhofkapelle was not only the initial celebration of Byzantine architecture in Bavaria, but also the first Byzantine revival building in German lands, and possibly in Europe as a whole. It was built to express the belief of Ludwig I, King of Bavaria as of 1825, that his most heartfelt causes— Philhellenism, German nationalism, the Bavarian monarchy and its Catholicism – could find unified expression through what was then understood to be Byzantine art and architecture. More specifically, he used this building to announce his revival of the role of the Catholic Church within the Bavarian regime, but he did so according to terms strictly defined by himself, as Bavaria's new king, which integrated Philhellenic ideals and German patriotism. Despite his own biases, Klenze's efforts to realize this vision of Byzantium for Ludwig at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle resulted in a still recognizable Byzantinizing structure composed of “baldachins” – domed bays supported by piers. Klenze's solution shows the power of his investment in his patron's ideas on the design.

For Klenze, architectural design evidently played a leading role in defining this chapel as Byzantine. It contrasts sharply, however, with his renovation of another church,

St. Salvator in Donaustauf, where he reworked the building's exterior to express a Byzantine style with seemingly no emphasis on structure. At Donaustauf he relied on a combination of ornamental motifs, typology and three-dimensional articulation to express his own view that medieval Germany had inherited Greek culture via groups migrating through the Balkans into the Alps. His Byzantium here contains essentially no influence from Eastern Mediterranean sources, Constantinopolitan or otherwise.

Chapter Four focuses on the renovation of Bamberg Cathedral and addresses the second theme: the discovery of Byzantine attributes in extant Bavarian monuments. When Ludwig commissioned its renovation, he did not think of Bamberg Cathedral as a Byzantine building. Early in the course of this renovation, however, while it was under the auspices of Friedrich Karl Rupprecht, it was “discovered” to contain Byzantine sculpture and the precious remains of likewise Byzantine ornamental painting. Consequently, it became a vehicle for distinguishing the Byzantine art and architecture of early medieval Germany from the truly German art and architecture of the later medieval period. This was done by contrasting it to Regensburg Cathedral. In the course of the renovations at Bamberg – despite available evidence to the contrary –extensive wall painting came to be considered the characteristic and exclusive province of German Byzantine buildings, and stained glass came to be considered the equally characteristic and exclusive province of the German style.

Leo von Klenze encouraged Rupprecht's studies of the cathedral, and together they began to believe that the entire history of medieval architecture was contained within it: the eastern end demonstrated the Byzantine style; the western transept, a Transitional style; and the western apse, the German style. The transition from round

arches to pointed arches at the building's west end appears to have been key to this analysis. Both Klenze and Rupprecht were fascinated by the traces of paint (more plentiful on the eastern end) and the sculpture. When Rupprecht died, however, the project was assigned to a Nuremberg architect, Karl Alexander Heideloff, and then to the other leading architect at Ludwig's court, Friedrich von Gärtner. Their assessment of the building's style reverted to Byzantine only.

Chapter Five considers the Ludwigskirche (St. Louis's Church), which Friedrich von Gärtner designed in part as a vehicle for the frescoes of one of the leading members of the Brotherhood of St. Luke, Peter Cornelius. Gärtner provided the ornamental borders and panels distinguished by Islamic patterns and motifs that Joseph Schwarzmann (who had painted the ornament at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle) painted between and around Cornelius's figural frescoes. The architecture thus had a complex relationship to these two intertwined and arguably competing fresco programs. That relationship serves as a vehicle for considering what Ludwig might have meant when he commissioned the building in a "purified Byzantine" style. Gärtner's interpretation of Ludwig's directive to purify the style turned increasingly towards more or less classicizing and Italianate models, with an ambiguous relationship to Islamic art and architecture. Another commission that Ludwig gave Gärtner at the time, to design a synagogue in the Moorish revival style – the first synagogue in this style – offers an instructive foil for considering what Gärtner took to be Islamic ornament, and how he did and did not distinguish it from his understanding of the Byzantine style. One of the complex aspects of this building is the relation and relative weight of architecture (structure, typology, three-dimensional

articulation) and ornament in creating its Byzantinizing character, since Gärtner's definition of "Byzantine" appears to have shifted as construction was underway.

Chapter Two Historical Framework

1. Ludwig as Crown Prince of the New Kingdom of Bavaria

King Ludwig I (1786-1868; r. 1825-48) personally instigated and funded almost all of the work that artists and architects undertook in restoring and reviving Byzantine art and architecture in Bavaria. For this reason, Ludwig's developing goals and ideas provide the focus of this dissertation.¹³⁶ Ludwig was born in Strasbourg, the first son of minor Alsatian nobility. He could never have expected the chain of events that would eventually elevate him to the status of Crown Prince of Bavaria. His father Maximilian Joseph (1756-1825), a second son in a side branch of the Wittelsbachs, inherited the Duchy of Pfalz-Zweibrücken from his brother in 1795. In 1799, just as Pfalz-Zweibrücken was lost to the French annexation of the Rhineland, Max Joseph had the good fortune of an additional and more substantial inheritance, the Electorate of Bavaria. A Francophile who was both charming and passive, Max Joseph subsequently cooperated with Napoleonic forces as they swept over Europe. In exchange, Napoleon granted a succession of new lands to Bavaria and raised it to the status of a kingdom in 1806. Max Joseph's minister, Maximilian Joseph Montgelas (1759-1838), led the Napoleonic-era expansion of Bavaria's territories, as well as the liberalization of its laws. Ludwig, an assertive German patriot, was in many respects the opposite of his father and was horrified by his father's and Montgelas' cooperation with the enemy. He was,

¹³⁶ The standard biography, which provides the starting point for much of my discussion of Ludwig and his background, is Heinz Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern. Königtum im Vormärz* (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1986).

nevertheless, delighted from the start to find himself elevated to the status of Crown Prince.

Because it abandoned Napoleon at his final hour, Bavaria was permitted to keep most of the lands it had gained under Napoleon and was granted in addition part of the Napoleonic Rhineland. Bavaria thus emerged stronger than ever from the Congress of Vienna (September 1814- June 1815), which re-organized post-Napoleonic Europe [[map 1](#)]. With the exception of Austria, Bavaria also found itself as the only significant Catholic German regime—an outcome which Ludwig took as a serious responsibility. One of the major indications of Bavaria's shift in public policy was the fall of Montgelas, in 1817, from the leading role he had held in the court since well before Max Joseph acceded to the throne. Max Joseph fired Montgelas in large part at the instigation of Ludwig, who had despised Montgelas' Enlightenment-influenced policies as French, anti-Catholic, and in sum, not German.¹³⁷ Though the degree to which Bavaria had thrived under Napoleon was largely due to Montgelas' diplomatic efforts, Ludwig blamed Montgelas for his father's unacceptable attitudes towards both the French and the Catholic Church. For Ludwig, Bavaria's retention of the lands and prestige it had gained under Napoleon did not require thanking the French, just as Bavaria's new, de facto confessional pluralism did not justify altering the kingdom's status as Catholic.¹³⁸ That his own wife (whom he married in 1810) remained Lutheran throughout her life did not soften Ludwig's confessional bias.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 201-209.

¹³⁸ Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 73.

¹³⁹ Therese von Sachsen-Hildburghausen did not have to convert, thanks in part to her mother's negotiations and also thanks to Ludwig's father, who felt that compelling Therese to convert might endanger the marriage of Ludwig's half-sister Elisabeth to

Ludwig was also honing his collection and patronage of art. He included it as a fully integrated aspect of his evolving political program. When he acceded to the throne, Ludwig further accelerated his efforts to establish Bavaria's capital city, Munich, as one of the major artistic centers of Europe [map 2]. This approach to art as politics soon placed him among the most significant German art patrons of the first half of the nineteenth century. He also became one of the most broad-minded of patrons. This was not yet the case at the time of Montgelas' dismissal. At first Ludwig remained loyal to the established classicizing aesthetic advocated by Goethe and his colleague Heinrich Meyer (1760-1832). They publicly condemned Romantic medievalism in the essay "New-German Religious-Patriotic Art" that Goethe commissioned from Meyer in early 1817.¹⁴⁰ Ludwig was engaged at this time in constructing a public museum in Munich for his collection of ancient Greek sculpture. He also initiated a restrained renovation of Speyer Cathedral, a building which his architects and engineers assessed as Byzantine in style. As per Ludwig's instructions, their renovation emphasized not this style, however, but the signs of the building's age.¹⁴¹ By 1825, however, when Ludwig acceded to the

Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm (as of 1840, Friedrich Wilhelm IV) of Prussia. See Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 147 and 584. On Ludwig's attempts in 1806 and 1809 to marry into the Russian and Austrian royal families, in part to undermine Bavaria's alliance with Napoleon, see Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*. 131-32 and 142-43.

¹⁴⁰ Heinrich Meyer [W.K.F., pseud. (i.e., Weimarer Kunstfreunde)], "Neu-deutsche religio-patriotische Kunst," *Ueber Kunst und Alterthum in den Rhein und Mayn Gegenden* 1, pt. 2 (1817): 7-62, reprinted in Goethe, *Schriften zur Kunst*, ed. C. Beutler, 708-727. [For the "Anmerkungen und Belege," omitted from Beutler's edition, see Heinrich Meyer, *Kleine Schriften zur Kunst*, ed. Paul Weizsäcker, *Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts* 25 (Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger, 1886), 121-31; nn. 60-63 include extensive passages from Friedrich Schlegel's *Europa* essays.]

¹⁴¹ Crown Prince Ludwig to the Bavarian *General-Commissär* and the *Regierungspräsident* of the Rhine District, July 14, 1818, quoted in Jochen Zink, "Zur Vollendung des Kölner und des Speyerer Doms: Mittelalterrezeption und frühe deutsche Denkmalpflege," in *Mittelalter-Rezeption II. Gesammelte Vorträge des 2. Salzburger*

Bavarian throne, he transformed his patronage of non-classical art and architecture, and specifically of the Byzantine revival style, into just the sort of religious-patriotic project that Goethe, Meyer and their followers had denounced.

2. Restoration Bavaria and the Greek War of Independence

The decades of the 1820s-30s during which Ludwig initiated the revival and restoration of Byzantine art and architecture coincided with a relatively short historical period known as the Restoration. Even though it principally referred to the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in France in 1815, this name came to be applied to all of Europe during the decade and a half following the fall of Napoleon. Aristocratic rule was confirmed and strengthened not only in France, but also throughout central Europe, thanks in large part to the Austrian minister Prince Klemens von Metternich (1773-1859), who had overseen the Congress of Vienna. Ludwig's interest in Byzantium expressed his complex relationship with the prevailing policies of the Restoration as defined by Metternich.

One of the major events that affected the cultural and political tenor of the Restoration was the Greek War of Independence from the Ottoman Empire. This drawn-out conflict began in 1821, and turned decisively in favor of the Greek rebels only in 1827 when the "Great Powers," England, France and Russia, intervened on their behalf.

Symposions: Die Rezeption des Mittelalters in Literatur, Bildender Kunst und Musik des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts, ed. Jürgen Kühnel, et al. Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, no. 358 (Kümmerle, 1982), 170. Zink describes Ludwig's approach in this letter as "stilpuristisch." This description, however, is inaccurate, for available records give no indication that Ludwig had any interest in Speyer's style per se, and to the degree that he did, had no interest in making any deletions or additions that might be interpreted as purifying it.

It was effectively over in 1828, with the arrival of Count Ioannis Kapodistrias. The Greek insurgent assembly had appointed Kapodistrias president of their nascent nation, which upon achieving autonomy would include the Peloponnesus, the mainland south of Thessaly, and nearby islands.¹⁴² From the start this war had unsettled Metternich. He had tried to suppress any organized expressions of the widespread German sympathy for the rebellious Greeks, as he feared this would encourage nationalist and democratic sentiment not only on behalf of the Greeks, but in opposition to the recently reestablished aristocracies of Central Europe.

It was during this Restoration period, so politically fraught, that art historiography and historicizing art and architecture became integral to the cultural politics of the reorganized German states. Art and architecture that had survived the decades of social and political upheaval promised a means of reconnecting with the past so as to make sense of the present. This was certainly true in Bavaria, where Ludwig looked to medieval and medievalizing art and architecture to represent his kingdom as essentially a traditional German and not a new Napoleonic creation. But Ludwig's agenda was not merely pro-German and anti-French. His historicizing efforts, and specifically his several major commissions to restore or revive what he considered Byzantine art and architecture, reflected his desire to integrate an unusual combination of commitments—to the Greek cause, to the re-establishment of the Catholic Church, and to German nationalism—into a cohesive program. The Greek cause and German nationalism might not have been so difficult to combine. After all, the Protestant regime of the Kingdom of Württemberg had no difficulty doing so. Its difficulties were in circumventing

¹⁴² Richard Clogg, *A Concise History of Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 42-45.

Metternich.¹⁴³ For Ludwig, his loyalty to the Catholic Church required the most ingenuity.

Tensions between Catholics and Protestants had eased during the Napoleonic era, when Napoleon's depredation of the Catholic Church made it weak and vulnerable. With the re-establishment of the church, however, the increasingly centralized papal authority came into conflict more and more often with developing nationalist sentiments. Ludwig found himself attempting to unite ideas that stood on either side of an increasingly sharp confessional divide. His solution was to espouse a specifically German Catholicism with greater local (specifically Bavarian) control. This involved categorical opposition to the Society of Jesus (an order dissolved by papal authority in 1773 but readmitted in 1814), as well as to anyone else suspected of excessive loyalty to papal instead of local authority, that is, of ultramontanism. Ludwig's approach was curiously reminiscent of the episcopal movement of the late eighteenth century, when German prince-archbishops likewise opposed ultramontanists, in particular the Jesuits, in their efforts to exert greater autonomy for a German Catholic Church. The episcopalists professed unwavering loyalty to papal authority as they understood it to have been introduced into Germany by St. Boniface (672-754), Apostle to the Germans and first Archbishop of Mainz, and established by the tenth century, under the Ottonian dynasty. They wished to reassert,

¹⁴³ On Metternich's suppression of Bavaria's and especially of Württemberg's efforts to support the Greek rebellion see Robert D. Billinger, Jr., *Metternich and the German Question: States' Rights and Federal Duties, 1820-1834* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1991), 28-29.

however, the episcopal privileges and prerogatives that, they believed, Rome had wrongly usurped from them in later centuries.¹⁴⁴

Like the eighteenth-century prince-archbishops, Ludwig found himself negotiating between his profession of absolute loyalty to the pope's spiritual authority and his intention to contain and control his subjects' allegiance to Rome. Similarly, he saw the early centuries of the German Church (and perhaps specifically the Ottonian Church) as providing a precedent for his claims.¹⁴⁵ This was an awkward position for Ludwig to clarify. As Heinz Gollwitzer has observed:

Ludwig did not succeed in finding a publicist to convincingly represent his personal take on church politics. His jurists either argued to the left or to the right of his position. He was not himself capable of juridically systematizing his views. In order to make himself nonetheless understood, he took the course of historical-Romantic and aesthetic illustration (and at the same time, sublimation).¹⁴⁶

Ludwig used art, in short, as his publicist. It was his artists and architects who presented his seemingly contradictory attitudes towards the Catholic Church in a harmonious form.

¹⁴⁴ On the episcopal movement see T.C.W. Blanning, *Reform and Revolution in Mainz 1743-1803* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 29-32, 103-04, 118-21, 220-28, 236-40.

¹⁴⁵ On the Ottonians, whose interpretation of the "temporal sword" as of equal authority to the Pope's "spiritual sword" provided a model for episcopalists, see Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State, 1050-1300* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), 1-5 and 24-28. I am grateful to Elaine Beretz for this reference, and for the suggestion that, though not a prince-bishop, Ludwig appears to have based his own claims on essentially the same reasoning and, by extension, the same historical precedent. As contemporary scholars (specifically Christain Ludwig Stieglitz – see Chapter One) interpreted Ottonian (or Saxon) culture as essentially Byzantine, the correspondence between Ludwig's and the episcopalists' vision of the early German Church suggests an added resonance for Ludwig's decision to revive the Byzantine style in his first major church commissions.

¹⁴⁶ "Einen Publizist zu finden, der Ludwigs persönliche kirchenpolitische Linie überzeugend vertreten hätte, ist ihm nicht gelungen. Seine Juristen argumentierten entweder "links" oder "rechts" von seiner Position. Selber war er nicht imstande, seine Anschauungen juristisch zu systematisieren. Um sich gleichwohl verständlich zu machen, schlug er den Weg historisch-romantischer und ästhetischer Veranschaulichung (und gleichzeitig Sublimierung) ein." Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 515.

But it was not only his religious views that required their skills. Ludwig's unceasing admiration for classical and classicizing art, his early embrace of the Nazarenes (discussed below) and other artists pursuing anti-classical ideals, and his fervent, longstanding support for the Greek War of Independence, despite his increasingly authoritarian political views, made his artistic and political views equally difficult for others to comprehend. While still Crown Prince, Ludwig initiated the revival of the Byzantine style in 1823 for a church whose architecture would announce the reintegration of the Catholic Church into his regime. For this reason the Bavarian Byzantine revival offers clear evidence for what might be termed the art history of nineteenth-century confessionalism. But more than this, I argue that, during the 1820s, Ludwig's unprecedented restoration and revival of what was considered Byzantine art and architecture provided the vehicle through which his artists and architects visually synthesized all of his religious, artistic and political positions as one unified whole.

3. The July Revolution and a Bavarian on the New Greek Throne

The July Revolution of 1830 forced the Bourbon king of France from the throne and brought into power a constitutional monarchy, leading to uprisings throughout Europe. The ensuing shift in political and cultural winds concluded the Restoration period. In Bavaria Ludwig I was shaken by these events and consequently adopted a more conservative outlook in all areas of his jurisdiction. In the following year, Kapodistrias was assassinated and the Great Powers decided to replace the Greek presidency with a monarchy. On May 7, 1832, Ludwig's younger son Otto was chosen as king of the new, devastated and already deeply indebted nation of Greece. With Ludwig's

backing, Otto refused to convert to the Orthodox Christian faith, something that sowed seeds of instability in his reign from the outset. Understanding itself as the protector of Orthodox Christianity, Russia pressured Otto and his father on Greece's behalf. Otto never did convert. Friction with the Orthodox Church, however, appears to have eroded Ludwig's confidence that he could continue to employ Byzantium as a means to express his unique confessional and political agendas. Bavarian interest in investigating the Byzantine artistic tradition lost momentum just as it became possible to study it closely. Encounters with Greece and Russia do not appear to have led anyone in Bavaria to openly question the overarching and often fanciful historical connections upon which their Byzantine revival style had relied. During Otto's reign Ludwig's artists and architects contributed to sacred and secular commissions in Greece and, to a lesser extent, Russia, and yet they neglected the opportunity to study the Byzantine tradition in any detail during their travels. They completed their Byzantine revival commissions without reference to the Byzantine traditions of the Orthodox world.

4. German Byzantium between the Classical and Gothic ideals

Ludwig I of Bavaria together with his artists and architects set out to define Byzantium in such a way that it would serve either as a vehicle for incorporating classical Greek ideals into Germany, or as the place where these ideals were combined with Eastern spirituality. At every turn their efforts betray the difficulty of negotiating between the standard and highly codified classicism that art and architectural academies provided on the one side, and the nascent Romantic ideas that were challenging it on the other. To judge by their early efforts, Leo von Klenze (1784-1864) and Friedrich von Gärtner (1791-1847), Ludwig's leading architects, would probably have been satisfied putting

their training into practice by designing buildings that expressed their understanding of the classical canon. It was Ludwig who compelled his architects to look beyond classical models. He never abandoned the admiration of classical Greek art and architecture with which he had begun as a collector and patron, but he did cease to believe that it constituted the unique pinnacle of human achievement.

The new, spiritually-charged Romantic aesthetic first defined by Friedrich Schlegel during the first decade of the nineteenth century linked cultures in a great chronological continuum marked by aesthetic ebbs and flows. It thus challenged the prevailing classicizing aesthetic, which upheld classical Greek art as the unique ideal for all time, so that any prior or subsequent deviations from this aesthetic were merely degradations of this standard. The Romantic approach permitted Schlegel, who had been as thoroughgoing a Hellenist as Ludwig, to identify the Middle Ages as the epitome of German and Christian (for Schlegel, essentially Catholic) art and culture. By the 1810s a medieval aesthetic was being revived by the painters of the Brotherhood of St. Luke, who were attempting to emulate early Italian painting. It was their art and their German Catholic program that inspired Ludwig in 1818, when staying in Rome during his second trip to Italy, to similarly expand his artistic vision to include the German Middle Ages as a second pinnacle of artistic expression, equivalent to that of Greece. It was on his third trip to Italy, in 1823-24, that Ludwig first seized on Byzantine art and architecture as providing the ideal bridge between the traditional classical Greek and the emergent German Romantic aesthetic.

5. Enlightenment vs. Byzantium

At the same time that Winckelmann-inspired artists and architects not only in German lands but throughout Europe were looking to classical Greek models, German intellectuals such as August Ludwig von Schlözer (1735-1809) and Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) were echoing condemnations of Byzantium pronounced by French Enlightenment thinkers.¹⁴⁷ Skepticism, if not antagonism, towards Christianity underlay the common conclusion that the Roman Empire had been destroyed when the Emperor Constantine adopted Christianity in the fourth century. The antique and medieval worlds were antithetical and, more specifically, Byzantium was not the continuation but the polar opposite of classical Greek culture – an example of what to avoid. When the Roman Empire, already a destructive influence on the world, adopted Christianity, it was only to the detriment of both: “a Roman-Christian bastard resulted, which some [such as Herder himself] wish had never come to be.”¹⁴⁸ For Herder, there was little more to say on the subject before the Turks took Constantinople when “they ended the Eastern Empire, which had been a burden to itself and to the Earth for over a thousand years, and without

¹⁴⁷ In particular, Voltaire and Montesquieu, and also the British historian Gibbon. See Remieg Aerts, “Dull Gold and Gory Purple: Images of Byzantium,” in *Polyphonia Byzantina: Studies in Honour of Willem J. Aerts*, ed. Hero Hokwerda, Edé R. Smits, and Marinus M. Woesthuis (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1993), 315-18; on Montesquieu, see also George Ostrogorsky, “The Development of Byzantine Studies,” introduction to Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Joan Hussey, rev. ed. (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1969), 4-5.

¹⁴⁸ “Die christliche Religion hob sich durch eigene Kräfte, wie durch eigne Kräfte das Römische Reich wuchs und wenn beide sich zuletzt gatteten: so gewann weder die Eine dadurch noch das Andere. Ein Römisch-Christlicher Bastard entsprang, von welchem manche wünschen, dass er nie entstanden wäre.” Johann Gottfried Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* 3 (1787), repr. in vol. 14 of *Herders Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Bernhard Suphan (Berlin: Wiedmannsche Buchhandlung, 1909), 202.

knowledge or desire thereby drove the arts westwards towards Europe.”¹⁴⁹ This art, or more specifically architecture, was that which had mistakenly come to be called Gothic: “in a few arts, for instance architecture, much of that which we call Gothic taste is actually the Arabic taste that these rough conquerors [i.e., the Arabs] found in the Greek provinces and developed in their own manner, which came over with them to Spain and spread further from there.”¹⁵⁰ That is, what they brought to Europe was no longer Byzantine but Arabic. What specific contributions the Roman-Christian bastards had made to this architecture, or to European culture more generally, was not one of the questions he or the other eighteenth-century thinkers regularly visited. Since the fall of the Byzantine Empire in 1453, the study of Byzantium had become the province first of transplanted Byzantine and then of Western scholars and theologians, but not of art historians. Because “Byzantine style” was essentially unexplored territory, the varied early nineteenth-century efforts to rehabilitate it from this eighteenth-century disrepute illustrate the complexity of the endeavor undertaken by artists, architects and scholars to re-envision their world at a time that came to be understood as the transition from Classicism to Romanticism.

New ideas about Byzantine and post-Byzantine culture were emerging. The failed Greek rebellion of 1770 suggested to Winckelmann-inspired Germans that the great

¹⁴⁹ “Sie haben das morgenländische Reich, das über tausend Jahre sich selbst und der Erde zur Last war, geendet, und ohne Wissen und Willen die Künste dadurch Westwärts nach Europa getrieben.” Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* 4 (1791), repr. in Suphan, *Herders Sämmtliche Werke*, 14:283.

¹⁵⁰ “... in einigen Künsten, z.B. der Baukunst, ist vieles von dem, was wir gothischen Geschmack nennen, eigentlich arabischer Geschmack, die diese rohen Eroberer in den griechischen Provinzen fanden, in ihre eignen Weise bildete, mit ihnen nach Spanien herüber kam und von da weiterhin fortpflanzte.” Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* 4, repr. in Suphan, *Herders Sämmtliche Werke*, 14:444.

Hellenic spirit was not dead and could free itself from Ottoman rule and rise again. What is more, the oppressed spirit of contemporary Greeks was seen as a mirror of that of oppressed Germans, so that references to modern Greece often contained veiled references to bourgeois German hopes for greater political liberties.¹⁵¹ The Greek rebellion of 1770 failed, but its memory brought hope to European Philhellenes that modern Greeks, infused with the taste of liberty, might throw off Ottoman rule and rekindle their Classical greatness.

Herder wrote at a heady time, as revolution was taking hold of France. It seemed his Enlightened antagonism towards hegemonic authority such as that which he attributed to the Roman Empire, the medieval Church and their progeny, the Eastern Empire, was about to be vindicated. The invasion of German lands by French Revolutionary forces in 1792, the annexation of the left (west) bank of the Rhine by France six years later, and the rise of Napoleon complicated the German embrace of classical models and the Enlightenment ideals with which they were associated. During the years 1803 to 1806 Napoleon's transformation of German states and religious institutions on the right bank of the Rhine reached its zenith. The French regime secularized many of the Catholic Church's territories and associated properties, in the process disbanding many of the ecclesiastical states and monasteries of the Holy Roman Empire and enriching and enlarging the remaining states under rulers allied with France. This circumstance threatened a level of destruction similar to that which had already occurred in French-

¹⁵¹ Johannes Irmscher, "Neograeca in Germania im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert," in *Graeca recentiora in Germania: Deutsch-griechische Kulturbeziehungen vom 15. bis 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Hans Eideneier (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994), 208, echoing Robert Franz Arnold, "Der deutsche Philhellenismus: Kultur- und literarhistorische Untersuchungen," *Euphorion: Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, suppl. vol. 2 (1896): 92.

occupied lands on the left bank during the preceding decade. German culture and Christianity appeared in danger of being overwhelmed by French rationalism and Napoleon's claim to an Imperial Roman legacy. This motivated a major challenge to the classicizing idiom in the arts.

6. Romantic Byzantium

This challenge was most forcefully launched by Friedrich Schlegel. While living in Paris from the spring of 1802 to the fall of 1804, Schlegel published his responses to the works of art on display at the Louvre. In certain respects, these were entirely positive. Embracing the novel chronological arrangement of the works as clues to their larger significance, Schlegel introduced a new form of art criticism: "Undiscovered or neglected paintings of the past became for the first time the quarry of an intellectual effort almost archaeological in impulse."¹⁵² For Schlegel, however, this was not an effort to recover neglected precursors to the artists who had been most revered during the Enlightenment. Instead, he understood (French) Enlightenment reverence to indicate the ruin of art, and located the beginning of artistic decline in the earliest works of Italian art to attract (French) Enlightened enthusiasm.

In analyzing the paintings the French troops were collecting for public display in Paris at the Louvre palace (which in the process became the Musée Napoléon), therefore, Schlegel rejected the trajectory of progress towards the "modern manner" as presented in the then still authoritative works of Giorgio Vasari (1511-74). This trajectory included

¹⁵² Jane van Nimmen, "Friedrich Schlegel's Response to Raphael in Paris," in *The Documented Image: Visions in Art History*, ed. Gabriel P. Weisberg, Laurinda S. Dixon, with Antje Bultmann Lemke (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1987), pp. 319-20.

most of the post-classical artists whom Winckelmann had recommended as having incorporated virtues of the ancients into their work.¹⁵³ In reporting on the paintings in Paris in 1803 for his new journal *Europa*, Schlegel asserted, “I have through and through only a taste for the old school of painting; only this do I understand and grasp, and only of this can I talk. Of the French school and of the very late Italians I will not speak.”¹⁵⁴

He further clarified:

From this newer school of Italian painting that is primarily characterized through Raphael, Titian, Correggio, Giulio Romano and Michelangelo—although other painters not as epoch-making remain essential components of it—the origin of the ruin of art is indisputably to be traced. And just as Correggio digressed into the realm of music, so too the old misunderstanding which continues to ceaselessly

¹⁵³ It was Part 3, the final section his *Lives*, that Vasari devoted to those whom he considered to have worked in the modern manner. One of the artists whom Vasari used to introduce this manner was Correggio, and it was specifically the sensuality and illusionism that Vasari had admired in Correggio’s dome frescoes which received Schlegel’s harshest criticism (as discussed further below). Vasari’s biography of Raphael, divided into three periods of artistic influence, concluded with the influence of Michelangelo on Raphael – Michelangelo being the artist whom Vasari considered as the modern manner’s greatest representative. For Schlegel, however, it was the earlier periods in Raphael’s oeuvre which represented a high point in the history of art, and precisely Michelangelo’s influence which signaled not only Raphael’s decline, but that of all art (as discussed further below). For Vasari, meanwhile, the use of gold leaf instead of yellow signaled lack of artistic refinement and skill, whereas Schlegel specifically contrasted the degeneracy that he attributed to Michelangelo with the attractions of works based on the earliest Christian style, that of the Greeks, with their childlike simplicity and their gold ground. See David Ekserdjian, introduction to Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, 2nd ed. (1568), abridged trans. Gaston du C. de Vere, ed. David Ekserdjian, 2 vols. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996), xviii-xix (on Michelangelo as the culmination of the “modern Manner,” the subject of Part 3), xxxi (on gold vs. yellow), xxxiii (on Correggio), and xxxv (on the tripartite division of Raphael’s oeuvre), and Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, 109 (originally published in Friedrich Schlegel, “Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde,” *Europa. Eine Zeitschrift*, 2:2, no. 1 (1805)), on paintings with gold ground vs. Michelangelo’s work, and references in the discussions below.

¹⁵⁴ “Ich habe durchaus nur Sinn für die alte Malerei, nur diese verstehe ich und begreife ich, und nur über diese kann ich reden. Von der französischen Schule und von den ganz späten Italiänern will ich nicht sprechen....” Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der Christlichen Kunst*, 13; originally published in Friedrich Schlegel, “Nachricht von den Gemälden in Paris,” *Europa. Eine Zeitschrift*, 1:1, n. 4 (1803).

confuse painting and sculpture is to be traced to Michelangelo as its first source.¹⁵⁵

The account of Antonio Allegri, known as Correggio (1494-1534), who was not known for his musical talent, as engaging in a ruinous musical digression, served Schlegel as a euphemism for the sensuality of Correggio's works. Correggio had famously treated even sacred subjects in an at least implicitly sexualized manner, and as his specific referent Schlegel may well have had one of Correggio's most famous works in mind: the *Assumption of the Virgin* in the dome of Parma Cathedral. Here the enraptured Virgin is lifted to heaven by a throng of music-playing, partially nude and distinctly amorous angels [**fig. 2.1**].¹⁵⁶ Winckelmann had praised Correggio, while Vasari, specifically admiring the *Assumption of the Virgin*, wrote "it seems impossible that [Correggio] should have been able... even to conceive it in his imagination, so beautiful are the curves of the draperies and the expressions that he gave to those figures."¹⁵⁷ For Schlegel, however, this was not even an Assumption – the subject had devolved into mere digression.

¹⁵⁵ "Von dieser neuern Schule der italiänischen Malerei, die durch Raffael, Tizian, Correggio, Julio Romano, Michel Angelo vorzüglich bezeichnet wird, wiewohl auch andre nicht so Epoche machende Maler noch wesentlich dazu gehören, ist unstreitig das Verderben der Kunst ursprünglich abzuleiten; und wenn Correggio in das Gebiet der Musik ausschweifte, so ist wohl auch das alte Mißverständnis, welches noch immer fortdauert, und Malerei und Plastik unaufhörlich von neuem verwechselt, in der ersten Quelle von Michel Angelo abzuleiten." Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der Christlichen Kunst*, 56; originally published in Friedrich Schlegel, "Vom Raffael," *Europa. Eine Zeitschrift*, 1:[2], no. 1 (1803).

¹⁵⁶ See the discussion of this work in Carolyn Smyth, *Correggio's Frescoes in Parma Cathedral* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 44-59, esp. p. 50.

¹⁵⁷ Winckelmann, *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works*, 2-3 and Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, 646.

Michelangelo's chief offense, according to Schlegel, was the introduction of illusionistic and other devices that blurred the distinction between two-dimensional and three-dimensional surfaces.¹⁵⁸ The works of Raphael, therefore, demonstrated for Schlegel both the end of the pure old style and the beginning of a downward spiral towards sensuality, illusionism, and France. As Schlegel determined by 1804, the decline of art began at the end of Raphael's career when, in rivalry with Michelangelo, he produced the works most valued in the eighteenth century.¹⁵⁹ The key markers of decline were explorations of sensuality (digression into music) and spatial illusionism.

The painting in which Schlegel observed Raphael's decline most clearly was the *Transfiguration of Christ* (1517), then the centerpiece of the Louvre's Raphael display. It was typical among German scholars, including art critics, to locate the shift from the Middle Ages, or Romantic era, to the modern era in the Reformation;¹⁶⁰ that Schlegel

¹⁵⁸ Michelangelo's purported disdain for Flemish painting and religious devotion (which was understood by Schlegel and others at this time as essentially German), may well have contributed to Schlegel's particular dislike of Michelangelo. See Francisco de Hollanda, "Michelangelo on Flemish Art," excerpted from "Four Dialogues" appended to Hollanda, *Tratado de Pintura Antigua* (written ca. 1541-48; published posthumously), reprinted in English translation in *Italian Art 1500-1600: Sources and Documents*, ed. Robert Klein and Henri Zerner (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966), 33-35. This development is also evident in Correggio, who appears to have been influenced at least in part by Michelangelo's work at the Sistine Chapel; see Smyth, *Correggio's Frescoes in Parma Cathedral*, 9 and 38.

¹⁵⁹ See Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, 87; originally published in Friedrich Schlegel, "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde," *Europa. Eine Zeitschrift*, 2:2, no. 1 (1805). Though first published in 1805, Schlegel dated the composition of the essay to Spring, 1804 (i.e., just before leaving Paris). See also van Nimmen, "Friedrich Schlegel's Response," esp. pp. 328-31.

¹⁶⁰ Eichner regards the Renaissance as incorporated within *die romantische Zeit* along with the middle ages as, he notes, the concept of the Renaissance as such did not yet exist: see Hans Eichner, "Germany: Romantische – Romantik – Romantiker," in Eichner, ed., *'Romantic' and its Cognates: The European History of a Word* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), 103-04. This definition did not, however, incorporate what came to be understood as the Mannerist art and architecture of the sixteenth century since, at

would focus on a work commissioned just as Luther was drawing up his ninety-five theses may have been a coincidence, but it is one that closely mirrored the progress of Schlegel's thought, in which the advent of the Reformation similarly signaled the end of the Christian era. The decline of Italian art, according to Schlegel's account, began simultaneously with the spiritual decline of the North: these cultural and spiritual devolutions would culminate in the French Enlightenment. Of the *Transfiguration* Vasari had written "that this work, among the vast number that [Raphael] painted, is the most glorious, the most lovely, and the most divine."¹⁶¹ This passage occurs around the midpoint of Vasari's tale of artistic progress up to his own day; others had carried this story forward in the centuries after Vasari's death. Schlegel's analysis was not simply a revision of the history of art as derived from Vasari, but a repudiation of its confidence in progress.

While Schlegel began his battle within the broadly accepted realm of Italian painting, his effort to revive the older and topple the newer schools had a clear corollary in the effort to revive German, that is, Christian culture prior to the Reformation, as equal and parallel to that of contemporary Italy and superior to that of Enlightenment and Napoleonic France. By 1805, Schlegel was looking to Byzantine icons for the origins of the older school. According to Vasari, such works had formed the basis for the Italian tradition established by Cimabue (c.1240-c.1302) that had culminated in the work of

least during the Napoleonic period, the Reformation served German scholars as the Romantic period's chronological endpoint. This definition allowed both Protestants and Catholics to claim medieval / Romantic art and architecture as their rightful inheritance.¹⁶¹ Giorgio Vasari, *Vite de' più eccellenti architetti, pittori et scultori italiani* (1st ed., 1550; rev. ed., 1568), abridged trans. of 2nd ed.: Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, 2 vols., trans. Gaston du C. de Vere, with intro. and notes by David Ekserdjian (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996), vol. 1, 740.

Michelangelo. Vasari's estimation of Byzantine artists as working "not in the good ancient manner of the Greeks but in that rude modern manner of those times," had led few to collect or investigate these works.¹⁶² Schlegel, however, addressed these works positively, as reflecting the oldest style of Christian painting, and one practiced by Greek priests.¹⁶³ He contrasted the icons with the degenerate art of Michelangelo: the Italian tradition, according to Schlegel, had not so much overcome Byzantine limitations in the thirteenth century, as lost Byzantine virtues in the sixteenth.¹⁶⁴

Schlegel next turned from re-assessment of painting prior to Raphael to his re-assessment of medieval architecture. His "Letters on a Trip" focused so intensely on medieval architecture that an expanded edition was published in 1823 as *Fundamentals of Gothic Architecture (Grundzüge der gotischen Baukunst)*.¹⁶⁵ The intensity of this focus was spurred by the destruction that he and his companions had encountered along the way. Schlegel began his essay by describing Gothic buildings in France and the harm done to them during the Revolution (the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, the monastery church of Saint-Denis, and the cathedrals of Reims and Cambay - of which only a tower remained standing).¹⁶⁶ But these losses were not to the French patrimony as much as they

¹⁶² Vasari, *Lives of the Painters*, vol. 1, 52.

¹⁶³ Schlegel, "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde," 104-05; see also above, Chap. 1, n. 4.

¹⁶⁴ Schlegel, "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde," 109.

¹⁶⁵ Schlegel, "Briefe auf einer Reise," 153-204.

¹⁶⁶ In his discussion of the architectural sculpture at Reims he further elaborates: "Dergleichen [heiligen] Bildnisse sind freilich in ganz Frankreich, den Niederlanden, und selbst in den Rheingegenden, fast überall herabgeworfen und zerstört, und dieses ist vielleicht der größte Schaden, welchen die Revolution in Frankreich selbst der Kunst zugefügt hat." Friedrich Schlegel, "Briefe auf einer Reise durch die Niederlande, Rheingegenden, die Schweiz, und einen Theil von Frankreich," first published in *Poetisches Taschenbuch auf das Jahr 1806*; republished in revised form as "Grundzüge der gotischen Baukunst" in *Friedrich Schlegels sämtliche Werke*, vol. 6 (Vienna: Jakob Mayer, 1823); both versions reprinted in integrated form in Schlegel, *Ansichten und*

were as-yet-unacknowledged losses to the German patrimony – for Schlegel insisted that the later medieval (“later Gothic”) architecture they saw, from Notre Dame to Cologne Cathedral, was, in its origin and essence, German.¹⁶⁷ This idea had largely lost scholarly support towards the end of the eighteenth century when, as in Herder’s assertions cited above, the British and French idea took hold that this architecture was Islamic in origin.¹⁶⁸

Ideen von der christlichen Kunst, ed. Hans Eichner, vol. 4 of *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, edited by Ernst Behler with Hans Eichner and Jean-Jacques Anstett (Munich: Ferdinand Schöningh; Zurich: Thomas, 1959), 159. According to the integrated version, this quotation is present in both the 1806 and 1823 eds.

¹⁶⁷ In looking for an authority, beyond his students, to support his assertion of the Germanness of the Gothic art he saw on his way, surprisingly Schlegel warmly referred his readers to Fiorillo’s recent works: Schlegel, “Briefe auf einer Reise” (1806 version only), 161 n. I (Schlegel) and n. 7 (Eichner). Schlegel did not cite any passage from Fiorillo in particular, perhaps because in fact Fiorillo had taken a stance only vaguely reminiscent of the patriotism of Goethe’s essay of 1772. The term “Gothic” appears to have meant little more to Fiorillo than a negative term for “medieval.” While Fiorillo clarified that he did not wish to use a negative term, at the same time he did wish to underline that Gothic architecture was German, not Italian. See Johann Dominik Fiorillo, *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste von ihrer Wiederauflebung bis auf die neuesten Zeiten*, v. 2: *Geschichte der Mahlerey in Venedig, der Lombardey (Ferrara, Modena, Reggio, Parma, Mantua, Mailand, Cremona, Bologna), Sizilien, Ligurien und Piemont* (Göttingen: Johann Friedrich Röwer, 1801), reprinted in facsimile in Johann Dominik Fiorillo, *Sämtliche Schriften*, v. 2 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1997), 379-80.

¹⁶⁸ Schlegel, “Briefe auf einer Reise,” both editions, 171, and 1823 interpolation, 193; Schlegel does not address the English terminology in the original edition, but he does argue against any Islamic influence on the (later) Gothic, whether from Spain or the Middle East. The notion that later medieval architecture derived from Islamic architecture had been published by F. Fénelon in France in 1717 and by Christopher Wren in England in 1750. William Warburton (1698-1779) had attributed the origins of Gothic architecture to Spain in a note in his edition of the *Works of Alexander Pope* (London: J. and P. Knapton, 1751), vol. 3, *Moral Essays*, 266-69, n. to verse 29; he may have been first to explicitly link this idea with the theory of Gothic architecture’s Islamic origins in the revision of this note in the 1760, and later, editions of *Moral Essays*. Cf. Pope, *Moral Essays* (1760), 267-68 n., Tonia Raquejo, “The ‘Arab Cathedrals’: Moorish Architecture as Seen by British Travellers,” *The Burlington Magazine* 128, no. 1001 (August, 1986): 555, n. 5 (where she attributes the revision to the 1769 edition), and Frankl, *Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations*, 391-92. Despite Goethe’s earlier homage to Strasbourg Cathedral as German in Goethe, “Von deutscher Baukunst. D.M. Erwini a

When he turned to the earlier, Hellenizing buildings of Germany, Schlegel explained that, like Hagia Sophia in Istanbul [fig. 2.2 a-d] and San Marco in Venice [fig. 2.3 a-d],¹⁶⁹ buildings such as Cologne's St. Aposteln [fig. 2.4 a-c] and St. Gereon [fig. 2.5 a-c] were organized by the combination and intersection (*Verknüpfung und Einschachtelung*) of geometric forms.¹⁷⁰ This description does loosely distinguish these

Steinbach," orig. self-pub., anon. (Frankfurt, 1772 [dated 1773]); reprinted in Goethe, *Schriften zur Kunst*, ed. Christian Beutler, vol. 13 of *Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche*, 28. August 1949, ed. Ernst Beutler (Zurich: Artemis, [1949]), 16-26, he, along with Herder and the architectural historian Christian Ludwig Stieglitz (whose later scholarship will be discussed in Chapter Three through Chapter Five), were among those who during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century accepted that the Gothic style had originated in Islamic architecture and so was not German in nature after all. Goethe was re-convinced of the German nature of Gothic by Schlegel's student Sulpiz Boisserée. On 14 May, 1810, shortly after his first meeting with Boisserée, Goethe wrote to his friend Karl Friedrich Reinhard concerning Boisserée's discussion of Gothic architecture: "strangest of all seems to me now the German patriotism which insisted in claiming this obviously Saracenic plant as a product of our native soil." See Robson-Scott, *Literary Background*, 176. Goethe was hardly alone in still tracing Gothic architecture to Islamic art at this time. The Prince of Württemberg, on visiting Boisserée's collection in 1814, was among those whose convictions of the Gothic style's Islamic origins had not yet been swayed by Schlegel and his associates; see Boisserée, *Tagebücher* v. 1, p. 162 (3. Juli 1814).

¹⁶⁹ Schlegel's information on St. Sophia is likely to have come from five drawings first published by Guillaume-Joseph Grelot (b. ca. 1630) in *Relation nouvelle d'un voyage de Constantinople enrichie de plans levez par l'auteur sur les lieux et de figures...* (Paris: Pierre Rocolet, 1680), of which there were several editions including the English trans. by John Phillips, *A late voyage to Constantinople containing an exact description of the Propontis and Hellespont...* (London: printed by John Playford, sold by Henry Bonwicke, 1683), from which the images used here have been taken. According to Eugene Kleinbauer, Grelot's were among the earliest published illustrations of the church and, "although his plan and elevation of St. Sophia were inaccurate, they continued to be reproduced in art books and travel accounts until the middle of the nineteenth century." See W. Eugene Kleinbauer, "Prolegomena to a Historiography of Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture," in idem, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture: An Annotated Bibliography and Historiography* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1992), xxv-xxviii.

¹⁷⁰ Schlegel, "Briefe auf einer Reise," 181-84, which indicated that this passage was present in both the 1806 and the 1823 editions, with the discussion extended in 1823 (pp. 184-85). The interpretation of St. Gereon's as Byzantine suggests the reasoning behind its influence on Leo von Klenze's alternative, "medieval" plan for the Walhalla of 1833. See

buildings, on the whole, from the buildings Schlegel called later Gothic (or German) in style: the walls, however perforated, and despite the complexity of their interplay, define the structures without being absorbed or dismantled into units of vertical division;¹⁷¹ the vaulting, apses and domes similarly provide vertical extension which does not visually overpower the spatial depth. Moreover, according to Schlegel, the Rhenish churches fulfilled some of the earliest ambitions of Byzantine architecture in being cruciform, as Constantine had wished, and in having domes built as high and wide as possible over the altars.¹⁷² For Schlegel, Byzantine influence linked later, Western medieval architecture to both that of Classical Greece and that of the Christian East, including the Holy Land. And while the patriotic fervor of the moment supported his re-introduction of the notion that later Gothic architecture was purely German, continued fascination with Classical Greece quickly brought favor to his idea that earlier Gothic architecture was Hellenizing. The Boisserées and Bertram soon extended Schlegel's ideas to the medium of painting, and assembled a collection of what they considered to be the Byzantine-German painting of Cologne and the Lower Rhine. They successfully lobbied leading lights (notably Goethe) for recognition of the importance of this school. Their architectural studies (particularly those of Sulpiz Boisserée) of Byzantine-German and truly German architecture nevertheless continued unabated.

Adrian von Buttlar, "Die Bayerische Ruhmeshalle, München, 1833-53," in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 176 and figs. 19.12-14.

¹⁷¹ My characterization here has been adapted from that made by Norbert Nussbaum with respect to Rhenish Late Romanesque architecture (specifically including St. Aposteln and St. Gereon) in *German Gothic Church Architecture*, trans. Scott Kleager (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 25.

¹⁷² Schlegel, "Briefe auf einer Reise," 182, where it is indicated that this passage was present in both the 1806 and the 1823 editions.

7. Art and Architectural History as Geography

The historiography and historicizing art and architecture of the German Byzantium that Schlegel initiated and upon which his charismatic students expanded, contribute to the prehistory of the German tradition of *Kunstgeographie* recently addressed by Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann.¹⁷³ As Kaufmann notes, Carl Ritter (1779-1859), who would later, with Alexander von Humboldt, found geography as a university discipline, responded to Schlegel's writings on medieval architecture in the Rhineland quite early in his career.¹⁷⁴ Specifically, I argue, in this lecture of 1808 Ritter was the first to build on Schlegel's suggestion that Byzantium might be recuperated from Enlightenment derision and reassessed as a conduit for culture to German lands. This speaks not only to the overlap of Schlegel's and Ritter's ideas about art and geography, but specifically to their joint enthusiasm for tracing German culture, and specifically that of its western periphery, the French-occupied Rhineland, not to France and its Romance heritage but to Greece and the East. But just like Schlegel, Ritter was motivated by the fear that with the widespread destruction of medieval Rhenish architecture, German history and its relationship to nature and to God were being destroyed: one must hurry, he

¹⁷³ Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004). See especially the introduction, pp. 1-13, and chap. 2, "The Formulation of a Geography of Art: From the End of the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Century," 43-67.

¹⁷⁴ Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art*, 43-44, and Carl Ritter's lecture, published two years later as Ritter, "Die Ruinen am Rhein," *Rheinisches Archiv für Geschichte und Literatur* v. 1 (1810): 199-220.

exclaimed, to see these buildings before they disappear.¹⁷⁵ The sacred architecture of the East, the cradle of Christianity, could be seen to have planted itself in the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation where its transformation, in stages, into the full expression of German culture could be seen in the Gothic buildings nearby. Ritter's ideas found a warm welcome.¹⁷⁶

8. The Brotherhood of St. Luke

Meanwhile, the ideas about painting which Friedrich Schlegel had published during his years in Paris and Cologne soon inspired a number of German artists to develop new approaches to their work. The most important of these belonged to a group that called themselves the Brotherhood of St. Luke. Founded in Vienna in 1809, this group was joined by Peter Cornelius (1783-1867), after it moved to Rome in 1810 under the leadership of Friedrich Overbeck (1789-1869) and Franz Pforr (1788-1812). Cornelius took a leadership position in the group after Pforr's death. One of its most celebrated early projects was the re-introduction of the art of fresco painting – an ambition advanced in particular by Peter Cornelius – at the Casa Bartholdy in Rome in

¹⁷⁵ In speaking specifically of Cologne: “Doch man eile sie zu betrachten; seit einem Jahrzehend sind allein an 50, mehr oder minder wichtige, öffentliche alterthümliche Gebäude daselbst niedergerissen worden. Diese Zerstörung und die historische Wichtigkeit mögen mich entschuldigen, wenn ich hier die Aufmerksamkeit nur auf die Antiquitäten dieser Stadt richte.” Ritter, “Die Ruinen am Rhein,” 202.

¹⁷⁶ Ritter's lecture was published by request in 1810, and was quoted at length in 1815, when he was described as one of the more significant voices addressing art-historical subjects (“Einer der gründlichsten Kenner der deutschen Kunstgeschichte”) in Johann Dominic Fiorillo, *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland und den vereinigten Niederlanden*, v. 1 (Hannover, 1815) reprint, *Sämtliche Schriften*, v. 6 (Hildesheim, Georg Olms, 1997), 389.

1816-17.¹⁷⁷ Cornelius's efforts to revive frescoes soon led Crown Prince Ludwig to bring him to Munich, not only to carry out further frescoes but also to lead the development of the art academy as a resource for the restoration and creation of major public works in which Church, state and art were to be united, and fresco cycles were to form a programmatic component.¹⁷⁸ The Brotherhood of St. Luke rapidly became widely influential throughout German lands; its members and their numerous followers came to be loosely (and at first derisively) dubbed the "Nazarenes."¹⁷⁹

How the Nazarenes adapted the concept of imitation in their work in order to realize Schlegel's historicizing approach to art would be most carefully articulated during the years 1817-19 when, in addition to the Casa Bartholdy frescoes, exhibitions of their paintings were held in Rome. The derisive attack on the Nazarenes by Goethe and Heinrich Meyer instigated numerous defensive reviews and discussions— including one by Schlegel (whose stepson had joined the Brotherhood).¹⁸⁰ One of the central questions that arose concerned the nature and significance of their use of the historical models they had chosen. According to Frank Büttner, the answer that emerged at this time was that

¹⁷⁷ The frescoes are now at the National Gallery, Berlin; see cat. no. 9 in *Nationalgalerie Berlin. Das XIX. Jahrhundert: Katalog der ausgestellten Werke* (Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz and E.A. Seemann, 2001), 95-97.

¹⁷⁸ See Johannes Erichsen, "'Aus dem Gedächtnis ins Herz'. Zum Verhältnis von Kunst, Geschichte und Politik unter König Ludwig I.," in Erichsen and Puschner, *Aufsätze*, 388-89, and the quotation in 398 n. 34: "Als der König Cornelius nach München berief, hatte er die Meinung und Absicht, seinen Erwählten an die Spitze einer Kunstschule zu stellen, die nicht bloß Lehranstalt bleiben, sondern benützt werden sollte, große und öffentliche Werke unter der Leitung und nach der Gesinnung des Meisters und seines Herrn auszuführen..." Julius Schnor von Carolsfeld, *Künstlerische Wege und Ziele*, ed. Franz Schnorr von Carolsfeld (Leipzig, 1909), 71.

¹⁷⁹ The term "Nazarene" originated in Rome, but its first documented appearance was in Heinrich Meyer's manuscript for "Neudeutsche religio-patriotische Kunst" (1817): see Frank Büttner, "Der Streit um die 'Neudeutsche religio-patriotische Kunst,'" *Aurora* 43 (1983): 55, and discussion below.

¹⁸⁰ Büttner, "Streit um die 'Neudeutsche religio-patriotische Kunst,'" 63-64.

Nazarene artists reinterpreted Winckelmann's concept of imitation (*Nachahmung*) to mean "following" (*Nachfolge*), a notion that possessed "distinct spiritual overtones."¹⁸¹ But if the notion of "following" helps to answer the question of what imitation meant for the Nazarenes in the 1810s, the question was reopened for those who, in the 1820s, tried to define and create Byzantine art and architecture for the new king of Bavaria. Following does not easily describe their work. One of the artists who most clearly abandoned imitation in the sense of following was Peter Cornelius himself.

As an art student in Düsseldorf, Cornelius had already come under the influence of Schlegel's ideas on the renewal of art as the expression of Catholic faith through his friends Fritz Flemming and Karl Joseph Ignaz Mosler, who were studying under Schlegel in Cologne.¹⁸² Schlegel expressed particular concern for the Jesuits, who at the time were banned from Catholic-ruled countries, as having been essential to the Church. This inspired Flemming to head for Russia in 1809, apparently ending up in the Prussian army (neither the Russian nor the Prussia regimes observed the papal ban); Cornelius accompanied Flemming as far as Frankfurt.¹⁸³ At the time he joined the Brotherhood, Cornelius's loyalty to the Catholic Church led him, in a letter to Mosler, to go so far as to locate in Raphael not simply the decline of art but the seeds of the tragic deception that

¹⁸¹ Büttner, "Streit um die 'Neudeutsche religios-patriotische Kunst,'" 64-67; see also Mitchell Benjamin Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined: Nazarene Tradition and the Narratives of Romanticism* (Aldershot, UK, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001), 87-89.

¹⁸² Frank Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken und Freskenprojekte*, vol. 1 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1980), 5-6.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 6.

was Protestantism.¹⁸⁴ And yet it was this late Raphael and his presumably degenerate students whose style Cornelius most closely followed.¹⁸⁵

When engaged not only in a Byzantine revival project, but one undertaken at the time of Schlegel's death and for a king who was monitoring anyone suspected of Jesuit sympathies, Cornelius appears to have returned to Schlegel's words with a renewed dedication expressed in part through a new approach to imitation. But Cornelius was not the only one caught in the embattled artistic continuum between classical idealism and Romantic historicism. The classically trained architects Klenze and Gärtner and local Nazarene-influenced painters including Heinrich Heß (1798-1863), all developed individual solutions to the unexpected task of producing a Byzantium that was barely known. In undertaking this project, the question of the meaning of imitation, famously encompassing "a bewildering variety of positions," was clearly never far from their minds - and the words of Winckelmann and Schlegel remained primary referents.¹⁸⁶

9. The Stability of Early Nineteenth-Century Byzantiums

Prior to the incorporation of art history into the universities as an independent discipline, it fell to artists, architects and patrons as much as to scholars to formulate and

¹⁸⁴ "Indessen ist nicht zu leugnen, daß hier viel an Kunstmitteln zu holen ist; aber auch viel Verführung ist hier, und zwar die feinste im Raphael selbst. In dieser liegt das größte Gift und der wahre Empörungsgeist und Protestantismus, mehr als ich je gedacht. Man möchte blutige Thränen weinen, wenn man sieht, daß ein Geist, der das Allerhöchste gleich jenem mächtigen Engel am Throne Gottes geschaut, daß ein solcher Geist abtrünnig werden konnte." Letter from Cornelius to Karl Ignaz Mosler written in Rome and dated March, 1812. See Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 1:61, who cites Ernst Förster, *Peter Cornelius. Ein Gedenkbuch aus seinem Leben und Wirken*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1874), v. 1, 117.

¹⁸⁵ Büttner, *Peter Cornelius, Fresken*, 1:61.

¹⁸⁶ Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 85, citing G. W. Pigman, "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1980), 1-32; here, p. 2.

define styles for art and architecture. Thanks to the dearth of Byzantine models on which to draw, what Byzantium had looked like was largely a creation of those who claimed to be describing, reviving, or renovating it—making it a category indexed to their cultural and political views. In so doing, few simply put aside their classical training and Enlightenment ideals, even if that is what they intended to do. Ideas become very stable when applied to practical projects and agendas. This stability made the Byzantium of Bavaria during the 1820s and 30s highly productive, as the actors who discussed or produced Byzantine works had, on the one hand, great latitude to inflect them according to their purposes and, on the other hand, no choice but to grapple with what exactly Byzantine style looked like, where it was found, and what it signified.

Chapter Three Byzantium between Ancient and Modern

1. Ludwig in Italy: From Classical Greece to Byzantium

During his Italian trip of 1817-18 Ludwig spent much of his time in Rome, where he began a long and fruitful relationship with the resident community of German and Danish artists. The famous farewell feast they prepared for Ludwig before his return trip indicates the degree of shared mutual enthusiasm (and the artists' anticipation of future commissions).¹⁸⁷ In particular Ludwig admired the Brotherhood of St. Luke's integration of pious Catholicism and fervent German patriotism, which harmonized with his own sentiments. Ludwig was already familiar with classical Greek monuments from his first Italian trip of 1804-05, taken at the conclusion of his university studies.¹⁸⁸ At Paestum, with its temples made famous by Winckelmann, Ludwig exclaimed that ancient Roman architecture amounted to no more than half-hearted attempts in comparison to Greek – thus confirming to his own satisfaction that what Winckelmann had written was true.¹⁸⁹ In connection with this trip Ludwig had begun an important collection of classical antiquities, for which he had the new court architect Leo von Klenze design a building, the Glyptothek (1815-30), the first public museum devoted to sculpture.¹⁹⁰ Klenze's mission was described at the time as giving a pure national type to Germany, and especially to Bavaria, by recreating the high art of the Greeks, which the Romans, the

¹⁸⁷ Heinz Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 114-15.

¹⁸⁸ Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 99-103.

¹⁸⁹ Emanuel Turczynski, "Bayerns Anteil an der Befreiung und am Staatsaufbau Griechenlands," in *Das neue Hellas. Griechen und Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I.*, ed. Reinhold Baumstark, exhib. cat. (Munich: Hirmer, 1999), 43.

¹⁹⁰ Sonja Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," in *Leo von Klenze. Architekt zwischen Kunst und Hof 1784-1864*, ed. Winfried Nerdinger, exhib. cat. (Munich: Prestel, 2000), 238-49.

Middle Ages, and the later periods had mangled.¹⁹¹ Structural developments and differences appear to have been considered largely irrelevant. This speaks to the anti-historical approach that supported the conclusion that the only true style for Germany, and presumably for any nation, was that of ancient Greece. This formulation was more rigorous in its denial of the possibility of originality than that which had been voiced by Winckelmann himself. Ludwig also commissioned Klenze to design a Catholic church, to be placed across from the Glyptothek and dedicated to the Holy Apostles, which would express his Christian convictions, as far as possible, in an equivalently Hellenic form.¹⁹²

During his trip of 1817-18, his second to Italy, Crown Prince Ludwig maintained this Philhellenism while embracing the Brotherhood of St. Luke and its efforts to revive early Italian and German painting. In so doing, he bridged an increasingly contested cultural-political divide that his companions and advisors generally did not.¹⁹³ In the staunchly Philhellenist camp (too closely associated with the neo-classicism of Napoleonic France for the medievalists) was Leo von Klenze, who joined the Crown

¹⁹¹ “Das Streben dieses wissenschaftlich rein ausgebildeten Künstlers [Klenze] ist kein geringeres, als das, dem deutschen Vaterlande und Baiern insbesondere endlich einmal einen reinen Nationaltypus der Kunst zu geben, der uns bisher mangelte, und in den ihm anvertrauten Werken höherer Art den Style der Griechen – an dem die Römer, das Mittelalter und die neuere Zeit nur geändert und geschnörkelt haben, um ihn zu verderben – so viel wie möglich in seiner angestammten Reinheit und Herrlichkeit wiederherzustellen....” Christian Müller, *München unter Maximilian I. Joseph*, vol. 1 (Munich, 1816), 244, cited in Adrian von Buttlar, “‘Also doch ein Teutscher?’: Klenzes Weg nach München,” in *Leo von Klenze*, ed. Nerdinger, 83 n. 124.

¹⁹² Hildebrand, “Werkverzeichnis,” 277-80 (cat. no. 44).

¹⁹³ Gerhard Bott, “Kronprinz Ludwig in altdeutscher Tracht in Rom,” in *Aufsätze*, ed. Johannes Erichsen and Uwe Puschner, unnumbered vol. of “*Vorwärts, vorwärts sollst du schauen...*”. *Geschichte, Politik und Kunst unter Ludwig I.*, ed. Claus Grimm, Veröffentlichungen zur Bayerischen Geschichte und Kultur 9/86 (Munich: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 1986), 174.

Prince in Rome in February and March of 1818.¹⁹⁴ By that time Ludwig, inspired by a few members of the Brotherhood of St. Luke who were wearing the Old German dress (i.e., cleansed of French fashion influences¹⁹⁵) upon his arrival, was wearing this costume himself, to Klenze's astonishment. More than this, Ludwig had gotten most of the German artists' community to wear it along with him, to demonstrate their commitment to German culture as well as to meet his approval—even insistence.¹⁹⁶ Klenze's misgivings¹⁹⁷ were confirmed when Ludwig soon announced to him, in writing, that he had changed his mind concerning the design of the Holy Apostles' Church to be built across from the Glyptothek. "I have retreated from the thought of making it as much like a heathen temple as possible, as the spirit of Christianity is different and demands an appropriate, basilican-type church."¹⁹⁸

Ludwig, whose commissions embodied his vision of history as a unifying force, had cultivated Klenze's Philhellenist ideals and those of the Brotherhood of St. Luke with

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ On the anti-French origin of the Old German dress before 1770 (i.e., on the eve of, and in the spirit of, Goethe's "Von deutscher Baukunst") see Bott, "Kronprinz Ludwig in altdeutscher Tracht in Rom," 176.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ Another of Ludwig's companions, Dr. Johann Nepomuk Ringseis, who was of the other camp, described Klenze's arrival into the costumed world Ludwig had created around himself in Rome: "Nun kam denn auch Klenze hinzu, ebenfalls [like Martin Joseph von Wagner] eingefleischter Hellenist, und gerieth schier außer Fassung über des Kronprinzen ihm ganz unerwartete Wendung... Zur Zeit, von der ich rede, war jedenfalls Klenze dem begeisterten Deutschthum gründlich abhold. Nicht nur die bildenden Künstler der neuen Richtung hatten seinen Spott zu erdulden, sondern auch der Dichter Rückert, der eben damals in Rom weilte...." Bott, "Kronprinz Ludwig in altdeutscher Tracht in Rom," 174.

¹⁹⁸ "Ich kam von dem Gedanken zurück solche, [die Apostelkirche] einem Heydentempel möglichst ähnlich zu machen, des Christentums Geist ist anders, ihm gemäß muß die Kirche sayn basilikenartig." Letter from Ludwig to Klenze dated February 11, 1818, quoted in Günther-Alexander Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche in München*, *Miscellanea Bavarica Monacensia* 115 (Munich: Kommissionsverlag UNI-Druck, 1983), 3.

equal enthusiasm. Beyond simply sharing their visions of the past, he sought and found a possibility to harmonize them.¹⁹⁹ During the winter of 1817-18, while visiting Sicily before settling in Rome, Ludwig had gone a step further than his divided companions and “discovered” Byzantine art and architecture – the art that connected the Classical Greek with the Italian and German traditions.²⁰⁰ He was specifically impressed by the buildings built for Roger II, the first Norman king of Sicily (r. 1101-54), which expressed the blending of medieval cultures characteristic of Sicily as a whole. Klenze, who missed the Sicilian section of this trip, had anticipated that the Roman stage would be followed by a trip to Ottoman Greece to see the monuments there. This might have provided the opportunity for Ludwig and Klenze to respond to architecture that expressed the Byzantine tradition more explicitly. The impending announcement of Bavaria’s new constitution, a constitution which Ludwig had long desired and to which he had contributed liberal impulses, compelled them to return home instead.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁹ On Ludwig’s interest in history as synthesizing tradition, culture and politics in a manner that is inherently useful for building up a sense of unity see Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 17-18, and Rudolf Endres, “Franken und Bayern im Vormärz und in der Revolution von 1848/49,” in Erichsen and Puschner, *Aufsätze*, 206. While Gollwitzer describes Ludwig’s search for historical syntheses as typical for his time, Endres underlines the unusually wide-ranging measures Ludwig took to translate traditions and culture – especially material culture – into enacted and embodied political forces. In addition to intense interest in the historicizing (in addition to historical) architecture under discussion here, these measures included the discovery (and invention) of regional costumes along with parades in which to wear them; the founding of local historical societies; and some of the earliest laws concerning the preservation of historical monuments.

²⁰⁰ Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 116-17.

²⁰¹ Eberhard Weis, “Die politischen und historischen Auffassungen Ludwigs I. in der Kronprinzenzeit,” in Erichsen and Puschner, *Aufsätze*, 19 and 22-23. Ilka Backmeister, “Biographisches Überblick,” in *Leo von Klenze*, ed. Nerdinger, 186. The constitution was announced on 26 May, 1818. In enthusiastic response to it, Leo von Klenze received a commission from a Franconian count to commemorate the event with a monument, a “Konstitutionssäule,” the ground stone of which was laid on the third anniversary in May

2. The German Search for Byzantium

The search for models through which to interpret Byzantine art and architecture had progressed since Schlegel's publication of "Letters on a Trip." In the spring of 1810, in a letter describing the evolution of his ideas as well as his collections to Goethe, Sulpiz Boisserée had extended the increasingly popular idea of the Byzantine origins of Rhenish medieval architecture to early Rhenish paintings.²⁰² Schlegel had made this connection, too, to judge from his letter asking Boisserée where he had gotten this idea.²⁰³ In his reply, Boisserée explained to Schlegel that he had drawn on Schlegel's reports from the Musée Napoléon, connecting the assertions that German and Italian painting had a common origin, and that (in discussing the Russian icons) the earliest Christian painting was Greek in style.²⁰⁴ For Schlegel and Boisserée, reliance on Byzantine models and

1821, coinciding (conveniently, for Ludwig and his supporters) with the rapid escalation of political Philhellenism in the wake of the outbreak of the Greek Wars of Independence. See Endres, "Franken und Bayern im Vormärz," 205.

²⁰² See the excerpt from Boisserée's letter to Goethe of May 8, 1810, quoted in Chapter One, n. 17, above. Boisserée described his discovery of the Byzantine origins of German painting as occurring in 1806-07 in his "Fragmente einer Selbstbiographie," but as this essay was written up after the fact, it is not clear the degree to which it incorporates later developments in his thoughts: see Sulpiz Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 5 vols., ed. H.-J. Weitz. (Darmstadt, 1978-95), 1:32. In his diary entries, Sulpiz Boisserée's first use of *neugriechisch* to describe paintings occurs in May 1811: specifically, to "4 neugriechischen Aposteln von Etkendorf" and as a component of the style of an early painting by Correggio: see Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 1:64 and 66. For his use of "Gräcizierend deutsch" see, e.g., 1:330.

²⁰³ Friedrich Schlegel, letter to Sulpiz Boisserée of 10 Nov. 1810, in Firmenich-Richartz, *Sulpiz und Melchior Boisserée als Kunstsammler*, 98-99.

²⁰⁴ "Ich meine hiemit besonders die gelegentlich *Europa IV* [i.e., *Europa ser. 4*, vol. 2, no. 2], S. 5, 30, 109 geäußerte Bemerkung, daß die Malerei bei den Italienern und Deutschen in der ersten Zeit aus einem und demselben Punkt müsse ausgegangen seyn, so wie die mehrmals gemachte Voraussetzung, daß die älteste christliche Malerei griechischer Art gewesen sey; denn gerade das durchgängige, ausschließliche Bestehen griechischer Art und Weise in alter Malerei und Bildhauerei der Deutschen von en ersten

teachers linked Italian and German (understood primarily as Rhenish and Netherlandish) painting and thus strengthened historical ties between Germany and Rome.²⁰⁵ Through Byzantium, early Italian and German works were more closely linked to one another than was Italy to other Latin cultures (i.e., France); the living traditions of Greece and Russia, moreover, maintained this art in its primitive form. Schlegel and Boisserée did not, however, pursue these living traditions.

Schlegel, who had moved to Vienna to help resurrect the Holy Roman Empire, wished Sulpiz Boisserée to extend his research on German-Byzantine art and architecture eastward from the Rhineland to the Habsburg lands at the other end of the former empire: specifically, in 1810 he encouraged Boisserée to visit the Kreuzkapelle in Karlstein Castle outside of Prague (begun 1348), which had long been the permanent home of the Imperial Insignia **[fig. 3.1]**.²⁰⁶ When Boisserée did not take up the task, two years later Schlegel published his own study of the chapel.²⁰⁷ Schlegel considered its Bohemian

Zeiten an bis Eyck, ist ja die Hauptgrundlage der durch unsere Entdeckungen neu erworbenen Kenntniß der vaterländischen Kunstgeschichte.” (The first two pages cited by Boisserée [5 and 30] are in Schlegel, “Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde,” repr., Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, 84 and 104. Schlegel dated this essay to Spring, 1804, though he first published it in 1805. The third page Boisserée cites is in Schlegel, “Dritter Nachtrag alter Gemälde,” *Europa* ser. 2, vol. 2, no. 4 [1805], repr., Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, 116. Though also published in 1805, Schlegel dated “Dritter Nachtrag” to Summer, 1804.) See Sulpiz Boisserée’s letter to Friedrich Schlegel of 19 Dec. 1810, published in Firmenich-Richartz, *Sulpiz und Melchior Boisserée als Kunstsammler*, 99-108, esp. p. 100.

²⁰⁵ Boisserée, “Fragmente einer Selbstbiographie,” in his *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 1:32.

²⁰⁶ Friedrich Schlegel, letter to Sulpiz Boisserée of 10 Nov. 1810, cited in Firmenich-Richartz, *Sulpiz und Melchior Boisserée als Kunstsammler*, 99 n. 55; Nussbaum, *German Gothic Church Architecture*, trans. Scott Kleager (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 125.

²⁰⁷ Friedrich Schlegel, “Schloß Karlstein bei Prag,” *Deutsches Museum* 2:10 (1812): 357-65, reprinted in *Friedrich Schlegels sämtliche Werke*, vol. 6 (Vienna: Jakob Mayer, 1823), *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, vol. 3, *Vermischte Aufsätze*, no.

paintings to be important examples of a transitional style, illustrating the shift from the Orthodox New Greek to the Catholic German schools.²⁰⁸ (Schlegel did not call attention to the well-known mid-fourteenth-century date of the chapel and its paintings, which would not have helped him to make this point, since the start of the German school was generally dated to the thirteenth century.²⁰⁹) The need for paintings in Greek churches was greater than that in Catholic ones, Schlegel supposed, especially on the iconostasis separating the nave from the choir which blocked the view of the Holy Communion for the Greek (as opposed to the Catholic) congregation.²¹⁰ This theory appears to have been based on new knowledge of the interior furnishings and services of Greek Orthodox

1, 303-11. Both versions reprinted together in Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der Christlichen Kunst*, 207-12. Page references are to *Ansichten und Ideen*.

²⁰⁸ “Es schließen sich diese Denkmale der Malerkunst in Böhmen auf der einen Seite an die altdeutsche Schule, auf der andern an die ältesten christlich griechischen Bilder. Schlegel, “Schloss Karlstein bei Prag,” 207. The overall effect of the chapel with its gold walls, jeweled windows and walls of paintings is still summarized as “Byzantine,” for instance in Norbert Nussbaum’s estimation that “the structure surpassed all previous reliquary chapels in its sheer Byzantine ostentatiousness.” Nussbaum, *German Gothic Church Architecture*, 125.

²⁰⁹ The chapel’s clear association with Charles IV (German King from 1347; Holy Roman Emperor from 1355 to 1378) left its date unambiguous.

²¹⁰ “Die ganze Verzierung der Kirche und ihrer Wände durch eine so große Menge gleichförmiger und gleich großer Heiligenbilder erinnert noch einigermaßen an die Einrichtung der griechischen Kirchen, welche von der katholischen so sehr verschieden ist. Eine Verschiedenheit, welche auch auf die Anwendung der Malerei einen sehr großen und wesentlichen Einfluß gehabt hat. Da die Messe in der griechischen Kirche im Verborgenen gefeiert wird, so entsteht das Bedürfnis, die Wand, hinter welcher dieses geschieht, und aus deren Mitteltüre der Priester zu bestimmten Zeiten mit dem Heiligtume hervortritt, mit Bildern zu verzieren und anzufüllen, weil die Augen der Andächtigen, welche an der heiligen Handlung Teil nehmen, stets dahin gerichtet sind. Es soll diese Wand gleichsam als ein reichgezierter Teppich und mit schönen Sinnbildern bedeckter Vorhang vor dem verborgenen Allerheiligsten erscheinen, und das Auge und Gemüt der Frommen immerwährend mit heiligen Gedanken und Bildern erfüllen. Ein einziges großes Alfresco-Gemälde würde für diesen Zweck und für die stete und anhaltende Betrachtung nicht so dienlich und anwendbar sein; man wählte also, den ganzen Raum mit einer Menge kleiner und durchaus gleichförmiger Bilder anzufüllen.” Schlegel, “Schloss Karlstein bei Prag,” 209.

churches, including not only the iconostases themselves but how they functioned.

Schlegel likely owed this new knowledge to contact with the Greek diaspora in Vienna, the largest in Habsburg or German lands at the time, which had completed a new church

(the Georgskirche) shortly before his arrival.²¹¹ The special connection between German art and architecture and the Byzantine tradition that Schlegel and Boisserée were

investigating was soon observed by others as well, whether they felt it spoke for the art or against it.²¹²

²¹¹ While there had been earlier private chapels used by the Viennese Orthodox communities, by 1786 the Greek community of Vienna had grown large and important enough that it was permitted to build its own church; soon there were two Orthodox congregations in Vienna: one for Ottoman Greeks, the Kirche zur Heiligen Dreifaltigkeit in the “Alten Fleischmarkt,” approved in 1787; and one for Austrian Greeks, the Georgskirche on Hafnersteg, built in 1802. Emmanuel Turczynski, *Die deutsch-griechischen Kulturbeziehungen bis zur Berufung König Ottos*, Südosteuropäische Arbeiten 48 (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1959), 90-92, n. 462, and 95. See also Turczynski, *Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte Griechenlands im 19. Jahrhundert. Von der Hinwendung zu Europa bis zu den ersten Olympischen Spielen der Neuzeit*, Peleus. Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Griechenlands und Zyperns, 16 (Bibliopolis: Mannheim and Möhnesee, 2003), 39-40.

²¹² For instance, in October 1812, Anton Friedrich Thiebaut, lawyer and music specialist in Göttingen and Friedrich Franz Dietrich, Graf von Bremer, of Hanover, visited the Boisserées’ and Bertram’s collection and “bei beiden äußerte sich auf verschiedene Weise eine gewisse Beängstigung Qual und Aufruhr gegen das *christliche Wesen* [italicized in the original] in der Kunst — das ihnen wie Pocken-Gift angeerbte griechische und noch dazu falsch und flach griechische Ideal der Schönheit konnte sich damit nicht vertragen. Der elegante Prof. mathesis fand nichts was ihm mehr gefiel oder überhaupt nichts was ihm gefiel, als die Veronica... Bremer, der mehr über die Sache nachgedacht zu haben schien, suchte und veranlaßte ein paarmal lebhaftere Gespräche über die Grundsätze und das Wesen der Schönheit, mit seinem scharfen feinen Verstand hat er sich die ganze Gedanken-Reihe der neueren von griechischer Kunst entliehenen Schönheits-Lehre zu eigen gemacht – am entschiedensten kam dies zum Vorschein als ich ihm die Zeichnungen vom Dom zeigte, die Giardiniera von Raphael hing dabei – die war ihm zu kalt, ja geziert... ” Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, v. 1, 1808-23, 84-85.

In 1814 Goethe, inspired by Boisserée and by the Russian Orthodox chapel of Maria Pavlovna (1786-1859),²¹³ undertook his own research into Byzantine art as a source for later developments.²¹⁴ He wrote to Maria asking for information about Russian icons, and for some actual examples, which would document “how a branch of art from the earliest times in Constantinople maintained itself unchanged up to our day through constant imitation, since in all other lands the art advanced and has distanced itself from its first strict religious forms.”²¹⁵ The request was forwarded to the conservative Russian nationalist Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin (1766-1826), at work on his magnum opus, the *History of the Russian State*, who sent Goethe four icons.²¹⁶ Goethe had hoped to share these with the Boisserées and Bertram, according to a letter of October 1815, but the case with the icons never arrived.²¹⁷ Goethe’s pursuit of the matter nearly resulted in the re-introduction of actual early Russian paintings into the discussion of Byzantine art, its relationship to other traditions and its influence in Germany (as Schlegel had proposed

²¹³ The wife of Karl Friedrich of Weimar and daughter of Tsar Paul I and Tsarina Maria Feodorovna, born Princess Sophie Dorothea of Württemberg.

²¹⁴ Of Russian icons Fiorillo had written “als Werke der Kunst betrachtet sind die mehrsten Bilder unter aller Kritik, und kommen den mittelmäßigen deutschen Bildern des Mittelalters lange nicht bey. Manche, welche von uralten Künstlern herühren, werden Heiligen und sogar Engeln zugeschrieben. Sie bleiben als Antiquitäten wichtig und verdienen bekannter gemacht zu werden als sie sind... Allein die strengen Gesetze hielten die Mahler von jeder Neuerung zurück.” Johann Dominick Fiorillo, “Versuch einer Geschichte der bildenden Künste in Rußland,” in *Kleine Schriften artistischen Inhalts*, vol. 2 (Göttingen: bey Heinrich Dieterich, 1806), 41-42; facsimile reprint, Fiorillo, *Sämtliche Schriften*, vol. 11 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1997), 41-42.

²¹⁵ “... wie ein, aus den ältesten Zeiten von Konstantinopel her abgeleiteter Kunstzweig bis auf unsere Tage sich unverändert durch eine stetige Nachahmung erhalten, da in allen andern Ländern die Kunst fortgeschritten und sich von ihren ersten religiösen strengen Formen entfernt hat.” Goethe, note to Maria Pavlovna, late Feb./early March 1814, in Goethe, *Schriften zur Kunst*, 646-47.

²¹⁶ Ibid. On Karamzin, see Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959), 178-80.

²¹⁷ Christian Beutler, introduction to Goethe, *Schriften zur Kunst*, 1153-54.

in 1805).²¹⁸ In the event, Byzantine and contemporary Greek and Russian art remained conflated and little studied.

3. An Italo-German Byzantium

Schlegel had also written of San Marco in Venice as the Italian peninsula's preeminent Byzantine building, akin to Hagia Sophia. Though Hagia Sophia was still known largely through reproductions of Grelot's drawings of 1680 [**fig. 2.2 a**], by 1823 its relationship to San Marco could be easily studied in the posthumous publication by Seroux d'Agincourt (1730-1814), *Histoire de l'art par les monuments* [**fig. 2.3 a**].²¹⁹ It appears that little was available on San Marco beyond this publication, and the other monuments of Italy that were considered to be Byzantine were similarly poorly documented. Although the Exarchate of Ravenna had been the principal early Byzantine

²¹⁸ How advanced Goethe's interest in Russian icons was in relation to Russian studies of art at that time is discussed by Maximilian von Propper, "Goethes Verhältnis zur russischen Ikonenmalerei. Analyse einer Legende," *Goethe. Neue Folge des Jahrbuchs der Goethe-Gesellschaft*, 25 (1963): 27-69; here pp. 30-31. On p. 35, Propper suggests Fiorillo had discussed the relationship between "altdeutscher und spätgriechischer Art" in 1812, and Friedrich von Rumohr had done the same somewhat later. It is not clear to me what work of Fiorillo could be meant here: the only work published by Fiorillo in 1812 was "Über einige Italiänische Gelehrte und Künstler welche Matthias Corvinus König von Ungarn beschäftigte," according to Claudia Schrapel "Verzeichnis der Schriften von Johann Dominicus Fiorillo," in *Johann Dominicus Fiorillo: Kunstgeschichte und die romantische Bewegung um 1800*, ed. Antje Middeldorf Kosegarten (Göttingen: Wallstein, 1997), 480.

²¹⁹ Jean Baptiste Louis Georges Seroux d'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'art par les monuments, depuis sa décadence au IV^e siècle jusqu'à son renouvellement au XVI^e*, 5 vols. (Paris: Treuttel et Würtz, 1810-23): see "S^{te} Sophie de Constantinople, S^t Marc, et autres églises de Venise construites dans le style grec moderne, x^e et xi^e siècles," described in vol. 3, *Texte. Description des planches* (1823), 24 and illustrated in vol. 4 *Planches. Architecture et Sculpture* (1823), plate 26. In the following plate (27), nos. 12-13, Seroux d'Agincourt himself reprinted two of Grelot's Hagia Sophia images, if in miniature: a simplified version Grelot's plate V (the ground plan reproduced here) and an reversed version of Grelot's plate VIII (the interior view looking east, also reproduced here).

stronghold in Italy, and it was known that one could still find buildings there from the reign of Emperor Justinian (r. 527-65), during the early nineteenth century these were minimally illustrated and surprisingly little discussed, probably because Ravenna was off the traditional, classically-oriented tourist path.²²⁰ It was largely through this tourist path and collections of prints that Byzantium came to be known, as the pursuit of Byzantine art and architecture was at first little more than an embellishment of the classical tour, and Italy already provided most of what was known of ancient Greek art and architecture for all but the few who made the adventurous trip to Athens. Winckelmann had contented himself with Italy; those interested in Byzantium didn't travel much further.

At least from the German perspective, however, some of the Byzantine buildings of Italy were essentially German, as the concepts of "Germany" and "Italy" overlapped. The close historic relations between the Frankish, Bavarian and Lombard nobility, and the recent resumption of direct Habsburg rule in Lombardy following the fall of Napoleon, its extension to Venice, and indirect Habsburg control over other Italian states, meant that these regions, as part of the Holy Roman Empire, were regarded as German (in the broadest sense) at least until 1859, when the Piedmontese-led nationalists began to push the Habsburgs out.²²¹ German scholars emphasized the German heritage of Italy by tracing the lingering cultural and ethnic evidence of Germanic tribes south of the Alps –

²²⁰ Illustrations of a couple of Ravennate buildings were available in Seroux d'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'art par les monuments*, vol. 4 (1823): plate 18, the Mausoleum of Theodoric, and plate 23, San Vitale.

²²¹ On Habsburg Italy see, e.g., Nicholas Doumanis, *Italy: Inventing the Nation* (London: Arnold and Oxford University Press, 2001), 48-93. For Lombardy and Venice as part of a region of contiguous German and German-controlled lands, see Karl Baedeker, *Handbuch für Reisende in Deutschland und dem Österreichischen Kaiserstaate*, 3rd ed. (Koblenz: Karl Baedeker, 1846).

specifically, the Ostrogoths and Lombards.²²² Additionally, the vibrant modern German communities throughout the Italian states, which had been fostering cultural exchange since at least the advent of the printing press, had become vital to the revival of arts and letters north of the Alps in Winckelmann's day and were at a highpoint during Ludwig's years as Crown Prince (1806-25).²²³

4. The First Bavarian Byzantine Renovation: Speyer Cathedral

Back in Bavaria, Klenze soon found himself confronted not only with realizing the perfect imitation of Greek art in the form of the Glyptothek, which was still under construction, but with the seemingly contradictory task of renovating the art of Greece in one of its later, mangled forms. Speyer Cathedral (ca. 1030-1106, with later renovations and additions), on the left bank of the Rhine, had fallen into disrepair under Napoleon. It was the most important monument in a region, the Bavarian Rhine District, that had been given to Bavaria by the Congress of Vienna. As of 1820, the cathedral's restoration was entrusted to Klenze and the architect and engineer Karl Friedrich Wiebeking (1762-1842).²²⁴ As the Stuttgart *Art Paper (Kunstblatt)* reported the following year, this

²²² For an overview of the philological origins of this scholarship see Patrick J. Geary, *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 27-30. Drawing on the philological arguments, those seeking to celebrate the German culture of Italy turned first and foremost to the mausoleum of Theodoric in Ravenna and Milan Cathedral, which served as evidence of Ostrogothic and Lombard sophistication.

²²³ See, for instance, Max Kunze, ed., *Italia und Germania. Deutsche Klassizisten und Romantiker in Italien*, exh. cat. (Berlin: National Gallery, 1975).

²²⁴ Brody Neuschwander, "The Art History of Speyer," 2 vols. (Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1986), 1:35-37 and 48. The journal *Der Katholik* was also founded in Speyer in 1820, to promote Catholicism in Rhenish Bavaria, as well as to promote a connection between the region's Catholics and those who had moved from there to the US; see Kathleen Neils Conzen, "Immigrant Religion and the Republic: German

restoration was by no means to be carried out “in the true style of the German Romantic, but rather in that which in its essence had developed from early Roman elements and would be better termed Lombard or Byzantine.”²²⁵ According to the latest scholarship, not only had the New Greek style first spread westwards to Gothic and Lombard (i.e., Germanic) regions of Italy before being exported to Germany and England; in Lombardy the New Greek style retained a pure and unmixed character when, in eleventh- and twelfth-century Germany and England, it became mixed with Arabic elements.²²⁶

Klenze and Wiebeking set out to define this building more precisely as Byzantine, though they viewed the style as limited in its broader application. Wiebeking, possibly inspired by the projected scale of Georg Moller’s *Monuments of German Architecture* (*Denkmaehler der deutschen Baukunst*, 1815-43), wrote an eleven-volume survey of the architectural history of the world.²²⁷ Wiebeking’s work, *Theoretical and Practical Civic*

Catholics in Nineteenth-Century America,” *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 35 (Fall 2004): 43-56, 47 and n. 16. This reflected the Bavarian regime’s broader attempts to maintain ties with Catholic immigrants to the US through missionary activities and building campaigns, as discussed in Kathleen Curran, *The Romanesque Revival: Religion, Politics, and Transnational Exchange* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 83-93. (Curran, like Neuenschwander, translates the terms “Byzantine” and “Neugriechisch” as “Romanesque,” as has become standard.)

²²⁵ “...[keineswegs] im eigentlichen Style der deutschen Romantik [=Gotik], sondern in demjenigen gebauet, welcher dem Wesen nach in Italien, und überhaupt aus altrömischen Elementen gebildet ward und unter der näheren Bezeichnung des lombardischen oder byzantinischen begriffen wird.” Anonymous article in *Kunstblatt* 79 (Oct. 1, 1821): 313ff., as cited in Gottlieb Leinz, “Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik,” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 44 (1981): 41 and n. 89.

²²⁶ Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 31.

²²⁷ Georg Moller, *Denkmaehler der deutschen Baukunst* (Darmstadt: bei Heyer und Leske, 1815-43), vol. 1, plates, with introduction, 1815; vol. 1, text, n.d. (not before 1819; possibly as late as 1821). On the publication date of Moller’s text to vol. 1 see 19 n. ** of Moller’s text and W.D. Robson-Scott, *The Literary Background of the Gothic Revival: A Chapter in the History of Taste* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 268 n. 2. As vol. 2 of Moller’s survey was first published in 1822-31 and vol. 3 was completed in 1843, only Moller’s plates, with their brief introduction, and perhaps the accompanying

Architecture (Theoretisch-practische bürgerliche Baukunde, 1821-26), included in its first volume what might be considered the first art-historical account of Speyer Cathedral.²²⁸ Wiebeking's goal—to investigate the potential of historic buildings and styles as sources for contemporary architecture—was an exhaustive response to the growing concern that modern architecture lacked sufficient new ideas. He credited Winckelmann with providing the foundation for his project by pointing out the need to study historical monuments in order to improve current practices for, “indeed, civil architecture assumes great and honorable qualities only when it is nourished by the riches of history and led by philosophy.”²²⁹ In this vein, Wiebeking assessed Speyer Cathedral

text were available to Wiebeking before he published vol. 1 of his work in 1821. The thought that Moller's projected survey nevertheless served as an inspiration for Wiebeking's even broader survey has been proposed by Susette Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms im 19. Jahrhundert*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg* 14 (1980): 192.

²²⁸ Carl Friedrich von Wiebeking, *Theoretisch-practische bürgerliche Baukunde, durch Geschichte und Beschreibung der merkwürdigsten antiken Baudenkmahe und ihrer genauen Abbildungen bereichert*, 11 vols. (Munich: Zängl, 1821-26). Neuenschwander, “Art History of Speyer,” 1:35, describes Wiebeking as the first to write about Speyer Cathedral “in an art-historical manner,” citing Hans-Erich Kubach and Walter Haas, eds., *Der Dom zu Speyer*, 3 vols., *Die Kunstdenkmäler von Rheinland-Pfalz* 5 (Munich: Deutscher Kunst-Verlag, 1972), 7. His work found qualified reception: Karl Schaase, in reviewing a work by another scholar, would state that although the illustrations in *Bürgerliche Baukunde* were very useful, the text “giebt doch nur eine ungeordnete Anhäufung unkritischer Notizen.” [Karl Schnaase], review of C. L. Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume bis in die neuern Zeiten*, in *Berliner Conversations-Blatt für Poesie, Literatur und Kritik* 2 (1828): 239. That this anonymously published review was written by Schnaase and is thus his first known publication has recently determined by Henrik Karge, “Das Frühwerk Karl Schnaases. Zum Verhältnis von Ästhetik und Kunstgeschichte im 19. Jahrhundert,” in Kosegarten, *Johann Dominicus Fiorillo*, 410. In 1817 Wiebeking had retired from his position as head of the division for road construction and hydraulic engineering (*Chef der Ministerial-Sektion für Straßen- und Wasserbau*). See Marie Frölich and Hans-Günther Sperlich, *Georg Moller. Baumeister der Romantik* (Darmstadt: Eduard Roether, 1959), 409 n. 623.

²²⁹ “...ja die Civil-Architektur nimmt überhaupt nur dann einen grossen und verehrungswürdigen Character an, wenn sie aus den Schätzen der Geschichte genährt und von der Philosophie geleitet wird.” Wiebeking, *Theoretisch-practische bürgerliche*

as a fine and influential example of a New Greek building. He traced the style to Christian churches of the Orient and probably specifically Palestine, “where our divine religion was founded and taught in its complete purity.”²³⁰ It depended “on load-bearing walls, round arches, groin vaults, and, on occasion, cupolas” and deserved “all possible attention, as do the many buildings influenced by it, and should on account of its excellent construction and sound execution be accorded the most precise investigation by all those interested in architecture, though the application of its features in new buildings is not advisable.”²³¹

Despite describing the building and its style more broadly as expressive of early Christian purity – a sentiment which echoed the contemporary ideas of the Brotherhood of St. Luke - Wiebeking held fast to his training in the classical canon, by which standard Speyer cathedral fell short as too irregular and disproportionate. Wiebeking found that “all rules, except that of solidity, are as foreign to Speyer as to the Lombard style, which is even less worthy of imitation than the New-Greek style.”²³² Without

Baukunde vol. 1 (1821), 262, quoted and translated in Neuenschwander, “Art History of Speyer,” 1:35-36 and 2:50.

²³⁰ “Eine *Neugriechische-Bauart* ist im Orient und höchst wahrscheinlich in Palästina, wo unsere göttliche Religion gegründet und in ihrer ganzen Reinheit gelehrt wurde, bey'm Bau christlicher Kirchen entstanden, und man hat ihr diese Benennung gegeben, weil sie im griechischen Kaiserreich früher, als im Abendländschen angewendet und verbreitet wurde.” Wiebeking, *Theoretisch-practische bürgerliche Baukunde* vol. 1 (1821), 588, quoted and translated in Neuenschwander, “Art History of Speyer,” 1:36 and 2:50.

²³¹ “Er verdient somit alle Aufmerksamkeit und mehrerer nach ihm angelegten Gebäude, erheischen, in Hinsicht seiner trefflichen Construction, und guten Ausführung, die genaueste Untersuchung von wissbegierigen Baukundigen, wenn gleich seine Anwendung bey neuen Gebäuden nicht rathsam ist.” Wiebeking, *Theoretisch-practische bürgerliche Baukunde* vol. 1 (1821), 616-17, quoted and translated in Neuenschwander, “The Art History of Speyer,” 1:36-37.

²³² “... alle Regeln, mit Ausnahme der zur Festigkeit abzweckenden, waren ihm eben so fremde, als dem Lombardischen-Styl, der noch weniger als dieser Neugriechische nachgeamt zu werden verdient.” Wiebeking, *Theoretisch-practische bürgerliche*

discernable rules, the style could not be abstracted and applied in buildings that met contemporary needs. For Wiebeking, Speyer was the building that demonstrated that the New-Greek style should be dismissed, along with all New Greek architecture, as a model for contemporary building.

Klenze, a Protestant with pagan leanings (if in both cases not as forcefully expressed as Goethe's) showed even less warmth towards medieval, and particularly towards Byzantine-German, architecture than Wiebeking.²³³ During the Speyer renovations he wrote a *Manual of Architecture for Christian Worship*.²³⁴ Klenze traced Byzantine domed churches to Roman halls of justice, bath houses, and gymnasia, which were first used for Christian worship: "from these was created that Oriental church plan with vaulted ceilings, domes and strong interior piers, of which Hagia Sophia in Constantinople displays the first developed model, and which was brought to the West

Baukunde vol. 1 (1821), 616-17, quoted and translated in Neuenschwander, "The Art History of Speyer," 1:37 and 2:50 (I have slightly revised Neuenschwander's translation).

²³³ For a discussion of how Klenze integrated his understandings of religion and architecture see Leo von Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur des christlichen Kultus, Facsimile-Neudruck der Ausgabe München 1822/24*, with introduction by Adrian von Buttlar (Nördlingen, Dr. Alfons Uhl, 1990), introduction, 10-11. Buttlar notes here the Prussian architectural critic and art historian Franz Kugler's astonishment at Klenze's blurring of the lines between the ancient mystery cults and Christian revelation: "...ein jeder gebildete Christ weiß, daß in dem wichtigsten Punkte, in dem der Erlösung, der innere Geist des Christenthums so außer aller Beziehung zu allen früheren Religionen steht, wie der Himmel entfernt ist von der Erde. Doch der Verfasser ist Künstler; ihn als Theologen zu beurteilen ist nicht unsere Sache." Franz Kugler, review of *Anweisung zur Architectur des christlichen Cultus*, 2nd ed. (1834), *Museum* 2:40 (Oct. 6, 1834): 314. For Klenze's cynical evaluation of Ludwig I's Catholicism see Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 95-96.

²³⁴ Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur des christlichen Cultus* (Munich, 1822; issued in 1824). Klenze would publish a 2nd edition in 1834. Also discussed in Backmeister, "Leo von Klenze – Biographischer Überblick," 188. (It seems that there is no evidence as to why Klenze did not issue his *Manual of Architecture* in 1822, when it was completed, but possibly it didn't seem politic for the architect in charge of the renovation to criticize Byzantine architecture so harshly at the same time that Speyer was being re-consecrated.)

primarily through Lombard buildings in northern Italy.”²³⁵ Unfortunately, Klenze does not note what Lombard buildings he had in mind. Klenze’s information on Hagia Sophia probably came from the same five drawings available to Schlegel back in 1806 (first published in Paris in 1680), which had not been superseded [**fig. 2.2a, c, d**: three of the drawings as published in 1683 the first English translation].²³⁶

A focus on domes as characteristic of the Byzantine style had been established by Friedrich Schlegel; Klenze’s focus on vaulting was, however, new. That Speyer Cathedral had not been vaulted from the start was not known at this time, and was disputed into the twentieth century.²³⁷ Schlegel had already established Hagia Sophia, via San Marco, as the origin of Byzantine architecture in the West in his “Letters on a Trip” of 1806 but, where he described the style of these buildings as organized around the intersection of geometric forms (and so, for Schlegel, Hellenizing), Klenze characterized the style and its relationship to classical precedent rather less generously:

...the domes always remained the characteristic and principal feature of their exterior form. Round arches, poor execution and composition, small windows without paintings [i.e. on the glass], seemingly cramped interior space, a confused, often formless exterior, and a certain mere craft-like appearance, if one may say so, are the characteristics that epitomize most of these churches. Only a certain reminiscence of magnificent antiquity, its architectural rigor, form, and masses, from which these failed forms emerged, and which at times look out from their murky darkness, only these can keep refined feeling from misjudging even

²³⁵ “...aus diesen jenes orientalische Kirchenschema mit gewölbten Decken, Kuppeln und starken inneren Pfeilern entstand, wovon uns *Santa Sophia* in Constantinopel das erste ausgebildetes Vorbild zeigt, und welches besonders durch die lombardischen Baue in Oberitalien den Abendländern zugeführt ward.” Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur*, 11.

²³⁶ These drawings were the only significant illustrations available (Seroux d’Agincourt’s images of Hagia Sophia, published in 1823, were copies of Grelot, as noted above); new, if likewise inaccurate, drawings were not published until 1839-40 (after the Allerheiligenhofkapelle had been completed); measured plans and sections were finally published by William Salzenberg in 1854-55. See Kleinbauer, “Prolegomena to a Historiography of Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture,” xxv-xxviii.

²³⁷ Neuenschwander, “Art History of Speyer,” 1:86-88 and 147-49.

the at times picturesque spaces and masses, and from viewing them in a broad damning judgment.²³⁸

For Klenze the excesses of Byzantine architecture were magnified by a problematic tendency towards a colossal pier-and-vault architecture (*Pfeiler-Gewölbe-Architektur*) that departed from the anthropomorphic Greek ideal of columns and orders.²³⁹

Following one of the leading art historians of the day, Christian Ludwig Stieglitz, Klenze asserted that the Byzantine style prevailed in Germany from the reign of Charlemagne (768-814) to the twelfth century.²⁴⁰

It is most probably due to the political dominance which Byzantium—and also Lombardic northern Italy, as well as mercantile Venice, where San Marco rose up

²³⁸ “...die Kuppeln stets das charakteristische und die Hauptsache ihrer äusseren Gestalt blieben. Rundbögen, schlechte Ausführung und Zusammensetzung, kleine Fenster ohne Malereyen, scheinbar beengter innerer Raum, ein verworrenes, oft formloses Aeüßeres, und ein gewisses blos handwerksmäßiges Ansehen, wenn man sich so ausdrücken darf, sind die Eigenthümlichkeiten, welche die meisten dieser Kirchen bezeichnen. Nur eine gewisse Erinnerung an die herrliche Antike, ihre architektonische Consequenz, Formen und Massen, woraus diese Mißgestalten hervorgingen, und welche aus dem trüben Dunkel derselben zuweilen hervorblickt, nur diese kann das reingebildete Gefühl befestigen, um nicht selbst die zuweilen malerischen Räume und Massen derselben zu verkennen, und in ein allgemeines Verdammungsurtheil zu begreifen.” Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur*, 11.

²³⁹ Dirk Klose, “Theorie als Apologie und Ideologie – Leo von Klenze als Kunstphilosoph und Theoretiker,” in *Leo von Klenze — Architekt zwischen Kunst und Hof 1784-1864*, ed. Winfried Nerdinger (Munich: Prestel, 2000), 121 and n. 75-76, where he cites Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architektur*, pp. 7 and 11.

²⁴⁰ Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 51. Elsewhere in *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, however, Stieglitz described only the Carolingian period through the tenth century as dominated by New Greek art and architecture; the eleventh through the first quarter of the thirteenth century he described as a transitional period of “mixed building design” (*gemischte Bauart*), when the New Greek style integrated Arabic influence as well as the German elements that “prepared the way for the pure Gothic or German style” (*den Weg zur reingothischen oder deutschen Bauart bahnte*) that was to follow: see for instance pp. 9-10 of his introduction. Klenze’s apparent reliance on Stieglitz for dating and interpreting New Greek architecture has also been noted by Christine Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration” unter König Ludwig I. von Bayern (1826-1831)* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2000), 32 and n. 333. Stieglitz also served as an authority for others working on Ludwig’s major Byzantine revival and renovation projects, as will be seen in chaps. 4 and 5.

as a faithful imitation of the model church in Constantinople—had over sunken Rome, that Charlemagne and his era preferred Byzantine to Roman architecture, and even used Byzantine architects; and so we see from this time on, and until about the twelfth century (when Rome, which had earlier ruled the world through weapons and laws, regained its status through doctrine and opinions) the West followed the plan of the Byzantine domed church with vaulted ceilings nearly exclusively.²⁴¹

Klenze clearly had no idea that San Marco was not modeled on Hagia Sophia but rather on Constantinople's second largest church, Holy Apostles (ca. 536-550). Schlegel had similarly associated Hagia Sophia and San Marco in 1806, though without claiming San Marco was a faithful copy. Holy Apostles, like San Marco, was built as a monumental cruciform basilica characterized by the use of domed square bays, a type popular under Justinian [**fig. 2.3 a**].²⁴² There are no known physical remains of Holy Apostles, which Mehmed II replaced with a mosque complex shortly after taking the city, and so Klenze's ignorance of it is not surprising.²⁴³ An architect, unlike Schlegel, and one who had had the opportunity to visit Venice and presumably saw San Marco for himself, Klenze

²⁴¹ “Es lag aber wohl zunächst in dem politischen Uebergewichte, welches Byzanz und auch das lombardische Oberitalien, sowie das handelnde Venedig, wo San Marco als treue Nachahmung der Musterkirche zu Constantinopel sich erhob, über das versunkene Rom hatten, daß Karl der Große und seine Zeit eher den byzantinischen als den römischen Baustyl, und selbst byzantinische Baukünstler anwendeten: und so sehen wir von dieser Zeit an, und bis zum 12ten Jahrhunderte etwa, wo Rom, wie zuvor durch Waffen und Gesetze, jetzt zum zweyten Male durch Lehren und Meynungen die Weltherrscherin ward, in den Abendländern fast allgemein das Schema der byzantinischen Kuppelkirchen mit gewölbten Decken befolgt.” Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur*, 11. Cf. Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 26-27: “Die Sophienkirche zu Constantinopel war vorzüglich das Muster, nach der von jetzt an die christlichen Kirchen errichtet wurden, was unter andern die Markuskirche in Venedig bezeugt.”

²⁴² On Holy Apostles see, for instance, Richard Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, 4th ed., revised by Krautheimer and Slobodan Curcic (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 242. A cruciform basilica is one with side-arms that create a ground plan in the form of a Latin or Greek cross. A bay is the unit of space between supporting columns or piers.

²⁴³ The Mehmed Fatih complex (1463-71). See Sheila S. Blair and Jonathan M. Bloom, *The Art and Architecture of Islam 1250-1800*, corrected ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 215-16.

focused on the vault-and-pier principle that was common to the ground plans of these buildings, while differences between their ground plans went unnoticed.²⁴⁴ One of the most innovative aspects of Hagia Sophia is that it combines the plan of a basilica with a domed pier-and-vault superstructure [fig. 2.2 a-b].

Yet Klenze also saw in the Byzantine style the foundation for the rebirth of true architecture, that is, architecture based on classical models, in Italy: “The consideration must however prevent us [from coming to a damning judgment of the Byzantine building plan], that later the rebirth of true architecture developed from this plan, and could emerge more easily than from the immediately following building style that was chiefly distributed in the West.”²⁴⁵ (The only non-classical architecture Klenze gladly used as a model was that of fifteenth-century Italy.²⁴⁶) The later medieval style should be called the northern basilica style, Klenze argued, as it is actually more closely based on Roman models than the Byzantine:

Really the name Gothic is false; Romantic is too general; German, Saxon, etc. are without proven historical foundation; and it would probably be best to baptize the

²⁴⁴ Klenze had visited Venice with Crown Prince Ludwig during their trip to Italy of 1817-18. Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 17. Presumably this visit occurred on the return trip, as Klenze did not join Ludwig until February 1818. He would re-visit Venice in order to study San Marco more carefully in 1826. These trips are discussed below.

²⁴⁵ “...doch muß uns hieran auch noch die Berücksichtigung hindern [ein allgemeines Verdammungsurtheil zu begreifen], daß sich an dieses Schema später die Wiedergeburt der wahren Architektur knüpfte, und leichter als aus dem nun folgenden und vorzugsweise in den Abendländern verbreiteten Baustyle hervorgehen konnte.” Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur*, 11. He later adds: “...die sogenannte Wiedergeburt der Künste in Italien sich gründete... auf die Gebäude, welche aus dem byzantinischen Style hervorgingen, und wovon uns z.B. der Dom, das *campo Santo*, und der hängende Thurm in Pisa; der Dom und da schöne Baptisterium zu Parma; das Oratorium von *Orsanmichele* und die *Loggia dei Lanzi* in Florenz, die schönsten Muster darbieten.” Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur*, 16.

²⁴⁶ E.g., his (Alte) Pinakothek, constructed 1826-42: see cat. no. 46 in Hildebrand, “Werkverzeichnis,” 282-90.

marvelous manner of building the “Northern Basilica style” as, in their main disposition these churches actually stand closer to the Roman basilica than to the Byzantine domed church.²⁴⁷

Clearly Klenze understood something about medieval masonry building types. But he argued against the use of either the Byzantine or the Romantic (the term he tended to use despite preferring “Northern Basilican”) styles because they had ceased to be appropriate; only Classical Greek architecture had universal qualities suitable to any time and place.²⁴⁸ The ancient Greek temple, he asserted, was as culturally German as the Northern Basilican church (which he didn’t think of as a specifically German building type, though he judiciously admired Strasbourg and Cologne cathedrals above all others). Classical Greek was, moreover, the only true Christian style, the style of the heroic period of Christianity during the lifetime of the Savior.²⁴⁹

On June 19, 1822, Speyer Cathedral was re-commissioned. Following its renovation, it appeared much as it had on the eve of the French Revolution, with its late eighteenth-century antechamber intact **[fig. 3.2 a-b]**.²⁵⁰ Wiebeking and Klenze did not see

²⁴⁷ Wirklich ist der Name gothisch falsch; romantisch zu allgemein; teutsch, sächsisch etc. ohne erwiesenen historischen Grund; und es wäre vielleicht das beste, diese wunderbare Bauart den nordischen Basilikastyl zu taufen; denn der Hauptdisposition nach stehen diese Kirchen wirklich den römischen Basiliken weit näher, als den byzantinischen Kuppelkirchen.” Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architektur*, 11-12.

²⁴⁸ “So wie die griechische Architektur überall entstehen konnte, wo geistreiche und gebildete Menschen nach ewigen Gesetzen der Natur, Mathematik und klaren Vernunft handelten, so konnte die Architektur des Mittelalters nur aus dem Mittelalter hervorgehen, weßhalb denn auch die griechische, die Architektur aller Zeiten, die des Mittelalters aber nur die des Mittelalters, so wie die indische, ägyptische, persische und astekischen, nur die von Indien, Aegypten, Persien und Amerika seyn und werden konnten.” Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architektur*, 12.

²⁴⁹ Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architektur*, introduction pp. 8 and 20 and facsimile p. 5.

²⁵⁰ Much of Speyer Cathedral’s western end, including its westwork (as well as most of the town of Speyer) were destroyed either during or in the aftermath of a fire set by Louis XIV’s troops in 1689 in the course of the Wars of the Palatine Succession. In 1772-78 Franz Ignaz Michael Neumann (who had trained under his father, the Baroque architect

eye to eye on much, but on two things they clearly and publicly agreed: Speyer Cathedral was a great example of New Greek architecture, but even the best New Greek architecture was unworthy of serving as a model for new construction.²⁵¹ Meanwhile, Ludwig's ideas on church architecture had begun to shift away from Klenze's (and Wiebeking's), even while Speyer was being restored, as evidenced by his changing plans concerning Klenze's Holy Apostles commission across from the Glyptothek. By July 1823, hearing news of a devastating fire at St. Paul's Outside the Walls in Rome, Ludwig determined that his new church should not be built in a classical Greek style as originally planned but rather in that of an Early Christian basilica; a few years later he transferred the project away from Klenze entirely, and Klenze never received another commission for a major church in the classical style advocated in his *Manual of Architecture*. Particularly in Bavaria, Byzantium was about to provide modern architecture with one of the new ideas for which Wiebeking had been searching. While perhaps Klenze had found it awkward to issue his *Manual of Architecture* in the same year as Speyer's dedication,

Balthazar Neumann) rebuilt the western sections of the nave to nearly universal acclaim (that is, when the fact that much of the nave is not original is even recognized). With what insufficient funds remained, Neumann also completed a dramatically reduced version of the westwork he had originally planned, resulting in an antechamber, the late Baroque style of which he tortured in what was apparently an effort to compensate for the loss of scale. Neumann's original plan shares similarities, particularly in scale and form, with the westwork still standing today, which was built by Heinrich Hübsch in the 1850s to replace Neumann's antechamber. It is the cathedral as restored by Neumann that Klenze and Wiebeking renovated. On F.I.M. Neumann's work at Speyer see Neuschwander, "Art History of Speyer," 37 and 39; Geissel, *Der Kaiserdom zu Speyer*, 460-64, and Erich Hubala, *Balthasar Neumann, 1687-1753: Der Barockbaumeister aus Eger* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Edition Cantz for Stadt Wendlingen am Neckar, 1987), 116-19, esp. fig. 16, which reproduces Neumann's original plan for Speyer Cathedral's façade.

²⁵¹ On the relationship between Wiebeking and Klenze see Norbert Lieb, "Klenze und die Künstler um Ludwig I. Aus dem Schriftwechsel des Königs und des Architekten," in *Festschrift für Max Spindler zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Dieter Albrecht, Andreas Kraus and Kurt Reindel (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1969), 659-60.

his efforts to escape Byzantium would grow more awkward during the years after he finally issued it in 1824.

5. Ludwig and the Palatine Chapel in Palermo

By the time Ludwig and Klenze returned to Italy in October 1823 (staying through March, 1824), making a second attempt to extend their travels to Ottoman Greece had become impractical, given the war. But this time Klenze did not miss the Sicilian leg of the journey.²⁵² And if the Greek rebellion made it now too dangerous to go see what remained of Periclean Athens, it had at the same time given new symbolic potential to the buildings of Italy (as well as Germany) that were understood as Byzantine. Ludwig returned to Palermo for Christmas 1823, where, at the Palatine Chapel on Christmas Eve he attended midnight mass, a service that had been banned in Bavaria since secularization.²⁵³ Ludwig must have known of Klenze's opinion of the Byzantine style (and Wiebeking's harmony with Klenze on the subject). When Klenze returned to Palermo after making his own tour of the island's ancient Greek monuments, Ludwig was nevertheless full of enthusiasm and took him back to the Palatine Chapel so

²⁵² Klenze focused on the question of classical Greek polychromy during this trip – an issue which Ludwig was pressing him to pursue (see discussion in next section) and of enough moment that, at the end of December in Selinus he would come upon Jakob Ignaz Hittorff, the leading researcher on this subject, in the company of a group of Berlin architects and artists who were intent upon their own investigations and not at all pleased to find Klenze in their midst. See Adrian von Buttlar, “Klenzes Beitrag zur Polychromie-Frage,” in *Ein griechischer Traum. Leo von Klenze der Archäologe* (Munich: Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, 1985), 214.

²⁵³ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 9 and 96 n. 1.

that they could study it together, as he wished to commission a copy of it for himself [**fig. 3.3 a-f**].²⁵⁴

The Palatine Chapel lacks an exterior façade, as it is entirely enclosed within its palace [**fig. 3.3 a-b**]. Ludwig, expecting that his copy would project from the eastern side of his palace, leaving the sides and eastern apse exposed, attempted to address questions concerning the exterior, and the larger architectural context and significance of the Palatine Chapel, by returning with Klenze to the cathedrals of Palermo and Monreale.²⁵⁵ Ludwig's interest in the Cathedral of Palermo had likely been heightened by the presence of the tomb of Frederick II Hohenstaufen (1194-1250), prominent in the pantheon of Germanic heroes associated with Italy. Not only was Frederick II the grandson of both the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa and of Roger II, first Norman king of Sicily, but he was himself King of Sicily, Holy Roman Emperor, and leader of the sixth (bloodless and successful) Crusade. As would soon be illustrated in another commission (discussed below), Ludwig was developing an interpretation of the Crusades as culminating the cultural interchanges between East and West that had begun with the introduction of Byzantine artists into Germany and Italy. It was this progress of ideas from East to West that had enabled the flowering of both the German (Gothic) style and the (Italian) Rebirth of Antiquity in arts and culture.

At Monreale, the elaborately patterned brickwork along the external sides and especially on the three apses suggested an interesting solution for exactly those areas which would form the public façade of his projected palace chapel in Munich [**fig. 3.4**].

²⁵⁴ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 9-10 and Sonja Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 382.

²⁵⁵ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 16-17.

The sealed urn with (some of the) entrails of his patron saint, St. Louis (Louis IX of France, 1215-70), left in Monreale the course of the body's return trip from the king's failed eighth Crusade, likely also sparked Ludwig's interest. Klenze certainly had no great interest in the buildings or in such historical associations. He merely agreed that the cathedrals of Palermo and Monreale were in the same style as the Palatine Chapel—a building for which he could barely contain his dislike.²⁵⁶ He was hardly alone: Ludwig was ignoring the opinion of these monuments that had been long established in standard German sources.²⁵⁷

Not only the desire for a grand Palatine chapel but also the desire for a building in the style of the Palatine Chapel in Palermo was unusual. Today the Palatine Chapel is known for epitomizing the syncretistic character of Norman Sicilian art, combining lavish and interwoven Byzantine, Islamic and Western Christian elements.²⁵⁸ Klenze pieced these threads out and saw their combination as a terrible defect, while Ludwig understood them as necessary to the whole, which he characterized together as Byzantine.²⁵⁹ Klenze would bemoan both Norman Sicilian architecture and Ludwig's predilection for expressing the “inherited sin of eclecticism,” through which Ludwig sought to evoke distant times and places through indiscriminate copying, rather than to establish and

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

²⁵⁷ In 1801, Johann Dominick Fiorillo had described the artistic fate of the Two Sicilies at the hands of Greeks and Northerners as tragic and Lombardy as similarly plagued by Northern invaders. Fiorillo, *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste von ihrer Wiederauflebung bis auf die neuesten Zeiten*, vol. 2, *Geschichte der Malerey in Venedig, der Lombardey (Ferrara, Modena, Reggio, Parma, Mantua, Mailand, Cremona, Bologna). Sizilien, Ligurien und Piemont* (Göttingen: Johan Friedrich Röwer, 1801), 734-35 and 203.

²⁵⁸ William Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom: Roger II and the Palatine Chapel in Palermo* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), especially chap. 4.

²⁵⁹ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 16-17. Hildebrand, “Werkverzeichnis,” 381.

maintain pure principles in the tradition of imitation established by Winckelmann.²⁶⁰ For Ludwig, and for those who succeeded to his vision of Byzantium, its architecture—even when expressed in what was taken to be its purest form – would retain the polyglot character he had loved in Sicily.

6. Ludwig inherits the Bavarian Throne

Ludwig's architectural plans encapsulated his most cherished ideas, and he did not have to wait long following his return from Italy to begin to give them full expression. When his father died on October 15th, 1825, he noted: “my first thought: building construction.”²⁶¹ His second thought, apparently, was to support the Greeks in their struggle (and in 1825 their cause was hardly decided): he immediately sent them 20,000 fl.²⁶² That Christmas, Ludwig re-introduced the celebration of midnight mass into all the churches of Munich.²⁶³ Unlike his father, who had enacted Napoleonic secularization policies, Ludwig understood the renewal of the Catholic Church as fundamental to Bavarian strength and prestige, and the promotion of Catholic arts and

²⁶⁰ Klenze wrote of his frustration on this point: “So sehr nun auch bei dieser Gelegenheit die alte architektonische Erbsünde des Eklektizismus bei dem Kronprinzen wieder hervortrat, so war ich doch andererseits wieder von dem wahren E[n]thusiasmus erfreut, welcher dabei für ein neues Kunstunternehmen hervortrat ... Aber vergeblich waren alle meine Versuche, den Kronprinzen durch ein an und für sich so einfaches raisonnement klar über den eigentlichen Grund des Eindrucks, welchen er empfangen, zu machen, und zu überzeugen, daß dieser Eindruck auch ohne die Begleitung der ungeheueren artistischen Unvollkommenheiten zu erlangen sei, welchen diesem Bauwerk des Mittelalters ankleben; daß man das, was bei jenem Eindruck die Erinnerung ... gethan, nicht wiedergeben, und nicht anders und nicht besser ersetzen könne, als durch größere Schönheit und Reinheit der Form.” Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 16.

²⁶¹ “Mein erster Gedanke, Gebäudeausführung,” Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 17.

²⁶² Arnold, “Der deutsche Philhellenismus,” 153.

²⁶³ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 96 n. 1.

education as Bavaria's special role among German states. When he came to the throne, he turned to Byzantium as part of the missing historical link in the rationale behind building up Munich as the centerpiece of his at once Philhellenic and patriotic-Catholic revival of arts and culture. Unlike that in other Catholic lands, such as the Prussian Rhineland or Silesia, where Catholicism offered a refuge from the state and an alternative and often oppositional source of identification, Ludwig's Bavarian Catholicism was pragmatic.²⁶⁴ While promoting and professing loyalty to the Catholic Church above the other confessions, Ludwig contained and directed it (for instance, despite the Church's objections, largely usurping its right to appointment bishops and other higher clergy within his realm²⁶⁵), while giving himself similar authority over the Protestant denominations.²⁶⁶ He sought to build loyalty to his vision of Bavaria's Napoleonic-era expansion as having providentially revealed underlying German cultural and geo-political connections, rather than as the fruit of opportunism and collaboration with the French. He sought to do this, moreover, without interference by religious leaders, whether Catholic or Protestant.

Ludwig also began to integrate Byzantine art and architecture into his larger cultural program. He regarded efforts to undo the Ottoman subjugation of the New Greeks as an extension of the same ideals for which he strove to undo the Napoleonic subjugation of the Catholic Church and the German people. Re-introducing pilgrimages and other traditional religious rites to Bavaria along with midnight masses was just a

²⁶⁴ As discussed in Thomas Mergel, "Mapping Milieus Regionally: On the Spatial Rootedness of Collective Identities in the Nineteenth Century" in *Saxony in German History: Culture Society, and Politics, 1830-1933*, ed. James Retallack (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000), 84.

²⁶⁵ Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 514-15.

²⁶⁶ Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 514-15, 586-87.

beginning. He then proceeded to turn Goethe's condemnation of the Byzantine origins of Catholic-patriotic art on its head by using what he considered Byzantine art and architecture to celebrate the post-Napoleonic revival of Christianity and the resurrection of the Greek nation as two sides of the same coin. Ludwig did not see the Byzantine style in terms of historical conflicts between a Catholic West and a Byzantine East, or artistic conflicts between Classicists and Medievalists; rather, it suggested to him a universal, pre-Protestant church whose art mediated between the ideals of the Classical and of the German and Italian spirits.

7. Art from the East: The Pinakothek Loggias

Ludwig's Philhellenism, though it had already become an object of humor among some of his disillusioned liberal Protestant subjects, continued unabated.²⁶⁷ In the spring of 1826, still anxious about the Greek cause, Ludwig sent off several officers with a troop of cadets to join the fight.²⁶⁸ On the home front, on Raphael's birthday (April 7), he

²⁶⁷ Notable among these disillusioned humorists was Karl Heinrich Ritter von Lang (1764-1835), a Frankish historian and publisher who served in the Bavarian regime from 1806, when Franconian lands had been integrated into Bavaria, until 1817, when he was placed in retirement with the fall of Montgelas. This turn of events was largely instigated by then Crown Prince Ludwig, as noted in Chapter Two. In 1826 Lang published the satire *Hammelburger Reise*, vol. 8, *Achte Fahrt, oder meine Begebenheiten am Hofe des Fürsten Ypsilandi in Griechenland* (Ansbach: privately printed, 1826) which directed itself against Ludwig's Philhellenism. Arnold, "Der deutsche Philhellenismus," 161, esp. 161n2; Franz Muncker, entry on Karl Heinrich Ritter von Lang, *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 17 (Munich: Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1883; reprint: Berlin: Dunker und Humblot, 1969; available online at [http://mdz.bib-bvb.de/digbib/lexika/adb/images/adb017/@ebt-link?target-idmatch\(entityref,adb0170608\)](http://mdz.bib-bvb.de/digbib/lexika/adb/images/adb017/@ebt-link?target-idmatch(entityref,adb0170608))), 606-613, esp. pp. 610-13.

²⁶⁸ In 1826 "sandte [Ludwig I.] den Oberst C.W. v. Heydeck (genannt Heidegger) mit mehreren Subalternoffizieren nach Hellas, um am Kampfe teilzunehmen, und eine rege Korrespondenz entwickelte sich daraus. Jede Nachricht über eine wackere That der Bayern begrüßt der Monarch mit neuem Enthusiasmus dafür berichtet er wieder

attended the groundbreaking ceremony for a new museum, this one devoted to painting and, like the Glyptothek, given a Greek name (the Pinakothek) [**fig. 3.5 a-b**].²⁶⁹ Though Klenze designed this museum largely in homage to the Italian Rebirth of Antiquity, the ground floor was devoted to (painted) Greek pottery with walls painted to match [**fig. 3.5 c**]; Ludwig, meanwhile, was negotiating the purchase of the Boisserées' and Bertram's collection of Byzantine-German (as well as Byzantine-Italian and later) paintings for the upper floor.²⁷⁰ The Boisserée Collection, and Byzantine-German art generally were, needless to say, not Klenze's choice.²⁷¹

Klenze intended the gallery on the southern side of the upper floor, with its domed bays and monumental glazed arcade along the exterior façade, to suggest the lowermost of the three stories of loggias at the Vatican palace designed by Bramante (1444-1514) just before his death: the Loggia of Cardinal Bibbiena that Giovanni da Udine (1487-1564) had decorated with grotesque ornament based on that of the recently discovered Domus Aurea.²⁷² When in Rome together in 1823, Ludwig and Klenze had

frohlockend über die Fortschritte einiger junger Hellenen (darunter des Sohnes von Markos Bozzaris), welchen er die Aufnahme in das Münchener Kadettenkorps gestattet hatte.“ Arnold, “Der deutsche Philhellenismus,” 154.

²⁶⁹ See cat. no. 46 in Hildebrand, “Werkverzeichnis,” 282-90.

²⁷⁰ Klenze's design for the Greek pottery collection is illustrated in fig. 46.8 in Hildebrand, “Werkverzeichnis,” 286. On Ludwig's purchase of the Boisserées' and Bertram's collection see Peter Eikemeier, “Die Erwerbungen altdeutscher und altniederländischer Gemälde,” in *“Ihm, welcher der Andacht Tempel baut....” Ludwig I. und die Alte Pinakothek. Festschrift zum Jubiläumsjahr 1986*, ed. Konrad Renger (Munich: Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, 1986), 58-63.

²⁷¹ In connection with a negative remark concerning the Boisserée collection, Klenze had written in 1822 of the sculptor Johann Heinrich Dannecker: “Ist selbst Danneckers Christus, dieses marmorne Gewebe der Penelope, was nie fertig wird, ist selbst dieser (Dannecker) nicht offenbar immer schlechter geworden, seit van Eyck und Scorel darin spoken?” Lieb, “Klenze und die Künstler Ludwigs I.,” 664.

²⁷² Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:62; Marcia B. Hall, introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 7-8

visited the Vatican Palace to study the loggias to decide this issue.²⁷³ To Klenze's consternation, four years later Ludwig accepted Peter Cornelius's proposal for an elaborate fresco program for the interior of the Pinakothek's gallery that was based on the less antiquarian ornament of the middle-storey loggia (the Loggia of Leo X), decorated in 1518-19 by Raphael and his assistants (including Giovanni da Udine).²⁷⁴ The gallery Klenze designed based on this loggia was glazed, not open to the elements (as one might expect of a loggia), but as the Vatican loggias had been glazed over for centuries, Ludwig and Klenze apparently saw no reason not to do the same in Munich. Somewhat more eccentrically, at the time of its planning and execution, and in much of the subsequent literature, Klenze's version has been called a *Loggiengang*, or sequence of loggias, and each of its domed bays, a loggia.²⁷⁵ For purposes of consistency, this traditional terminology will be retained here.

The theme proposed by Cornelius entirely suited Ludwig's agenda in that it celebrated the museum's style as expressive of both German and Italian artistic traditions, and articulated the parallel progress of these traditions through history towards a transcendent art of universal significance [**fig. 3.5 d**].²⁷⁶ The eastern loggias of the

and plate 30 (Loggia of Cardinal Bibbiena), and George L. Hersey, *High Renaissance Art in St. Peter's and the Vatican: An Interpretive Guide* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 225, 229, and fig. 194 (a sixteenth-century drawing of the Logge di Raffaello from the exterior).

²⁷³ Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:62.

²⁷⁴ Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:63-64, and Bette Talvacchia, "Raphael's Workshop and the Development of a Managerial Style," in Hall, *Cambridge Companion to Raphael*, 173 and plate 31 (the Loggia of Leo X).

²⁷⁵ As noted by Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:64.

²⁷⁶ Whereas Cornelius prepared the cartoons for the loggia's bays from 1827-1836, Clemens Zimmermann and assistants carried out the actual painting (1830-40). See discussions in Gisela Goldberg, "Ursprüngliche Ausstattung und Bilderhangung der Alten Pinakothek," in *"Ihm, welcher der Andacht Tempel Baut..."*, 152-53 and 160-61;

Loggiengang depicted the history of painting in the South – mostly Italian lands – based on Vasari’s *Lives of the Artists*. Those in the western loggias depicted painting (and architecture) in the North (mostly German lands and the Low Countries), based on the accounts by Carel van Mander (1548-1606), as written up for Cornelius by Sulpiz Boisserée.²⁷⁷ These histories – which, rather than illustrating the paintings or buildings themselves, focused on historical events and portraits of those who influenced their development – began at the eastern and western ends of the building and progressed more or less chronologically towards the center loggia, in which Raphael was celebrated as epitomizing the best of both traditions.²⁷⁸ Cornelius had from the start proposed to illustrate the histories of painting, or more precisely of painters, by Vasari and van Mander in these loggias (as well as the somewhat later work of Joachim von Sandrart, which was not used in the end) – histories full of biographical anecdotes and legends.²⁷⁹

Stefanie Bielmeier, *Gemalte Kunstgeschichte. Zu den Entwürfen des Peter von Cornelius für die Loggien der Alten Pinakothek*, *Miscellanea Bavarica Monacensia* 106 (Munich: Commissionsverlag UNI-Druck, 1983), 150-51, and Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:64-68.

²⁷⁷ Carel van Mander, *Het schilder-boeck waer in voer eerst de laerlustighe iueght den grondt der edel vry schilderconst in verscheyden deelen wort voorghedraghen* (Harlem: Paschier van Wesbvach, 1604), first published in German in 1617 as *Das Leben der niederländischen und deutschen Maler*. See Bielmeier, *Gemalte Kunstgeschichte*, 149.

²⁷⁸ Goldberg, “Ursprüngliche Ausstattung und Bilderhangung,” 152-64 and Bielmeier, *Gemalte Kunstgeschichte*, 149. Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate reproductions of Cornelius’s cartoons (or the completed frescoes) for the scenes that are most significant to this discussion.

²⁷⁹ “Durfte ich es wagen Eurer Koniglichen Majestat meine unmageblichen Gedanken in Beziehung auf die in den Logen der Pinakothek auszufuhrenden Gegenstande vorzulegen, so wurde ich vorschlagen in den kleinen nach Art der Rafaelischen Logen anzuordnenden Bildern der Kreuzgewolbe das Leben der Maler von Cimabue bis auf die neuere Zeit nach Vasari, Carl van Mander, Sandrart u.a. darzustellen, und in den sie umgebenden Arabesken Beziehungen auf ihre Werke, ihre eigenthumlichen Neigungen und Verdienste anzubringen. Die wurde meines Erachtens ein fur das Gebaude genugenter Gegenstand seyn....” Letter from Cornelius to Ludwig I dated May 22, 1827, cited in Bielmeier, *Gemalte Kunstgeschichte*, 132.

Ludwig not only embraced this idea: he actively helped Cornelius to transform it into a program expressive of the origins and purpose of art. The aspects of the resulting program which are not emphasized in Vasari or van Mander are therefore those most revealing of Cornelius's and Ludwig's agendas. Its subjects are known not only from Cornelius's surviving cartoons and from black-and-white photographs (of the frescoes as painted by Clemens Zimmermann and assistants made before their destruction in WWII), but also from the descriptions written up by Cornelius and Zimmermann.²⁸⁰

Beyond the story of Italy's and Germany's parallel progress towards a common artistic vision, two themes stand out. The first, the unity of religion (i.e., Christianity) and art, was a cornerstone of the outlook of the Brotherhood of St. Luke as well as of Ludwig's outlook. The second, far less prominent in the work of Cornelius or the Brotherhood of St. Luke, seems to express specifically Ludwig's viewpoint (echoing if not directly inspired by Friedrich Schlegel's) that it was contact with the East that provided the essential impulse not only for Christianity and the arts in the West, but for all knowledge. In accordance with these overarching themes, the first loggias for each sequence depicted the alliance of religion with art, while those of the second were devoted to the contacts between West and East. The Eastern contacts depicted in the loggias spanned the period from Charles Martel's victory over the Saracens in 732 (included in the northern sequence in loggia 24) [**fig. 3.5 e**] through the Crusades [**fig. 3.5**

²⁸⁰ These descriptions, extensively quoted in Goldberg, "Ursprüngliche Ausstattung und Bilderhangung," 154-59, were originally published in Clemens von Zimmermann, *Beschreibung der Freskomalereien in den Loggien der koniglichen Pinakothek in Munchen* (Munich, 1840).

f] (included in the southern sequence in loggia 2), setting the revival of arts and sciences into motion.²⁸¹

It is not until the third loggia of the Italian sequence that Cornelius turns to Vasari. Here he begins where Vasari began, with Cimabue being given by his father to a Greek painting master, and then attentively observing Greek painters execute their craft [fig. 3.5 g].²⁸² The corresponding loggia in the sequence devoted to northern art depicted the development of German architecture as furthering all of the arts among the Germanic peoples. In the dome, a scene of architects at work before the gates of a great city underlined the role that urbanization played in this development [fig. 3.5 h, bottom]. Another scene in the dome depicted Meister Gerhard (d. 1260) presenting a model of Cologne Cathedral to Konrad von Hochstaden, enthroned as Archbishop of Cologne (1238-61), who initiated replacement of the extant Byzantine (i.e., Carolingian) building in 1248 [fig. 3.5 h, top].²⁸³ Cologne's transition from Byzantine to German architecture was not depicted literally, however, but by illustrating the event which had necessitated building a larger cathedral in the latest style. This event, seen in the accompanying lunette, was the defeat of Milan and consequent removal of the relics of the Magi to Cologne in 1164, which had enabled the archbishops to establish Cologne Cathedral as a major pilgrimage site [fig. 3.5 i].²⁸⁴ The establishment of German architecture had led (turning to van Mander in the following loggia) to the production of the earliest German (including Netherlandish, according to the Boisserées among others) paintings in the

²⁸¹ Goldberg, "Ursprüngliche Ausstattung und Bilderhangung," 154-55, bays [*Loggien*] 1-2 and 25-24.

²⁸² Goldberg, "Ursprüngliche Ausstattung und Bilderhangung," 155, bay [*Loggia*] 3.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, bay [*Loggia*] 23.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

collections, i.e., the transition from the Byzantine to the Byzantine-German style [**fig. 3.5 i-k**].²⁸⁵ While the Crusaders and Greek artists had set the stage for this transition, German urbanization and specifically the rulers, patrons and architects of Cologne are depicted here along with Erwin von Steinbach, Johannes Hültz and Meister Pilgram, who together finally accomplished the perfection of German architecture.²⁸⁶ Execution of the frescoes had to wait until the Pinakothek was ready for plastering and would take a full decade.²⁸⁷

8. A Bavarian Byzantine Revival Begins: The Allerheiligenhofkapelle

Although Klenze was already well occupied (not only with the Pinakothek), Ludwig set him to work on plans for the Byzantine court chapel. Ludwig wished to use this, the first church built in Bavaria following Secularization, to announce what was celebrated as the restoration of the Catholic Church's role in Bavarian politics (a restoration that was somewhat less than total, as clerical authority was specifically integrated with the state under his control). Ironically, there was a medieval Byzantine-style chapel, complete with its genuinely Byzantine-style ground plan and original

²⁸⁵ Ibid., bay [*Loggia*] 22.

²⁸⁶ Erwin von Steinbach (b. ca. 1244; d. 1318), credited with being the genius behind Strasbourg Cathedral, e.g. in Goethe's "Of German Architecture"; "Joh. Hütz von Köln" (Johannes Hülz of Cologne), the master of the Strasbourg lodge who completed the cathedral's spire in 1420-39, and Meister Pilgram: Anton Pilgram (b. 1460/65; d. ca. 1515, an architect and sculptor whose early career was spent in his birthplace, Brno, who ended his career directing construction of Vienna Cathedral, and to whom, for most of the nineteenth century, this cathedral's famous openwork tower was mistakenly attributed. In May 1827 Cornelius proposed painting this history of art to Ludwig, who was immediately enthusiastic about the idea, though by November Ludwig had decided that Cornelius's preliminary drawings should actually be executed by Clemens von Zimmermann, possibly due to Cornelius's conflicts with Klenze over the relationship between the frescoes and the architecture. See **n. 91**, above.

²⁸⁷ Zimmermann and his assistants painted the bays (*Loggien*) in 1830-40: see Goldberg, "Ursprüngliche Ausstattung und Bilderhängung," 152.

Byzantine-style fresco program, available as a model for Ludwig and his architects in nearby, newly Bavarian, Regensburg: this chapel even had the same dedication, to All Saints, that Ludwig gave to his commission.²⁸⁸ The Regensburg chapel was, however, thought at this time to be a baptistery dedicated to St. George, while the frescoes remained under whitewash for another couple of generations, so that the significance of the building seems to have gone entirely unnoticed at the time.²⁸⁹

²⁸⁸ Regensburg Cathedral's centrally planned Allerheiligenkapelle, with its extensive fresco program, was constructed as the burial chapel of Bishop Hartwig II of Regensburg (bishop 1155-64). See Jörg Traeger, *Mittelalterliche Architekturfiktion. Die Allerheiligenkapelle am Regensburger Domkreuzgang* (Munich: Schnell und Steiner, 1980), 9.

²⁸⁹ While Regensburg had been under Bavarian rule since 1810, the building known as the Allerheiligenkapelle at Regensburg Cathedral apparently went unmentioned in Klenze's and Ludwig's discussions of the Munich commission. It also finds no mention by Justus Popp and Theodor Bülow, who were working on Regensburg Cathedral on Ludwig's behalf, in their studies of Regensburg's Byzantine, Transitional and German architecture, *Die Architektur des Mittelalters in Regensburg dargestellt durch den Dom, die Jakobskirche, die alte Pfarre und einige andere Ueberreste deutscher Baukunst* (Regensburg: privately printed, 1834-39) (a work discussed in Chapter Four). According to Jörg Traeger, the first publication of the ground plan and elevation of Regensburg's Allerheiligenkapelle was Bernhard Grueber, *Vergleichende Sammlungen für christlich-mittelalterliche Baukunst*, pt. 2: *Die Constructionslehre* (Augsburg, 1841), p. 30 and plate 26. Traeger notes that at this time, however, the chapel had been known for over a century as the 10th-century Baptistery of St. George, belonging to Regensburg's earlier Cathedral of St. Stephen, according to Bernhard Schuegraf, who corrected the date, purpose, and patronym of the chapel in "Baptisterium im alten Domkreuzgang zu Regensburg," in *Das Königreich Bayern in seinen alterthümlichen, geschichtlichen, artistischen und malerischen Schönheiten...*, vol. 3 (Munich: Georg Franz, 1846), 75ff. It was not until 1852, Traeger informs us, that Ferdinand von Quast, "Reihenfolge und Charakteristik der vorzüglichsten Bauwerke des Mittelalters in Regensburg," *Deutsches Kunstblatt* vol. 3 (1852), 164-223, first suggested there might be frescoes under the whitewash; definite "remains of old painting" were first noted in Andreas Niedermayer, *Künstler und Kunstwerke der Stadt Regensburg* (Landshut, 1857), 105f. See Traeger, *Mittelalterliche Architekturfiktion*, 11, 17 and 20. A complete restoration of the frescoes, with additions to complete weak and missing areas, occurred in 1897 under H.G. Hagenmiller; these infills were removed, along with some of the original paint, in 1955, leaving the rather faint remains of the original fresco cycle seen today, as discussed by Richard Strobel, "Der Domkreuzgang mit seinen Kapellen und Anbauten," in *Der Regensburger Dom: Beiträge zu seiner Geschichte*, ed. Georg Schwaiger, Beiträge zur

Klenze, like Ludwig an ardent supporter of the Greek war for independence, had nevertheless made clear in his *Manual of Architecture for Christian Worship* that he did not share Ludwig's admiration for the Byzantine style, and had not bothered to omit or disguise his dislike when issuing the book shortly after his return from Italy in 1824. In fact, though Klenze was not pleased to have to imitate any medieval architecture, he seems to have especially disliked the Palatine Chapel.²⁹⁰ Klenze copied ornamental patterns from the Palatine Chapel for use at Allerheiligenhofkapelle, but could not extract from the building the abstract principles that he desired for producing an architectural imitation in the classicizing tradition.²⁹¹

Klenze pulled Ludwig away from a "mixed-style" interior by convincing him that he should use the interior of San Marco in Venice to modify and unify the example provided by the Palatine Chapel as, he told Ludwig, San Marco was the "prototype for the chosen Byzantine style." This was not quite what he had written in *Manual of Architecture for Christian Worship*, where he had stated that Hagia Sophia in Constantinople was the prototype of the style on which San Marco was modeled.²⁹² The

Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg 10 (Regensburg: Verein für Regensburger Bistumsgeschichte, 1976), 128-29.

²⁹⁰ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 16.

²⁹¹ Both Ludwig and Klenze always referred to the building as the *Allerheiligenhofcapelle*, i.e., the court chapel, though subsequently it has come to be more commonly called the *Allerheiligenhofkirche* (All Saints' Court Church). Following Haltrich's example I have chosen to use Ludwig's and Klenze's term, though in its modern spelling, i.e., Allerheiligenhofkapelle (Haltrich, in his text, retains the original spelling); see Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, iii.

²⁹² The availability of copies of Grelot's plan of Hagia Sophia, e.g., in Seroux d'Agincout's *Histoire de l'art par les monuments* (1823) - one adequate to Klenze's purposes - has been discussed above. An argument has been made that Klenze proposed San Marco as a model for the interior as a reference to the site where, in 1177, Pope Alexander III and Holy Roman Emperor Frederick Barbarossa met, a meeting that had finally brought reconciliation between church and state. This reference, according to the

shift to San Marco as the model for the interior allowed Klenze to rid his design of the hybrid elements of Palermo's Palatine Chapel he could not bear to include, such as the elaborately carved and painted muqarnas ceiling over the nave, and the use of pointed arches in what was supposed to be a predominantly Byzantine plan [**fig. 3.3 c-d**].²⁹³ At the same time, although it was not as close to a basilican plan as the Palatine Chapel, the degree to which San Marco's Byzantine plan had been "adjusted to the Western predilection for basilican patterns" also suited Klenze's purposes.²⁹⁴ The argument in his *Manual* had been, after all, that the ideal Christian church echoed the form of the first Roman buildings transformed for Christian use, that is, basilicas. Ludwig, for his part, seems to have acceded to Klenze's idea without argument, and quickly sent Klenze off to Venice to study San Marco in detail; while in Venice, Klenze was also to negotiate a

argument, underlined Ludwig's larger goal of reinstituting the Catholic in the wake of Napoleonic secularization. Florian Zimmermann, "Allerheiligenhofkirche in der Residenz, München," cat. no. 35 in *Romantik und Restauration. Architektur in Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I. 1825-1848*, ed. Winfried Nerdinger with Antonia Gruhn-Zimmermann (Munich: Hugendubel, 1987), 218. Zimmermann's proposal is tempting and has been repeated as established (e.g., Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 386). As for the other, much more tangential argument he makes, however, concerning San Michele in Pavia, where Frederick Barbarossa among other Holy Roman Emperors was crowned King of the Lombards ("mit Ausnahme des Doms zu Piacenza der einzige Hausteinbau dieser Kunstlandschaft und darin der Allerheiligenhofkirche verwandt," according to Zimmermann), there is no actual evidence that Klenze had such a reference in mind. If such a reference had been intended, it is surprising not only that it was never mentioned in the voluminous records on the building but also that Klenze, of all people, would have proposed it (unless as a cynical means to move Ludwig to adopt a model Klenze had chosen for other reasons). Klenze was not Catholic and not impressed by Ludwig's religious convictions or policies (see, for instance, Klenze's description of Ludwig cited in Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 95-96).

²⁹³ Klenze lists the off the elements he found incompatible as "antike Säulenschäfte, Spitzbögen, Kreuzschiff, Kuppel, sarazenische Stalaktitendecken, kufische Inschriften und reiche byzantinische mosaik Wandverkleidungen... Sicilien zeigt der Geschichte gemäß besonders ausgeprägten Mischstyl." Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 16. The nave ceiling, one of the most striking features with which Ludwig dispensed, is discussed in detail in Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, 57-62.

²⁹⁴ Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, 411.

contract for the building's mosaics.²⁹⁵ As can be seen by comparing the ground plans and interior views [**fig. 2.2 a and d; fig. 3.6 a, f-1, f-2 and g-h**], the building Klenze designed for Ludwig is a galleried basilica with two domed bays in the nave, a barrel-vaulted choir and semi-circular apse. The external silhouette [**fig. 3.6 b-c**] is wholly basilican, as the domes are hidden by a continuous pitched roof and the facade is modeled on Lombard examples. Whereas at San Marco the galleries are little more than cat walks above the lower colonnades, Klenze designed full galleries, to offer seating for the highest-ranking members of the congregation in accordance with longstanding Western imperial tradition (the royal entrance from within the palace was on the gallery level at the southeast corner); he also eliminated the south and north arms of San Marco's Greek-cross plan and reduced the number of domes to two. In so doing, Klenze had created a fully basilican (and miniature) reduction of San Marco.

Klenze argued against Ludwig's insistence on the Byzantine style until well after the ground-stone was finally laid on All Saints' Day (November 1), 1826. In 1827 Klenze asserted that the chapel should be oriented towards the west rather than east, to make possible an entrance façade along the public, eastern face of the Residence.²⁹⁶ Ludwig was reluctant to shift from a traditional, eastern orientation, but Klenze disliked the idea of allowing the choir of the church, with its protruding apse, to form the center of the

²⁹⁵ Klenze had already visited San Marco with Ludwig on his trip to Italy of 1817-18 and again in 1823; this third trip took place in late May and early June, 1826. Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 17-18 and 58.

²⁹⁶ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 38-39. Haltrich states that construction of the foundations was already underway when negotiations concerning a façade began, but as Ludwig had already rejected Klenze's fifteenth-century Venetian façade proposal in February, 1827, and work on the foundations (beyond laying the groundstone) did not resume until June of 1827 (*ibid.*, 24), negotiations concerning the façade must have begun before construction.

eastern façade of the Residence, as in his mind the choir and sides were the least attractive exteriors of Christian churches, and he did not want to do without the more attractive entrance façade.²⁹⁷ Before permission had actually been granted for such a change, Klenze proposed to give the façade elements he associated with the Rebirth of Antiquity in Italy²⁹⁸: “using some transitions, which Venetian churches of the fifteenth century afford us [...] a style which through strict architectonic consistency does not exclude the charm of those forms directly derived from the Romantic [i.e., the Gothic]” **[fig. 3.6 d]**.²⁹⁹ The transition from the Romantic style (rather than from the Byzantine

²⁹⁷ “Aber freilich kann hier nur die ungünstigste Seite aller christlichen Kirchen, die Seitenfacade nemlich und die Chorseite sichtbar werden, da die Lage der Sache erfordert, daß die günstigere Vorderseite angebaut und versteckt werde.” Zimmermann, “Allerheiligenhofkirche in der Residenz, München,” 217.

²⁹⁸ On the date of this plan, see Hildebrand, “Werkverzeichnis,” 386 n. 25.

²⁹⁹ “einige Übergänge, welche uns venezianische Kirchen des 15. Jahrhunderts gewähren, benutzend [...] einen Styl, welcher durch strenge architektonische Consequenz den Reitz jener aus der Romantick unmittelbar hervorgebildeten Formen nicht ausschließt...” Adrian von Buttlar, *Leo von Klenze. Leben – Werk – Vision*, 237-41. At this time, as noted in Chapter One, the concept of the Rebirth of Antiquity was limited to Italian art and architecture, the influence of which later spread and continued, in various diluted but largely undifferentiated forms, up to the present. In considering Klenze’s (and, in other contexts, Ludwig’s) interest in fifteenth-century Italian architecture in the 1820s it is worth noting that, while Italian painting of this time was widely admired, the architecture had at best a mixed reputation—at least in the 1840s and among non-Bavarian proponents of the New Greek/Round Arch style, including Rudolph Wiegmann and Heinrich Hübsch, as well as Carl Albert Rosenthal and Karl Bötticher. Rosenthal (in 1844) and Hübsch (in 1847) would condemn what was then coming to be termed Renaissance architecture as based on corrupt Roman models (Hübsch more specifically calling it “a slavish imitation of corrupt Roman architecture,” a “sham architecture,” and a “dishonest and untrue” “accumulation of thick blocks of stone and heavy barrel vaultings,” and Rosenthal calling it a “‘periwig style’ which we would also end up with if we likewise used corrupt Roman arch as model.” See Wolfgang Hermann, introduction to *In What Style Should We Build? The German Debate on Architectural Style*, ed. and trans. Wolfgang Hermann (Santa Monica: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1992), 47-49. Whether and how such condemnations relate to the determined citations of fifteenth-century Italian architecture in Munich – not only by Klenze and but also by Gärtner in their commissions for Ludwig, starting in the 1820s and continuing throughout his reign – is an interesting question. These condemnations certainly suggest

style Klenze as described in his *Manual*) to that of the fifteenth-century Italy, i.e., the Rebirth of Antiquity, Klenze presents here as a Venetian characteristic – one which he presumably chose to help connect his façade proposal both with the chapel’s interior (based on San Marco) and with the Residence’s exterior. That in proposing this façade Klenze had the visual unity of the Residence as a whole in mind is evident from the regrets he expressed at the end of the project.³⁰⁰ A façade suggesting the Rebirth of Antiquity (albeit here in a Venetian idiom) would have been appropriate to the rest of the Residence’s exterior, which was quickly gaining a more formal and unified appearance thanks to the additions Klenze was building along the other sides of the Residence that borrowed motifs from Florentine palaces of the same period.³⁰¹ The Greek inscription in

that the modern tendency to understand architecture such as Klenze’s Pinakothek as an expression of the Round Arch style advocated by Hübsch in 1828 is at best problematic (Hübsch, though he did not see his work in connection with that being undertaken for Ludwig in Bavaria, specifically considered his Round Arch style as resuming the New Greek architectural tradition of Germany – a telling aspect of the interpretation of German Byzantine architecture that unfortunately lies beyond the scope of this dissertation.)

³⁰⁰ “...damit das Publikum gleich von Anfang heran sich mit der Idee bekannt macht, daß hier etwas ganz nâues und mit dem Königsbau gar nichts gemein habendes begonnen wird, und sich gewöhnt, in der Residenz nicht eine Ganzes, was ja nun einmal nach den bestehenden Umständen unmöglich ist, sondern ein Aggregat mehrerer, in sich abgeschlossener Bauwerke zu sehen.” Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 40.

³⁰¹ These include the façade of the palace gardens to the west, provided by the westliche Hofgartentor and Hofgartenarkaden, constructed 1816-26 (Hildebrand, “Werkverzeichnis” cat. no. 49, pp. 303-07); the southern façade provided by the Königsbau, constructed 1826-1835 (planning begun 1823; interiors completed 1867; Hildebrand, “Werkverzeichnis” cat. no. 91, pp. 369-77); and to the north, though still in the planning stages, the Festsaalbau and Apothekenflügel, constructed 1832-42 (planning begun 1816; interior completed 1863; Hildebrand, “Werkverzeichnis” cat. no. 47, pp. 290-97).

the gable seen in the proposal, meanwhile, underlined Klenze's and Ludwig's shared interest in Christianity's Greek origins.³⁰²

Ludwig responded “for the 1000th time” that he was required to use the “Gothic-Saracen” style, i.e., the syncretistic style associated not only with Palermo, but broadly with Crusader architecture of the eastern Mediterranean.³⁰³ Given that the interior was Byzantine, Ludwig's choice for the façade would seem less harmonious both with the interior and the with the rest of the palace façade than Klenze's, except for Ludwig's specific interest in the Crusades as a vehicle for the blending of Eastern and Western culture that had provided a foundation for Western cultural development.³⁰⁴ A façade celebrating the fifteenth-century Italian Rebirth of Antiquity, despite the incorporation of Romantic features that Klenze considered Venetian, appears not to have sufficiently satisfied Ludwig's desire to celebrate light from the Orient – the Byzantine inheritance from which Muslims and Crusaders both borrowed and over which they fought - that had nourished the progress of the arts in the West (as per the art history elucidated in the Pinakothek's *Loggiengang*).³⁰⁵ Klenze had no interest in such a program, as he saw in this inheritance only a degradation of Greek principles to mere incident. But when, on

³⁰² Buttler, *Leo von Klenze. Leben – Werk – Vision*, 238 (in reference to Klenze).

³⁰³ Ludwig's response came at the end of February 1827. See Hildebrand, “Werkverzeichnis,” 385.

³⁰⁴ Ludwig's ideas, as integrated into the history of art presented in the Pinakothek *Loggiengang* and as expressed in his unusual choices for this chapel, appear to combine the notion that the German style developed from contact with Islamic architecture that was still popular at least into the 1810s, when it was espoused by Goethe and the King of Württemberg among others (as discussed in chap. 2), with the developing notion that Islamic art was merely an offshoot of the Byzantine style (which had grown in significance without being any better understood, as will be discussed further below)

³⁰⁵ The Allerheiligenhofkapelle's “Byzantine” interior frescoes, discussed below, were similarly intended to provide a New Greek opposition to the classical themes which Cornelius was painting in the Glyptothek. Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 73.

April 15, 1828, Ludwig finally did give permission for a new orientation with an eastern entrance façade, it was under the condition that Klenze's design be "thoroughly in the Byzantine style," dropping the requirement that Klenze's design demonstrate a blend of East and West.³⁰⁶ Why is not clear: perhaps focusing on one style reflected a compromise with Klenze, who had already established, when choosing San Marco over the Palatine Chapel as his model for the interior, that he despised syncretism more than he despised the Byzantine style on its own. At the same time Ludwig determined that Klenze could not keep up with his rapidly developing ideas concerning the church across from the Glyptothek.³⁰⁷ In addition to procuring another architect for this commission, Ludwig narrowed the dedication from Holy Apostles', which was confessionally neutral, to St. Boniface, Apostle to the Germans, whom he now celebrated as having initiated the pre-Reformation German Catholic faith from which Protestants had strayed.³⁰⁸

Ludwig finally accepted a design for the exterior of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle which Klenze largely modeled on Lombard churches which he, apparently following

³⁰⁶ "Jedoch erhielt ich wegen der Allerheiligenhofcapelle die Erlaubnis, Entwürfe aber durchaus im byzantinischen Style zu machen, wo sie eine Vorderseite becäme." Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 39. The final plans for the façade were completed by May, 1828; work on the façade didn't begin, however, until March 18, 1829 (Haltrich, 20-21 and 25).

³⁰⁷ See p. 129, above. Klenze had lost the commission for the Apostelkirche by 1828. Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 3-4; Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 277-80 (cat. no. 44), and Adrian von Buttlar, *Leo von Klenze. Leben – Werk – Vision* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1999), 241.

³⁰⁸ Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 584-85. St. Boniface's, designed by Georg Friedrich Ziebland, would not be built until after Ludwig's efforts to create a Byzantium for Bavaria had largely come to an end. The church, in which Ludwig was to be buried, was incorporated into a Benedictine monastery founded in 1848, the year of its completion. The foundation was representative of Ludwig's eagerness to have the Catholic Church in his kingdom dominated by monks, not priests, and his particular patronage of the Benedictine order as epitomizing pre-Reformation German Catholicism. Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 523-27.

Stieglitz, understood not only as Byzantine in style but as primary models for the adoption of the Byzantine style by Charlemagne and his successors.³⁰⁹ As the Allerheiligenhofkirche was under construction, Klenze revised his *Manual* for its second edition (1834), seemingly in part so as to justify the chapel's façade on the grounds that the Byzantine architecture of Lombardy distinguishes itself through "more competent construction and technique."³¹⁰ There are no notes that explicitly refer to sources for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle's façade among Klenze's or Ludwig's papers, but there are careful drawings of both San Zeno, Verona, and San Carlo dei Lombardi, Florence (with measurements) preserved among Klenze's papers, and aspects of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle's design suggest more or less direct quotations from these churches.³¹¹

³⁰⁹ See the quotation from Klenze in n. 56, above. Stieglitz, whose works seem to have served as sources for Klenze, cited the Pavian churches of San Giovanni in Borgo (the one which he illustrated, although he apparently didn't realize that it had recently been torn down) and San Michele, as well as the Basilica di Santa Giulia at Bonate Sotto (in the province of Bergamo), as examples of Lombardy's New Greek style. He used them to demonstrate that, while the style had been introduced to Germany and (along with Christianity) to England from the Gothic and Lombard (i.e., Germanic) regions of Italy during the sixth and seventh centuries, from the eleventh through early thirteenth centuries Arabic influences impacted the New Greek style in Germany and England, while in Lombardy it remained pure and unmixed. See Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 9 and 31.

³¹⁰ "...Der lombardische Stil... zeichne sich durch 'tüchtigere Konstruktion und Technik' aus, und es scheine, daß ,durch dieses lombardische Mittelglied hauptsächlich die byzantinische Bauart den Abendländern zugeführt ward.'" Buttlar, quoting Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur des christlichen Cultus*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1834), 13, in *Leo von Klenze. Leben – Werk – Vision*, 241.]

³¹¹ On San Carlo dei Lombardi/San Michele in Florence and San Zeno in Verona see Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 42 and 43, n. 1. As evidence, Haltrich notes not only citations from the facades of these churches in the façade finally approved for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, but also the measured drawings of these churches preserved in Klenze's papers at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (H.S. Klenzeana XI, 12/20). As for St. Michaels, Haltrich notes "handelt es sich um die heute S. Carlo dei Lombardi benannte Kirche in der Via de Calzaiuoli gegenüber

In its overall organization, the Allerheiligenhofkapelle's façade suggests that of San Zeno in general outline and in the nearly identical rose window – a 12-petal rosette around an open center ring, which though simple, seems otherwise rarely or never to have been used in surviving Lombard churches [**fig. 3.7**]. The corbel table, with its stilted arches, is also similar to that of San Carlo dei Lombardi (previously known as San Michele), though the profiled rather than flat corbels give Klenze's version a more finished look [**fig. 3.8 and fig. 3.6 b**]. At least as distinctive, however, are the similarities between the portal at San Carlo dei Lombardi and Klenze's. They are framed by pilasters and engaged columns, respectively, with Composite capitals, and surmounted by pilasters flanking a tympanum under a crocketed gable that projects over the doorway. To his portal Klenze added relief sculpture in the tympanum and freestanding figures atop the pilasters; and he gave the tympanum a rounded (i.e., Byzantine) rather than a pointed arch. These features are found in other Lombard facades, for instance, that of the abbey church of S. Pietro in Vildobone (just southeast of Milan) [**fig. 3.9 a-b**].³¹² Klenze inserted a rosette bracketed by what would today be considered Gothic cusped spandrels into the space in between the pointed gable and the round-arched tympanum below it.

Whether in his use of Lombard motifs Klenze intended a reference to the role of Frederick Barbarossa and other Holy Roman Emperors as rulers of Lombardy, or to Lombardy's Germanic heritage more broadly, is unclear.³¹³ Klenze does appear to have

Orsanmichele" (p. 43, n. 1). See also Zimmermann, "Allerheiligenhofkirche in der Residenz, München," 218, esp. n. 10.

³¹² As noted in Buttler, *Leo von Klenze. Leben – Werk – Vision*, 241, where Buttler also notes that S. Bassiano in Lodi Vecchio also has a round-arched tympanum (though containing no figural sculpture).

³¹³ The reference to Frederick Barbarossa has been suggested in Zimmermann, "Allerheiligenhofkirche in der Residenz, München," 218.

integrated or interpreted elements from a number of other buildings from the region as well, resulting in a unique composition that still looks essentially Lombard. Most prominent are the features Klenze incorporated from the façade of the Cathedral of Piacenza (since the fall of Napoleon part of Habsburg Italy).³¹⁴ These include the columnar wall buttresses and the horizontal molding at Piacenza that links them [**fig. 3.10 a-b**]. The interruption of the molding's horizontal course by the window, which the molding curves up and over, and its seemingly arbitrary relationship to the engaged columns, is more prominent at Piacenza than in other Lombard facades (e.g., the molding that curves under the rose at San Zeno, supported by both corbel table and lesenes). Piacenza's engaged columns, while likewise typical of Lombard buildings, are distinctive in that they end where they cease to serve their internal structural function, without visually supporting anything, unlike those at San Zeno or San Pietro at Vildobone, for example, which, while serving the same internal structural function, also visually connect with, and appear to support, the raking cornice. In Klenze's version, however, the pilasters really do support nothing, structurally or visually, and are as purely ornamental as the molding that links them (which at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle extends up and over the portal rather than up and over the rose window). As at Piacenza, at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle these engaged columns establish the standard tripartite vertical division of the façade. Why Klenze should have been so drawn to the unusual, visually disconnected pilasters on Piacenza's façade to express this division is difficult to say. If

³¹⁴ While apparently no drawings of Piacenza Cathedral survive among Klenze's papers (as they do for San Carlo dei Lombardi and San Zeno), and Zimmermann and Haltrich do not discuss the resemblance, the features shared between the two buildings suggest to me that Piacenza Cathedral served as Klenze's model for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle façade.

he was seeking, as has been argued, specific historical references within Lombardy,³¹⁵ Piacenza would have been a curious reference since, as a member of the Lombard League, it had fought against, not with, the great German heroes Frederick I Barbarossa and Frederick II.

Rather than a reference to Germany, perhaps a reference to the Crusades was intended, as it was at the Council of Piacenza in 1095 that the first Crusade was launched. Or perhaps Klenze saw in Piacenza a unique example of Lombard architecture in its transition from Byzantine to the style of the Italian rebirth of antiquity, and thus an illustration, with the cathedral, leaning tower, and *campo santo* in Pisa, the baptistery in Parma, and *Orsanmichele* and the *Loggia dei Lanzi* in Florence, of his thesis that this rebirth had transformed the Byzantine style (not the Romantic, i.e., the Gothic) into great architecture.³¹⁶ Whether or not to express such historical programs, Klenze abandoned Lombard references when he capped his façade with crocket articulation. These crockets consist of S-scrolls lavishly carved on their sides so as to emphasize the plane they share with the rest of the façade; their rolled-in ends, those closer to the top of the gable forming large roundels, are likewise oriented to the façade plane and present themselves as static, not generating a sense of motion as do Gothic-style crockets, possibly in order to look more Byzantine. Also appearing Gothic to modern eyes, but likely interpreted as Byzantine by Klenze, are the aedicules on the steps of the façade as well as atop the

³¹⁵ See n. 106, above.

³¹⁶ “Aber wie gesagt, waren es nicht diese [romantische] Bauten, worauf die sogenannte Wiedergeburt der Künste in Italien sich gründete, sondern diese folgte unmittelbar auf die Gebäude, welche aus dem byzantinischen Style hervorgingen, und wovon uns z.B. der Dom, das *camp Santo*, und der hängende Thurm in Pisa; der Dom und das schöne Baptisterium zu Parma; das Oratorium von *Orsanmichele* und die *Loggia dei Lanzi* in Florenz, die schönsten Muster darbieten.” Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur*, 16.

buttresses along the sides of the chapel: these echo the similarly numerous Gothic aedicules that crown San Marco [**fig. 2.3 c**], Klenze's model for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle interior, in a simplified form not unlike that found flanking the tympanum at San Pietro in Vildobone [**fig. 3.9 b**].

Whatever Klenze's intentions, Ludwig continued to demand alterations. He wanted the windows along the sides to resemble those he had admired at the Cathedral of Trieste: Klenze seems to have decided not to argue the point, reasoning somewhat resignedly, "because in the pure Byzantine style window dressings of all types are found, the very narrow as well as the very wide, there is no difficulty in forming those of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle according to Your Majesty's wishes and taste."³¹⁷ Through Ludwig's strenuous objections to a fifteenth-century Italian style and Klenze's equally strenuous objections to mixing styles (as at the Palatine Chapel), the final design of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle was in what both took to be the true Byzantine style [**figs. 3.6 a-c; e-h**].

At Ludwig's insistence, Klenze's plans were reviewed by a committee of the Munich Academy of Art, headed by the professor for architecture, Friedrich von Gärtner.³¹⁸ Gärtner was required to give his responses in written form with drawings illustrating his points.³¹⁹ He reserved his harshest criticisms for the façade, which "was

³¹⁷ "... da sich im rein byzantinischen Stil Fensterumgebungen aller Art, sowohl sehr schmale als sehr breite, finden, so hat es gar keinen Anstand, die der Allerheiligenhofcapelle nach I.M. Wunsch und Geschmack zu formen." Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 39.

³¹⁸ The other members were Peter Cornelius, head of the academy as well as of the painting department, Ludwig Schorn, editor of the *Art Paper (Kunstblatt)* and Johann Nepomuk Ringseis, Ludwig's doctor and long-time advisor (Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 19).

³¹⁹ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 18-19 and 39.

about three hundred years younger than the interior and in reference to aesthetic appearance so bad, that it is really inconceivable that a man of so much learning and talent can make something so absurd.”³²⁰ It is noteworthy that Gärtner specifically objected to the project as not depicting a unified historical moment. Given that the chronological development of the Byzantine style (however defined) had received next to no scholarly attention, it is Gärtner’s desire for such unity despite a dearth of scholarship that might now be considered anachronistic. As will be seen in Chapter Five, Gärtner was less concerned to produce historical verisimilitude when designing his own Byzantine-style building – despite Klenze’s attempts to push him towards a specific historical model. The production of historically accurate renditions of styles appears to have been something that each felt the other should master while, for himself, the spirit of the style would suffice.

9. Heß’s, Schraudolf’s and Schwarzmann’s Byzantine Revival Frescoes

Ludwig accepted Klenze’s façade despite Gärtner’s objections. In the meantime, another complication had arisen: Klenze, who had traveled to Venice in early summer, 1826, to secure what seemed the best mosaicists for the chapel, had determined that their work would prove too costly and unreliable.³²¹ Klenze proposed covering the interior with frescoes instead. For this job Klenze recommended Heinrich Maria Heß, who had assisted Cornelius with the Glyptothek frescoes; in turn Cornelius, as head of the

³²⁰ “Das Äußere war um 300 Jahre jünger als das Innere und in Beziehung auf ästhetisches Gesicht so schlecht, daß es wirklich unbegreiflich ist, daß ein Mann von so viel Kenntnissen und Talent so etwas absurdes machen kann.” Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 19; see also 39.

³²¹ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 58-59.

academy, had just proposed Heß for a professorship in painting.³²² According to Klenze's account, at first Ludwig rejected the suggestion of Heß: "No, no not him, he would not do what I want done. Don't you know of another, a really stiff fellow (mimicking poses in Byzantine caricatures) – that is needed here! He will know how to elicit the effect that the chapel at Palermo made on me on Christmas Eve."³²³ But Klenze, apparently not charmed by Ludwig's attempt at humor, persevered, and seems to have won his case by the following summer.³²⁴ Gärtner suggested using tiles prepared at Nymphenburg, where he was in charge of the porcelain works, to create a gold background for the frescoes that would produce a mosaic-like effect.³²⁵ Klenze proposed an alternative, which involved creating a similar effect by surrounding frescoes with a background of gold leaf: it was this solution that was finally carried out. Heß, who had trained in a classicizing style in Bavaria before adopting the style of the Brotherhood of St. Luke and studying in Rome,

³²² Heß had studied under the Classicist Langer at the Munich Academy before turning towards the ideals of the Lukasbund and leaving for Rome on a scholarship (1821-26); he had followed the Lukasbund's direction but never a member. Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 60 and 73-75, citing Herbert von Einem, *Deutsche Malerei des Klassizismus und der Romantik, 1760-1840* (Munich: 1978), 181 ff.

³²³ "Nein nein nicht den, der würde, was ich will nicht machen. Wißen Sie denn nicht einen anderen, so einen recht steifen Patron (indem er wie jener Stellungen der byzantinischen Kunstzerrbilder nachahmte) – das ist hier nöthig! Der wird die Wirkung wieder hervorzubringen wißen, welche mir die Kapelle von Palermo in der Christnacht machte." Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 60, citing the Handschriftenabteilung der bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, *Klenzeana Memorabilien*, v. 2, p. 22 ff.

³²⁴ According to Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 61, Heß did not officially receive the contract until Jan. 20th, 1829, but apparently the commission was established at least a year and a half earlier. Sulpiz Boisserée, in his diary entry for Aug. 23rd, 1827, learned on that date in a conversation with Cornelius that Heß was receiving the commission; on Feb. 27th, 1828, Boisserée visited Heß to see his progress on the cartoons. See Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, v. 2, 202 and 274.

³²⁵ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 60-61.

seemed to have provided just the right balance to be able to satisfy Ludwig without upsetting Klenze's own aspirations for muting the Byzantine aspects of the interior.

Until Heß was brought in, Klenze seems to have been responsible for all aspects of the church, including the designs for the interior walls (to be carried out by mosaicists). Ludwig did not require the inclusion of any specifically Byzantine or related ("Saracen") figural or decorative elements (beyond a gold background) in the church's decoration, probably because he did not have any meaningful knowledge of them. Klenze's 1826 proposals for the longitudinal interior elevation and choir end of the building demonstrate that despite his disparaging remarks, he nevertheless made a strong attempt to include such elements [**fig. 3.6 f-1 and f-2**]. While it is not clear to what degree Klenze differentiated among the ornaments in his design, they are certainly in keeping with the mixing of Byzantine and Islamic elements at the Palatine Chapel [**fig. 3.3 c-e**].

Based on his and Ludwig's understanding of Byzantine mosaic figures as rigid and expressionless, Klenze restricted the program to individual saints – if these were part of an overall iconographic program, this remains unclear. Enthroned in the apse of the choir beneath Christ Pantocrator sits an ideal Christian king (St. Louis?) [**fig. 3.6 f-2**].³²⁶ The king is flanked by pairs of unidentified male saints, of whom the two closest (one tonsured, wearing a mantle; the other with a thick head of hair and beard in a robe with an intersecting geometric pattern below the waist) appear to directly address him while holding out documents for him to examine.³²⁷ Two smaller standing figures of sainted

³²⁶ This figure is generally read as St. Louis. See, e.g., Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 385.

³²⁷ Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 385.

kings flank the apse, labeled with illegible inscriptions; beyond them, unlabeled, stand another sainted monk in what looks like a Franciscan habit and a saint wearing a white hooded scapular over a dark tunic and holding a cross before him.

The depiction of a king at the center of the apse, whether or not specifically read as St. Louis, is somewhat at odds with the inscription Klenze placed over the apse, from Matthew 16:18: “you are Peter and on this rock I will build my church.”³²⁸ Peter does not appear to be depicted anywhere. Perhaps rather than a reference to Peter per se, this inscription may be read as a reference to the doctrine of Petrine supremacy, on which is founded the Catholic doctrine that the Bishop of Rome is the rightful head of the Church. While this seems an odd point to emphasize in the apse of a Byzantine revival chapel, it underlines the purpose of the building as a declaration of Ludwig’s restoration of the Catholic Church in Bavaria. On the other hand, Klenze seems to have taken the symbols of the evangelists that flank the Pantocrator –today more strongly associated with the Latin West — to be essentially Byzantine, as he labeled them with inscriptions that seem to be in Greek like all the others (though in the upper register of the apse, only the IX XC flanking the Pantocrator is clearly legible).

When Heß was given responsibility for re-designing everything above the gallery level, Klenze’s visual quotations from the Palatine Chapel remained in place for the ground level, but the Greek inscriptions were entirely replaced by Latin ones provided by the court chaplain Michael Hauber.³²⁹ Heß delegated much of his design work, according

³²⁸ In addition to a couple of spelling mistakes, etc., Klenze’s version, which begins “ΣΥ ΕΣ” rather than “σὺ εἶ,” appears to have been contaminated by Latin. I thank Catherine Conybeare and Richard Hamilton for their assessments of Klenze’s text.

³²⁹ *Hofprediger* Hauber was *erzbischöflicher geistlicher Rat und Synodalexaminator*. Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 62 and n. 27. On the division of

to Klenze, to his student from the Munich Academy, Johann Schraudolf (1808-79).³³⁰

The ornamental painting was delegated entirely to Joseph Anton Schwarzmann (1806-90) who, however, conferred with both Heß and Klenze before executing his designs.³³¹

Heß and Schraudolph, neither of whom had seen the Palatine Chapel in Palermo, proved less interested in wrestling with Byzantine style, layout, figures or ideas than had Klenze [fig. 3.6 g-h]. The style to which Heß and Schraudolf aspired was not the strongly Byzantinizing style that Cimabue had learned from his teachers, that is, the style of thirteenth-century Italy called the *maniera greca* since Vasari derided it in the sixteenth century. Rather, they looked to the perfection and end of the Greek style that was the start of the Italian style, which Vasari had attributed to Cimabue himself and his successors. Fra Angelico (ca. 1400-55) and his contemporaries appear to have been among the artists on whom Heß and Schraudolf based their versions of this later style.³³² To reference the *maniera greca*, as per Ludwig's wishes, they incorporated the gilt backgrounds of the thirteenth century although these were no longer common by the fifteenth. The somewhat saccharine quality of Heß's and Schraudolph's interpretations of their fifteenth-century

responsibility for the design of the interior between Heß and Klenze see also Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 385.

³³⁰ Four additional assistants helped Heß and Schraudolf carry out the fresco painting, though Klenze noted Heß's tendency to give himself exclusive credit for all aspects of the painting project. Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 60, 62-3, 75 and 102.

³³¹ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 62 and 102.

³³² As noted by Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 73. Among the specific works by Fra Angelico which suggest this association are the *Transfiguration* (1438-45) at the Monastery of San Marco, Florence, where the figure of Christ with his white robes and outstretched arms provides a more intense version of the Christ in the apse at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, and the *San Marco Altarpiece* (ca. 1438-40), in the museum of San Marco, where the Virgin and Child enthroned against a patterned cloth suggest a more dynamic version of the same scene in the soffit of the central transverse arch at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle.

models made for a particularly stark contrast between the figures and the fields of gold against which they were set.³³³ Despite Ludwig's initial reservations concerning Heß, however, when all was completed this combination turned out to delight Ludwig as much as anyone else. Heß was Ludwig's Raphael.³³⁴

Schwarzmann's ornamental program likewise expressed a fifteenth-century Italian character, as illustrated by the floral scrolls in the spandrels of the nave arcade. That this included Islamic reticulate band patterns that incorporated acanthus scrolls does not diminish its Italian character to modern eyes, but may have been understood by Schwarzmann and Klenze as expressing the Byzantine basis of the Italian Rebirth of Antiquity (e.g, framing the soffits of the barrel vaults in **fig. 3.6 g-h**). The ornament thus literally and figuratively mediated between the acknowledged Italianate character of Heß's figures and the Byzantinizing character of Klenze's architecture. Sulpiz Boisserée, who had moved to Munich when Ludwig purchased his (Byzantine-German) paintings, paid a visit to the Academy to see Heß's preparatory sketches for the frescoes in 1828, commenting: "The King has the church of Monreale in mind and wants everything in the Byzantine style throughout on gold ground. In this respect he sets too narrow limits while, on the other hand, in the choice of subjects he allows every freedom!"³³⁵ In

³³³ As noted by Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 73.

³³⁴ Of Heß, Ludwig rhapsodized "Raphaelischer Zeit, würdiger Meister bist du," in a poem of 1847. Sabine Heym, "'Solch eine Schloßkapelle...': Zu Bau und Ausstattung der Allerheiligen-Hofkirche," in *Die Allerheiligen-Hofkirche der Münchener Residenz. Geschichte – Zerstörung – Wiederaufbau*, ed. Kurt Falthäuser (Munich: Bayerisches Staatsministerium der Finanzen, Presse- und Öffentlichkeitsarbeit, [2003]), 22.

³³⁵ "In der Academie. Heß Entwürfe zu den Malereien der neuen Schloß-Capelle Der König hat die Kirche von Monreale im Sinne will alles im byzantinischen Stil durchaus auf Gold-Grund. In der Hinsicht setzt er zu enge Schranken und in der Wahl der Gegenstände läßt er hingegen alle Freiheit!" Sulpiz Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, v. 2, 274, entry for Feb. 27th, 1828.

discussing the frescoes with Heß, Ludwig appears to have shifted his desired stylistic model from the Palatine Chapel to Monreale Cathedral, although, as will be seen, Heß did not embrace this model. As for Boisserée's comment on the subject matter, it is worth noting that he was close to Cornelius and the other members of a Munich circle in the late 1820s, known by its opponents as the "Congregation," which espoused a conservative Catholic revival.³³⁶ Whether or not Boisserée objected to Heß limiting the specifically Catholic aspects of the "All Saints" theme to the point of near confessional neutrality nevertheless remains unclear.

To judge from the images of the frescoes made before their destruction, Heß's figures, while set on a gold background, were depicted as fully and comfortably present in colorfully-clothed, perspectively-rendered bodies, while being given plenty of room on the spatially ambiguous field of gold, never challenging its ability to contain them [**fig. 3.6 g-h**]. To anchor his figures Heß used a range of devices to counteract the indeterminacy of the gold ground. These included depicting figures as if seated on architectural elements such as arches and pendentives; framing the gold area behind the figures as if it formed a sort of enlarged halo; and inserting smaller framed scenes onto the gold ground as if they were pictures nailed to a wall. Heß's colors were bright and, while the figures were impressively large, they were not massed so as to overwhelm. Heß understood the Byzantine style in terms of sensuality and exoticism, that is, Byzantine

³³⁶ Boisserée was close to most of the members of this group: in addition to Cornelius, its two central figures, Joseph Görres, whom Ludwig had appointed to a professorship in history at the University of Munich in 1826, and Johan Nepomuk Ringseis, Ludwig's personal physician. See the discussion in Jon Vanden Heuvel, *A German Life in the Age of Revolution: Joseph Görres, 1776-1848* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001), 293-303.

imagery for Heß implied a paradisiacal place and time somewhere in the beyond. The Allerheiligenhofkapelle was to transport one there.

His subjects included the main personages of the Old and New Testaments as well as the Church fathers, interspersed with key Old and New Testament narratives and personifications of Christian virtues and sacraments.³³⁷ Court Chaplain Hauber's Biblical inscriptions in Latin appear to have suggested some elements of this program, though not all of it.³³⁸ In the narthex Heß depicted patrons of the arts and sciences united with religion; of these, all were Biblical figures except St. Cecilia (music) and Pope Gregory the Great (theology). Curiously, there seems to have been no accent placed on the dedication to All Saints, although the many individual figures conformed to Ludwig's and Klenze's notion that Byzantine church decoration consisted primarily of icons. Traditional Bavarian saints or saintly groups, such as the Fourteen Helpers of Those in Need, were not included. Possibly the focus on Biblical figures, the sacraments, fathers of the Church, and Christian virtues was designed to express the chapel's Byzantine theme in that Byzantine Christianity was admired as a modern manifestation of the early Church rather than as an independent confession. Since the Biblical and Patristic emphasis was as accessible to Protestants as to Catholics, the resulting iconographic program at "All Saints" was surprisingly ecumenical. The image in the apse of the Virgin Mary enthroned in a blue robe (between Peter and Paul, Moses and Elijah and beneath the

³³⁷ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 66-72.

³³⁸ For Hauber's inscriptions (translated into German) see Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 66-72.

Trinity) did provide a specifically Catholic focal point that was also given a local inflection insofar as she was interpreted as the *Patrona Bavariae*.³³⁹

10. Reception of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle

When set in the architectural space Klenze had provided, the overall effect of the paintings proved fully satisfying not only to Ludwig but to most of his contemporaries, and was widely acclaimed in the leading (and generally Protestant) art journals of the day – specifically because Heß had not copied the Byzantine style (though perhaps the ecumenism of the fresco program also came into play). Franz Kugler, for instance, wrote approvingly that “antiquated motifs are... only taken up in particular instances, there is nothing of the servile imitation of the manner of depiction of an earlier time.”³⁴⁰ M.

Gessert’s review, meanwhile, praised Heß specifically for avoiding the pitfalls of the Byzantine style:

In formal observation, however, the artistic requirements of the present permit neither in the sculptural parts nor the painting an unconditional repetition of the Byzantine tradition with all its faults and severities, but rather that purification and ennoblement of the same seems here in place, which in a free adoption of ancient motifs stands best to achieve.³⁴¹

³³⁹ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 71.

³⁴⁰ “altertümliche Motive sind ... nur im Einzelnen aufgenommen, nichts von knechtischer Nachahmung der Darstellungsweise einer früheren Zeit,” Kugler, *Kleine Schriften über neuere Kunst und deren Angelegenheiten*, vol. 3 of *Kleine Schriften und Studien zur Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Ebner und Seubert, 1854), 547.

³⁴¹ “In förmlichem Anbetracht dagegen gestatteten die künstlerischen Anforderungen der Gegenwart weder bei den plastischen Theilen noch den Malereien eine unbedingte Wiederholung der byzantinischen Überlieferung mit allen ihren Mängeln und Härten, vielmehr schien hier jene Reinigung und Veredelung derselben am Ort, welche in einem freien Eingehen auf antike Motive am besten zu erzwecken stand.” M. Gessert, *Schornsches Kunstblatt* no. 90 (1839): 359, quoted in Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 73-74, esp. n. 3.

In successfully mediating between the desires of Ludwig for imitation in the service of historicizing evocation and of Klenze for imitation based on accepted principles and ideals, Heß had struck a chord that turned out to have wide appeal. Klenze's adaptation of San Marco's ground plan for the chapel rather than that of the Palatine Chapel made Heß's work easier, as its series of domes (particularly once they were covered in gold) already provided Ludwig and others with an exotic, Eastern Byzantine spatial experience that transported them beyond the familiar German-Byzantine context no matter what the imagery. In 1839, having returned to Sicily, Ludwig wrote to Klenze: "The Cathedral of Monreale... didn't please me any more, as I have become accustomed to the Allerheiligenhofkapelle splendidly built by you and ornamented with frescoes by Heß."³⁴² Ludwig had not yet returned to the nearby Palatine Chapel, which he wrote of on the following day with a greater sense of nostalgia, stating how much he still admired its mosaics and that he still regretted that it had proved too costly to copy them in Munich, despite his evident admiration for Heß's frescoes.³⁴³

Of the Palatine Chapel in Palermo, the only traces that remained were the floor and wall surfaces designed by Klenze, that is, those extending to the parapets of the galleries. These varied little from Klenze's original proposal (which had still assumed the use of mosaics above the gallery level) [**fig. 3.6 f-1 and f-2**]. The colored marble

³⁴² "Der Dom von Monreale ... gefiel mir nicht mehr, gewöhnt an die herrliche von Ihnen gebaute und von Heß mit Fresken gezierte Allerhilighofcapelle." Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 97, citing H.S. Klenzeana XIV, 1, letter from Ludwig to Klenze written in Palermo and dated March 19th, 1839.

³⁴³ "...die Kapelle im königlichen Palaste [in Palermo] machte auf mich einen großen Eindruck, mit ihrem durchgeführten prachtvollen Mosaik. Ich hatte auch solches gewünscht. Sie [Klenze] aber machten die freylich sehr gegründete Einwendung, daß sie gar kostspielig wären." Quoted in Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 97, citing H.S. Klenzeana XIV, 1, letter from Ludwig to Klenze written in Palermo and dated March 20th, 1839.

pavement and gallery parapets were ornamented with a South Italian kind of quincunx derived from Byzantium and related patterns not unlike those at the Palatine Chapel [**fig. 3.6 e-g and 3.3 d-e**].³⁴⁴ The faux-marble dado paneling and wainscoting friezes likewise drew on the Palatine Chapel's example. Yet while the friezes were modeled fairly closely on what some scholars have dubbed the "lotus lancéolé" pattern found in the Palatine Chapel, Klenze intentionally or unintentionally omitted the reciprocating aspect of the pattern, which is what most characterizes this type of ornament not only in the Palatine Chapel but in the Islamic tradition from which it comes [**fig. 3.3 f-1 and f-2**].³⁴⁵ Klenze's designs retained a distinction between foreground and background and were more strictly symmetrical and simpler than those at Palermo, as is particularly evident in the nave pavement which, following the Palatine Chapel's example, he organized into three large rectilinear fields. At the same time, he replaced the prominent use of red in the Palermo pavement with yellow, thus associating the floor of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle more

³⁴⁴ Noted in Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 77.

³⁴⁵ The term "lotus lancéolé" for the wainscoting frieze is used by Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, 38, following Emile Bertaux, *L'Art dans l'Italie méridionale* (Paris: A. Fontemoing, 1904), 502. Tronzo (46) notes the scholars, including Bertaux, who have attributed Islamic origins this motif, while countering that it occurs in the Byzantine tradition as well. Tronzo's Byzantine example (his fig. 35), however, is further from the versions found in the Palatine Chapel, Mamluk Egypt (1260-1517), and elsewhere in the Islamic world not only in general outline but also in omitting, like Klenze's version, the motif's reciprocal character. Whether intentionally or not, one might argue on this basis that while the Palatine Chapel's version remains true to Islamic tradition, for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle Klenze re-interpreted the motif in a Byzantinizing manner. Reciprocating patterns of the type found in the Palatine Chapel's "lotus lanceolé" friezes, which form surface decoration that eliminates the distinction between background and foreground, "remained in vogue in the Islamic world up to about the fourteenth century," and "ultimately derive from textiles," the earliest such example dating between 945 and 1055. See Eva Baer, "Change and Counterchange," in *Islamic Ornament* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 79-80.

closely with the gold background of the fresco program above. The result provided a bold counterpoint to the two domes above.

Ludwig was delighted by the overall result. His program—to balance the classical, pagan Glyptothek with a Byzantine church – had been fulfilled, and details such as the faithfulness of the artists to the Palatine Chapel appear to have been ancillary to that goal. As the first new church building in Bavaria since secularization, the Allerheiligenhofkapelle had a particularly strong impact on fresco painters and their efforts to reconcile Ludwig’s professed strict historicism with contemporary taste. Not only Heß but also his primary assistant, Johann Schraudolph, and the painter responsible for the ornament, Joseph Schwarzmann, found themselves employed in further monumental fresco projects for Ludwig for much of the remainder of their careers.³⁴⁶ The Allerheiligenhofkapelle unfortunately remains the shell which survived aerial bombing during World War II, and although it has been stabilized and renovated to the extent that it is a usable and austere beautiful space, it offers only a limited sense of the original interior appearance. It is difficult to recognize as the first Byzantine revival building of more than regional significance.³⁴⁷ It was also one of the few major court chapels of the nineteenth century.³⁴⁸ That Ludwig’s idea came to fruition (despite the endless

³⁴⁶ Heß had four other assistants in addition to Schraudolph. Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 62 and 102.

³⁴⁷ In 1823 a stylistic shift is apparent in work of the Koblenz architect Johann Claudius von Lassaulx (with his design for a parish church in Valwig, on the Mosel, constructed 1824-27) that, despite lack of written documentation, was apparently intended as a turn from Gothic to the German-Byzantine style, which slightly predates Ludwig’s assertion of a plan to have a Palatine Chapel built for him in Munich. Lassaulx later took specific inspiration from the Byzantine revival style developed under Ludwig. See Chapter Four for further discussion and references.

³⁴⁸ On the place of Klenze’s Allerheiligenhofkapelle as one of the few notable palace chapels of the nineteenth century and reflective of eighteenth-century rather than

negotiations with Klenze, including modifications he demanded) reflects both Ludwig's determination and the degree to which the chapel spoke to Ludwig's larger purposes. Ludwig equated Byzantium with the early Church, but for Ludwig this church was specifically Catholic.

11. Klenze's Model Byzantine Church: SS. Michael and John the Baptist, Eltmann

Perhaps it was his struggles with Ludwig that inspired Klenze to propose his own Byzantine projects: the design of SS. Michael and John the Baptist (*St. Michael und Johannes der Täufer*), a Catholic church in Eltmann, Franconia, and the renovation of St. Salvator (the *Salvatorkirche*) in Donaustauf, outside Regensburg. Klenze designed the church in Eltmann as a model for other Byzantine-style provincial churches, while he renovated that in Donaustauf to illustrate his understanding of the transfer of Greek culture into German lands. Both projects occurred almost simultaneously. Klenze took over the planning of Sts. Michael and John the Baptist in 1830 from Franz Joseph Schierlinger, head of the district planning and construction department (*Regierungs- und Kreisbaurath*), who had already provided a classicizing design complete with hexastyle Doric entrance façade.³⁴⁹ In the process, Klenze overstepped the architect in whose

nineteenth-century palace design, see Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, v, 10 and 95.

³⁴⁹ Hildebrand, cat. 141 "Werkverzeichnis," 421-22, describes Schierlinger as the *Bamberger Bezirksingenieur*, a position Schierlinger had held in 1829 when appointed to oversee Friedrich Karl Rupprecht's renovations at Bamberg Cathedral (as discussed in Chapter Four), but he seems to have later been promoted, as Max Joseph Schleiß, *Fest-Rede bei der feyerlichen Einweihung der neu erbauten Kirche zu Eltmann am 29. September 1838 durch den hochwürdigsten Herrn Bischof Friedrich von Gross zu Würzburg* (Würzburg: Commerzien-Assessor Bonitas sel. Witwe, 1838; facsimile reprint, Eltmann: Kath. Pfarramt, 1988), 10, describes Schierlinger as *Herr Regierungs- und Kreisbaurath*. On St. Michael and John the Baptist in Eltmann see also Gabriele Schickel,

purview all buildings in the Lower Main district (*Untermainkreis*) technically fell.³⁵⁰ (This architect was Johann Gottfried Gutensohn, who in 1841 would be the first to publish a building as Renaissance revival in style, as discussed in Chapter One.³⁵¹) At the most fundamental level, Klenze was demonstrating his authority over other Bavarian architects.

Klenze was also demonstrating his authority to define architectural styles. That Klenze should have rejected Schierlinger's design outright in favor of a Byzantinizing one seems surprising, given Klenze's avowed preference for the classical Greek style for churches, and indicates the pressure on Klenze to master the continually evolving views of his patron. Approved by Ludwig to exemplify the Byzantine revival style for the region, Klenze's design would make Sts. Michael and John the Baptist among the most lavish and expensive of Franconian churches.³⁵² Due to financial considerations, the building was not begun until 1835; it was completed in 1838. The most striking stylistic feature of the design was its façade, a reduced version of that only recently approved for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, which omitted the gable over the tympanum, the engaged columns flanking the portal, and the crocket articulation, and which massed together the round-arched windows in a triple arcade at the gallery level, between the stepped molding and rose window [**fig. 3.11**].

"Typesierung und Stilwahl im Sakralbau," in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 64-65; and Schickel, cat. 57, "'Katholische Kirche, Eltmann, 1823-1838," in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 287. Schierlinger's unexecuted plan, in the Bayerische Hauptstaatsarchiv, Abgabe Oberste Baubehörde, is illustrated in Hildebrand, fig. 141.1 and Schickel fig. 57.1. Hildebrand describes the church as still substantially as built under Klenze.

³⁵⁰ Hildebrand, cat. 141 "Werkverzeichnis," 421-22.

³⁵¹ Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 421-22,

³⁵² Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 421.

Klenze's basic plan for the interior, however, bore no relationship to the Allerheiligenhofkapelle's domed pier-and-vault construction. In the Eltmann plan, a narthex with a gallery above it opens onto a nave with no aisles, ending in a single, rounded apse. Klenze's omission of any suggestion of pier-and-vault construction, which he had informed Ludwig was definitive of the Byzantine style as imported to San Marco from Hagia Sophia, conforms with his personal interpretation of the style as imported via a different route: from ancient Greece to medieval Germany and Lombardy via the Pelasgians (thus sidestepping Constantinople). In 1829-31 Klenze had explored this separate, basilican version of the Byzantine style with Friedrich Karl Rupprecht in the course of Rupprecht's renovations of Bamberg Cathedral, the seat of Eltmann's archbishop. Both Klenze and Rupprecht understood Bamberg Cathedral as an important example of the German Byzantine style, as will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four. (Schierlinger, as also noted in Chapter Four, had overseen Rupprecht's renovation of Bamberg, and it was he who closely supervised the intern in the district planning and construction office who carried out the finishing details and furnishing of the interior of Klenze's Byzantine design for Eltmann.)³⁵³ Klenze's understanding of the German Byzantine style as more directly inherited from Greece than from Constantinople may also be reflected in the accent on "New Greek" as equivalent to "Byzantine" in the speech given at the church's dedication.³⁵⁴ Klenze's most explicit articulation of this importation of the Byzantine style into Germany can be found, however, in his renovation of St. Salvator, Donaustauf.

³⁵³ Schleiß, *Fest-Rede bei der feyerlichen Einweihung der neu erbauten Kirche zu Eltmann*, 10-11.

³⁵⁴ Schleiß, *Fest-Rede bei der feyerlichen Einweihung der neu erbauten Kirche zu Eltmann*, 11, also discussed in Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 422.

12. Klenze's Western Byzantium: St. Salvator, Donaustauf

St. Salvator apparently dated to the late fourteenth century, but its exterior had been renovated in the early seventeenth century in a style that, along with everything else created in the wake of the rebuilding of St. Peter's (i.e., from the sixteenth century until the revival of a more rigorous classicism after the mid-eighteenth), was highly objectionable to his eyes [**fig. 3.12 a**].³⁵⁵ To judge by a preparatory study of 1830, by that date he already hoped to replace St. Salvator's "Latin bonnet" (*welsche Haube*), that is, its onion dome, with a pointed steeple.³⁵⁶ That replacing the onion dome with a pointed steeple was Klenze's idea of how to make the church more Byzantine reflects the degree to which he had translated "Byzantine" not in terms of San Marco or the early Church, but as way of cleansing the German architectural inheritance from any taint of seductive Roman influence (whether classical or Catholic), while seeking to connect the rigorous style of ancient Greece with that of early medieval Germany. St. Salvator was on the Danube near the site of a major monument to German genius that he was building in the classical Greek style, the Walhalla (1830-42). By 1839 at the latest Klenze planned a more elaborate "restoration" of St. Salvator in the Byzantine style [**fig. 3.12 b**]. In addition to an octagonal steeple, the church received smaller windows and, as its primary ornament, corbel arcades below the eaves and below the string courses defining its upper tower levels. These reflected Stieglitz's assertion in *History of Architecture from Earliest*

³⁵⁵ Jörg Traeger, *Der Weg nach Walhalla: Denkmallandschaft und Bildungsreise im 19. Jahrhundert*, 2nd ed. (Regensburg: Bernhard Bosse and Mittelbayerischen Zeitung, 1991), pp. 90-92, figs. IXb, 60, 62a-b and figs. 138-39, and Annette Faber, "Restaurierung St. Salvator bei Donaustauf, 1839-1842," cat. no. 28 in *Romantik und Restauration*, ed. Nerdinger, 197-98.

³⁵⁶ Traeger, *Der Weg nach Walhalla*, 91.

Antiquity (1827) that the “nearly only and always repeated ornament on the exterior of buildings, placed below the moldings” was a simple round-arch frieze, which was

... indisputably the invention of Byzantine artists because it never appears in Roman art and thus the name New Greek or Byzantine ornament can be ascribed to it. By the way it will be important for the history of art, because it is to be recognized as a characteristic mark of the Byzantine style.³⁵⁷

The roof over the nave, which curved out to create wide eaves, was made crisply angular and the eaves eliminated; the open porticoes leading to the side entrances through the central western tower were given flat roofs capped by rounded merlons, and the two smaller structures on the path to the church were redesigned to match them. The proposed renovation of the mid-eighteenth-century interior never happened,³⁵⁸ but the exterior transformation, with its emphasis on angularity relieved only by the corbel arcades and round-arched windows, demonstrated, in Klenze’s eyes, the link between Classical Greek rigor and the Byzantine architecture of Germany: a link which he apparently believed had been more direct in Germany than in Byzantium itself, since (unlike at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle) there was no trace of San Marco in Klenze’s Byzantine-style renovation.³⁵⁹

³⁵⁷ „Die fast einzige und immer wiederholte Zierrath, am Aeußern der Gebäude unter Simswerken angebracht, ist eine Reihe halbkreisrunder, mit einander verbundener, kleiner Bogen; unstreitig eine Erfindung byzantinischer Künstler, da sie an Werken der römischen Kunst nicht vorkommt, daher ihr der Name“ neugriechische, byzantinische Verzierung, beigelegt werden kann. Uebrigens wird sie für die Geschichte der Kunst bedeutend, da sie als ein charakteristisches Kennzeichen des byzantinischen Styles anzuerkennen ist.“ Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume*, 299.

³⁵⁸ The interior was renovated in 1746 so as to harmonize with the baroque style of the exterior. Veit Loers, “Walhalla und Salvatorkirche. Romantische Architektur und ästhetische Landschaft im Vormärz,” in *Die Walhalla. Idee, Architektur, Landschaft*, ed. Jörg Traeger (Regensburg: Bernhard Bosse, 1979), 75.

³⁵⁹ Curiously even with regard to this most explicit instance of reifying the direct transmission of ancient Greek culture via Byzantium to Germany in the form of what was

In the same year in which he drew up this soon-to-be-realized vision of St. Salvator as embodying the German medieval reception of the classical Greek inheritance represented by the Walhalla, Klenze painted a view which dramatized the result [fig. 3.12 c]. In this work he underlined the strength of Germany's connection to the Classical world and specifically to that under Greek influence by inserting a farmhouse in a style which he attributed to the Raetians – an indigenous people of the Alps who, according to Pliny the Elder, had spoken a language related to Etruscan, and according to the latest thinking of Klenze's day, were in fact related precursors to the Etruscans. Barthold Georg Niebuhr, at the University of Berlin, had published the suggestion that in fact the Etruscans had descended from Raetians who migrated to Etruria after the advent of an influx of Pelasgians (i.e., the original inhabitants of Greece) had joined with them in the Alps.³⁶⁰

Niebuhr's thesis had attracted the particular interest not only of Klenze, but of many Philhellenic Bavarians, as much of Bavaria had once been part of the Roman province of Raetia.³⁶¹ Drawing on Niebuhr, Stieglitz had further concluded in *Geschichte der Baukunst* that the Etruscans, by way of the Raetians, were not only a Pelasgian

taken to be authentically ancient Greek and authentically German Byzantine architecture, Annette Faber provides the standard explanation that what was meant by "Byzantine" basically corresponds with the modern term "Romanesque." This undermines Klenze's point and obfuscates the larger understanding of the German cultural inheritance of Greece via Byzantium which had come to dominate the contemporary German conception of the Middle Ages. See Faber, "Restaurierung St. Salvator bei Donaustauf," 197 n. 3

³⁶⁰ See discussion and close-up of the farmhouse in Klenze's painting in Traeger, *Der Weg nach Walhalla*, 73-75.

³⁶¹ Another example of the enthusiastic Bavarian reception of Niebuhr's thesis was that by Ludwig Steub, *Ueber die Urbewohner Rätians und ihren Zusammenhang mit den Etruskern* (Munich: Verlag der literarisch-artistischen Anstalt, 1843), who began his study not only by citing the ancient sources but relating the excitement Niebuhr's thesis had generated.

people but essentially Greek, and so brought Greek culture, including Greek architecture, to the Romans, who degraded it as they did not understand true beauty.³⁶² Inspired, it would seem, by Stieglitz as well as by Niebuhr, with this farmhouse Klenze illustrated that not only the Byzantine architecture of medieval Germany but the pre-Germanic, Raetian architecture, and the southern German lands, had been integral to transfer of Hellenic culture to the West. Much of Bavaria south of the Rhine had been part of the Roman province that included Raetian lands and was named for the Raetians; while the Walhalla and St. Salvator were situated on the north bank of the Rhine, this was evidently close to enough to Raetia for Klenze's purposes.

In the second edition of his *Manual of Architecture for Christian Worship*, published in 1834, Klenze modified his approach to the Byzantine style. He announced that it was in fact ready for a "Palingenesie," that is, rebirth.³⁶³ Presumably he expected the *Palingenesie* he announced in his manual to be revealed in his own Byzantine design of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, which had not yet opened to the public as the frescoes

³⁶² Schnaase criticized Stieglitz sharply for associating the Etruscans more closely with the Greeks than with the Romans. Schnaase argued that, while the Romans had initially based their art on that of the Etruscans, it was the Romans who first adopted Greek forms and brought them to Etruria. Schnaase, moreover, refused to accept the assessment of Roman art and architecture as unlike the Greek in favoring display (*Prachtliebe*) without a sense for beauty (*Schönheitssinn*), an assessment which Stieglitz had repeated almost verbatim from *Von altdeutscher Baukunst* (1820), 21, and which echoed the well-established tendency to disparage the Romans as having degraded Greek forms. Schnaase countered that Roman art and architecture expressed a different, but not inherently inferior perspective, the development of which it was important to address as it expressed the transition from the classical to the Christian spirit. Schnaase, review of *Geschichte der Baukunst*, 257-58.

³⁶³ Buttler, introduction to Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architektur*, 21, where Buttler cites Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architektur*, 2nd ed. (1834), 13.

were still underway.³⁶⁴ Finding he actually could discover principles in Byzantine architecture that made it imitable on his terms also no doubt was made easier by his excitement that the Greek War of Independence, which he had long supported, had come to an end. Greece (that is, principally, Attica and the Peloponnesus: much of what is now Greece remained Ottoman at this time) was not only independent, but with the appointment of Ludwig's second son, Otto, as King of Greece, it was arguably in certain respects a dependency of Bavaria (in addition to its explicit and complex dependency on the three "Protecting Powers," France, Russia and the United Kingdom, whose armies and funds had assured the Greek victory following their intervention in the conflict beginning in 1827).

Klenze's public change of heart concerning the Byzantine style may also have been a bid for further work in the field discussed in his *Manual*—whether in Munich or in Greece. Despite the expertise he claimed in such matters (not least in the *Manual* itself), Klenze had not received another significant church commission. Ludwig himself had remained enthusiastic about the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, but instead of giving the next Byzantine-style commission to Klenze—the commission for a major building along the Ludwigsstraße to be named the Ludwigskirche—he had given it to Klenze's rival, Friedrich von Gärtner, the professor of architecture at the Munich Academy who had judged Klenze's Allerheiligenhofkapelle proposal so harshly. Shortly after the

³⁶⁴ Klenze's moderation of his earlier condemnations of the Byzantine style may also reflect his enthusiasm for new possibilities for commissions in Greece (which in fact he received), following the end of the Greek War of Independence and the appointment of Ludwig's second son, Otto, to the new Greek throne (see discussion below). In July through October of 1834 Klenze was able to visit Greece for the first time, though he does not mention the buildings he saw there in the second edition of his *Manual*. Perhaps final revisions, and even publication had been completed before his trip began.

Allerheiligenhofkapelle was finally complete and the dedication ceremony had come and gone,³⁶⁵ the frustrated Klenze seems to have revoked his notion of a *Palingenesie* for Byzantine architecture. In his *Aphoristic Notes Gathered on His Trip to Greece* (1838), Klenze returned to condemning the Byzantine style, and regretting its influence in the West:

The wealth, luxury, and practice of art verging on the maniacal in the Byzantine Empire contributed to the power and dominance of its manner of art, which it spread over the entirety of Christian Europe, and maintained until the end of the tenth century—then generally regarded as the end of the world—and with few modifications even into the middle of the thirteenth.

Similarly, the disturbances of Iconoclasm helped this Byzantine art, in which the classical elements disappeared to the same degree that a craftsman-like technique took over, to gain entry into and spread throughout the West.

It was namely especially the art-practicing monks from the order of St. Basil who, fleeing before the sword of the rough Isaurians, came into Italy and there were received by the popes into new monasteries, which became just so many workshops and propagandists for Byzantine art.³⁶⁶

³⁶⁵ The dedication ceremony took place on October 29, the Sunday before All Saints' Day, 1837.

³⁶⁶ “Der Reichthum, Luxus, und eine bis zur Manie getriebene Kunstaübung im byzantinische Reiche, trugen dazu bei, seiner Kunstart eine Macht und ein Uebergewicht zu geben, welches sie über das ganze christliche Europa verbreitete, und bis zum Schlusse des damals ganz allgemein als das Ende der Welt bezeichneten zehnten, und mit geringen Modifikationen sogar bis in die Mitte des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts erhielt. // Eben so trugen die Wirren des Ikonoklasmus dazu bei, dieser byzantinische Kunst, in welcher die antiken Elemente in eben dem Grade verschwanden, als eine handwerksmäßige Technik darin Ueberhand nahm in den Abendländern Eingang und Ausbreitung zu verschaffen. // Es waren nemlich besonders die kunstübenden Mönche vom Orden des heiligen Basilios, welche vor dem Schwerte des rohen Isauriers fliehend nach Italien kamen, und dort von den Päbsten in neue Klöster aufgenommen wurden, welche zu eben so vielen Werkstätten und Propaganden byzantinischer Kunst wurden....“ Leo von Klenze, *Aphoristische Bemerkungen gesammelt auf seiner Reise nach Griechenland* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1838), 317-8.

Chapter Four
Byzantine vs. Gothic Polychromy:
Ludwig's Restoration of
Bamberg's Cathedral of St. Peter and St. George

1. Ludwig I's Program to Undo Bamberg's Post-Medieval Polychromy

Bamberg's Cathedral of St. Peter and St. George would soon become Ludwig's second Byzantine architectural project.³⁶⁷ Initially, however, Ludwig leaned on Friedrich Wiebeking's evaluation of Bamberg published in 1821, along with his evaluation of Speyer Cathedral, in *Theoretical and Practical Civic Architecture*. On August 26, 1826, Ludwig wrote to Bamberg's newly appointed archbishop, Joseph Maria Freiherr von Fraunberg, that:

³⁶⁷ Jörg Traeger has noted that the cathedrals of Bamberg (on the Regnitz near the confluence with the Main) and Regensburg (on the Danube) were, under Ludwig I, linked by the Ludwigs-Donau-Main-Kanal, a major project which Ludwig initiated in late 1825, almost as soon as he had acceded to the throne. This canal was of German and not only Bavarian national significance, and was weighted with historical symbolism, since Charlemagne had been the first to attempt such a project (as noted on the monument Ludwig erected in Erlangen to commemorate completion of the canal in 1846). The canal was intended for freight, and not for passenger traffic either by boat or along the towpaths flanking its banks: it did not create a landscape traversable by tourists until later in the century, after the canal had largely ceased to function for commercial purposes. As a traversable waterway Ludwig focused on the Danube, where he built up steamship service along with tourist attractions to compete with the growing success of tourist steamships along the Rhine. Steamships were not able to traverse the Regnitz river or the locks in the canal. Traeger has noted that, nonetheless, both Ludwig and Klenze oversaw the aesthetic as well as logistical aspects of *Oberbaurat* Heinrich Freiherr von Pechmann's plans for the Ludwigs-Donau-Main-Kanal, and has made the interesting case that the canal created an imagined historical landscape along its route, which was realized largely through maps and prints. According to Traeger, these cathedrals were renovated in part as this route's monumental endpoints. See Traeger, *Der Weg nach Walhalla*, 126-30 and 141-67, and Ludwig's ruling of July 1, 1834 concerning the canal and its purposes in Manfred Kimmig, "Der Ludwigs-Donau-Main-Kanal" *Ausstellungskatalog zur gleichnamigen Ausstellung im Fembohaus in Nürnberg aus Anlaß der Einweihung des Staatshafen Nürnberg am Main-Donau-Kanal, September 1972* (Nuremberg: Stadtarchiv Nürnberg, 1972; also available online at http://kanaldoku_ausstellungskat.pdf), 4-5.

... It has already come disagreeably to my attention on earlier visits to the archbishop's metropolitan church at Bamberg that this majestic, great monument of the German building style has received some disfigurements and renovations that oppose artistic sensitivity. In order to improve this, and to reestablish the undisturbed sight of this sublime temple in the spirit of its pure style, it is my wish that the tall disfiguring altar be removed; then all trace of the white paint in the church be sanded away, so that the stone appear in its natural color; likewise that the oil paint with which the ornamented columns are covered be chiseled away, if the same should not be removable by any other method; and, finally, that the ornamented columns [...] be cleaned and supplied with an appropriate coating of oil.³⁶⁸

Ludwig seems to have known few if any details of the renovations of which he disapproved, the first of which had occurred in the seventeenth century and the most recent of which had just been completed under the direction of Georg Betz (1768-1832), the priest left in charge of Bamberg Cathedral during the years 1808-21, while the building served as a parish church.³⁶⁹ Textual and other evidence survives for Betz's renovations but, unfortunately, no depictions of the interior as it appeared upon their

³⁶⁸ "...Es ist mir schon früher bey dem Besuche der Erzbischöflichen Metropolitan-Kirche zu Bamberg unangenehm aufgefallen, daß dieses herrliche, große Denkmal des deutschen Baustyles einige Verunstaltungen und Renovationen erhalten hat, welche dem Kunstsinne widerstreben. Um diese zu verbessern, und den ungestörten Anblick dieses erhabenen Tempels in dem Geiste seines reinen Styles wieder herzustellen, ist es Mein Wunsch, daß der große verunstaltende Altar hinwegkomme; dann der weisse Anstrich der Kirche bis auf die Spur abgerieben werde, so daß der Stein in seiner natürlichen Farbe erscheine, desgleichen daß die Oelfarbe mit welcher die Bildsäulen übertüncht wurden, abgemeißelt werde, wenn selbe auf keine andere Art abzunehmen wäre und endlich die Bildsäulen [...] gereinigt und mit einem entsprechenden Oel-Anstrich versehen werden." Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv – Geheimes Hausarchiv München, NL Ludwig I. 48/5/31 – Nr. 6, cited in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 29.

³⁶⁹ Following the death of the former Prince Bishop in 1805, Bamberg Cathedral had ceased to function as the seat of a bishop. (The Bishop of Würzburg took responsibility for the diocese, along with his own, from his seat in Würzburg until his death in 1808). Georg Betz, "ein gebildeter, aktiver und engagierter Theologe" who had since 1801 ministered to a small parish that worshiped in the cathedral's north transept, found himself left in charge of the entire building. Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 47.

completion in 1821. Evidently, however, it was the white interior paint and the size and style of the high altar that particularly disturbed the king.³⁷⁰

Ludwig's concerns closely echoed the ideas and vocabulary Friedrich Wiebeking had used to discuss Bamberg and other German-style buildings. For Wiebeking, the classical ideals which he had found wanting at Speyer Cathedral and Germany's other Byzantine buildings, were instead expressed in the "architectonic beauty" (*architektonischen Schönheit*) of German architecture despite its general decline (*Verfall*) due to disfigurements (*Verunstaltungen*) of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.³⁷¹ Giving the new furnishings at Bamberg Cathedral as an example, Wiebeking contrasted post-medieval high altars which destroyed the "magnificence of the choir and the perspective," with original, German-style ones, such as that which he (mistakenly) took to be the surviving original at Regensburg Cathedral.³⁷² More than this, German-style interiors had been entirely changed and degraded (*ganz verändert und verdorben*) during

³⁷⁰ On Ludwig's limited awareness of Betz's renovation, see Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 29.

³⁷¹ Wiebeking, *Bürgerliche Baukunde* 1:13, as discussed in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 29, n. 307, and Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 193, n. 47.

³⁷² On the effect of the Bamberg and Regensburg altars see Wiebeking, *Bürgerliche Baukunde* v. 1, 686, as discussed in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 29 and n. 307, and Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, p. 196, nn. 69-70. On Wiebeking's belief that the baroque high altar in Regensburg Cathedral was actually the original German-style altar see Wiebeking, *Bürgerliche Baukunde* 1:87, as discussed in Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, p. 196, n. 68. Despite Wiebeking's many inaccuracies concerning Regensburg Cathedral, Raasch 193, n. 46 notes that his discussion of the building (*Bürgerliche Baukunde* 1:684-90) was, like his discussion of Speyer Cathedral, the first scholarly effort in this direction.

these centuries by a whitewash over all but the ribs of the vaults, which were painted orange or (again as at Bamberg) grey.³⁷³

At the time of his letter to Fraunberg, neither Ludwig nor anyone else considered that removing the later coats of paint could reveal evidence of Bamberg Cathedral's medieval paint; assertions that his letter demonstrates that he wished to cleanse the cathedral of any polychromy are, therefore, unfounded.³⁷⁴ Ludwig had his sights on the later re-paintings and it will be seen that he was immediately intrigued when he learned that medieval paint had survived underneath them. His interest in polychromy was wide-ranging, and he was always open to evidence of it that challenged earlier assumptions. At the same time, even though remnants of chancel screens survived, neither Ludwig nor those working for him ever questioned whether Wiebeking's call to restore "the undisturbed sight of [the building's] pure style" accurately reflected a medieval aesthetic. This emphasis on unobstructed space in fact reflected an aesthetic that had originated with the Jesuits. Their emphasis upon the Eucharist had led them to eliminate chancel screens such as those at Bamberg, where they had blocked the views of both the eastern and western choirs.³⁷⁵ Given Ludwig's anti-Jesuit stance, there is a certain irony in his insistence on unobstructed interior views.

³⁷³ On the whitewashing highlighting the ribs of the vaults see Wiebeking, *Bürgerliche Baukunde* 1:87, as discussed in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 29 and n. 307, and Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, pp. 193-94, n. 49.

³⁷⁴ Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine 'Restauration,'* 31-33.

³⁷⁵ Jeffrey Chipps Smith, *Sensuous Worship: Jesuits and the Art of the Early Catholic Reformation in Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 122 and Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 81 and n. 905 (as numbered in text) / 906 (as numbered in endnotes), and Christian Dümmler, *Der Bamberger Kaiserdom. 1000 Jahre Kunst und Geschichte* (Bamberg: Fränkischer Tag, 2005), 51.

The evolving and somewhat contradictory goals of Bamberg's renovation became increasingly complex. Archbishop Fraunberg could hardly have imagined that most of his tenure at the cathedral (1824-42) would be marked by an ever more invasive campaign. In response to Ludwig's letter he put together a commission consisting of the cathedral chapter plus, as specialists, Martin Joseph von Reider (1793-1862) and Friedrich Karl Rupprecht (1779-1831), neither of whom had any professional experience with architectural renovations.³⁷⁶ Reider, a Bamberg native and notable collector of local antiquities, had taught drawing and in 1826 was serving as managing director of a trade school.³⁷⁷ Rupprecht's qualifications, beyond his skills as a painter and engraver, included co-founding Bamberg's Art Society (the *Bamberger Kunstverein*, which he continued to serve as secretary) in 1823, his annotated catalogues of print collections, and his participation in the art market.³⁷⁸ These specialists did not see eye-to-eye and competed to advance their own proposals for the cathedral's renovation.

³⁷⁶ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 36.

³⁷⁷ Reider had long argued against moving or removing the baroque furnishings at Bamberg, but when they were finally auctioned off (as discussed below), he purchased much of the sculpture from them for his collection. These sculptures included the well-known crucifixion group for the high altar by Justus Glesker (1601-78), which Bamberg Cathedral was able to repurchase in the early twentieth century. Many of Reider's other artworks were integrated into the founding collection of the Bavarian National Museum, where they remain. On Glesker's crucifixion group and for a thumbnail sketch of Reider see Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, *Altäre des Bamberger Domes*, 126-29 and 357; see also Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 36 and n. 358 and J. F. Morper, "Ein unbekanntes Gutachten Joseph Martin von Reiders zur Domrestauration von 1828," *Bamberger Blätter für fränkische Kunst und Geschichte: Beilage zum Bamberger Volksblatt* 7, no. 8 (1930): 29.

³⁷⁸ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* pp. 23-24 and 27, and n. 285. On pp. 18-20 and 55 Hans-Schuller notes that Rupprecht had studied at the Gymnasium in Nuremberg (1799-1802) and possibly at the academy of art in Dresden (according to posthumous biographical accounts), but that no evidence of study in Dresden survives beyond a classicizing orientation and specialty in miniature portraiture. According to

As his solution to Ludwig's concerns Reider proposed a minimally invasive overpainting of the white surfaces with stone-colored paint, the replacement of the offending altar, and adaptation of the pulpit and organ to the Old German Style; further, he attempted on more than one occasion to replace Rupprecht with Heideloff as a more appropriate specialist for the renovations.³⁷⁹ Heideloff taught at Nuremberg's city trade school (soon elevated to a state polytechnical school) and had not only renovated the altar at St. Jacob's to Ludwig's satisfaction but also worked on a number of medieval and medieval-revival buildings; in short, he did have more relevant experience.³⁸⁰ Following Rupprecht's death, Heideloff would inherit his position but, as will be seen, the approach to the restoration that Rupprecht had developed in consultation with Ludwig I attained a level of sophistication (by modern standards) that Heideloff, relying on his own judgment without regard to his predecessor's work, would not maintain.

In his proposal, Rupprecht discussed not only how he would remove the white coat of paint and replace the recent altar but also how he planned to move the New Roman furnishings out of the nave and choir, design new furnishings in the Old German style, and install stained glass in the windows of the eastern and western choirs.³⁸¹

Rupprecht's own account, he had studied at an art school, at two art academies, and on study trips.

³⁷⁹ Bernhard Schemmel, *Friedrich Karl Rupprecht 1779-1831* (Bamberg: Staatsbibliothek, 1981), 135 and 145-50. In 1828, in a bid to wrest the renovation from Rupprecht, Reider would make a much more radical proposal in conjunction with Heideloff: see Morper, "Unbekanntes Gutachten Joseph Martin von Reiders," 29-31.

³⁸⁰ Among other projects undertaken since his move to Nuremberg in 1820, by 1826 Heideloff had renovated the altar of St. Jacob's Church, the bridal portal of St. Lawrence's Church, and the Church of Our Lady (all in Nuremberg); Ludwig had specifically cited his renovation of St. Jacob's altar as an example worthy of imitation. See Götz, "Carl Alexander Heideloff und der 'Typus der Stadt Nürnberg,'" 540.

³⁸¹ Rupprecht's initial proposal for renovating Bamberg Cathedral as communicated in his letter of Sept. 16, 1826, Archiv des Erzbistums Bamberg, Rep. 2 / Nr. 2310/7, cited in

Rupprecht consulted with Albert Reindel, the director of Nuremberg's art school, who had renovated the *Schöner Brunnen* (1385-96), Heinrich Beheim's German-style fountain in the main market square in Nuremberg [**fig. 4.1**].³⁸² Rupprecht made no stylistic distinction between the seventeenth-century renovations and those that had just been completed, commenting on the project as a whole:

The removal of the foreign objects and ornaments, which contradict the Old German style of this church, is a difficult task because for 250 years all work which was installed in it was no longer made in this style, but rather in the New Roman (*in dem neurömischen*), and one here, as almost everywhere, believed that in this way they were concealing the putative shapelessness of the Old German church.³⁸³

Archbishop Fraunberg and the cathedral chapter preferred Reider's plan, and apparently at least some felt that in removing the New Roman elements Rupprecht, who was Lutheran, was planning to remove what they saw as the Catholic identity of the interior.³⁸⁴

Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* pp. 64, 80, and 87 and nn. 747 (as numbered in text) / 748 (as numbered in endnotes) and 980 (as numbered in text) / 981 (as numbered in endnotes).

³⁸² In his initial proposal (Sept. 16, 1826, Archiv des Erzbistums Bamberg, Rep. 2 / Nr. 2310/7), Rupprecht not only discussed the excellence of Reindel's restoration techniques, but cited Heideloff as one who imitated them. Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 61 and 64.

³⁸³ "Die Hinwegräumung der fremdartigen Gegenstände und Verzierungen, welche dem altdeutschen Style dieser Kirche widersprechen, ist eine schwere Aufgabe, da seit 250 Jahren alle Arbeiten welche darinnen angebracht wurden, nicht mehr in diesem Style, sondern in dem neurömischen gemacht wurden, und man hier, so wie fast überall durch dieselben die vermeinliche Unförmlichkeit der altdeutschen Kirche zu verbergen glaubte." Rupprecht, letter of Sept. 16, 1826, Archiv des Erzbistums Bamberg, Rep. 2 / Nr. 2310/7, cited in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 80.

³⁸⁴ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 36-37; Schemmel, *Friedrich Karl Rupprecht 1779-1831*, 13-14. Archbishop Fraunberg had previously served as Bishop of Augsburg, per Renate Baumgärtel-Fleischmann et al., *Die Altäre des Bamberger Domes von 1012 bis zur Gegenwart* (Bamberg: Bayerische Verlagsanstalt, 1987), 345, and so was presumably familiar with the early stained glass windows of Augsburg's nave (discussed at the beginning of this section). These do not appear to have

Ludwig, on the other hand, concurred with Klenze's preference for Rupprecht's plan.³⁸⁵ Ludwig's understanding of the appropriate aesthetic expression of Catholicism in his kingdom was not in harmony with that of the Catholic hierarchy and he would come into conflict with it with increasing frequency during his renovation campaign at Bamberg, as at Regensburg and elsewhere. Ludwig contrasted the medieval architectural styles, which he considered appropriately German Catholic, with the New Roman style associated with ultramontanism and specifically with the newly revived Society of Jesus. Expanding on the aesthetic of Wiebeking and others, Ludwig sought to remove post-medieval elements from medieval buildings.

Believing that the Jesuits led people away from their properly German sensibility and towards an essentially Latin Catholicism, Ludwig refused them entry into Bavaria; this is one religious position in which he saw eye to eye with his wife.³⁸⁶ At the same time that Ludwig was freeing Bavaria and its monuments from New Romanism, Heideloff, whom Reider seems to have preferred to Rupprecht not only due to his experience but also on account of his Catholicism, was facing increasing difficulties in his career in predominantly Protestant Nuremberg. Ironically, in a population apparently

influenced his assessment of the appropriateness of installing stained glass windows at Bamberg, as he appears to have advocated retaining the Baroque changes and additions rather than attempting to revert to a more fully medieval-style interior, however that style might have been defined.

³⁸⁵ Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 73-74, where Klenze's evaluation is cited in full, and Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 39 and nn. 394-95 (as numbered in text) / 395-96 (as numbered in endnotes), where Hans-Schuller cites Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Geheimes Hausarchiv München NL Ludwig I. 48/5/31 – Nr. 6, Gutachten of Oct. 29 1826, and addendum (with the same date).

³⁸⁶ Hubert Bastgen, "Ludwigs I. von Bayern 'Liberalismus' und 'Jesuitenfurcht'." *Nuntiaturreporte aus dem Jahre 1829,* "Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft 49 (1929): esp. p. 649 n. 11 and p. 648; Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms,* 232; Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern,* 603.

unaware of the aesthetic rift between their king and many members and officials in his Catholic Church, Heideloff was accused of a Catholic over-emphasis on the Gothic style.³⁸⁷

With Rupprecht's proposal in mind, Ludwig I quickly commissioned windows for Bamberg Cathedral from Gärtner, in his position as artistic director at Nymphenburg.³⁸⁸

Gärtner wrote Heinrich Heß (whom Klenze was advocating for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle frescoes) to ask him to design the windows; Heß was in Rome at this time but replied he would be pleased to prepare cartoons upon his return to Munich at the end of the year, when he would be taking up a professorship at the art academy.³⁸⁹ At the end of October 1826, Klenze wrote that the eastern choir (*Georgenchor*) would be the

³⁸⁷ On Reider's probable preference for Heideloff in part on confessional grounds see Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 56. On Heideloff's difficulties in Nuremberg as a Catholic and as an ally of Ludwig (and, from the 1840s, in correspondence with August Reichensperger, leader in the Prussian Rhineland of the Gothic Revival as the style of Catholic revival) see Götz, "Carl Alexander Heideloff und der 'Typus der Stadt Nürnberg,'" 544-45.

³⁸⁸ Ludwig commissioned the windows by July 21, 1826, even though the production of colored glass sheets in sufficient quantity was not yet an option. See Elgin Vaassen, "Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom aus der königlichen Glasmalereianstalt, Gründung König Ludwigs I., aus dem Jahre 1828," in *Diversarum Artium Studia. Beiträge zu Kunstwissenschaft, Kunsttechnologie und ihren Randgebieten. Festschrift für Heinz Roosen-Runge zum 70. Geburtstag am 5. Oktober 1982*, ed. Helmut Engelhart and Gerda Kempter (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert, 1982), 169-70, citing Bayer. Hauptstaatsarchiv München, MG 68631, Abschrift. By the autumn of 1826 the commission had been announced in Leipzig's *Illustrierte Zeitung*, new series vol. 19, no. 474 (1852), 74 as cited in Leinz, "Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik," p. 408 and n. 61; Rupprecht's version of events is discussed below and in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 88.

³⁸⁹ Vaassen, "Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom," 170, citing Geheimes Hausarchiv, Abt. III des Bayer. Hauptstaatsarchiv München, Nachlaß Ludwig I., 48/5/31,6.

best location for these windows. This is the latest date at which the commission for stained glass at Bamberg can be documented as underway.³⁹⁰

Upon Heß's arrival in Munich Ludwig had him travel not to Bamberg but to Regensburg with Gärtner, to design stained glass for that city's cathedral.³⁹¹ Regensburg had lost much of its medieval stained glass in favor of clear bull's eye windows by the early eighteenth century.³⁹² The first stained glass windows would be installed at Regensburg April 1828.³⁹³ Set into the western façade, these windows (unfortunately destroyed during the Second World War) were intended to re-assert what was understood to be Regensburg Cathedral's polychrome interior illumination (though, it will be seen,

³⁹⁰ Vaassen, "Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom," 170, citing Geheimes Hausarchiv, Abt. III des Bayer. Hauptstaatsarchiv München, Nachlaß Ludwig I., 89/2 (aus 89/2/I).

³⁹¹ Loers, "Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms," p. 241, n. 78, asserts that Ludwig had commissioned the Regensburg Cathedral stained glass windows in 1826, citing Johann Nepomuk Sepp, *Ludwig Augustus, König von Bayern und das Zeitalter der Wiedergeburt der Künste* (Regensburg, 1903), 489. That the commission was underway no earlier than the end of 1826 and definitely by the first weeks of 1827 is evident from Klenze's advice on where to locate stained glass windows in Bamberg Cathedral (noted above), and Gärtner's letter to Wagner of January 15, 1827, in "Die Briefe Friedrich von Gärtner," ed. Georg Brenninger et al., in *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, ed. Winfried Nerdinger (Munich: Klinkhardt und Biermann, 1992), 300-303, esp. p. 302.

³⁹² See Achim Hubel, *Die Glasmalereien des Regensburger Domes* (Munich: Schnell und Steiner, 1981), 25.

³⁹³ Heß provided the cartoons, with the assistance of Schraudolf (his chief assistant at the Allerheiligenhofkirche as well); Frank and an artist in Nuremberg named Schwarz made the windows. Ludwig was not completely satisfied with either Frank's or Schwarz's work and even before the windows' installation intended eventually to replace them, which he did in 1853. Loers, "Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms," 241 and 243-44. The only surviving images of these windows are photos taken after they were moved to the Frauenkirche in Nuremberg, where the panels had to be reorganized to fit into new tracery. Vaassen, "Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom," 176 [citing August Essenwein, *Der Bilderschmuck der Liebfrauenkirche zu Nürnberg* (Nuremberg, 1881), 19], and figs. 72 and 73; see also Loers, "Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms," 240-41.

neither the iconography nor the style of the surviving late medieval windows at Regensburg was taken into consideration).³⁹⁴

Even though Bamberg had lost all of its stained glass, and despite Rupprecht's pleas, Ludwig simply dropped the commission for stained glass there and never reinstated it. Perhaps this was simply an arbitrary decision, for no direct evidence survives for why the stained glass commission was redirected from Bamberg to Regensburg. Unlike Bamberg Cathedral, the cathedral in Regensburg was in a terrible state of disrepair, but Ludwig's commission in no way addressed the building's pressing structural issues, such as major leaks in the roof, nor even the acute fragility of its surviving medieval windows (most notably, those in the choir).³⁹⁵ Nor does a personal interest in Regensburg Cathedral appear to have motivated this shift. Ludwig had never been to Regensburg, and his knowledge of the cathedral appears to have been limited.³⁹⁶ Stylistic considerations, however, do appear to have played a significant, and possibly definitive, role. Sulpiz Boisserée, whose collection of German-Byzantine and German paintings Ludwig was in the process of purchasing, has been credited with advising

³⁹⁴ The windows installed in 1828 in Regensburg were given to the Frauenkirche in Nuremberg in 1860, after being replaced by ones which Ludwig considered superior; they were destroyed in World War II. See Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, p. 243, n. 223 and Vaassen, "Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom," 175-76.

³⁹⁵ Susette Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 207-08; Achim Hubel, *Glasmalereien des Regensburger Doms*, 25-27.

³⁹⁶ Ludwig first visited Regensburg Cathedral on October 18, 1830, according to Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, p. 208, n. 5, citing *Kunstblatt* no. 11 (1830), 361, and Loers, "Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms," pp. 245-46, n. 104. (Loers quotes here a letter describing Ludwig's visit to the cathedral on that day, but the quotation does not relate that this was Ludwig's first stay in Regensburg.)

Ludwig that stained glass windows were essential for German style buildings.³⁹⁷ At the same time, those involved in the Bamberg commission - including Ludwig, Klenze, Rupprecht and Reider – ceased to call Bamberg Cathedral’s style German and from this point on called it Byzantine.³⁹⁸ Bamberg’s eastern choir, moreover, became a particular focus of research into this style. Through a combination of exploration and simplification, this research established order out of the confusion concerning medieval polychromy that had developed when enthusiasm for it took hold during the Napoleonic era.

2. Early Nineteenth-Century Investigations of Medieval Polychromy

During the years 1793 to 1813, decades marked by constant political upheaval, the Prince and Duke of Anhalt-Dessau, Leopold III Friedrich Franz (1740-1817), installed what was not only the first but also the most comprehensive stained glass collection in a Gothic Revival building in Continental Europe, the Gothic House (1769-73) of his English Garden at Wörlitz [**fig. 4.2**].³⁹⁹ A renewal of interest in stained glass on the Continent, inspired by developments in England, was just beginning.⁴⁰⁰ The major, and nearly only, scholarly treatment of the subject was still that written a generation ago

³⁹⁷ For Boisserée’s as well as Wiebeking’s contributions to stylistic considerations of Regensburg Cathedral see Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 226-28.

³⁹⁸ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* 32, under “Nebenbemerkung,” provides a brief historiography of the term „Byzantine“ as a long-outdated invention of Friedrich Schlegel’s in order to explain how Bamberg could have been called Byzantine by Rupprecht and others.

³⁹⁹ This collection and the Gothic House, which survive intact, have recently been the subject of extensive study and restoration. See Rüdiger Becksmann, “Die Glasgemälde im Gotischen Haus zu Wörlitz: zum Stand ihrer Erforschung und Edition.” *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 56/57 (2002/03):163.

⁴⁰⁰ For a list of significant early collectors of stained glass in German lands, with bibliography, see Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 33.

by Pierre Le Vieil (1708-72),⁴⁰¹ who had come to the subject in the mid-eighteenth century while engaged, ironically, in replacing windows of the ‘ancient style’ in Notre-Dame of Paris with clear glass.⁴⁰² As Fiorillo noted, Le Vieil had concluded that the windows of St. Denis were the oldest surviving examples of stained glass anywhere.⁴⁰³ It was the flood of further examples removed from church properties and unleashed onto the market during the course of secularization that led to the blossoming of interest in stained glass while Prince Leopold’s project was underway, and in German lands stained glass was soon being celebrated as a specifically Germanic art.

Stained glass on exhibit in Paris at the Musée de monuments français, and in particular two works listed as in the “Salle des quatorzième et quinzième siècles” in 7th edition of the handbook to the museum by its founder and head, Marie Alexandre Lenoir (1761-1839),⁴⁰⁴ inspired Friedrich Schlegel to address the subject at some length in the

⁴⁰¹ Pierre Le Vieil, *L'art de la peinture sur verre et de la vitrerie par feu*, Académie Royale des Sciences. Descriptions des Arts et Métiers 14 ([Paris]: de l’Imprimerie de L.F. Delatour, 1774). 2nd ed. in Descriptions des arts et métiers faites ou approuvées par Messieurs de l’Académie royale des sciences de Paris 13 (Neuchâtel, 1781), translated into German by C. Harrepeter in 1779-80: see Vaassen, “Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom, 166.

⁴⁰² Virginia Chieffo Raguin, “Revivals, Revivalists, and Architectural Stained Glass,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 49 (1990), 313 and Henry Kraus, “Notre-Dame’s Vanished Medieval Glass, I. The Iconography,” *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, ser. 6, 68 (1966): 131-48; according to Kraus (p. 132), the destruction of stained glass at Notre-Dame continued into the first decades of the nineteenth century.

⁴⁰³ Le Vieil, *L'art de la peinture sur verre*, 23. Fiorillo names Le Vieil without providing the citation, in his *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland und den vereinigten Niederlanden*, vol. 1 (Hannover: Bei den Brüdern Hahn, 1815; facsimile reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1995), 199.

⁴⁰⁴ Marie-Alexandre Lenoir, *Description historique et chronologique des monumens de sculpture réunis au Musée des monumens français, ... augmentée d’une dissertation sur la barbe et les costumes de chaque siècle et d’un traité de la peinture sur verre...*, 7th ed. (Paris: Chez l’Auteur, Laurent Guyot, Levrault; Augsburg: Tezari, 1803), 298. Schlegel, “Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde,” 105, cites no. 16, a panel depicting St. Veronica at the Passion, and no. 18, the Annunciation. Schlegel’s editor mistakenly identifies Schlegel’s

spring of 1804, in the last essay that he wrote on art for *Europa* before leaving Paris for Cologne.⁴⁰⁵ Stained glass was not only its own branch of painting; it challenged contemporary taste in color just as composers were challenging contemporary taste in music:

Just as shrill dissonances are often used with great significance in the music of great masters to give expression to passion bordering confusion, so the almost garish colors of stained glass must be superbly suited to impress the whole depth of the greatest suffering and Christ's Passion with full power in the eye and heart of the viewer.⁴⁰⁶

Such windows were perfectly suited to the architecture of which they formed a part:

Where in the choir of Old Gothic churches the narrow windows rise to a height that is nearly immeasurable to the eye, there is hardly possible for any painting to have an effect; there the stained glass functions just like carpets woven of colorful crystals, like a translucent mosaic of brightly shining gemstones blended together in large groups most skillfully, where the sky breaks in through the world's most splendid colors like bright flames; they appear in this manner as a whole and in abundance, if at the same time rarely and only in certain specific lighting can any single one be entirely clearly distinguished.⁴⁰⁷

reference as referring to Lenoir's similarly titled *Musée des Monuments Français; ou description historique et chronologique des statues, ... bas-reliefs et tombeaux des hommes et de femmes célèbres, pour servir à l'histoire de France et à celle de l'art*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1800-1806).

⁴⁰⁵ Schlegel, "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde," 105-06. The composition of the essay is dated to Spring, 1804.

⁴⁰⁶ "So wie die grellen Dissonanzen in der Musik von großen Meistern oft zum Ausdruck der höchsten, fast an Verzweiflung grenzenden Leidenschaft mit größter Bedeutsamkeit genutzt worden sind, so dürften die beinahe schreienden Farben der Glasmalerei vorzüglich geschickt sein, die ganze Tiefe der höchsten Leiden und Leidensgeschichten mit voller Gewalt in Auge und Herz der Beschauer einzudrücken." Schlegel, "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde," 106.

⁴⁰⁷ "Wo im Chor altgotischer Kirchen die schmalen Fenster in eine dem Auge fast unermessliche Höhe steigen, da wirken die Glasmalereien nur wie Teppiche von bunten Krystallen gewebt, wie eine durchsichtige Mosaik der hellstimmerndsten Edelsteine in großen Partien aufs kühnste durch einander geworfen, wo der Himmel durch die höchste Farbenpracht der Erde wie in lichten Flammen hereinbricht; sie wirken auf diese Weise im Ganzen und in Masse, wenn gleich selten und nur bei gewissen bestimmten Beleuchtungen jedes Einzelne ganz deutlich unterschieden werden kann." Schlegel, "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde," 106.

While Lenoir's publication was one of the fruits of his extensive efforts to save artworks threatened by the Revolution, Schlegel seemed to have some doubt as to the place of stained glass among the monuments of French art. He wrote that had seen better examples at St. Michael and Gudula in Brussels and in many places in Cologne than in Paris.⁴⁰⁸

From today's vantage point it is surprising that Schlegel should name the former Collegiate Church of St. Michael and Gudula (today Brussels' Cathedral of St. Michael) in this context. This building's principal windows date to the sixteenth century, and depict monumental scenes set into landscapes and architectural settings that extend across the rows of glazed surfaces as if the narrow lancets merely separated the viewer from a sacred world on the other side of a stone screen.⁴⁰⁹ The architectural settings are inspired by the buildings of sixteenth-century Italy and contrast rather than harmonize with the stone tracery into which they are set [**fig. 4.3 a**]. One of the most striking windows, however, a Last Judgment, was inspired not by contemporary Italian architecture but specifically by Michelangelo's fresco at the Sistine Chapel [**fig. 4.3 b-c and 5.5 h-1**]. Schlegel seems to have been unaware that in admiring these windows above the French examples he was preferring stained glass from a time when the Gothic style was waning and Michelangelo's influence was already widespread – that is, the time which he had earlier specified as marking the decline of art – and not stained glass from the “Old Gothic” tradition to which he apparently assumed all stained glass must belong.⁴¹⁰ His

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁹ Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 21.

⁴¹⁰ In that the later nineteenth-century historiography of stained glass, the glazing of St. Michael and Gudula in Brussels, along with that of St. Janskerk in Gouda, would come to mark the climaxes and endpoints of the tradition. See Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 21.

understanding of German and Italian art from the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries as parallel highpoints of the medieval era (as discussed in Chapter One) helps to explain how he might have interpreted such windows as in some sense Gothic. Nevertheless, it seems Schlegel had not given the relationship of stained glass to his periodization of medieval styles much thought.

Whether Schlegel knew in 1804 of Prince Franz's collection at Wörlitz or Le Vieil's work (as a renovator or a scholar) is not clear from his essay.⁴¹¹ By 1815, however, that stained glass was a Gothic, or German art form appears to have been established among both collectors and scholars in German lands, though it was still no more strongly associated with one Gothic period than the other. When Heinrich Friedrich Karl, Reichsfreiherr vom und zum Stein (1757-1831), one of the great liberal reformers of the era and a hero of the Wars of Liberation, was traveling the Rhine with Goethe, he purchased five stained glass panels remarkable both for their early date (ca. 1140-60) and for their inclusion of a self-portrait of the artist, Gerlachus, who had made and donated them [**fig. 4.4 a-b**].⁴¹² Stein purchased the panels for an Old German (generically Gothic) style tower that Christian Zais was building for him as a victory monument at his family

⁴¹¹ Schlegel did not mention the stained glass of St. Denis, and wrote that "die Kirche Notre Dame, das einzige Gebäude daselbst, was als ein wahrhaftes Kunstwerk der Architektur betrachtet werden kann, aber ungünstig und niedrig gelegen, nicht fertig gebaut, und inwendig durch Modernisierung der Säulen usw. schrecklich verschimpft worden ist, enthält keine bedeutende Verzierungen der Art." Schlegel, "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde," 106. It would appear from this account that Schlegel was not responding directly to Le Vieil and was also unaware of the stained glass that had been removed from Notre Dame only a generation or so ago.

⁴¹² The panels have since been loaned to the Westfälisches Landesmuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte, Münster. See Rüdiger Becksmann, "Glasmalerei," cat. no. 400 in *Die Zeit der Staufer*, v. 1 (Stuttgart: Württembergisches Landesmuseum, 1977), 278-79, and Becksmann, *Deutsche Glasmalerei des Mittelalters. Eine exemplarische Auswahl* (Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen, 1988), pp. 94-95 and plate 2.

seat in Nassau. In so doing, he followed the example set by Prince Franz. But from the outset, Stein's project to build a victory monument had a more focused patriotic purpose than that of the Gothic House at Wörlitz, leading to entirely different design challenges.

A likely unwitting difference was the nature of the stained glass Stein had purchased: while both he and the Prince Franz considered stained glass to be a German art identified with the Old German style, the Prince's collection consisted of late and post-medieval pieces, while Stein had collected much earlier works. Moreover, an English Gothic Revival building had served as the inspiration and initial model for Wörlitz (Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill Mansion in Twickenham, 1752-1770s), which helps to explain the Gothic House's particularly dilute and idiosyncratic Gothicizing motifs. For his model Stein chose what he took to be a representative example of authentically Old German architecture: the Glockenturm (bell tower) of Heidelberg Castle, which, as the castle's most prominent feature, had come to symbolize the complex as a whole [fig. 4.5; fig. 4.6].⁴¹³ Stein and Zais looked to the upper three octagonal stories of this tower, with their stringcourses and tracery windows in what is today considered a Late Gothic style, which had been built onto the base of an earlier defensive tower during the first half of the sixteenth century.⁴¹⁴

⁴¹³ On the (bell) tower at Heidelberg as the model for Stein's tower in Nassau, see Frank Schwieger, *Johann Claudius von Lassaulx, 1781-1848. Architekt und Denkmalpfleger in Koblenz* (Neuss: Gesellschaft für Buchdruckerei, 1968), 67. Zais's "gothischer Turm zum Andenken an die Befreiungskriege" became the highpoint of a visit to Nassau, where Stein's family seat had become "eine Stelle voll ernster Erinnerungen." Baedeker, *Handbuch für Reisende in Deutschland* (3rd ed.), 392.

⁴¹⁴ Georg Dehio, *Handbuch der Deutschen Kunstdenkmäler*, [v. 1]: *Baden-Württemberg*, revised by Friedrich Piel (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1964), 194; Bernd Müller, *Architekturführer Heidelberg. Bauten um 1000-2000*, Sonderveröffentlichungen des Stadtarchivs Heidelberg, no. 10 (Mannheim: Edition Quadrat, 1998), 30-31.

The Glockenturm had stood in ruins since lightning struck it in 1764. Because much of the castle's fortification had long since been destroyed by Louis XIV when he attempted to claim the region for France, the largely abandoned castle had already come to symbolize not merely the generic passage of time, but specifically the history of German suffering at French hands. Writers, artists and travelers, Goethe not least among them, had long celebrated the sight of the decaying castle and the view over Heidelberg down to the Neckar River and across the Rhine valley from the verandah beside the Glockenturm.⁴¹⁵ The choice of this ruin as a model helped to make Stein's tower a powerful symbol of regeneration in the wake of French aggression.

Christian Zais (1770-1820), Building Inspector for the Duchy of Hesse-Nassau since 1805, devoted his career to building up the duchy's new capital, Wiesbaden, with neoclassical buildings on a neoclassical town plan. That Stein chose Zais to build his Old German tower (the general outlines of which Stein appears to have drawn up on his own) speaks to the novel symbolism of medieval architecture at this euphoric moment, when it could be assumed that no special knowledge was necessary to produce a work that was sufficiently Gothic to be easily read as symbolic of Germany (and its virtuous medieval particularism) freed from France (and its false Enlightenment universals). Zais, nevertheless, did not find the commission to be simple. He received it by October 1814, a

⁴¹⁵ On the development of the castle's significance as a ruin and as a patriotic and art historical monument see, e.g., Fritz Sauer, *Das Heidelberger Schloß im Spiegel der Literatur. Eine Studie über die entwicklungsgeschichtlichen Phasen seiner Betrachtungsweise* (Heidelberg: Carl Winger's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1910; reprint: Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1977).

few months after the fall of Napoleon that the tower was intended to celebrate.⁴¹⁶ The following summer, with Stein, Goethe and Boisserée all in Wiesbaden, he still found himself challenged enough by the project that he cornered Boisserée to discuss the plans in detail. Boisserée was impressed by the demands Stein was making, if not by the artistic vision:

I must say, may God preserve anyone from becoming a private architect – because the best must become botchers for all the demands that the people make. But what should I think of a gentleman who massively constructs an Old German octagonal tower, allowing it to be jammed in between two modern buildings, at the same time connecting and culminating the living and working quarters...⁴¹⁷

What precisely troubled Zais is not clear. Whether or not he was at home with the function of the building in relation to the adjoining structures, he certainly was new to its style. Among the exterior features that today stand out as distinct from the medieval

⁴¹⁶ As noted by Sulpiz Boisserée on Oct. 18th 1814: “Baumeister Zais von Wiesbaden. baut einen gotischen Turm für Minister Stein zu Nassau.” Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, v. 1, 166.

⁴¹⁷ “Das muß ich sagen, Gott behüte einen daß man kein Haus-Baumeister wird – da muß der Beste zum Pfuscher werden vor allen den Forderungen die die Menschen machen. Aber was soll ich von einem Herrn denken, der einen achteckigen altdeutschen Turm massig aufbauen, zwischen zwei moderne Gebäude einklemmen läßt als Verbindung und wieder Abschluß des Wohnhauses und der Wirtschafts-Gebäude...” Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, v. 1, 166 (18 October, 1814) and 237 (August 6, 1815). The design has long been attributed to Johann Claudius von Lassaulx, who began his architectural career by helping to renovate the estate for Stein, and attributed to 1814, though construction on the tower did not begin until 1815, when Lassaulx was back in Koblenz: see Schwieger, *Johann Claudius von Lassaulx, 1781-1848*, 67. There does not appear to be any evidence for this attribution. Christian Zais was the architect in charge at the estate from the summer of 1814 through the completion of the project, and so seems the more likely candidate, though the most recent monograph on Lassaulx still argues for Lassaulx as having strongly influenced Zais’s design or even having designed it in conjunction with Stein without Zais’s input: see Udo Liessem, *Studien zum Werk von Johann Claudius von Lassaulx, 1781-1848* (Koblenz: Görres-Verlag, 1989), 202-04. The evidence provided by Boisserée’s diary entries concerning his conversations with Zais were not noted by Schwieger or Liessem. As Boisserée depicts Zais as still struggling to satisfy Stein with the tower’s design after Lassaulx’s departure and never mentions Lassaulx in conjunction with the project, it seems reasonably certain that Stein provided the basic idea and Zais, not Lassaulx, was responsible for its fulfillment.

model in Heidelberg is the quatrefoil roof balustrade: before it caught fire, the tower had had a domed roof surmounted by a cupola serving as a belfry (which had given the tower its name). Perhaps Stein desired to incorporate an accessible roof from which one could view the surrounding region, as one could from the verandah by the Glockenturm. The roof balustrade also suggests that, although reconstructing a medieval ruin close to home, Stein and Zais adopted some of the Georgian character of the contemporary Gothic revival architecture of England. This would not be terribly surprising as Stein was, like the Prince of Anhalt-Dessau, a great Anglophile.⁴¹⁸

Another evident stylistic concern, which was perhaps not perceived as such at the time, was how to integrate Gerlachus's stained glass panels into this building. The incompatibility between the stained glass and the architecture in this regard was representative of early attempts to integrate authentically medieval polychromy into medieval revival architecture. Unlike the eccentric and varied window openings at Wörlitz, which accommodated a wide range of smaller stained glass pieces, the window openings at Nassau were all lancets filled with geometric tracery not unlike that which could be inferred from the bell tower ruins. In fact, the arches of these windows were even more sharply pointed than those in Heidelberg—perhaps because the pointed arch was a defining feature of the Old German style that, with rigor unmatched at Wörlitz, Stein wished to reproduce. Neither the internal design of the stained glass panels that Stein had purchased for the tower, nor their overall shape—which indicated that they had

⁴¹⁸ While roof balustrades in eighteenth-century English Gothic revival architecture were relatively common, quatrefoil friezes in particular typically capped the designs of Batty Langley (1696-1751), a British landscape gardener and designer of the mid-eighteenth century who established orders for Gothic architecture equivalent to the classical orders, and published numerous Gothic revival pattern books disseminating his ideas. See Megan Aldrich, *Gothic Revival* (London: Phaidon, 1994), 40 and 44.

been created for round-arched openings with no tracery—seem to have suggested anything in particular regarding their compatibility with this Old German style to Zais, or to Stein, Goethe, or the Boisserées, though all of them were aware of Zais’s project and were at the forefront of those investigating the medieval monuments of the Rhine at the time.⁴¹⁹

In Bavaria, where the monuments of the kingdom’s many new possessions were also being investigated and assessed, the style and character of the stained glass windows of Augsburg Cathedral’s nave (ca. 1100), which were similarly round-arched and without tracery went similarly unremarked for another couple of generations before being recognized as the earliest surviving intact and in situ stained glass windows anywhere [fig. 4.7].⁴²⁰ In the same year that Stein made his purchases in the Rhineland, however, Fiorillo published evidence which he believed demonstrated that the art of stained glass had originated not only in Germany, but by the late tenth century and in the former Bavarian abbey of Tegernsee.⁴²¹ Previously, according to Fiorillo, no one had managed to

⁴¹⁹ Sulpiz Boisserée’s brother Melchior was among those who had already developed a particular interest in stained glass, focusing on the stability of glass colors, according to Sulpiz’s reports on the subject to Goethe in letters written in 1816-17: see Leinz, “Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik,” 408.

⁴²⁰ On the Augsburg windows see Becksmann, *Deutsche Glasmalerei des Mittelalters*, 92-93 and plate 1. The earliest scholarly discussion of these windows, as cited by Becksmann, is Thomas Herberger, *Die ältesten Glasgemälde im Dome zu Augsburg* (Augsburg, 1860; reprint, 1979). Becksmann argues (p. 93) that at approximately the same date that these windows were created for Augsburg, the clerestory windows of Speyer Cathedral “mit farblich und formal verwandten monumentalen Standfiguren verglast worden sein.” Important and likewise long unremarked, late Romanesque (1220-30) stained glass was also present at Regensburg Cathedral: see Achim Hubel, “Das spätromanische Wurzel-Jesse-Fenster des Domes,” in *Die Glasmalereien des Regensburger Domes* (Munich: Schnell und Steiner, 1981), 15-15 and plates 2-6.

⁴²¹ “Die einzige merkwürdige Stelle, welche das hohe Alter dieser Kunst in Deutschland, und zwar in Baiern beweiset, befindet sich in einem Briefe des Abtes von Tegernsee, Gozperfs, (983-1001) an einen Grafen Arnold. ... [A footnote here refers the reader to a

document the existence of stained glass in Germany prior to the thirteenth century, or anywhere earlier than those at St. Denis that Le Vieil had attributed to the twelfth century.⁴²²

This development excited Stieglitz who, upon recounting Fiorillo's discovery in 1820, added his own opinion that the inspiration for this development had come from Byzantine mosaics.⁴²³ Le Vieil had asserted that stained glass substituted for the art of painting that had declined along with ancient Greece, and had originated in France, inspired by the Greek mosaic tradition as imitated by the Romans and practiced in medieval Italy. Le Vieil did not emphasize a Byzantine role in the history of stained glass, nor did he consider Germany to have contributed to the art of stained glass; in addition to France, he credited England and the Low Countries.⁴²⁴ In his historiography

quotation from this letter.] Aus der Beschreibung des Abtes ersieht man, daß die gemahlten Glasfenster eine der neuesten Erfindungen waren, dergleichen man weder von den Alten gehört, noch von der Gegenwart hoffen konnte." Fiorillo, *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland* 1, 198; see also 177-78, 184 and 197. Abbot Gozpert (or Gozbert), previously a monk at St. Emmeram, founded a school at Tegernsee Abbey and oversaw advances in book arts that served as a model for other Bavarian monasteries. Josef Hemmerle, *Die Benediktinerklöster in Bayern*, Germania Benedictina 2: Bayern (Augsburg: Kommissionsverlag Winfried-Werk 1970), 297.

⁴²² "Ungeachtet mehrere gelehrte Männer dem Ursprung und dem Fortgang der Glasmahlerei nachgespürt haben, so ist es ihnen dennoch nicht geglückt, vor dem dreizehnten Jahrhundert in Deutschland eine Spur davon zu finden...."; "...Und le Vieil... entdeckte ebenfalls keine ältere Denkmähler unserer Kunst, als die Fensterscheiben zu St. Denis, welche aus dem zwölften Jahrhundert seyn sollen, aber es schwerlich sind. So wenig le Vieil in Frankreich, so wenig entdeckte er in Italien und England...." Fiorillo, *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland*, 1:198 and 199.

⁴²³ Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 116-17. In making this assertion, Stieglitz may have been encouraged by Fiorillo's account of Tegernsee as having had the earliest documentary evidence of mosaics in Bavaria (a mosaic floor installed by Abbot Eberhard, d. 1091). Fiorillo, *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland*, 1:208-09. Schlegel had also compared stained glass to mosaics in "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde," 106.

⁴²⁴ Le Vieil, *L'Art de la peinture sur verre*, iv, 9, and 17.

Stieglitz both stressed the Byzantine over the Roman component of Le Vieil's account and embraced Fiorillo's German rather than French patriotic twist.

Until it was secularized in 1803, Tegernsee had been the most important Benedictine foundation of the Duchy of Bavaria; since much of it was converted into a Wittelsbach summer palace in 1817,⁴²⁵ the abbey was intimately familiar and of personal interest to Ludwig. Once he acceded to the throne Ludwig became a prominent patron of the Benedictine order, which he regarded as truly German.⁴²⁶ In the meantime, quickly following Tegernsee's purchase, and perhaps inspired by the new-found association with the history of stained glass accorded not only to the abbey, but also to Benedictinism, Bavaria, and Germany, Ludwig embarked on his campaign to revive this art in Bavaria.

3. Ludwig's Early Fascination with Classical Polychromy

Crown Prince Ludwig was already at the forefront of art patrons who not only knew of, but also embraced, the use of color in classical and classicizing art and architecture. His acquaintance with evidence of ancient polychromy had originated with his purchase of sculptures from the pediments of the Temple of Aphaia at Aigina (ca. late sixth and fifth centuries BC) in 1811.⁴²⁷ As noted by excavators Carl Haller von

⁴²⁵ For the abbey's history see Hemmerle, *Benediktinerklöster in Bayern*, 297-304, and the Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte website: <http://www.datenmatrix.de/projekte/hdbg/kloster/html-data/geschichte_ks0405.php>. Neither account mentions, however, the connection drawn by Fiorillo (and espoused by Stieglitz, if not by Ludwig and others as well) between Tegernsee Abbey and the history of stained glass.

⁴²⁶ Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 526.

⁴²⁷ See Harry Francis Mallgrave, *Gottfried Semper: Architect of the Nineteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 31-34, and Adrian von Buttlar, "Klenzes Beitrag zur Polychromie-Frage," in *Ein griechischer Traum. Leo von Klenze der*

Hallerstein (1774-1817) and Charles Robert Cockerell (1788-1863), these sculptures, the raison d'être of the Glyptothek, were rich in traces of ancient polychromy. Cockerell, who had hoped to see the sculptures go to the British Museum, published a discussion of their polychromy in 1819.⁴²⁸ In the meantime, Johann Martin von Wagner (1777-1858), a classicizing painter and sculptor and Ludwig's art agent in Rome,⁴²⁹ and the philosopher Friedrich von Schelling (1775-1854), since 1807 General Secretary of the Munich Academy of Visual Arts, published their own report on Munich's new sculptures in 1817. In it Wagner drew bold conclusions concerning the ancient use of color.⁴³⁰ Building on Wagner's arguments, Schelling assessed the

... necessary decline of art through the isolation and ultimately complete separation of the arts that promote one another—architecture, painting and sculpture—that, given the degree to which [the separation] is now taking place,

Archäologe, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek (Munich: Staatliche Antikensammlung und Glyptothek, 1985), 213-14.

⁴²⁸ C.R. Cockerell described "the painted pedimental sculptures [that he had] unearthed on the island of Aegina in 1811... [with] Carl Haller von Hallerstein as confirmation of Pliny and Pausanias, in which 'we have a very remarkable, and very ancient example of the practice which prevailed among the Greeks, of painting their sculpture; for the style and execution of the colours found on the statues and ornaments of the temple, prove that they cannot be of any other date than the original construction.'" C.R. Cockerell, "On the Aegina Marbles," in *Journal of Science and the Arts* 6:12 (London, 1819), 340, as cited and discussed by Harry Francis Mallgrave, introduction to Gottfried Semper, *The Four Elements of Architecture and Other Writings*, trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Wolfgang Hermann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 6-7 and nn. 24 and 28. Mallgrave notes that Cockerell was expanding here on the general theory of Greek polychromy which Quatremère de Quincy had published in *Le Jupiter olympien, ou l'art de la sculpture antique considéré sous un nouveau point de vue* (Paris, 1815), which was in turn based on lectures he had given a decade earlier. See also Mallgrave, *Gottfried Semper: Architect of the Nineteenth Century*, 29-38.

⁴²⁹ See Raimund Wünsche, "Johann Martin von Wagner," cat. no. 3 in *Das neue Hellas: Griechen und Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I.*, ed. Reinhold Baumstark (Munich: Hirmer, 2000), 211-12, with references.

⁴³⁰ Buttlar, "Klenzes Beitrag zur Polychromie-Frage," 213.

would have to finally ensue as soon as painting and sculpture, instead of serving the public, should become mere objects of the appreciation of private persons.”⁴³¹

In this call to reunify the arts, Schelling expanded the question of where and how color was used in Classical Greece to ask where and how the arts reflected the cohesiveness or decay of modern society. Klenze praised Cockerell, among others, when drawing his own more timid conclusions concerning the ancient use of color in an address given in 1821 (subsequently published), and in 1822 he noted that Ludwig had begun pushing him towards new building projects that would illustrate and explore the growing understanding of classical polychromy.⁴³² Ludwig, however, had already looked beyond Cockerell to embrace Schelling’s concerns about artistic and social cohesion, and beyond classical polychromy to pursue the question of polychromy in medieval art and architecture – and just how he was going to revive that, as well.

In 1818, when Ludwig contracted with Peter Cornelius to create monumental frescoes for the Glyptothek in Munich, Ludwig’s explorations of classical polychromy

⁴³¹ “...nothwendigen Verfall der Kunst durch Isolierung und endlich völlige Trennung der sich gegenseitig fordernden Künste, der Architectur, Malerei und Sculptur, die bis zu dem Grad, in welchem sie jetzt stattfindet, vollends erfolgen mußte, sobald Malerei und Bildhauerkunst, anstatt dem Oeffentlichen zu dienen, bloße Gegenstände der Liebhaberei von Privatpersonen wurden.” Friedrich Schelling, in J. M. von Wagner, *Bericht über die Aeginetischen Bildwerke im Besitz seiner Kgl. Hoheit des Kronprinzen von Bayern. Mit kunstgeschichtlichen Anmerkungen von F.W.J. Schelling* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1817), as cited and discussed in Buttlar, “Klenzes Beitrag zur Polychromie-Frage,” 213.

⁴³² Leo von Klenze, “Versuch einer Wiederherstellung des toscanischen Tempels nach seinen historischen und technischen Analogien (vorgelesen in der philosophisch-philologischen Classe den 3. März 1821),” in *Denkschriften der Kgl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München für die Jahre 1821 und 1822*, v. 8 (Munich, 1824), 1-86, and Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, Klenzeana I, 1 = Memorabilien I, 124r. In the Memorabilien Klenze wrote: “2. Sept. [1822] äußerte er (Ludwig) nach vielfachen Gesprächen mit mir über die Farbanwendung in der Architektur und Wünsche, dazu Gelegenheit zu finden, den Gedanken, dereinst einen polychromen Tempel im englischen Garten oder auf dem Gasteigberge erbauen zu lassen, welchen ich begierig ergriff und nähern werde.” Both citations from Buttlar, “Klenzes Beitrag zur Polychromie-Frage,” 213-14.

were more advanced than those of medieval polychromy, and neither patron nor artist appears to have given much thought to wall paintings that predated Raphael.⁴³³ Nor does either appear to have considered stained glass equal to fresco painting as an aspect of public architecture that ministered to the populace, even though Ludwig established the Royal Glass Institute (*Königliche Glasmalereianstalt*) in Munich in the same year that he commissioned the Glyptothek frescoes. The Nuremberg porcelain painter Michael Sigmund Frank, whose efforts to revive the art of stained glass Ludwig had long supported, agreed in 1818 to continue his experiments at the Royal Porcelain Manufactory (*Königliche Porzellanmanufaktur*), based at Nymphenburg, a summer palace just outside Munich.⁴³⁴ (Frank was not stationed at Nymphenburg itself but in Munich, at the porcelain-painting workshop.⁴³⁵) Munich's Royal Glass Institute compared well with similar efforts in Cologne, Berlin, Dresden and Vienna: as the Nymphenburg foreman Carl Schmitz proudly reported in 1819, Munich's progress in

⁴³³ Cornelius contracted to paint the interior of the Glyptothek in April, 1818, while living in Rome. He arrived in Munich in late October, 1819; the painting began on June 9th, 1820. See Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 1:xiii.

⁴³⁴ Frank had been firing enamel paints onto sheets of glass in an effort to approximate medieval style stained glass since at least 1808, when he sent an example to Ludwig, who in return gave him money and space in Nuremberg Castle to continue his experiments. See Vaassen, "Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom," 166. In 1818 Ludwig hired Frank, who had just quit working for Ludwig Kraft Ernst, Prince of Öttingen-Wallerstein. Wallerstein had been building up his art collection at his castle (as an Upper German pendant to the Low German collection formed by the Boisserées and Bertram) and, in 1814, had engaged Frank to establish a glassworks at the castle to continue to perfect his stained glass techniques based on examples in the collection. See Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 159-62 and Karl-Heinz Zuber, *Der "Fürst Proletarier" Ludwig von Oettingen-Wallerstein (1791-1870). Adeliges Leben und konservative Reformpolitik im konstitutionellen Bayern* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1978), 37-39, who cites the source-rich treatment ("die materialreiche Abhandlung") by Georg Grupp, "Fürst Ludwig von Oettingen-Wallerstein als Museumsgründer," *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins für Nördlingen und Umgebung*, v. 6 (1917): 73-110.

⁴³⁵ Vaassen, "Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom," 168 n. 8

creating stained glass windows was already more advanced than these others.⁴³⁶ Even though it was hardly the first such workshop, moreover, within fifteen years Munich had surpassed all other stained glass production, both in the manufacture of colored glass and in the quality of its painting.⁴³⁷

⁴³⁶ Friedrich Schlegel described a Spring 1818 visit to a large private stained glass collection in Cologne, organized according to the chronological development of the art from its origins until its decline in the revised version of his “Dritter Nachtrag alter Gemälde,” first published in his collected works in 1823; see Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen*, 138 n. I. This has been identified as the Hirn collection, which was probably the most important collection of stained glass of Cologne, a city that had rapidly developed as a center of interest in the subject: see Herbert Rode, “Ramboux’ Plan einer Glasgemäldegalerie – ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte des Städtischen Museums Köln,” *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 29 (1967): 335. It is not clear whether Ludwig knew of the Hirn collection at this time, or of the increasing engagement in investigating the history of the subject that it demonstrated, but at least at the level of production his interest in medieval revival-style stained glass appears to have been competitive. In 1826 the pharmacist J. Schmithals of Xanten published the first German-language work of the nineteenth century on the production of medieval-style stained glass, *Glasmalerei der Alten*, in Lemgo in 1826, in which he focused on formulas for enamel paints: enamel paints were still the primary means of trying to replicate stained glass windows as colored sheet glass was still of limited quality and quantity. Frank focused entirely on enamel paint until 1824-28, when he experimented, apparently with success, in producing colored glass at the glassworks in the secularized monastery of Benedictbeuern. See Vaassen, “Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom,” 167-69. By 1830, Frank’s work at the Munich stained glass workshop had been superseded and Frank had returned to Nuremberg. See Leinz, “Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik,” 407 and 410; on Öttingen-Wallerstein and his art collection (which would be purchased by Ludwig I in 1828) see Renger, “Ihm welcher der Andacht Tempel baut,” 63-65. Paris was also a notable site of early efforts in reviving stained glass manufacture, but there does not appear to have been much contact between Bavarian and Parisian efforts before the article “Glasmalerei in München und Paris, Brief des Herrn v. Schelling, Präsidenten der Kgl. Akademie der Wissenschaften in München an Herrn Saint Marc Girardin...” appeared in the *Morgenblatt für Gebildete Stände*, Beilage: *Schorn’s Kunstblatt* (1839), cited in Veit Loers, “Die Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms und seine Restauration unter König Ludwig I. von Bayern (1827-29),” in Schwaiger, *Der Regensburger Dom: Beiträge zu seiner Geschichte*, n. 77.

⁴³⁷ Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 178.

4. Crown Prince Ludwig's early explorations of medieval polychromy in tandem with late classicizing renovations at Bamberg cathedral

Ludwig's patronage of stained glass and fresco painting in tandem, if not explicitly as historically related, from 1818, set the stage for the course of renovations at Bamberg and Regensburg that began in the following decade. The connection between Nazarene fresco painting and what was understood as the Byzantine style would be made by 1827, almost a decade later. At the same time, and in contradistinction to the evolving definition of Byzantine, stained glass would come to be more or less exclusively associated with what was understood as the German style.⁴³⁸ These developments provided the basis for broader claims such as those made by Gottfried Semper in the 1830s, that classical Greek polychromy was the progenitor of medieval polychromy: these claims, as will be seen in the next chapter, provided conceptual bridges across cultural and not simply stylistic divides and the rationale for buildings designed to embody these cultural bridges.

⁴³⁸ In 1824 the Hirn collection in Cologne went up for auction: the auction catalogue by Matthias Joseph de Noël, *Verzeichnis einer großen Sammlung gebrannter Gläser der Glasmalerei*, was heralded by Goethe among others as an exemplary contribution to the history of stained glass: see Elga Böhm, "Matthias Joseph de Noël (1782-1849). Erster Konservator des Kölner Museums 'Wallrafianum,'" *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 41 (1980): 173. In 1827 when the next major collection went up for auction, that of Christian Geerling, a lavish catalogue was produced, *Sammlung von Ansichten alter enkaustischer Glasgemälde nebst erläuterndem Text*, which along with De Noël's catalog may be numbered among the first scholarly contributions to the subject since Le Vieil's; the subscription list for Geerling's catalogue included Ludwig I as well as Friedrich Wilhelm, Crown Prince of Prussia. See Birgitte Wolff-Wintrich, "Kölner Glasmalereisammlungen des 19. Jahrhunderts," in *Lust and Verlust. Kölner Sammler zwischen Trikolore und Preußenadler*, ed. Hiltrud Kier and Frank Künter Zehnder (Cologne: Wienand, 1995), 342-44 and Raguin, "Revivals, Revivalists, and Architectural Stained Glass," 323. Analysis of any impact of these collections and catalogues might have had on the Bavarian revival of stained glass under Ludwig (or the impact of Ludwig's efforts on the developing scholarship these collections and catalogues represent) is lacking.

Ludwig's interest in polychromy would come to play a great, even defining role in his efforts to renovate Byzantine and German-style buildings and to build new ones in these styles. The mixed results of his commissions have led to underestimation of his role in the exploration of medieval polychromy, and nowhere more so than at Bamberg's Cathedral of St. Peter and St. George [**figs. 4.8 a-d**].⁴³⁹ This basilica, with its transept at the west and apses flanked by towers at both ends, displays strong links to the Romanesque architecture of the Rhineland, and especially to the basilica (formerly a cathedral) at Worms [**fig. 4.9 a-b**], and is today considered an outstanding Late Romanesque monument. In the course of restoring it in the 1820s and 1830s, what were then considered Byzantine and German polychromy were distinguished from one another in a manner that found long-term resonance in scholarship as well as in historical and historicizing architecture. As noted above, the nearly parallel restorations at Regensburg's Cathedral of St. Peter (ca. 1273 – ca. 1520, with later additions) [**figs. 4.10 a-b**] were key to this development. Regensburg, a basilica whose western façade is flanked by towers that remained incomplete until later in the nineteenth century, has a south transept at the eastern end, but no corresponding north transept as a tower from a previous building still stands in this location. It is the only High Gothic cathedral in Bavaria.⁴⁴⁰

⁴³⁹ The original Bamberg Cathedral was constructed in 1007-12. This building was largely destroyed by fire in 1081, and was rebuilt during the tenure of Bishop Otto I (1102-39). After this building was in turn destroyed by fire in 1185, Bishop Ekbert von Andechs-Meran had the present, new and larger building erected: this was begun ca. 1215-20 and dedicated in 1237. See Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine Restauration*, p. 76 and nn. 867-68 (as numbered in text) / 868-69 (as numbered in endnotes).

⁴⁴⁰ The first cathedral on the present site in Regensburg was constructed ca. 700; subsequently it was enlarged and rebuilt more than once. The present building dates largely from 1273 to ca. 1520, when construction on the ambitious project ceased. The

Even though Bamberg Cathedral was among the few medieval monuments that had survived the Napoleonic wars without falling into disrepair, Ludwig looked to it first as the most appropriate location for the stained-glass windows Frank would create. In 1820 Ludwig sent Klenze, along with the Nymphenburg foreman Carl Schmitz, to Munich's Frauenkirche (*Kirche zu Unserer Lieben Frau*, 1468-94) [**fig. 4.11 a-b**], to compare the surviving late Gothic stained glass windows in its choir with the Nymphenburg experiments.⁴⁴¹ The major window Klenze and Schmidt would have seen there, a five-lancet tracery window of ca. 1488-93, known after the donors as the Scharfzandt, is the largest work associated with the Strasbourg stained-glass artist Peter Hemmel (ca. 1425-after 1500) and his workshop [**fig. 4.11 c-d**].⁴⁴²

first major renovation occurred in the seventeenth century; during the nineteenth century the building was both renovated and completed. For an overview see Achim Hubel and Manfred Schuller, with Friedrich Fuchs und Renate Kroos, *Der Dom zu Regensburg. Vom Bauen und Gestalten einer gotischen Kathedrale* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1995).

⁴⁴¹ Leinz, "Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik," 407.

⁴⁴² See Paul Frankl, *Peter Hemmel. Glasmaler von Andlau* (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1956), 104-115 and figs. 192-226. Fiorillo had discussed the Frauenkirche's windows in some detail in 1815, marveling that "die Farben sind in die Gläser hineingetränkt oder eigentlich geschmolzen, und die Gemälde selbst stellen meistens biblische Geschichten vor. Die Fenster dieser Kirche waren ehemals nach der Südseite mit solchen bemahlten Gläsern ganz versehen, und bildeten einen schönen bunten Vorhang, um die Sonnenstrahlen abzuhalten, wodurch weder die Menschen von der Sonne geblendet, noch Malereien und andre Kunstsachen hiedurch abgebleicht oder sonst verdorben werden konnten.... aber, ... wurden die Fenster mit neuen weißen Glastafeln versehen, und die farbigen abwechselnd, bald oben bald unten, beibehalten." He did not specifically discuss the windows in the choir (where none were replaced with clear glass), nor did he mention Hemmel (he named Egidius Trautenwolf and Johann Hebenstreit). Fiorillo, *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland*, 212-13. It is not clear from these accounts that Klenze or Ludwig knew of Hemmel by name, either, although Hemmel's windows, particularly the gothic canopies framing the figures, were soon serving as models for the windows made for Regensburg Cathedral (discussed below), and ultimately for much of the revival stained glass of nineteenth-century Germany. See Raguin, "Revivals, Revivalists, and Architectural Stained Glass," 323-24 and Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 20. (The figures of the nineteenth-century windows,

While it might seem that Hemmel's work, influenced as it was by the engravings of Martin Schongauer (ca. 1448-91), was not distant in style from the works of the late Gothic painters and engravers serving as Frank's models (Dürer and Lucas van Leyden), Klenze (not a fan of Gothic art or architecture) saw little resemblance between the Frauenkirche's windows and those Frank was making at Nymphenburg.⁴⁴³ Klenze, moreover, was less than enthusiastic concerning the artistic merit of the former: "as far as the style of the images is concerned, it varies greatly, on the whole however the figures are too small and the appearance wallpaper-like."⁴⁴⁴ Munich's Frauenkirche, a hall church, had windows extending nearly the entire height of the continuous exterior walls. In Bamberg Cathedral, a basilican church, the windows necessarily are divided between aisles and clerestory. Although not noting that they were of different building types, Klenze did further observe that Our Lady's tall mullioned lancets did not resemble the window openings at Bamberg, stating: "for Bamberg the dimensions, as far as I have

however, tended to echo the style of Nazarene paintings, giving the effect criticized by Adolphe Napoléon Didron in the quotation in Raguin, p. 316.)

⁴⁴³ Frankl, *Peter Hemmel. Glasmaler*, 133, suggests it was perhaps Hemmel who influenced Schongauer; in any event, the shared style and motives are striking. The goal of the stained glass efforts at the Royal Porcelain Manufactory, as described by Schmitz, was to reach again the level of the works of the brilliant epoch of stained glass "of the Middle Ages through the works of Lucas van Leyden and Albrecht Dürer in Germany" (*des Mittelalters, durch die Werke von Lukas von Leyden und Albrecht Dürer in Teutschland*). Leinz, "Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik," 407, citing Carl Schmitz, report dated Nov. 14, 1819, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Geheimes Hausarchiv München I A 40, IV.

⁴⁴⁴ "Was den Style den Bilder anbelangt, so ist er sehr verschieden, im Ganzen aber die Figuren zu klein und das Ansehen tapetenartig." Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Geheimes Hausarchiv München I A 36 I, Klenze to Ludwig no. 78, April 20th, 1820, as cited in Leinz, "Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik," p. 407 and n. 60.

been able to learn here, would hardly apply” [**fig. 4.8 a-d and 4.11 a-b (Bamberg & Frauenkirche)**].⁴⁴⁵

Crown Prince Ludwig’s interest in embellishing Bamberg had perhaps been an outgrowth of his deliberations as to whether he shouldn’t move his seat to Bamberg, rather than Munich, upon inheriting the Bavarian throne.⁴⁴⁶ Bamberg’s elevation to an archbishopric was also impending; in 1821 the newly re-established diocese of Speyer, as well as those of Eichstätt and Würzburg (all three previously suffragan to Mainz), were to be placed under Bamberg’s authority. For his part, the archbishop appears to have had little interest in his new seat – or at least, the place where it was located.⁴⁴⁷ Already, however, Bamberg possessed extraordinary symbolic significance for Ludwig and his lineage, the Wittelsbachs (who had ruled Bavaria since 1180). Duke Henry IV of Bavaria had founded the Bamberg diocese in 1007. By this date Henry was also King of the Eastern Franks (since 1002) and King of the Lombards (since 1004) and was soon to accede to the throne of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, which he would rule as Henry II (from 1014 to 1024).

⁴⁴⁵ “Für Bamberg würden die Maaße so viel ich hier habe erfahren können schwerlich passen.” Ibid.

⁴⁴⁶ Hubert Glaser, “‘Schwung hatte er, wie Keiner!’ König Ludwig I. von Bayern als Protektor der Künste,” in *Ludwig I. und die Neue Pinakothek*, ed. Herbert W. Rott (Cologne: Pinakothek-Dumont, 2003), 11-41; here, p. 19 n.14, citing Ludwig’s discussions with Klenze on this subject on Jan. 10, 19 and 24, and on Feb. 10, 20 und 28, 1819 as documented in Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Ludwig I.-Archiv 3, 39, pp. 30 f., 51, 63, 89-92, 120, and 142 f. As Crown Prince, Ludwig’s seat was in Würzburg.

⁴⁴⁷ The new Archbishop of Bamberg, Joseph Graf von Stubenberg, had already been named, though not officially installed, in 1818. His official installation took place on Nov. 11, 1821. Stubenberg had previously held the position of Prince Bishop of Eichstätt and remained in Eichstätt, concerning himself little with Bamberg’s cathedral, until his death in 1824. Achim Hubel, “Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes. Zur Geschichte der Denkmalpflege im frühen 19. Jahrhundert,” *Bericht des historischen Vereins Bamberg* 121 (1985): pp. 47-48 and n. 13.

Subsequently not only was Henry sainted (in 1146), but so was his wife Kunigunde (in 1200), making Bamberg Cathedral, where both are buried, a major pilgrimage site. Moreover, the bishop who rebuilt the cathedral following its first major fire (Otto of Bamberg, 1060 or 1061-1139) was canonized and buried in a church nearby, increasing the significance of both the cathedral and the town. Since Henry descended from the Bavarian branch of the Ottonian dynasty (and died without heir as the last emperor in the Ottonian lineage), renovation of his cathedral would help the Wittelsbachs to demonstrate the appropriateness of Bavarian rule in Franconia – a region Bavaria had gained under Napoleon.⁴⁴⁸ At the same time, it would illustrate Bavaria's ancient and current German national and spiritual significance at least as fully as the cathedral in Speyer – the other Bavarian cathedral closely associated with the rulers of the Holy Roman Empire.

Judging by his desire to endow Bamberg Cathedral with stained glass windows, Ludwig was distressed that the building did not sufficiently express these medieval (that is, Bavarian and German) origins on account of its overall colorlessness (a point which he would make more forcefully five years later, after inheriting the throne). Ludwig had little evidence, however, of the original polychromy from which to proceed. By the early

⁴⁴⁸ Henry had inherited the Duchy of Bavaria from his father, Duke Henry II (951-95), before acceding to the kingship of the Eastern Franks. Duke Henry II was the son of Duke Henry I of Bavaria, brother of Emperor Otto I. Napoleonic-era Bavaria had gained Franconia (or regained it, as Ludwig was trying to demonstrate through renovating Bamberg Cathedral, etc.) in a piecemeal fashion: the Prince-Bishoprics of Würzburg and Bamberg were seized in 1802 in advance of the legislated handover of power, leading to long-term resentment; Bavaria gained the Free City of Nuremberg and Margravate of Ansbach in 1806 and the Prussian Margravate of Bayreuth in 1810. Like the Bavarian Land on the Rhine, the region was confessionally mixed: Bamberg and Würzburg were largely Catholic, while other areas were largely Protestant and in part for this reason also resentful (even fearful) of Bavarian Catholic control. See Endres, "Franken und Bayern im Vormärz," 199-203.

nineteenth century the cathedral exhibited no trace of its original interior polychromy.⁴⁴⁹ In the course of renovations in 1611 Bamberg's stained glass windows had been removed.⁴⁵⁰ By the middle of the seventeenth century, moreover, most of the interior surfaces, including architectural sculpture, had received a coat of white paint, with capitals and vault bosses highlighted in gold, while articulating elements such as responds and ribbing had been painted in white faux marble and were set off by compound piers and moldings that were either left unpainted or painted the color of the underlying stone [**fig. 4.8 c: interior of Bamberg Cathedral from the west (ca. 1672-83)**].⁴⁵¹ The new, dark brown furnishings stood out within this brightened and whitened environment, as did their colorful, naturalistically painted figural sculptures.⁴⁵² The renovations had been directed by Georg Betz (1768-1832), the priest left in charge of Bamberg Cathedral during the years 1808-21, while the building served as a parish

⁴⁴⁹ Soon after Ludwig began his campaign to renovate Bamberg cathedral in 1826, Bamberg citizens came forward to donate some of the medieval stained glass panels that had been removed from the cathedral and come into private hands (see discussion below); if Ludwig or anyone else involved in the renovations knew of the existence of these panels before this date, they appear not to have mentioned them in any surviving documents.

⁴⁵⁰ On the removal of the stained glass windows from Bamberg Cathedral see Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine Restauration*, 87.

⁴⁵¹ Evidence of the Baroque architectural polychromy survives in the painting by Georg Adam Arnold of the interior of Bamberg Cathedral from the west (ca. 1672-83) in the Bamberg Diocesan Museum (on loan from the Bavarian National Museum) [**fig. 4.8 c**].

⁴⁵² These renovations of Bamberg Cathedral took place in 1648-53, as noted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine Restauration*, 11. Investigation of the surviving early Baroque altarpieces has demonstrated that their figural sculpture was brightly colored with naturalistic details which were first painted white in the course of Betz's early nineteenth-century renovations (discussed below). Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 58, 61 and 63.

church.⁴⁵³ Unfortunately no image of Betz's renovations survives. These were the ones that most directly attracted Ludwig's ire – apparently even before their conclusion.

That Bamberg Cathedral had not only been kept in repair but also had been carefully renovated during the Napoleonic period was highly unusual, and speaks to the Bavarian regime's recognition of the building's symbolic value from the outset of its seizure of Bamberg in 1802. In fact, Betz had proposed much more extensive renovations, which, in their first formulation, Karl von Fischer (1782-1820), the first professor of architecture at Munich's Academy of Visual Arts, had strongly rejected on the grounds that Bamberg was "a noteworthy monument of the unusual architecture of the eleventh century which would be worthy to maintain in its full originality."⁴⁵⁴ (Evidently Fischer believed the building dated to Henry II's day – its most important incarnation for Bavarian claims – although in fact the surviving building was constructed over two centuries later and had at best questionable associations with the Wittelsbachs, as discussed below.) In their second formulation Betz's plans received full approval from the authorities in Munich, and were limited instead by the authorities at Bamberg.⁴⁵⁵

⁴⁵³ Following the death of the former Prince Bishop in 1805, Bamberg Cathedral had ceased to function as the seat of a bishop. (The Bishop of Würzburg took responsibility for the diocese, along with his own, from his seat in Würzburg until his death in 1808). Georg Betz, "ein gebildeter, aktiver und engagierter Theologe" who had since 1801 ministered to a small parish that worshiped in the cathedral's north transept, found himself left in charge of the entire building. Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 47.

⁴⁵⁴ "...ein merkwürdiges Denkmal der sonderbaren Baukunst des 11^{ten} Jahrhunderts ist welches würdig wäre in seiner völligen Originalität fortzudauern." The evaluation was given to Ludwig on May 19, 1809. Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 48-49, citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg, Bestand Regierung von Oberfranken, Kammer des Innern, Rep. K3 G II Nr. 14318. Fischer was appointed to the professorship in architecture in May, 1808.

⁴⁵⁵ Betz's second proposal was largely rejected by Adam Friedrich von Gross zu Trockau, a member of Bamberg's cathedral chapter and the locum tenens, who did not wish to give

In the end Betz was able to commission new furnishings by Wilhelm Wurzer (1773-1846), including a high altar, tabernacle and pulpit, all of which still displayed a baroque sensibility in their overall form despite classicizing details. Betz had the early seventeenth-century altars refurbished and painted to match Wurzer's works, so that all were white and gold with architectural elements in pale marbling. The resulting interior maintained Bamberg's vibrant seventeenth- and eighteenth-century traditions, before the Bavarian takeover of 1802 entailed loss of its status as a prince-bishopric and the closing of its university, founded in 1647, in 1803. Wurzer had been trained in the reasonable expectation of maintaining the artistic and cultural traditions that had flourished there during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; Betz had recognized the legitimacy of these traditions and of this expectation in giving Wurzer the commission.⁴⁵⁶ Betz's initial intention to update this tradition by repainting the interior entirely in white was, however, modified to retain the grey-green stone color with which the piers and moldings had been painted in the seventeenth century, and to emphasize the fabric of local stone by also covering the likewise seventeenth-century white faux-marble paint on the responds and

Betz free reign as Gross was focused on maintaining the cathedral as such in hopes of filling the bishop's seat. On Betz's proposals see Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 48-55.

⁴⁵⁶ Son of a Bamberg sculptor as well as son-in-law of the sculptor to Bamberg's last Prince Bishop, Wurzer had trained, most notably, under Roman Anton Boos (1733-1810), court sculptor to the Electorate of Bavaria since 1774. Boos's by now conservative style had already begun to attract criticism in Munich well before Wurzer arrived to study with him: Boos's pulpit for Munich's Church of Our Lady of 1778-80 had attracted particularly harsh criticism, according to Peter Volk, *Münchner Rokokoplastik*, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum München Bildführer 7 (Munich, 1980), 120-29, as cited in Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," p. 67 n. 92. Wurzer nevertheless not only modeled his work closely on Boos's but left Munich poised to inherit his father-in-law's position at the Bamberg court. In giving him the commission, Betz honored this now empty inheritance. On Wurzer, including a detailed discussion of his work in relation to Boos's see Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 66-68.

ribs in the same grey-green color.⁴⁵⁷ The more dramatic elements in the baroque color scheme (dark furnishings, polychrome figures, faux white marbling) were still sacrificed in favor of a classicizing preference for limited polychromy dominated by white; the intent appears to have been to call attention to the building's medieval structure and its native substance. This nod to the growing identification with medieval architecture would not, however, be sufficient to satisfy Ludwig.

As Betz's tenure at Bamberg came to an end (1821), Ludwig began to counterbalance the classicizing additions to nearby Nuremberg that had been made under his father and Montgelas. He commissioned Albert Reindel, who would later advise Rupprecht, to renovate the dilapidated *Schöner Brunnen* [**Fig. 4.1: Schöner Brunnen**].⁴⁵⁸ To accomplish this elaborate and widely admired project, carried out between 1821 and 1824, Reindel had established a masonry workshop to re-carve many of the fountain's decrepit sculptural elements.⁴⁵⁹ Upon Ludwig's accession to the throne, however,

⁴⁵⁷ Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 62-63. Hubel notes that the engaged columns, responds, ribbing in the vaults and similar elements were painted a grey-green stone-like color. This stone color presumably covered all of the seventeenth-century white faux marbling. This modification otherwise seems to have retained the baroque color scheme for the architectural elements (as would appear to be the case from Arnold's painting, though not noted by Hubel). It is not clear from Hubel's sources whether the architectural committee in Munich, Betz himself, or a third party was responsible for modifying Betz's original plan to paint all architectural elements white.

⁴⁵⁸ On Carl Haller von Hallerstein's classicizing colonnade of 1806/07 in the main market, the rows of poplars planted in 1810 in the Maxplatz, and Heideloff's classicizing Empire-style monument to Dürer and Willibald Pirckheimer of 1821 see Norbert Götz, "Carl Alexander Heideloff und der 'Typus der Stadt Nürnberg,'" in Erichsen and Puschner, *Aufsätze*, 538. On Albert Christoph Reindel's renovation of the Schöne(r) Brunnen, and his work at St. Sebaldus, see Michael Brix, *Nürnberg und Lübeck im 19. Jahrhundert. Denkmalpflege, Stadtbildpflege, Stadtumbau* (Munich: Prestel, 1981), 60-70.

⁴⁵⁹ Brix, *Nürnberg und Lübeck*, 65-66. In 1898-1903 the fountain was fully reconstructed according to new standards of historicism: it is this reconstruction which stands on the

according to a contemporary account of his meeting with a delegation of Nuremberg dignitaries, Ludwig let it be known that he was unhappy with the finished result due to its monochrome coat of paint; as a model renovation he recommended the St. Jacob's Church altar by Carl Alexander Heideloff, a colleague of Reindel who, unlike Reindel, was on the delegation.⁴⁶⁰ A fascination with medieval color would mark all of Ludwig's ensuing medieval renovations and revival commissions. It is largely what led him, while still disputing the style of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle with Klenze, to initiate undoing Bamberg's recent (and earlier) renovations. Given Ludwig's response to his work on the *Schöner Brunnen*, presumably by the time Reindel was advising Rupprecht, he was better attuned to Ludwig's expectations.

5. Byzantine Bamberg 1. Rupprecht Discovers Traces of Medieval Paint

In 1827 Christian Ludwig Stieglitz, the most established architectural historian in Germany at the time, broadly expanded upon *Of Old German Architecture* (1820), a work Klenze had relied upon in his 1822/24 *Manual* (as noted in ch. 2). Stieglitz's major new publication, *History of Architecture from Earliest Antiquity into the Recent Era*, perhaps the first world history of architecture, remained the only such work in German for many years: it would be reprinted in 1837 and again (although it was being superseded by Kugler's *History of Architecture* of 1856-59 and Albert Rosengarten's *Die*

main market square today; the few original remains of the fountain are nearby in the German National Museum (p. 70).

⁴⁶⁰ The account was prepared following the delegation's return by the Nuremberg bookseller and printer Friedrich Campe, but only survives in a much later publication in *Fränkischer Kurier* no. 625 (December 6th, 1901) and no. 641 (December 15, 1901), according to Götz, "Carl Alexander Heideloff und der 'Typus der Stadt Nürnberg,'" p. 540 and n. 16.

architektonischen Stylarten) in 1857.⁴⁶¹ A number of his ideas, however, spoke specifically to the concerns of 1827, a critical year for Philhellenes (as France, England and Russia had joined forces to turn the tide of the Greek rebellion against the Ottomans). Arguably this inspired Stieglitz's notion that the pointed arch, and specifically the arches of Bamberg Cathedral (i.e., those at western end of the cathedral), were Byzantine. In discussing Germany under the Ottonian (Saxon) emperors, Stieglitz wrote:

that both Greek arts and sciences were cultivated in Germany at that time is not subject to any doubt. If the culture of Germany was already advanced by means of Greek culture during Charlemagne's reign, a definite connection between West and East developed above all under the rule of the Saxon emperors. This connection was reinforced to no small degree through the Greek Princess Theophanou, the consort of Otto II.⁴⁶²

That the pointed arch originated in Byzantium rather than Germany was further evidence of the depth of Germany's Greek roots. Though transplanted first to Italy, the pointed arch was not appropriate for southern buildings, Stieglitz explained; that is why it became far more popular in Germany, where it turned out to be useful for creating the high roofs and steeply pitched gables suitable to the northern climate.⁴⁶³ Stieglitz cited Bamberg

⁴⁶¹ Klaus Jan Philipp, "Christian Ludwig Stieglitz (1756-1836). Der Beginn der Architekturgeschichtsschreibung in Deutschland zwischen Klassizismus und Romantik," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, Bauhaus-Universität Weimar* 42 no. 2/3 (1996): 116; Albert Rosengarten, *Die architektonischen Stylarten* (Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1857).

⁴⁶² "Daß überhaupt griechische Kunst und Wissenschaft damals in Deutschland cultivirt wurden, ist keinem Zweifel unterworfen. War schon während Carls des Großen Regierung die Cultur Deutschlands durch griechische Cultur befördert worden, so entstand vornehmlich unter der Regierung der sächsischen Kaiser eine genaue Verbindung des Abendlandes mit dem Morgenlande. Diese Verbindung wurde durch die griechische Prinzessin Theophania, Otto's des Zweiten Gemahlin, in nicht geringem Grade befestigt." Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume*, 322.

⁴⁶³ "War aber auch der Gebrauch des Spitzbögens nicht in Deutschland aufgekommen, so wurde dieser Bogen doch bald eine Eigenthümlichkeit der deutschen Kunst. Zwar auch in südlichen Ländern nicht unbekannt, wurde der Spitzbogen hier doch nicht allgemein angewandt, als mit den südlichen Formen nicht übereinstimmend. In Deutschland

Cathedral among the German uses of the pointed arch and its continued application not only under the Saxons but also through the eleventh and twelfth centuries.⁴⁶⁴ In Munich this Philhellenic argument possibly inspired and certainly supported the redefinition of Bamberg as Byzantine. By 1828 even *Kunstblatt*, the leading art journal, defined Bamberg Cathedral as a “Byzantine architectural monument from the eleventh century.”⁴⁶⁵

Back in Bamberg, Rupprecht had quickly given up on commissioned windows and looked to the art and antiquities market in hopes of finding stained glass there.⁴⁶⁶ By June 1828, highly frustrated, he found himself recounting to his friend, the art dealer and painter Carl Gustav Boerner, that initially “the king wanted to have several windows made at his own expense, [and] Heinrich Heß received the commission for the cartoons that Frank should carry out in Munich,” but now “one even hesitated to re-install the ones on hand.”⁴⁶⁷ Rupprecht had not received permission to install any stained glass, even

hingegen, wo das Klima hohe Dächer und hohe Giebel verlangte, mußte er willkommen seyn, als angemessen den hier gewöhnlichen Formen.” Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume*, 325.

⁴⁶⁴ “Entdecken wir bereits an Kirchen aus den Zeiten der sächsischen Kaiser einige Spitzbögen, so treffen wir sie auch an Werken des elften und zwölften Jahrhunderts an. Unter andern finden sie sich an der, im zehnten und elften Jahrhundert erbauten, Domkirche zu Limburg an der Lahn, am Dom zu Bamberg, und an den Fenstern des Thurmes der evangelischen Kirche daselbst, in der obern Gallerie des Schiffes in St. Sebald zu Nürnberg, und an dem kleinen Fenster des halbkreisrunden Chorschlusses des Doms zu Würzburg.” Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume*, 326.

⁴⁶⁵ A “byzantinisches Baudenkmal aus dem eilften Jahrhundert,” *Kunstblatt* no. 16 (25 Feb. 1828): 63-64, as cited in Leinz, “Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik,” p. 411 and n. 90, where Leinz suggests a comparison with the essay by K.F.E. Trahdorff, “Die Baukunst des Mittelalters im Gegensatz gegen die Baukunst der Alten,” *Kunstblatt* no. 6 (Jan. 21, 1828): 21ff.

⁴⁶⁶ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* 87.

⁴⁶⁷ Karl Friedrich Rupprecht to Carl Gustav Boerner, June 12, 1828: “Der König wollte auf eigene Kosten mehrere Fenster herstellen lassen, Heinrich Heß bekam den Auftrag zu Cartons, die in München Frank ausführen sollte,” but now “man sich sogar weigert, das

those of the cathedral's original panels that remained in the possession of Bamberg citizens who were offering to donate them. For Rupprecht, faced with such panels proving that Bamberg Cathedral had in fact originally had stained glass, the new conceptualization of Bamberg as Byzantine did not alter the desirability of replacing those windows. He had lost, however, all authority in the matter and in the end could not install any stained glass at all.⁴⁶⁸

Boisserée, on a visit to the Royal Glass Institute with Gärtner in 1828, had learned that “damascened” glazing —windows in patterned shades of grey, of the type that has come to be known as grisaille – was now under consideration for churches in the Byzantine style.⁴⁶⁹ These windows, carried out for the Ludwigskirche, Ludwig's latest Byzantine commission, were rejected by early 1829 because Ludwig feared they would darken the interior.⁴⁷⁰ (The re-introduction of grisaille windows into the Ludwigskirche,

Vorhandene wieder reinzusetzen,” quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* 88 and n. 981 (as numbered in text) / 982 (as numbered in endnotes), where she cites Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, Msc.misc. 70/69 1-5.

⁴⁶⁸ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* 87-88. Several stained glass panels that are believed to have originated in Bamberg ca. 1414 are today displayed in the cathedral cloister: see Dümler, *Der Bamberger Kaiserdome*, 148-49. It would be interesting to know if any of these were among those offered at the time of the renovations under Ludwig.

⁴⁶⁹ Sulpiz Boisserée, entry for February 23, 1828: „...Mit Gärtner in d. Porzellan-Fabrik. Glas-Malereien für den Regensburger Dom ein ganzes Fenster.... Damascierte Glas-Malerei auch bei Kirchen in romanisch-griechischem Stil anzuwenden.“ Sulpiz Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 2:273. Boisserée had had drawings made of the grisaille windows in the choir chapels of Cologne Cathedral in 1811 (Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 33, n. 2); consequently, he probably considered grisaille windows as not specifically German Byzantine in style and perhaps as more characteristic of the New Gothic style, though such assessments are not clear from his diary entry.

⁴⁷⁰ In an entry for Jan. 2, 1829, Boisserée noted: “[Audienz mit Ludwig...] grau- und grau-Malerei für die Fenster neuer Kirchen-Gebäude—namentlich für die Ludwigs-Kirche verworfen, fürchtet, sie machen zu dunkel—.” Sulpiz Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 2:352-53. Surprisingly, in an entry for April 25, 1835, Boisserée noted: “Vor 12 mit Mathilde und Moriz bei den neuen Glasgemälden in der Ludwigs-Kirche.”

as well as Ludwig's other Byzantine revival commissions, will be discussed further in the next chapter.) Finally, on July 22, 1830, the rectilinear panes of white glass in St. George's Choir (the older, eastern choir) that had been installed during one of the earlier renovations at Bamberg were repaired and cleaned.⁴⁷¹ This apparently ended discussion of locating or making new stained or grisaille glass for any location in that building.

The first evidence of Reider's assessment of Bamberg as Byzantine appears to be the report that he sent Ludwig on June 28, 1828, in which he described the style as a mix of ancient Greek and Roman with added elements, and he boldly cited manuscripts removed from Bamberg Cathedral to the court library in Munich (in the course of the simultaneous secularization and Bavarian takeover of 1802-03) as proof of the style's mixed nature.⁴⁷² As evident in Ludwig's contemporary historicizing commissions in Munich, the glory of this style resided in wall paintings or mosaics. By 1830, with

Perhaps this is in reference to the glass cut to fit the tracery of the rose window, the oriels of the bifora, etc., which as far as I have been able to determine was colorless. As suggested by Boisserée's term "romanisch-griechisch," by the late 1820s Boisserée, who had only moved to Munich after Ludwig purchased the painting collection from Bertram, his brother Melchior, and him, had begun to shift away from the notion that Western buildings could or should be considered New Greek or Byzantine, although his new colleagues in Munich were still very much involved in cultivating this connection.

⁴⁷¹ Further window repairs and replacements were made at Bamberg on May 2 and 4, 1831. See Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 88; for a photo of the Georgenchoir with what are apparently these same windows see her fig. 32; for a drawing by Rupprecht of the west end of the cathedral, showing similar glazing in the Peterschor and what appears to be honeycomb-patterned glazing in the clearstory, see her fig. 62. In the meantime, Sulpiz's brother Melchior Boisserée commissioned copies of paintings belonging to their former collection from the Munich stained-glass workshop, and found that the paintings could even be improved through this translation; Friedrich von Gärtner, apparently sharing Melchior's approach, expressed particular enthusiasm for the second of these windows, which he couldn't wait to show Ludwig I. See Johann Baptist Bertram to Melchior Boisserée, Dec. 24, 1830, in *Sulpiz Boisserée*, ed. Mathilde Boisserée, 1:564-65, and Leinz, "Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik," 409.

⁴⁷² See the publication of Reider's report in Morper, "Unbekanntes Gutachten Joseph Martin von Reiders," 30.

colored stained glass now understood not as generically medieval but as specifically New Gothic, Ludwig commissioned a New Gothic church to provide a Munich showcase for his Royal Glass Institute, even though he did not particularly like the style (the Mariahilfkirche, discussed in the next section).⁴⁷³

In the spring of 1829 Rupprecht had begun to carry out his now more modest program for Bamberg. Thanks perhaps to Reindel's experience with Ludwig's focus on polychromy, and perhaps to the redefinition of the Byzantine polychromy by the architectural authorities in Munich, this new program stressed the question of whether the original wall painting might be recovered. As Rupprecht wrote to the local district council [*Ober-Mainkreis, Kammer des Inneren*] in Bayreuth a week before installing the scaffolding, he expected he might find "old paintings carried out in the Byzantine style from the time of St. Otto (Bishop of Bamberg 1102-39), as is to be found at Worms" beneath the later layers of paint.⁴⁷⁴ In making this suggestion Rupprecht may well have been informed by Fiorillo's history of German art of 1815, where he wrote that St. Otto had replaced the floor, erected the columns by St. George's choir, "and ornamented the entire interior of Bamberg Cathedral with paintings that were just as precious as those that... had been consumed by flames."⁴⁷⁵ If traces of these paintings did survive,

⁴⁷³ This is the only Old German (or Gothic) revival style church Ludwig commissioned. Leinz, "Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik," 411.

⁴⁷⁴ "alte, im byzantinischen Style behandelte Gemälde aus der Zeit des heiligen Otto zu finden, so wie dergleichen in Worms zu finden sind." Rupprecht to the local district council's chief administrator (*Regierungspräsident*) and general commissioner (*Generalkommissar*) in Bayreuth, Freiherr von Welden, May 23, 1829. Quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 43 and n. 483, citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg Rep. K3 GII/2 14319 v. 1 (compare the letter of July 1, 1829, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Geheimes Hausarchiv München, NL Ludwig I. 48/5/31, no. 6).

⁴⁷⁵ "[Otto] legte einen neuen Fußboden an, führte die prächtigen Säulen nebst dem Chor des heil. Georg in die Höhe, und schmückte das ganze Gebäude mit Gemälden, die, wie

according to Rupprecht, the Worms murals (discovered in 1815 at what is still called a cathedral, though the bishopric was dissolved after 1792, under French Revolutionary rule) provided an instructive example of how not to proceed, as they had been treated unprofessionally by “someone entirely ignorant of finer architecture, who encouraged and approved the plans of every worker.”⁴⁷⁶ [fig. 4.9 c: St.Christopher, Worms]. Once he began removing the later coats of paint, though he did not find wall paintings at Bamberg like those at Worms, Rupprecht did indeed find significant traces of medieval polychromy on the architectural ornament and figural sculpture.⁴⁷⁷ Rupprecht ascribed

sein Biograph versichert, eben so kostbar als diejenigen waren, welche die Flammen verzehrt hatten.” Fiorillo, *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland*, 1:240. Or, perhaps Rupprecht was informed by the biography of St. Otto that Fiorillo cites in n. d) as the *Vita S. Ottonis* by Canisius, Lect. antiq. vol. 3 pt. 1, 48.

⁴⁷⁶ “...ein mit der höheren Baukunst ganz Unbekannter, die Absicht jedes Handwerkers begünstigte und guthieß.” Rupprecht to Freiherr von Welden, May 23, 1829, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* 43, citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg Rep. K3 GII/2 14319 v. 1. Traces of the Romanesque wall painting in Worms Cathedral still remain; the most important is the over-life-size image of St. Christopher on the east wall of the northern transept, which dates to ca. 1200. The initial discovery and the restoration that troubled Rupprecht are not discussed by Hans-Schuller, however, and I have yet to locate any further information on them. In 1820 Stieglitz, in *Von deutscher Baukunst*, plate 21, published his own drawing, apparently based on the image of St. Christopher, with ambiguous areas filled in; in his text vol. he does not comment on the painting’s recent discovery nor on the quality of its restoration or the degree of guesswork apparent in his infills. In 1815 Fiorillo, in *Geschichte der Zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland* v. 1, elsewhere a source for Stieglitz, does not note the existence of wall paintings in his description of Worms (pp. 379-81), although noting such paintings appears to have been a priority for him: perhaps they had not yet been discovered at that date (his information on Worms in general was not up-to-date, as he did not realize that the rotunda by the cathedral had been destroyed ca. 1808; see p. 381).

⁴⁷⁷ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* 33, asserts that before Rupprecht’s work at Bamberg Cathedral, nobody had considered the possibility of medieval architectural polychromy (as opposed to medieval figural wall paintings). While Rupprecht’s work was the most significant investigation of such painting to date, the existence of medieval architectural polychromy, both exposed and under whitewash, was known to Sulpiz Boisserée, among others, some twenty years before Rupprecht’s work began. Rupprecht seems to have wanted to assure his superiors in Bayreuth and Munich that he had known to expect and appreciate the significance of original paint on

them to the early twelfth-century rule of Bishop Otto, in accordance with prior expectations.⁴⁷⁸

Neither Rupprecht nor any of those associated with this renovation ever came to the realization that not only St. Henry's early eleventh-century building but also St. Otto's early twelfth-century rebuilding had burned down and been entirely replaced in the thirteenth century (ca. 1215-20 to 1237) under Bishop Eckbert. The prestige of his sainted predecessors is perhaps partly responsible for the failure to find evidence of Eckbert's rebuilding; an unwillingness to associate the building with Eckbert may also have come into play, as Eckbert was inconveniently closely associated with a Wittelsbach who was anathematized and killed for murdering an heir-apparent to the Holy Roman imperial throne.⁴⁷⁹ As Leo von Klenze, Sulpiz Boisserée and others followed Christian Ludwig Stieglitz in dating the start of the German style to the thirteenth century,⁴⁸⁰ attribution of the extant building to Bishop Otto helps to explain how upon investigation

the sculpture (as well as wall paintings and inscriptions), to judge from Hans-Schuller's own statements drawn from Rupprecht's report of 14 June 1829: see Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 66 and n. 767 (as numbered in text) / 768 (as numbered in endnotes).

⁴⁷⁸ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 43 and n. 483.

⁴⁷⁹ Eckbert's reconstruction of the cathedral had been delayed because he had fled in 1208 due to suspicions of his complicity in the murder of Philipp von Schwaben. Philipp, youngest son of Frederick Barbarossa, had been murdered by Count Palatine Otto VIII of Wittelsbach just before Philipp was to be chosen Holy Roman Emperor. Philipp was buried in Speyer Cathedral; his death came to be known as the *Bamberger Königsmord*. Otto VIII was beheaded. Eckbert, well-connected and lucky, was rehabilitated and allowed to return to Bamberg in 1212. The idea that Bamberg Cathedral owed something (much less everything) to Bishop Eckbert does not seem to have been raised by anyone associated with the cathedral's nineteenth-century renovation. In 1849 Heideloff could still confidently propose a fresco program on the history of German architecture that began with Otto's rebuilding of Henry II's cathedral at Bamberg to demonstrate the transition from the Byzantine to German style: see Götz, "Carl Alexander Heideloff und der 'Typus der Stadt Nürnberg,'" 540-41 and 546-47.

⁴⁸⁰ As discussed in chap. 2.

they, along with Rupprecht and Ludwig I, came to reinterpret Bamberg as a Byzantine building despite initially seeing it as German.⁴⁸¹ That Bamberg Cathedral revealed the path of Byzantine influence into the West was an idea that would continue to attract the attention of architectural historians into the twentieth century.⁴⁸²

In mid-June of 1829, only a few weeks after the scaffolding was up and work had begun, Rupprecht submitted the first report on his activities in the cathedral to the local district council.⁴⁸³ Rupprecht had begun his project by making measurements throughout the cathedral, so that the scaffolding may have been fairly extensive, but his work began in the eastern end and through most of his tenure focused on the sculpture of the screens that flank the eastern choir's north and south sides [**fig. 4.8 a, groundplan**]. Because he

⁴⁸¹ Leo von Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architektur*, 11-12; Sulpiz Boisserée, *Geschichte und Beschreibung des Doms von Köln, nebst Untersuchungen über die alte Kirchenbaukunst...* (Stuttgart: privately printed and J.G. Cotta, 1823), 41; Christian Ludwig Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst* (1820), 9-10 and 68-69. Wiebeking, on the other hand, attempted in v. 1 of *Bürgerliche Baukunde* to trace the Gothic style back to tenth century in Lower Saxony – an idea that immediately drew public criticism from Christian Ludwig Stieglitz in his review for *Kunstblatt* no. 2 (1821): 393-95 and 197-98. Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, p. 193 and n. 42. The attribution of the building to Henry II, as Karl von Fischer had in 1809 and *Kunstblatt* in 1828, appears to have ceased with Heideloff who, shortly after Rupprecht's death, designed furnishings for Bamberg on the basis of this attribution.

⁴⁸² Wilhelm Vöge saw Byzantine influence on the sculpture of Bamberg Cathedral, which he traced to Bamberg from Byzantium via Languedoc and Poitou in Vöge, "Über die Bamberger Domsulpturen," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 22 (1899), 94-104; 24 (1901): 195-229 and 255-289, according to Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* n. 882 (as numbered in endnote section). A generation later Georg Dehio similarly discussed the Byzantine origins of the polygonal form of the apses at Bamberg Cathedral as having come to Provence, then Burgundy, then Germany via two routes: Trier and the upper Rhine. According to Dehio, this Byzantine form can be seen around 1200 at minsters of Basel and Freiburg and some upper Alsatian churches. He traced the Byzantine influence seen at Bamberg via the Upper Rhine route. summarized in Dehio, *Der Bamberger Dom* (Munich: R. Piper, 1924), 13, where he refers back to his contribution to *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Architektur* 3 (1909-10): 49.

⁴⁸³ Rupprecht to the *Kammer des Inneren*, June 14, 1829, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 44 and n. 502, citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg, Rep. K3 GII/2 14319, v. 1.

had wished to avoid the mistakes made in Worms, Rupprecht explained that he had “ordered the greatest attentiveness” in the removal of the recent paint.⁴⁸⁴ As a basis for his observations he combined his knowledge of historical paint and painting techniques with information gleaned from archival sources.⁴⁸⁵ Nevertheless, he did remove some of the early polychromy, for instance from the folds of a figure of St. Anne, as he had already decided that it would not be appropriate to restore the paint on this figure.⁴⁸⁶ On the other hand, he removed much of what he took to be the original gilding with an eye towards its potential restoration. Explaining his actions he wrote:

If its restoration were intended, this could by no means or manner take place on the old [gilding], but rather this would have to be removed first to gild on a fresh ground. I have therefore had these same traces removed and only retained in a couple of places so that one can make certain of [the original gilding] for oneself.⁴⁸⁷

Rupprecht recommended restoring one field or one figure as a trial, and discussed the painting on the wing of an Angel of the Annunciation [**fig. 4.8 e-f**]: “The wing [of this angel] was painted with peacock feathers in watercolor, entirely in the ancient style and treatment... I have had the same cleaned as carefully as possible and now ordered it to

⁴⁸⁴ “...bei der Reinigung die größte Aufmerksamkeit befohlen.” Rupprecht to the *Kammer des Inneren*, June 14, 1829, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* p. 66 and n. 767 (as numbered in text) / 768 (as numbered in endnotes), citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg, Rep. K3 GII/2 14319, v. 1.

⁴⁸⁵ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* 67.

⁴⁸⁶ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* 67.

⁴⁸⁷ “Würde deren Wiederherstellung beabsichtigt, so könnte dieses auf keine Weise oder Fall auf das Alte stattfinden, sondern dieses müßte erst weggenommen und auf einen frischen Grund vergoldet werden. Ich habe daher selbiges wegnehmen und nur ein paar Stellen aufbewahren lassen, damit man sich davon überzeugen kann.” Rupprecht to the *Kammer des Inneren*, June 14, 1829, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* p. 67 and n. 778 (as numbered in text) / 779 (as numbered in endnotes), citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg, Rep. K3 GII/2 14319, v. 1.

remain untouched.⁴⁸⁸ He thought that the angel's wing, if done artfully and in combination with a restoration of the gilding, would have a good effect.⁴⁸⁹ Rupprecht appears to have hoped that his color would provide the basis for a historically-based repainting of the interior which would, nevertheless, leave room for him to make his own aesthetic judgments without slavishly following the original.⁴⁹⁰

Rupprecht expected to work in direct consultation with the King and so wished to send his reports directly to the Royal Cabinet (*königliches Kabinett*) in order to receive Ludwig's instructions efficiently. The district council, apparently wanting to discourage Rupprecht from circumventing its authority, informed him, by way of Franz Joseph Schierlinger, the district engineer [*Bezirksingenieur*] it had employed to oversee Rupprecht's work, that the king had given oversight to the district and so did not expect

⁴⁸⁸ "Die Flügel desselben waren mit Pfauenfedern in Wasserfarbe, ganz im alterthümlichen Style und Behandlung bemalt... Ich habe solchen so sorgfältig als möglich reinigen lassen und ihn nun unberührt zu lassen befohlen..." Rupprecht to the *Kammer des Inneren*, June 14, 1829, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 67 and n. 779 (as numbered in text) / 780 (as numbered in endnotes), citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg, Rep. K3 GII/2 14319, v. 1.

⁴⁸⁹ "...wenn es *mit Kunst* geschähe, neben den Vergoldungen gewiß gute Wirkung machen." Ibid.

⁴⁹⁰ Curiously, Hans-Schuller asserts (p. 33), seemingly against her own evidence, that Rupprecht intended to find that the cathedral was not originally painted and (p. 125) that the earliest paint dated to the sixteenth century. Her evidence does not suggest that Rupprecht had a strong preference for removing the early paint in order to see the underlying stone, or that he preferred the bare stone to a historicizing reconstruction of the building's early polychromy (as again suggested on p. 33). Compare, for instance, Rupprecht's statements from his initial report of June 14, 1829 (quoted by Hans-Schuller on p. 97), where he regrets his inability to save the paint on the "Figur des hl. Dionysius und des Verkündigungsengels," which was "ganz im alterthümlichen Style und Behandlung" as much of it had already chipped away or disappeared when it was overpainted, or his other discussions of paint and gilding that he specifically finds to be original, such as the passage in his report of July 1, 1829, on the water-gilding which he dates to Bishop Otto's rebuilding of the church (quoted on pp. 101-104).

to receive his reports.⁴⁹¹ Rupprecht had, however, already sent Ludwig an expanded version of his report to the council, as he had heard that Ludwig was wondering about the project's progress.⁴⁹² As soon as Ludwig received Rupprecht's account of the unexpected survival of traces of the medieval paint, he wrote back excitedly that Rupprecht had been doing good work but that none of the original paint should be removed before he (Ludwig) had seen it.⁴⁹³ Apparently upset that Rupprecht had removed any original paint at all in advance of his own evaluation of it, Ludwig wrote:

...everything ancient, whether paint or images, should be saved, and to the degree that it can occur without visible mixing of the old with the new, should be restored again. Color paint is... to be avoided, the patina of age to be created through marbling and the like. – Gilding is entirely to be omitted until I myself have again seen the cathedral in person, but what can be preserved of the original gilding is to be saved.⁴⁹⁴

⁴⁹¹ Ober-Mainkreis district council [*Kammer des Inneren*] in Bayreuth to Franz Joseph Schierlinger, July 1, 1829, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 44, citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg, K3 GII/2 14319, v. 1. The council further emphasized the chain of command by sending its instructions to Rupprecht via Schierlinger. On Rupprecht's expectation of receiving instructions directly from Ludwig, see Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* n. 502.

⁴⁹² Rupprecht to Ludwig, July 1, 1829, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 44 and n. 776 (as numbered in text) / 777 (as numbered in endnotes), citing Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Geheimes Hausarchiv München, NL Ludwig I. 48/5/31 – no. 6. As Rupprecht sent his letter to Ludwig on the same date that the local district council in Bayreuth sent its letter to Schierlinger telling him to tell Rupprecht not to contact the king, it seems probable that Rupprecht received word from Schierlinger only after he had already initiated contact with Ludwig.

⁴⁹³ Hans-Schuller asserts that Ludwig was imbued with a classicizing aesthetic and so wished to see the underlying stone surfaces at the expense of the medieval as well as of the baroque and later color schemes (see Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 31). Yet Ludwig embraced Rupprecht's news of the medieval paint traces with arguably more decisiveness than Rupprecht himself (who had already begun to remove those paint traces which he felt weren't useful for an historicizing repainting).

⁴⁹⁴ "... alles alterthümliche, es sey Malherei oder Bildnerey, soll geschohnt, und soviel es, ohne eine sichtbare Mengung des Alten mit Neuem geschehen kann, wieder restauriert werden. Farben-Anstrich ist... zu vermeiden, das Altersgrau durch Marmorierung [?] u.d.gl. herzustellen. – Vergoldungen sind durchaus, bis Ich selbst den Dom wieder in Augenschein genommen habe, zu unterlassen, was aber von der ursprünglichen Vergoldung erhalten werden kann ist zu schonen." Ludwig to Rupprecht,

Following Ludwig's response, Rupprecht never again mentioned removing remains of medieval paint or gilding, even though the district council strongly advocated against keeping it.⁴⁹⁵ To Rupprecht's letter seeking clarification Ludwig replied: "namely that the truly ancient should be retained, but later distortions of it should be removed," a directive that Ludwig would consistently repeat.⁴⁹⁶ Neither Ludwig nor the district council appears to have had any interest in Rupprecht's ideas concerning re-gilding and re-painting the cathedral.⁴⁹⁷

In the meantime, Rupprecht had begun to document the traces of medieval (in his understanding, Byzantine) architectural and sculptural painting at Bamberg in preparation for a monograph on the cathedral [figs. 4.8 f, h-i]. By the following summer he could report to Ludwig that "the cathedral provides important dates for the Byzantine building style" and so he had had to correct many of his earlier views.⁴⁹⁸ By February 1831 Rupprecht announced his coming monograph on the Old and New Byzantine styles.⁴⁹⁹

July 5, 1829, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 67 and nn. 783-84 (as numbered in text) / 784-85 (as numbered in endnotes), citing Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Geheimes Hausarchiv München, NL Ludwig I. 48/5/31 Nr. 6.

⁴⁹⁵ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 68.

⁴⁹⁶ "...nämlich daß das wirklich alterthümliche erhalten, spätere Entstellungen desselben aber hinweggeschafft werden sollen." Ludwig's marginal notation on a letter to him from Rupprecht dated July 7th, 1829, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* n. 787 (as numbered in text) / 788 (as numbered in endnotes), citing Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv – Geheimes Hausarchiv München, NL Ludwig I. 48/5/31 – no. 6; see also Ludwig to Rupprecht, Jan. 21, 1830, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* n. 784/785, citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg K3 GII/2 14319 v. 1.

⁴⁹⁷ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 68.

⁴⁹⁸ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 160.

⁴⁹⁹ "...Ein begleitender Text soll sich über den alt- und neubyzantinischen Baustyl verbreiten und manchen Aufschluß geben. Dieses Werk ist vorzugsweise für den Architekten, Kunst- und Alterthums-Freund bestimmt...." Rupprecht, *Fränkischer*

He would discuss the eastern choir (St. George's Choir) as an example of the Old Byzantine style, the western choir (St. Peter's Choir) as Old Gothic, and the western crossing as a New Byzantine style which, as he had determined with Klenze's support, demonstrated the transition between the styles found in the choirs.⁵⁰⁰ Klenze "especially recommended" that Rupprecht make further drawings of the sculpture in the southern arm of the transept "because the architecture of this part of the cathedral constitutes the transition from Byzantine to the Gothic."⁵⁰¹ While the southern transept is not the most lavishly sculpted section of the cathedral, striking elements include, along the north side, the southern choir screen of the western choir, and in the southern wall, a large rose window [**fig. 4.8 j-1 and j-2**]. The district council directly blamed Rupprecht's studies for the slow progress of the renovation, but apparently it was outranked in this respect by Klenze's active encouragement of Rupprecht's research. In defending himself from the council's accusations that he was proceeding too slowly, Rupprecht emphasized that Klenze had "repeatedly ... particularly asked him to investigate the nature of the old and new Byzantine style, the distinction between which expresses itself precisely here [at Bamberg Cathedral] so clearly... because this is the most important evidence for the architect of the Ludwigskirche, which His Majesty intends to have built precisely in this

Merkur no. 45 (Feb. 14, 1831), quoted in Schemmel, *Friedrich Karl Rupprecht 1779-1831*, 158-9.

⁵⁰⁰ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 157-61.

⁵⁰¹ "Oberbaurat Leo von Klenze hatte Rupprecht 'besonders empfohlen', die Bauplastik im südlichen Querschiff weiterzuzeichnen, 'weil die Architektur dieses Theils des Domes den Uebergang vom Byzantinischen zum Gotischen bildet [...].'" Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 143, quoting district engineer Schierlinger to the local district council, August 2, 1831 (citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg. Rep. K3 GII/2 14319 v. 1), and Rupprecht to the cathedral chapter, August 2, 1831 (citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg. Rep. K3 GII/2 14319 v. 1). Cf. quotations from Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv – Geheimes Hausarchiv München, NL Ludwig I. 48/5/31-Nr. 6 in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 190 and 193.

style [emphasis retained from the original].”⁵⁰² Another aspect of Rupprecht’s constant effort to understand the Byzantine style was his proposal for a parish altar to replace Wurzer’s, on which Rupprecht had already begun work in 1826 [fig. 4.8 k]. Rupprecht based his plan from the start on the ornamental and figural sculpture of the northern and southern screens of St. George’s Choir, which soon became the paradigm of his Old Byzantine style.⁵⁰³ As he discovered new Byzantine motifs elsewhere in the cathedral he continued to add to the proposal for, as he noted, “the Byzantine building style forbids the repetition of the same ornament on one and the same object.”⁵⁰⁴ The use of the incidental had become the guiding principle: in this sense, like Heß in his frescoes at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, Rupprecht had found a way to mediate between Ludwig’s desire to evoke time and place and Klenze’s idealism. On his proposal for a figure of Kunigunde for the altar [fig. 4.8 l] he wrote:

In the cartoon submitted representing [a figure of] the saintly Kunigunde precisely in the same size in which it should be carried out on the altar, I remark further that I have given her intentionally the Greek Byzantine crown, scepter, robe and the

⁵⁰² “...wiederholt ... ans Herz gelegt hat, um die Charakteristick des alt und neu byzantinischen Styls auszuforschen, wo sich gerade hier die Scheidungslinie so deutlich ausspricht [...] weil solche der wichtigste Anhaltspunkt für den Architekten der Ludwigskirche sind, welche S. Majestät genau in diesem Style gebaut wissen wollen [Hervorhebungen von Rupprecht],” Rupprecht to the Bamberg Cathedral Chapter, Aug. 2, 1831, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* pp. 50 and 51 and nn. 591 and 621, citing Staatsarchiv Bamberg Rep. K3 GII/2 14319 v. 1. Curiously, despite the intensity of Klenze’s focus on Bamberg’s German Byzantine style with regard to the Ludwigskirche, Bamberg played little role in his renovation of St. Salvator, Donaustauf (as discussed in Chapter Two).

⁵⁰³ See Bernhard Schemmel, “Entwürfe für den Pfarraltar von 1826/29. Domrestaurierung und Pfarraltar 1826/31,” in Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, *Altäre des Bamberger Doms*, 242-53.

⁵⁰⁴ “...der byzantinische Baustyl die Wiederholung derselben Verzierung an einem und demselben Gegenstand verbietet...,” Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* 142 (also n. 616 and p. 162), citing a letter by Schierlinger of June 13, 1831, transmitting Rupprecht’s position to the local district council in Bayreuth (Staatsarchiv Bamberg, Rep. K3 GII/2 14319 v. 1).

model of the earlier state of the cathedral, in order to draw her back thoroughly to that era and so to satisfy the historians and archaeologists.⁵⁰⁵

Rupprecht's image of Henry II's wife, St. Kunigunde, as a "Byzantine queen" demonstrates how fully Rupprecht believed he could base his concept of what was Byzantine on models close at hand, assuming they reflected a Byzantium in which the Eastern Roman Empire would have recognized itself.

Unfortunately, Rupprecht's studies soon came to an end despite such encouragement. By late September, his apparently like-minded assistant requested that an artist be employed to document the painting being uncovered in the apse vault of the western choir, as Rupprecht was bedridden and the colors were fading with exposure to air.⁵⁰⁶ This request seems to have gone unheeded. The following month Rupprecht died, apparently in part due to the stress of his constant work at the cathedral. He left behind 200 drawings and 10 octavo notebooks documenting the preparations for and the course of his work at Bamberg, including pencil sketches.⁵⁰⁷

⁵⁰⁵ "Bei dem vorgelegten Carton, die heilige Cunigundis, genau in derselben Größe, wie solche an dem Altar ausgeführt werden soll, vorstellend, bemerke ich noch, daß ich derselben absichtlich die griechische byzantinische Krone, Zepter, Gewand und das Modell des früheren Zustandes der Domkirche gegeben habe, um sie durchgängig jenem Zeitalter näher zu rücken und so den Historiker und Archäologen zu befriedigen." Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 52 and n. 632.

⁵⁰⁶ Friedrich Karl Rupprecht, letter dated February 5, 1827, in Archiv des Erzbistums Bamberg, Rep. 2, no. 2310/7, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 70 and n. 806 (as numbered in text) / 807 (as numbered in endnotes).

⁵⁰⁷ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* pp. 7, 18 and nn. 126-128. Friedrich Karl Rupprecht died in Bamberg on October 25, 1831.

6. Byzantine Bamberg 2: The Restoration under Heideloff

While Rupprecht's careful records were preserved, his successor, Karl Alexander Heideloff, did not keep equivalent records of his own work.⁵⁰⁸ This, and Heideloff's willingness to act without consulting Ludwig first, presumably pleased the Bamberg Cathedral Chapter and the district council in Bayreuth. In June 1832, before Heideloff had begun to work at Bamberg, Sulpiz Boisserée came to see the traces of paint discovered under Rupprecht's watch and particularly noted those in the western apse vault, but apparently he did not concern himself with the future of the restoration campaign.⁵⁰⁹

Heideloff began his work that August, according to the report of the building inspector, by replacing Bamberg Cathedral's problematic floor with tiles in what he believed, on the basis of his excavations at the site, matched those of its original, Byzantine floor.⁵¹⁰ By December Heideloff had set about restoring the paintings without

⁵⁰⁸ The restoration of Bamberg Cathedral was entrusted to Heideloff on Nov. 12, 1831. Urs Boeck, *Karl Alexander Heideloff*, *Mitteilungen des Verein für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg*, v. 48 (Nuremberg: Verein für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg, 1958), 351.

⁵⁰⁹ Sulpiz Boisserée in Bamberg: "Dom. Spuren alter Gemälde am Peters-Chor. Gegen West. der Georg-Chor gegen Osten an diesem letzten Bildwerke an der Chorwand wie dort die Malereien in den Neben-Gängen an der Chorwand. An dem Peters-Chor dort Süd-Seite Maria in der Mitte über ihr als Brust-Bild Christus oder Gott Vater. Dann 8 Apostel zu jeder Seite 4, über jedem ein Engel als Brust Bild." Entry for June 18, 1832, Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, v. 2, 679. Heideloff hadn't yet touched the paintings; his restoration work on Bamberg Cathedral began in August, 1832 Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* n. 720. At this date, Boisserée was not in a position to interfere with the renovations (at least officially), though in 1835 he would be appointed General Conservator of the Sculptural and Architectural [„plastische“] Monuments of Bavaria (see Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 269).

⁵¹⁰ "Bei seiner jüngsten Anwesenheit dahier deutete der Baudirektor Heideloff an, daß der fragliche Boden, nicht wie vorher mittelst viereckiger Platten, sondern im Geist der Erbauungszeit des Domes hergestellt werden soll und versprach hierzu eine Zeichnung zu fertigen... Daß die von dem Baudirektor Heideloff gegebene Zeichnung ganz dem

further ado, including repainting the apse vault in a manner that had at best an uncertain relationship to the original of 1240; a renovation in 1970 attempted to recover the painting's original state [**fig. 4.8 m**].⁵¹¹ The site inspector, however, wrote approvingly to the district council in Bayreuth, starting with the apse vault:

The vaults of St. Peter's Choir bore half vanished traces of painting of pretty arabesques of human and bizarre forms. The city architect Heideloff of Nuremberg restored several of the same with the practiced hand of an artist... and created for the cathedral in this manner one of its most lovely ornaments, which is similarly noteworthy in historical and artistic regard. Because the arabesques and images were merely painted in outline, the original image could be reproduced with that much more certainty...⁵¹²

That the building inspector considered these patterns to be arabesques reflects that, whether intentionally or not, increasingly direct connections were being drawn by Gärtner in Munich (with whom Heideloff was in contact) between Byzantine ornament and that which would today be considered Islamic (as will be discussed in the next

byzantinischen Baustyle entspricht, dürfte aus folgendem zu entnehmen seyn: Als nämlich ein Theil des Bodens durch Hinwegnahme der größtentheils zerbrochenen Platten gereinigt war, zeigten sich 6 Zoll unter der Oberfläche desselben ein 2ter zwar ebenfalls zerstörter Boden, jedoch war derselbe von Säule zu Säule mit Bändern von der Breite der Säulenbasis versehen und bildete also Quadrate gleich der Heideloff'schen Zeichnung." Boeck, *Karl Alexander Heideloff*, 351, citing Bayerisches Staatsarchiv Bamberg, Rep. K 3, G. Bd. II b, report of the building inspector dated August 26, 1832.

⁵¹¹ Report of the Bamberg building inspector quoted at length in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 69 and nn. 799-803 (as numbered in text) / 800-804 (as numbered in endnotes); see also n. 807 (as numbered in text) / 808 (as numbered in endnotes).

⁵¹² "Die Gewölbe des Sct. Peters Chors trugen halb erloschene Spuren von Malerey schöner Arabesken menschlicher und bizarrer Gestalten. Der städt[ische] Architekt Heideloff von Nürnberg restaurierte mehrere derselben mit Kunst geübter hand... und verschaffte auf diese Weise dem Dome eine seiner schönsten Zierden, welche in historische und artistischer Beziehung gleich merkwürdig sind. Da die Arabesken und Bilder lediglich in Kontur gemahlt waren, so konnte die ursprüngliche Darstellung um so sicherer ganz getreu wieder gegeben werden...." Letter of the building inspector dated Oct. 24, 1832, Staatsarchiv Bamberg Rep. K3 GII/2 14319 v. 1, quoted in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 69 and n. 803 (as numbered in text) / 804 (as numbered in endnotes).

section.) By 1833, in any event, Heideloff had removed the traces of early paint from the columns of the crypt and proposed creating coats-of-arms for the crypt in the Byzantine style – that is, incised into the stone rather than in relief – for all of the Bamberg bishops who had lost or never had a monument in the cathedral.⁵¹³ As this proposal was not carried out, it is not possible to know more precisely what he had had in mind. How he had determined that engraving or sunk relief was Byzantine is unclear (little of the architectural ornament or sculpture at Bamberg is carved in this manner); perhaps it was because he considered flatness and a two-dimensional appearance essential to the style. The idea appears to have been shared by Gärtner, as will be discussed in conjunction with the Ludwigskirche in the next section.

Ludwig and Klenze seem to have been distracted as Heideloff began his efforts, presumably thanks to the election of Ludwig's son Otto to the throne of Greece on May 7, 1832.⁵¹⁴ This had occurred largely through the diplomatic efforts of the longtime leader of Philhellenist efforts in Bavaria, Friedrich Thiersch (1784-1860), a Protestant whom some had derided for bringing Northern ideas to Southern Germany. Actually, with Ludwig's staunch support, Thiersch had begun strengthening contacts between the

⁵¹³ On the removal of undocumented traces of early paint from the crypt columns see Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* 178. On his further plans for the crypt Heideloff wrote: "Durch das Arrangement [providing memorials for bishops who had none] dürfte dem unterirdischen Gewölbe mehr Interesse und Bedeutsamkeit verliehen werden, ohne daß dadurch die Kosten sich besonders erhöhen würden, indem diese Wappen etc. nach byzantinischer Art nicht relief, sondern in vertieft gehauen[en], darauf mit schwarzem Kitt auszulegenden einfachen Umrissen ausgeführt werden." Boeck, *Karl Alexander Heideloff*, 351, citing Heideloff's report dated Jan. 26, 1833, in Bayerisches Staatsarchiv Bamberg, Rep. K 3, G. Bd. II b.

⁵¹⁴ Karl Dickopf, "Der Weg Griechenlands zur 'Souveränität'—ein immer noch aktuelles Lehrstück der Weltpolitik," in *Die Erträumte Nation: Griechenlands Wiedergeburt im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Reinhard Heydenreuter, Jan Murken and Raimund Wünsche (Munich: Biering und Brinkmann, 1995), 79-81.

Bavarian Academy and the educated elite among Ottoman Greeks a decade before the outbreak of the revolution.⁵¹⁵ While for Ludwig, Otto's election crowned his Philhellenic endeavors with glory, the international press ridiculed the fate of the Greeks who had won a Bavarian king rather than self-determination, much less democracy, at the end of their decade of warfare.⁵¹⁶ On Bavarian Constitution Day, which followed shortly on May 27, hopes for liberalization in Bavaria, let alone Greece, were at a low point and were marked by an impromptu protest in Franconia and, famously, a major demonstration in the Royal Bavarian Land on the Rhine, near Speyer at Hambach Castle (the *Hambacher Fest*).⁵¹⁷ The Bavarian regime's draconian response controlled further open protest in Franconia, but was less successful in ending the stream of publications from the Rhenish Palatinate that openly opposed Bavarian involvement in Greece and,

⁵¹⁵ Among his other Philhellenist activities, Thiersch had arranged for Greek students from the Ottoman Empire to study in Bavarian and other German schools and universities. Emanuel Turczynski, "Bayerns Anteil and der Befreiung und am Staatsaufbau Griechenlands," in *Das neue Hellas*, 43, citing *Denkschrift der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München für die Jahre 1814-1815* v. 5 (Munich, 1817), xii ff., and Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 479.

⁵¹⁶ Ludwig Börne (1786-1837), a leading writer in the Young Germany (*Junges Deutschland*) literary movement, was among those who spearheaded ridicule of Otto, notably in his *Briefe aus Paris*, nos. 86, 89, 90, published 1832-34. Durnig the 1840s the Berlin humorist Adolf Glaßbrenner (1810-76) continued what had become a comic tradition of mocking Otto, until Glaßbrenner was banned from Prussia as a leading democrat in the political protests of 1848. Arnold, „Der deutsche Philhellenismus,“ p. 155, n. 1 and p. 157, n. 2.

⁵¹⁷ On the protest in Franconia (the *Gaibacher Verfassungsfest*) see Rudolf Endres, "Franken und Bayern im Vormärz und in der Revolution von 1848/49," in "*Vorwärts vorwärts...*" [v. 2], 207-09. For a discussion of the significance of the Hambacherfest for developing a sense of local German, as opposed to Bavarian identity see Celia Applegate, *Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990), 27.

specifically, the sending of Bavarian troops and taxes to support Otto, as unconstitutional.⁵¹⁸

Ludwig's immediate reaction to Heideloff's work in Bamberg does not appear to be recorded, but is suggested by his response to growing pressure from Regensburg to take on urgently needed repairs. At the end of 1833, Ludwig forbade all restoration at Regensburg Cathedral excepting the most critical repairs to the windows, until he could personally determine their necessity on site, as

fear siezes me every time that I hear of the restoration of honorable antiquities, like the majestic cathedral in Regensburg, because I have seen so many disfigurations in similar cases. The *only* cathedral still maintained unaltered, the cathedral at Regensburg, is too dear to me....⁵¹⁹

When, however, Heideloff finally turned to Munich for approval of his new, Byzantine-style proposals for furnishing Bamberg Cathedral, they were harshly criticized [fig. 4.8

⁵¹⁸ The mayor of Würzburg was convicted with the charge of high treason and jailed for 15 years for his spontaneous speech on Constitution Day in Franconia: see Endres, "Franken und Bayern im Vormärz," 208. Meanwhile, the Bavarian regime censured and arrested Georg Friedrich Kolb, editor of the *Neue Speyerer Zeitung*, for his support of the Hambacher Fest, but failed to gain a conviction. See *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, Bd. 12 (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1980), 441. Kolb underscored his journalistic efforts by writing and publishing two further tracts within the year protesting Ludwig's use of Bavarian troops and taxes in support of his son: *Über die Sendung baierischer Truppen nach Griechenland* and *Über eine nähere politische Verbindung Baierns mit Griechenland*.

⁵¹⁹ Ludwig I to Bishop Schwäbl, Dec. 31, 1833: "Schrecken ergreift mich jedesmal, wenn Ich von Restauration ehrwürdiger Alterthümer, wie die herrliche Domkirche in Regensburg ist, höre, da ich so manche Verunstaltung in ähnlichen Fällen, gesehen habe. Der *einzig*e, noch unverändert erhaltene Dom zu Regensburg ist mir zu lieb...", quoted and discussed in Loers, "Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms," 248, citing Bischöfliches Zentralarchiv Regensburg, Bischöfliches Domkapitel, Sitzungsprotokolle 1823-34, entry of Jan. 25, 1834, also quoted and discussed in Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 204 and 210, citing Hauptstaatsarchiv Amberg, KdI, Abgabe 49, 15372, letter of Dec. 31, 1833 from Ludwig to Schwäble (copy).

n].⁵²⁰ Unlike Rupprecht, who had continuously worked to incorporate varied motifs from Bamberg Cathedral into his high altar design (abandoned upon his death), Heideloff had looked elsewhere for models for his designs, and particularly to the pulpit that Henry II (r. 1002-24) had given Aachen Cathedral while ruling as king but before being crowned emperor in 1014 [fig. 4.8 o: pulpit of Henry II, Aachen, ca. 1002-14].⁵²¹ From the Aachen pulpit Heideloff had incorporated the golden, gem-studded rows of recessed square fields, with bosses at their centers and at the intersections of the stiles and rails framing them. The central relief of St. Peter in Heideloff's altar design also echoed the solid, rounded forms and contrapposto stance of the sixth-century pagan ivory panels set into the fields along the outer sides of Henry II's pulpit.⁵²² Ludwig, however, was not interested in these furnishings, and it has been suggested that this was due their polychromy.⁵²³ While Heideloff had to return to the drawing board, Ludwig and Klenze

⁵²⁰ Heideloff presented his proposals for the pulpit, organ case, choir stalls and doors for the eastern choir and main altars for both choirs in his "Erkundigungen Betreffs der berühmten aus Kaiser Heinrichs Zeit herstammenden, im Dome zu Aachen sich befindenen Evangelien Kanzel, von welcher ich mir genaue Beschreibung u[nd] Zeichnung, Behufs einer Anwendung zu einer Nachahmung für den Bamberger Dom zu beschaffen bemüht war..." as cited and discussed in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 80 and n. 880 (as numbered in text) / 881 (as numbered in endnotes), who dates Heideloff's report to Jan. 9, 1834, and Boeck, *Karl Alexander Heideloff*, 352, who dates Heideloff's report to Jan. 28, 1834.

⁵²¹ Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 80 and n. 880 (as numbered in text) / 881 (as numbered in endnotes).

⁵²² For a brief discussion of the pulpit of Henry II at Aachen see Peter Lasko, *Ars Sacra 800-1200*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 124-27.

⁵²³ Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 83. Because Hubel offers no direct evidence of Ludwig's objection to their polychromy, it is difficult to know whether this is based on documentation or on conjecture in conformity with the scholarly tendency (also evident in the work of Hans-Schuller and others) to insist on Ludwig's sustained interest in creating a monochrome interior at Bamberg. Whatever the true nature of Ludwig's objections, cost was not the problem, according to Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, "Die 30er und 40er Jahre des 19. Jahrhunderts," in Baumgärtel-Fleischmann et al., *Altäre des Bamberger Domes*, 270.

were preparing for their first trip to Greece, to help Otto build up the war-torn village of Athens into a capital worthy of his new kingdom.⁵²⁴ While Thiersch was maneuvering in Greece to have Otto appointed to the throne, his assistant was the young architect Gottfried Semper, who had arrived in Greece to research ancient Greek polychromy.⁵²⁵ Semper had not bothered to disguise his dislike of Klenze nor of Gärtner (which he seems to have inherited from his teacher Gau⁵²⁶), and perhaps not surprisingly had not found another position in Greece under Otto; instead, he continued his research in Italy.⁵²⁷ Despite his differences with the leading Bavarian architects, Semper evidently embraced the idea that medieval German polychromy was shared with Italy and derived from the eastern Mediterranean, and he followed Bavarian renovations and research closely. In publishing his *Preliminary Remarks on Painted Architecture and Sculpture of the Ancients* in 1834, the work that helped bring him to Dresden and launched his international reputation, he commented that

⁵²⁴ Ludwig and Klenze traveled to the Peloponnesus (and Nauplia, the provisional capital) as well as Attica in July-October 1834. During these months Klenze revised the proposed city plan, led conservation measures on the Acropolis, and pursued his investigations of ancient Greek polychromy. Ilka Backmeister, "Leo von Klenze – Biographischer Überblick," in *Leo von Klenze. Architekt zwischen Kunst und Hof*, ed. Nerdinger, 190, and Friedrich Wilhelm Hamdorf, "Klenzes archäologische Studien und Reisen, seine Mission in Griechenland," in *Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, Ein griechischer Traum*, 154-95.

⁵²⁵ Mallgrave, *Gottfried Semper: Architect of the Nineteenth Century*, 43-46.

⁵²⁶ Mallgrave, *Gottfried Semper: Architect of the Nineteenth Century*, 26-27 and 52, esp. n. 123. (P. 27 refers to an Eduard von Gärtner, but this is corrected to Friedrich von Gärtner in the index.)

⁵²⁷ On leaving Greece in July 1832 Semper stayed two months in Pompeii before traveling to Rome, where he found remains of color on Trajan's Column, wrote his essay *Scoprimento d'antichi colori...*, and met the patron of his first building (C.H. Donner, a city councilman in Semper's hometown, Altona), for whom he built a garden pavillion in which he attempted to reconstruct ancient polychromy according to his research; see Martin Fröhlich, *Gottfried Semper* (Zürich: Verlag für Architektur, 1991), 168, and Mallgrave, *Gottfried Semper: Architect of the Nineteenth Century*, 46-52 and 62-63.

The older monuments of Florence, Milan, Verona, Venice, and generally speaking, of the whole of northern Italy, were colored. ... Northern Italy in every age and respect especially relied on the effect of color. Commerce with Greece and the Levant undoubtedly induced this trend. Of special interest to Germany are the polychrome works of old-German architecture in Innsbruck, Regensburg, Nuremberg, Bamberg, and other places [...] Through the efforts of Mr. Heideloff of Nuremberg, the Bamberg Cathedral has recently emerged from the jumble of its stucco dressing and arisen to its ancient glory.⁵²⁸

Semper had not had to rely on Thiersch to be kept up-to-date on Bavarian investigations of medieval polychromy. In 1825 he had traveled to Munich to study with Gärtner and, though he had quickly given up on Gärtner, he had remained in Bavaria, visiting his Hamburg friend Theodor Bülow (1800-61) in Regensburg before moving to Paris to study with Gau.⁵²⁹ Bülow, with whom Semper stayed in contact for many years, had remained in Regensburg studying its architecture with his colleague Justus Popp (1803-79).⁵³⁰ The first six installments of Bülow's and Popp's *Architecture of the Middle Ages in Regensburg* came out in the same year as Semper's *Preliminary Remarks*; the completed work was quickly published in French translation, more grandly entitled *The*

⁵²⁸ Gottfried Semper in *Vorläufige Bemerkungen über bemalte Architektur und Plastik bei den Alten* (Altona: J.H. Hammerich, 1834), quoted in Semper, *Four Elements of Architecture*, 69. It is not clear to me what monuments Semper had in mind in Innsbruck, Austria (the only non-Bavarian German city he mentions); in Regensburg he was almost certainly referring to Popp's and Bülow's work, discussed below; for Nuremberg he may have consulted with Heideloff, though Heideloff himself seems to have been more interested in documenting architectural sculpture than architectural painting; as far as I have discovered, he left little written indication of his thoughts on medieval polychromy.

⁵²⁹ Mallgrave, *Gottfried Semper: Architect of the Nineteenth Century*, 16-18. Semper announced and recommended Bülow's and Popp's forthcoming publication in his *Vorläufige Bemerkungen über bemalte Architektur* (1834) (see Semper, *Four Elements of Architecture*, 69 and n. 17.)

⁵³⁰ Semper, *Four Elements of Architecture*, 69 and 299 n. 16, where Mallgrave adds that several letters from Bülow of the years 1835-52 are in the Semper archives at the ETH-Zürich, Höggerberg.

Three Ages of Gothic Architecture.⁵³¹ For Bülau and Popp, the architecture of the Middle Ages “belonged to no people in particular,” as “it is the continuation of the Greek style.”⁵³² The German (*Deutsch*) style (called “gothique” in the French version, which also used this term to describe the Middle Ages as a whole) was the culmination of these developments when, after “passing through various transitional epochs, it attained its greatest perfection.”⁵³³ While the early churches of Rome, and of all of Italy, were imitations of Greek temples,

The further one went, in terms of the type of covering, from the first imitation of the Greek temples, which exercised a considerable influence on the disposition of the walls, the more the style became original; and as the change from coffered ceilings to round-arch vaults occurred above all during the epoch of the Greek empire, the style of this period is called correctly the Byzantine. Greek architecture was in decline, it sought refuge in its ancient cradle; nevertheless, the seat of modern Greece [i.e., Byzantium] in Egypt does not appear to have been without influence on the dawning taste.⁵³⁴

⁵³¹ Justus Popp and Theodor Bülau, *Die Architectur des Mittelalters in Regensburg dargestellt durch den Dom, die Jakobskirche, die alte Pfarre und einige andere Ueberreste deutscher Baukunst* (Regensburg: privately printed, 1834-39). The French translation appeared as *Les trois âges de l'architecture gothique, représentés par des exemples choisis à Ratisbonne... ouvrage traduit de l'allemand, et accompagné des quarante-huit planches de l'édition originale et d'une planche additionnelle complétant la théorie* (Paris: Librairie de l'architecture de Bance aîné, 1841).

⁵³² “L’architecture du moyen-âge, quant à son origine, n’appartient à aucun peuple en particulier. Elle est la continuation du style grec....” Popp and Bülau, *Les trois âges de l'architecture gothique*, 1.

⁵³³ “En passant par diverses époques de transition, elle atteint sa plus haute perfection dans le type gothique.” Popp and Bülau, *Les trois âges de l'architecture gothique*, 1.

⁵³⁴ “Plus on s’éloigna, quant au genre de couverture, de la première imitation des temples grecs, ce qui exerça une influence considérable sur la disposition des murs, plus le style devint original; et comme le changement des soffites en voûtes plein-cintre se rencontre surtout à l’époque de l’empire grec, le style de cette période est appelée avec raison le byzantin. L’architecture grecque étant en décadence, elle alla se réfugier dans son ancien berceau; néanmoins, le siège du grec moderne en Égypte ne paraît pas avoir été sans influence sur le goût naissant.” Popp and Bülau, *Les trois âges de l'architecture gothique*, 1. For a definition and illustration of a summertree (or summer), see Francis D. K. Ching, *A Visual Dictionary of Architecture* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1995), 107.

To exemplify the Byzantine style, Popp and Bülow chose St. Jacob's Church (also called the *Schottenkirche*, 1120-90) [**fig. 4.12**]:

The church of Saint Jacob in Regensburg, as that work will make known in all its parts, is constructed in the Byzantine style. The nave of this basilica has a coffered ceiling, and the profiles of this church carry imprints that clearly prove their Greek origin.⁵³⁵

The emphasis on a ceiling supported by *soffites* (summers: horizontal beams supporting girders), distinguished this understanding of the Byzantine style from that which Rupprecht and Klenze had derived from the eastern end of Bamberg Cathedral (which Popp and Bülow do not mention).

The parish church of the former imperial abbey of St. Emmeram, St. Rupert's (second half of the eleventh century, with many subsequent changes and additions), exemplified Popp's and Bülow's Transitional Style [**fig. 4.13**]. Popp and Bülow explained that this style, "whether because of the progress of the exact sciences, or the study of the requirements of the climate, or even the desire to create a national style, or finally all these causes together," developed gradually between the tenth and thirteenth centuries alongside the continued popularity of the Byzantine style.⁵³⁶ The key advances were the introduction of the ogee arch— meaning, for them, any pointed arch— and the vaulting of the nave, which permitted the opening up of the walls while requiring the addition of exterior buttressing. This style was essentially identical to the New Byzantine style that

⁵³⁵ "L'église de Saint-Jacques à Ratisbonne, que cet ouvrage fera connaître dans toute ses parties, est construite dans le style byzantin. La nef principale de cette basilique a un soffite, et les profils de cette église portent des empreintes, qui prouvent évidemment leur origine grecque." Popp and Bülow, *Les trois âges de l'architecture gothique*, 1.

⁵³⁶ "Soit que ce fussent des progrès dans les sciences exactes, ou des études sur les exigences du climat, ou bien le désir de créer un style national, ou enfin toute ces causes réunies..." Popp and Bülow, *Les trois âges de l'architecture gothique*, 1.

Rupprecht and Klenze had located in the transept at Bamberg (which Rupprecht and Klenze had also considered to be transitional). [fig. 4.8 j]. The subsequent style demonstrated how, eventually, the Germanic peoples so fully adapted and rejuvenated the Transitional, or New Byzantine art and architecture in their midst that they made it their own:

just as the Greeks imprinted upon Egyptian art the seal of liberty and victory, like that of their noble origin and of their serene sky, so too the Germanic peoples, pure in origin and free like them, revived with energy the Greek art which had degenerated, and spread it through their victories throughout Europe, in submitting it to the inspiration of their robust taste.⁵³⁷

At Regensburg Cathedral, Popp's and Bülau's representative example of the style,

...The most scrupulous specialists look in vain for a foreign origin for the details of this monument. Calculated for our climate, ornamented with foliage of our forests, with the flowers, the fruits and the animals of our country, with the traditions of our religion and of our history, it is only in the beauty of the whole that one recognizes the Greek origins of the Gothic [here defined as German] style.⁵³⁸

In discussing the transition from Byzantine to German polychromy, Popp and Bülau followed Fiorillo and Stieglitz, explaining that stained glass was an ingenious, German

⁵³⁷ “Ainsi que les Grecs imprégnèrent à l’art égyptien le sceau de la liberté et de la victoire, comme de leur noble origine et de leur ciel serein, ainsi les Germains, d’origine pure et libres comme eux, relevèrent avec énergie l’art grec qui dégénérait, et le répandirent par leurs victoires dans toute l’Europe, en le soumettant aux inspirations de leur goût hardi.” Popp and Bülau, *Les trois âges de l’architecture gothique*, 2.

⁵³⁸ “Le connaisseur le plus scrupuleux cherchait en vain une origine étrangère aux détails de ce monument. Calculé pour notre climat, orné du feuillage de nos forêts, des fleurs, des fruits et des animaux de notre pays, des traditions de notre religion et de notre histoire, ce n’est que dans la beauté de l’ensemble que l’on peut y reconnaître l’origine grecque du style gothique.” Popp and Bülau, *Les trois âges de l’architecture gothique*, 2.

invention designed to compensate for the unsuitability of Byzantine-style frescoes for the Northern climate.⁵³⁹

7. Byzantine Bamberg 3: Gärtner Takes Over

What King Ludwig thought of Semper's comments on Bavarian developments is not clear, but shortly after returning from Greece, Ludwig took responsibility for the renovations at Bamberg away from Heideloff and gave it, along with responsibility for the Regensburg renovations, to Friedrich von Gärtner, to whom Klenze increasingly had to cede his authority.⁵⁴⁰ Gärtner spent little time in Bamberg, delegating most day-to-day responsibilities to the royal building inspector Friedrich Panzer and, despite Ludwig's apparent dissatisfaction with Heideloff's contributions, allowing Heideloff continued influence. Nevertheless, of Heideloff's proposed furnishings, only the doors and his re-worked proposal for a Byzantine altar in the eastern choir (1835-37) were carried out according to his designs, which were based on the relief sculpture of the northern screen of the eastern choir, although the altar was now to be placed in the western (Gothic)

⁵³⁹ “Les vitraux de couleur sont une compensation très ingénieuse des peintures grecques. Il est certain que les anciens maîtres savaient apprécier l'éclat des couleurs, mais l'humidité et les changemens subits de la température de notre climat, en donnant bientôt un air délabré et sombre à tous les ornemens de ce genre, lors même qu'ils se trouvent dans des endroits couverts, durent les amener à remplacer ces peintures éphémères par des créations plus durables; le verre coloré leur en fournit les moyens, et le soleil vint chaque jour refléter sur les sveltes colonne de leurs temples les nuances brillantes des mille couleurs de leurs vitraux peints.” Popp and Buleau, *Les trois âges de l'architecture gothique*, 7.

⁵⁴⁰ Gärtner was entrusted with the renovation of Bamberg Cathedral on Dec. 26, 1834. Boeck, *Karl Alexander Heideloff*, 351.

choir.⁵⁴¹ Heideloff was, however, so pleased with this altar that he published it in 1838 as a model “High Altar in the Byzantine Style” [fig. 4.8 p].⁵⁴² Meanwhile, his re-worked proposal for a high altar in the western choir [fig. 4.8 q] appears to have served as the basis for the high altar carried out by Friedrich Panzer under Gärtner’s direction, as Gärtner took far less interest in interpreting the cathedral than had either Rupprecht or Heideloff. Since the high altar designed for the western choir was now to be used for the eastern choir, the most substantial changes to Heideloff’s design are those that draw on the southern screen of the eastern choir, i.e., in the end, the altars of both choirs were executed in the Old Byzantine style [fig. 4.8 r]. Gärtner’s interest in Byzantium and its style, as will be seen in the next section, had embarked on a different course.

The cathedral chapter in Bamberg had been pleased with the definition of their cathedral as Byzantine, inasmuch as they had opposed the installation of stained glass there in the first place (as they also opposed other proposed changes to the New Roman furnishings). For them, stained glass was not inappropriate to the building’s style (the

⁵⁴¹ On Heideloff’s continued influence see Boeck, *Karl Alexander Heideloff*, 352; on the execution of his proposed doors see Manfred F. Fischer, “Creator et Conservator: Der Denkmalpfleger,” in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 162; on his altar designed for the eastern choir see cat. nos. 122 and 128-29 in Baumgärtel-Fleischmann et al., *Altäre des Bamberger Domes*, 270-71 and 278-79. At the time Heideloff created his altar designs, the high altar was located in the western choir, so that his design for this choir was more elaborate. Under Gärtner, however, the high altar was relocated to the eastern choir. Heideloff’s (western) high altar design appears to have formed the basis for the altar that was finally carried out for the eastern choir, but several other hands contributed to it as well. See cat. nos. 123 and 127 in Baumgärtel-Fleischmann et al., *Altäre des Bamberger Domes*, 270 and 272-78. Back in Nuremberg, Heideloff continued to employ Ludwig’s name as support for his increasingly unpopular efforts to preserve Gothic architecture and to build in the Gothic style: see Götz, “Carl Alexander Heideloff und der ‘Typus der Stadt Nürnberg,’” 536.

⁵⁴² The altar design was published as plate 3 in Karl Alexander von Heideloff, *Der christliche Altar archäologisch und artistisch dargestellt* (Nuremberg, 1838). See cat. no. 129 in Baumgärtel-Fleischmann et al., *Altäre des Bamberger Domes*, 279.

objection that seems to have been foremost in the minds of Ludwig and his architectural commission), but rather to its very function as a (Catholic) church.⁵⁴³ In this matter the clergy's objections to the renovation were resolved without conflict, but in general its continued allegiance to the New Roman style as the Catholic style found ever less resonance in Munich. The grand furnishings by Justus Glesker (a Protestant from Lower Saxony who had trained in Rome and who, largely on the basis of his subsequent renovation of Bamberg Cathedral, had become the most renowned sculptor of mid-seventeenth-century Germany⁵⁴⁴) aroused particular passion. Initially, Ludwig had only questioned Wurzer's high altar; it seems Heideloff had introduced the idea of a far more comprehensive replacement of the furnishings with ones of his own design. This idea met with Gärtner's approval, although rather than using Heideloff's proposals, he redesigned most of the furnishings according to his own taste.⁵⁴⁵ Under Gärtner, such stylistic purification picked up speed. Though he had studied under Karl von Fischer, the architecture professor who had rejected Betz's first proposal for Bamberg Cathedral on the grounds that the cathedral was "worthy to be maintained in its full authenticity," Gärtner held greater admiration for Wiebeking, the apparent progenitor of many of

⁵⁴³ As Rupprecht indicated in the letter to Boerner of June 12, 1828, cited above: "Selbst der Plan, die vorrätlichen Glasfenster einzusetzen, ist vorzugsweise durch den hiesigen Maler Dorn hintertrieben worden, der behauptete, die Kirche würde dadurch finster werden... auch sei so etwas gar nicht für eine Kirche geeignet. Daß solche Behauptungen bei dem Domcapitel vollen Applaus finden, versteht sich von selbst." Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine "Restauration,"* p. 88 and n. 981 (as numbered in text) / 982 (as numbered in endnotes).

⁵⁴⁴ Dümmler, *Bamberger Kaiserdom*, 50.

⁵⁴⁵ Loers, "Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms," 244.

Ludwig's purifying renovations.⁵⁴⁶ Within his first year at Bamberg and Regensburg, he auctioned off or destroyed all the New Roman furnishings at both cathedrals.⁵⁴⁷ This purification process began his exercise in clearly defining these cathedrals as major Byzantine and German monuments for Bavaria.

Local opposition to Gärtner's measures at Bamberg Cathedral had led to the closure of the cathedral in late 1836.⁵⁴⁸ In August 1837 Gärtner concluded his replacement of the furnishings with works of his and Heideloff's design. Days before the cathedral's re-opening was to be celebrated, Gärtner allowed that one final project remained unfinished. He proposed that the interior should be re-painted in a historicizing manner, a project Rupprecht had discussed when he first wrote Ludwig in 1829. Gärtner was convinced "that the restoration of this building, in my opinion, is so perfectly successful, that if it wasn't known through history, in later times it would not be regarded as a work of the present century."⁵⁴⁹ This judgment was perhaps made easier since he had

⁵⁴⁶ Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 193-96 and Herman van Bergeijk, "Hinter dem 'Vorhang des schönen Lebens'. Gärtners Begegnung mit Italien," in *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 51-69; here, p. 51.

⁵⁴⁷ See Loers, "Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms," 249, and Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 84-85. Regensburg Cathedral's renovations were not completed until 1841 per Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 208.

⁵⁴⁸ Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 85.

⁵⁴⁹ "...daß die Restauration dieses Gebäudes, meiner Ansicht nach so vollkommen gelungen ist, daß wenn diese nicht durch die Geschichte bekannt würde, sie in späterer Zeit nicht als ein Werk aus dem gegenwärtigen Jahrhundert betrachtet werden würde." Friedrich von Gärtner, letter of August 23, 1837, quoted in Hubel, "Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes," 85, citing Alexander von Reitzenstein, "Akten zur Geschichte des Bamberger Domes. Restaurierung 1826-1841," typescript ms., n.d. (ca. 1934), 102-05, which is a copy of Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Geheimes Hausarchiv München, Nachlaß König Ludwigs I, 48-5-31. See also Frank Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," in *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben 1791-1847. Mit den Briefen an Johann Martin von Wagner*, ed. Winfried Nerdinger, 130, and Hans-

dropped the effort at historical analysis of the cathedral that had so engaged Rupprecht and Klenze. However, Gärtner added, “the present condition is monotone,” although the remains of color found on the walls “indicate undeniably that the entire cathedral was richly gilded and painted, which can also be proven historically. Involuntarily the desire comes to mind to see this monument too fully restored in its earlier adornment.”⁵⁵⁰

Apparently, Heideloff’s more limited renovations of the paint traces now seemed insufficient; Gärtner’s proposal for a comprehensive interior program of gilt as well as painted surfaces suggests the influence of Heß’s work at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle as much as the influence of the evidence Rupprecht had found *in situ*.

If Gärtner was hoping that Ludwig would announce a campaign to paint the interior at the ceremonial re-dedication on August 25th, Ludwig’s birthday, he was disappointed. While Ludwig likely shared Gärtner’s view that the interior was less than ideal, he was either too financially or otherwise overextended in his other projects, or too disappointed in the developments at Bamberg since Rupprecht’s death, to undertake such a project.⁵⁵¹ Neither he nor any member of his family bothered to attend the concluding festivities.⁵⁵² An article in the journal *Kunstblatt*, meanwhile, stated that Gärtner had lacked consideration for the cathedral chapter; the restoration was further criticized for

Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine “Restauration,”* 69 and n. 804 (as numbered in text) / 805 (as numbered in endnotes).

⁵⁵⁰ “...der jetzige Zustand monoton ist.... [Farbreste] deuten aber unleugbar darauf hin, daß der ganze Dom reich vergoldet und bemalt war, was auch geschichtlich nachgewiesen ist. Unwillkürlich drängt sich der Wunsch auf, dieses Denkmal auch ganz in seinem früheren Schmuck wieder hergestellt zu sehen.” Ibid.

⁵⁵¹ Büttner, in “Gärtner und die Nazarener,” 130, offers his opinion that Ludwig probably shared Gärtner’s estimation of the interior, as seems to be supported by Ludwig’s eventual decision to paint Speyer Cathedral in very much the manner Gärtner had proposed for Bamberg.

⁵⁵² Dümmler, *Bamberger Kaiserdom. 1000 Jahre*, 59.

offences against liturgical necessities and for the placement and furnishing of altars “contrary to the ritual.”⁵⁵³ The dean of the cathedral, Friedrich Brenner, who must have forgotten that the interior had been painted white before the restoration began, complained in an anonymous but easily attributed pamphlet published that in its refurbished state the building looked “entirely too cold, frosty, uniform and corresponded too little to the splendor of the Catholic service.”⁵⁵⁴ Similar assessments were communicated to Sulpiz Boisserée, who had been appointed General Conservator of the Sculptural and Architectural [*plastische*] Monuments of Bavaria in 1835 – as Gärtner’s campaign began – and so presumably shared some responsibility for the result.⁵⁵⁵

8. The Little Byzantine

Heideloff’s response to Gärtner’s work was among the most positive public acknowledgements he received. Though he had not attempted to document the changes he had made at Bamberg, Heideloff had made studies of its architectural ornament which, together with studies of the ornament on other Byzantine buildings in German lands, and

⁵⁵³ Joachim Heinrich Jäck, “Ueber die Restauration des Bamberger Doms,” *Kunstblatt* no. 18 (1837): 426, quoted and discussed in Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, p. 232 and n. 170.

⁵⁵⁴ “gar zu kalt, frostig, einförmig und der Pracht des katholischen Gottesdienstes zu wenig entsprechend.” [Friedrich Brenner], *Einige Worte über die Wiederherstellung des Domes zu Bamberg bei seiner Wiedereröffnung am 25. August 1837* (Bamberg, 1837), quoted and discussed in Bruno Neundorfer and Walter Milutzki, “Das 20. Jahrhundert,” in Baumgärtel-Fleischmann et al., *Altäre des Bamberger Domes*, 292, and Renate Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, “30er und 40er Jahre des 19. Jahrhunderts,” 259.

⁵⁵⁵ Sulpiz Boisserée, on his conversation with a “Prof. Reutter of Bamberg,” wrote “Klagen über die Restauration des Doms Roheiten bei Entfernung der Grabmäler der Fürst-Bischöfe und Domherren etc. Vandalismus gegen den Perücken-Stil; und Ignoranz in Betreff auf Cultus und kirchliche Altertümer.” Sulpiz Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 3:556-57, entry for October 17, 1839. On Boisserée’s appointment to the position of General Conservator see Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 269.

even a couple of examples from France and from manuscript illuminations, he published as *The Little Byzantine: Pocketbook of the Byzantine Building Style (Der kleine Byzantiner. Taschenbuch des byzantinischen Baustyles)*, dedicated to Gärtner.⁵⁵⁶ On the front and back covers, Heideloff depicted the rulers whose reigns, according to his introduction, framed the flowering of the Byzantine style in German lands: Charlemagne, crowned Holy Roman Emperor in 800, on the front, and Emperor Ludwig IV, “the Bavarian”, who died in 1347, on the back [**fig. 4.14 a**].⁵⁵⁷ That German Byzantium had begun with Charlemagne had been established by Stieglitz; that it had ended with Ludwig the Bavarian was Heideloff’s own nod to the special role of Byzantium in Bavaria (even if that role was more characteristic of nineteenth-century Bavaria than that of the Middle Ages).

Most of the drawings in his book are of architectural ornaments Heideloff had found in Franconian and Swabian churches in Bavaria and Württemberg. Especially well represented are the Church of St. Sebaldus and the castle in Heideloff’s hometown, Nuremberg.⁵⁵⁸ From the Imperial Chapel (*Kaiserkapelle*, a double chapel, ca. 1200) of Nuremberg Castle, Heideloff illustrates a capital in the lower chapel depicting four eagles facing outward in a circle, and comments that “the magnificent composition allows one to correctly conclude, that it belongs to the time of Henry II (1007), just as the character is

⁵⁵⁶ Karl Alexander Heideloff, *Der kleine Byzantiner. Taschenbuch des byzantinischen Baustyles zum Handgebrauch für Architekten und technische Lehranstalten* (Nuremberg: Riegel und Wiessner, 1837).

⁵⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 5-13.

⁵⁵⁸ Ten plates include diagrams of ornament from Nuremberg; of these, 5 plates include diagrams of St. Sebaldus’s (11; 26-27; 31-32) and five of diagrams from various buildings in the castle (1-2, 12, 25, 36).

consonant with that of Bamberg Cathedral” [fig. 4.14 b].⁵⁵⁹ This suggests a shift from Rupprecht’s dating of the extant building to the time of St. Otto, i.e., a century after Henry’s death. The aggrandizing backdating suits the character of Heideloff’s illustration of the capital in Nuremberg, which makes it look quite different from the capital seen today in situ, on which the birds are rather less fierce and their features cruder [fig. 4.14 c].

The Rhineland is surprisingly poorly represented, beyond Worms Cathedral (which Heideloff compares rather weakly to Bamberg, given the significant connections to be drawn), and the Cathedral of Limburg an der Lahn, and the earlier portions of Freiburg Minster.⁵⁶⁰ He noted that the Limburg church (begun ca. 1175-1200; dedicated 1235) [fig. 4.14 d] has particularly old and fine ornament, and illustrated three different thick vegetal scrolls. Heideloff appears to have sought out buildings with broader German national associations, including the cathedral at Gelnhausen (a site associated with Frederick Barbarossa and his palace) and the Wartburg. A few ornaments he derived from manuscripts and monuments in France and England. Given Heideloff’s conviction that all of Bamberg Cathedral was Byzantine and that he confidently dated it and

⁵⁵⁹ “Ein Kapitäl aus der sogenannten Kaiser capelle auf der Burg zu Nürnberg. Die grossartige Composition lässt mit Recht schliessen, dass solche der Zeit Heinrich II. (1007) angehört; so wie der Charakter übereinstimmend mit dem des Bamberger Domes ist.” Heideloff, *Der kleine Byzantiner*, 18-19.

⁵⁶⁰ Heideloff still refers to Limburg Cathedral as a collegiate church; it had just been raised to a cathedral in 1827. Diagrams of Worms Cathedral are on plates 3 and 4; the similarity of column bases to “den besseren im Dom zu Bamberg” is noted in caption to plate 4 (p. 16). This comparison is somewhat surprising given the much more evident and significant comparisons to be made between design of Worms Cathedral and that of Bamberg Cathedral. See discussion in Dümler, *Bamberger Kaiserdom: 1000 Jahre Kunst und Geschichte*, 26-27 and 63, with bibliography. Diagrams of ornament at the collegiate church of Limburg an der Lahn are found on plates 21-22 and 25, and of Freiburg Minster on plates 21-22.

Nuremberg's Imperial Chapel two centuries or more too early, it is perhaps not surprising that of his few examples from France, three are from the Abbey Church of St. Denis outside Paris, and all of these appear to derive from the ambulatory and choir built under Abbot Suger (1140-44), today famous as a point of origin for the Gothic style **[fig. 4.14 e]**.⁵⁶¹ Heideloff's judgment that these are Byzantine ornaments probably derived both from the heavy curvilinear foliate designs, not fundamentally different from those he had found elsewhere, and from the round arches of St. Denis' ambulatory windows. The finer and more delicate quality of this architectural sculpture he attributed to a higher quality stone than that found in Germany but, he added, the effect is not so splendid as at Bamberg.⁵⁶²

A focus on the neglected church of the former monastery of Heilsbronn, closely associated with the Prussian ruling family but now part of Bavaria, is likely due to Heideloff's efforts to secure a commission for its renovation as much as to a general interest in the Hohenzollerns. Nevertheless, Heideloff's Byzantium is broadly German and, though centered well east of the Rhine, never concerned with the southern and eastern Mediterranean regions from which this Byzantium presumably derived its impulse, but only with the lands (France and England) to which German Byzantine influence appears to have extended.

⁵⁶¹ Heideloff, *Der kleine Byzantiner*: diagrams of ornament at the Abbey Church of St. Denis are included on plates 24 and 28; the arcades of Périgueux on plate 23, and St. Peters, Northampton, and Sts. Peter and Paul, Kettering, Northamptonshire, on plate 32.

⁵⁶² "Die Ornamente sind feiner und zarter gehalten als gewöhnlich die, welche in Deutschland gefunden werden. Das feine Material mag dies begünstigt haben; dennoch ist der Effect der Abtey St. Denis nicht so grossartig, als der, welchen der Dom zu Bamberg hervorbringt." Heideloff, *Der kleine Byzantiner*, 21.

His plates of Bamberg, meanwhile, are entirely devoted to the patterns painted on the vaulting of the western choir (St. Peter's Choir), which Rupprecht began to uncover and Heideloff had re-painted [**fig. 4.14 f-g**]. In waxing enthusiastic about the traces of paint and gilding found at Bamberg, Heideloff does not take on Rupprecht's (and Klenze's) notion that this section of the building in fact demonstrated the completed transition from Byzantine to Old Gothic; for Heideloff the entire church was Byzantine. He now seems to have dated the structure back to Henry II (as evident in his comment concerning Nuremberg Castle's Imperial Chapel); the paint, however, he still considered to be from the twelfth century, attributing it specifically to the patronage of St. Otto.⁵⁶³ It is perhaps possible to read into Heideloff's choice of motifs from Bamberg and his determination to read the entire structure as exhibiting a style that was coming to be defined by its painted (or mosaic) interiors, not only his support for Gärtner's suggestion that Bamberg should be re-painted but his hope that if this were to happen, he might receive the commission, despite Ludwig's evident displeasure at his earlier efforts. As will become evident in the next chapter, even though Rupprecht had concerned himself so deeply with the paint traces at Bamberg, it is Heideloff's book, as opposed to that which Rupprecht had been preparing with Klenze, that was fully in harmony with Gärtner

⁵⁶³ "Vier verschiedene Muster von Balkgemälden in den Feldern (Kappen) der Gewölbe des Peterschor im Dom zu Bamberg. Die Motive sind überaus schön gedacht und sinnreich aufgelöst und gewiss aus der Zeit Otto des Heiligen, welcher im Jahre 1108 nach einem Brande die Kirche mit Malerei verschönert haben soll. // Der Vervasser hat als Restaurateur des Domes viele Spuren dieser früheren Malerei nebst Vergoldung entdeckt, deren Ornamente mit denen der Sculptur ganz übereinstimmten. — Die Farbe des Plafond, von welchem unsere 4 Motive genommen sind, ist röhlicht grau gehalten, der Grund hingegen sticht ins violette; die Ornamente selbst haben einen warmen röhlichten Ton, mit Conturen von gebranntem rothen Oker." Heideloff, *Der kleine Byzantiner*, 19 and plates 13-16.

in its focus on surface treatment to the exclusion of structure as the key to recreating the past.

9. German Style Stained Glass and Classical Purity

In the meantime Ludwig, having assessed Regensburg Cathedral, had determined that it was not in fact the unaltered structure he had cherished in 1833, but had been spoiled by New Roman additions that had to be removed. Thus one of the more expensive projects underway as the Bamberg renovation was being completed was the replacement of the late-seventeenth-century crossing dome at Regensburg with its stucco work and its fresco depicting heaven, as Ludwig considered it too disfiguring (*deform*).⁵⁶⁴ Despite the misgivings of the cathedral chapter, which argued that both the cost and the delay in re-opening the cathedral would be excessive, this took place in January-July of 1837; by 1838 the crossing dome had been replaced with a groin vault inscribed with Ludwig's name and title.⁵⁶⁵ As Ludwig limited further additions to the polychromy to the stained glass, without its New Roman dome or furnishings Regensburg's interior was more monochrome upon its completion than at the start of the renovation.⁵⁶⁶

Nevertheless, in the sermon given upon the re-opening of Regensburg cathedral, its dean,

⁵⁶⁴ "...bestand der König auf der unverzüglichen Vorlage eines Kostenvoranschlags über die Ersetzung der 'deformen Kuppel.'" Gärtner to the Building Inspection, July 14, 1837, quoted in Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, pp. 205-06 and 225-27, and n. 133, citing Landbauamt Regensburg, *Akten zur Domkirche*, 167, 1836-40. Ludwig also had those altarpieces that were missing cheaply replaced by students at the art academy. Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 231. On the crossing dome see Loers, "Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms," 230.

⁵⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶⁶ Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 231-32.

Melchior Diepenbrock, expressed his delight: the Gothic style appears to have suited Regensburg's tastes more than the (unfinished) Byzantine style suited Bamberg's.⁵⁶⁷

Whether intended or not, the removal of Regensburg's spatial as well as iconographical center, its stuccoed and frescoed dome, had not only purified the German-style building of later additions but also of elements considered proper to the earlier, Byzantine style.⁵⁶⁸ For Ludwig, who never considered stained glass capable of conveying complex iconographical programs, such programs were the near-exclusive province of Byzantine-style buildings. (The degree to which his conception of the domed, frescoed, clear-glazed and spatially uninterrupted Byzantine interior drew on post-Reformation, and even specifically Jesuit precedent went unrecognized.) The German-Byzantine style could claim classical simplicity in its geometrical forms, if not in its gilded and frescoed walls, thanks to its supposed ancient Greek heritage. At the same time, the paint-free, monochrome walls of the purified version of Regensburg, with its simplicity (*Einfachheit*) and grandeur (*Erhabenheit*), expressed what was understood as the German style's classical purity despite the anticlassical, spiritual effect attributed to its stained glass windows.⁵⁶⁹ This clear reference to Winckelmann underlines that in making the transition from the Byzantine to the German style, medieval Germans had moved from centuries of imitating the Greeks to true originality in the manner outlined by Winckelmann, and had become, as Winckelmann had advocated, "great or if, possible,

⁵⁶⁷ The sermon is quoted by Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 234, 238 and 250.

⁵⁶⁸ On the Baroque dome as Regensburg Cathedral's iconographical as well as spatial center see Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 225-26.

⁵⁶⁹ On the contradiction between the classical purity read into the monochrome walls and the spiritual effect attributed to the stained glass windows see Raasch *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 228.

inimitable,” by achieving “the general and most distinctive characteristics of the Greek masterpieces,” “a noble simplicity and a quiet grandeur” (*eine edle Einfalt, und eine stille Größe*).⁵⁷⁰ Winckelmann had overlooked this native achievement and moved to Rome, leaving it for Bülow and Popp to rediscover.

In his renovations of the cathedrals of the new Bavarian territories of Bamberg and Regensburg Ludwig had been motivated to create a cohesive, Catholic and Bavarian, historical landscape rather than to address the buildings’ repair needs or to satisfy his scholarly curiosity. His genuine interest, however, in the physical evidence of the buildings’ original state and particularly in interpreting their polychromy led him and his architects to discover (or invent) for both the Byzantine and German styles a balance between classical virtue and the new Romantic spirit.

10. Byzantine vs. German to Romanesque vs. Gothic

Enthusiasm for medieval buildings, and their poor repair following the Napoleonic wars, had led to renovation campaigns such as that conducted at Speyer from 1818 to 1822 (when its Byzantine style had not yet gained general admiration), as well as to commissions for buildings in historicizing styles, such as Klenze’s likewise Byzantine Allerheiligenhofkapelle. With Ludwig’s growing attention to the relatively undeveloped fields of restoring medieval buildings and reproducing their styles in new ones came a practical need to more precisely define these styles so as to make the historical and geographical connections clear and, in this developing Romantic sense, imitable. To accomplish this, he and his architects came to focus on oppositions and to ignore

⁵⁷⁰ Winckelmann, *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works*, 4-5 and 32-33.

ambiguities where doing so would promote the legibility of the medieval styles and strengthen their ability to evoke distant times and places.

The leading scholarship of the early post Napoleonic period had traced stained glass to late tenth-century German churches in the Byzantine style. In line with the desire for heightened stylistic clarity, however, the presence of colored stained glass in buildings considered Byzantine, as well as painted interiors and grisaille glazing – from the late thirteenth century often mixed with colored glazing⁵⁷¹ – in those buildings considered German came to be ignored. Extant wall painting and grisaille glazing in “German” (or, “Old German”) buildings and colored stained glass in “Byzantine” (or, “German Byzantine”) ones were generally left alone, but in the pioneering historicizing commissions and historical renovations conducted under Ludwig I at this time they came to be treated as mutually exclusive hallmarks of Byzantine and German polychromy, just as round and pointed arches were treated as mutually exclusive hallmarks of Byzantine and German masonry.⁵⁷² Until mid-century, stained glass and pointed arches were read as

⁵⁷¹ Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 17-18, notes not only the frequent combination of grisaille and colored stained glass in windows produced from the end of the thirteenth century in order to bring in more light, but the insistence of nineteenth- and twentieth-century revivalists on the exclusive use of colored stained glass and on the resultant dim lighting in Gothic-style buildings.

⁵⁷² For this reason none of Ludwig’s Byzantine revival commissions and renovations received stained glass windows, and all either received frescoes or were recommended for such. Ohlmüller’s Maria-Hilf-Kirche in the Au and Regensburg Cathedral received stained glass but no frescoes: painting was largely restricted to the altar pieces. As Raasch points out concerning the Regensburg renovation, which removed the frescoes and most of the fixtures that had been added in later renovations, “die Restauration ‘säuberte’ die Architektur von [der barocken] Bilderwelt und duldet sie nur noch unmittelbar an den Altären und im Bereich der Glasmalereien in den Fenstern.” See Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms*, 188 (and further discussion on pp. 225-26).

indicative of the German style to the extent that inconsistencies between them were widely ignored.⁵⁷³

These early interpretations conflict strongly with re-interpretations of medieval architecture established by the second half of the nineteenth century. This historiographical shift towards the paradigms that underpin much twentieth-century scholarship has made many of the medieval renovations and revival styles of the first half of the nineteenth century difficult to read as they were intended. What in the early nineteenth century were understood as German-style buildings came to be read as Gothic – a style by then associated more closely with France. In the meantime, what in the early nineteenth century had been understood as Byzantine buildings had come to be read as Romanesque. With the notable exception of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, early nineteenth-century Byzantine revival buildings such as St. Louis's or St. Salvator, Donaustauf, became largely incomprehensible as such. Though designed to be legibly Byzantine, these buildings lost their historiographical position because Byzantium and its art and architecture became better known. Yet it is possible to see in retrospect that during the first half of the nineteenth century Byzantine and German styles of polychromy were defined in a manner that has retained currency for what is today known as Romanesque and Gothic architecture. Like the tendency to oppose round and pointed

⁵⁷³ Sulpiz Boisserée appears to have been among the first to pay attention to the existence of Byzantine (Romanesque) stained glass, when after a visit to St. Pantaleon in Cologne on 18 October 1829, he noted “schöne Glasmalereien byzantinische Grund-Construction mit mehreren späteren Veränderungen. An der Süd-Ost-Seite des Neben-Chors noch erhaltener Rest des Ursprünglichen“ (Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 2:428). As argued below, however, by this date the understanding of frescoes as characteristically Byzantine and stained glass as characteristically Gothic had been so well developed – especially in Munich, where Boisserée was then living – that such observations appear to have had no audience.

arches, a tendency to oppose wall paintings and stained glass still influences how these styles are seen, understood, and reproduced.

Chapter Five Eastern vs. German Byzantine

1. Ludwig of Bavaria and his Crusading Patron Saint: Louis IX of France

Ludwig I of Bavaria was born in Strasbourg on the feast day of the French king Louis IX, patron saint of France, August 25, 1786. It is hardly surprising that he was named for St. Louis (1214-70; ruled from 1226). As was typical among the minor nobility of Alsace, Ludwig's father Max Joseph, a colonel in the *Corps d'Alsace* of the French army, had loyalties to the Holy Roman Empire that overlapped with those to the French monarchy.⁵⁷⁴ The king of France at this time, Louis XVI (1754-93; ruled from 1774), had already subsidized the cash-strapped colonel before becoming godfather to Ludwig, Max Joseph's first-born child.⁵⁷⁵ Ludwig honored St. Louis but, thanks to his early and lasting prejudices against France and most things French (a prejudice which long troubled his father⁵⁷⁶), he did not honor him as patron of France. Nor, for similar reasons, did Ludwig celebrate St. Louis as a patron of innovative and influential *rayonnant* Gothic art and architecture, as exemplified in the saint's court chapel, the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris (1243-48; restored following damage during the French Revolution) [**fig. 5.1 a-b**].

To associate Gothic architecture with a French king, let alone to point to a jewel such as St. Louis's Sainte-Chapelle, would have appeared unpatriotic for any German

⁵⁷⁴On Maximilian Joseph's relationship to the French crown see Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 54-57.

⁵⁷⁵Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 56.

⁵⁷⁶On June 8, 1807, a frustrated Max Joseph wrote to Ludwig: "Ich will Dein Gefühl gegen N[apoleon] nicht erwähnen, denke was Du willst; nur bitte ich, nicht zu vergessen, daß dieser Mann allein uns vergrößert hat und daß er es noch tun wird und daß er bei dem Frieden uns viel Schaden, aber auch viel Nutzen verschaffen kann..." Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 135.

ruler and it seems certain that Ludwig never considered such a course. Instead of its style, Ludwig's interest lay in the program of the Sainte-Chapelle. From its inception this had celebrated the relics of the Passion that had once been among the proudest possessions of the Byzantine Empire – and had become available in the wake of the Fourth Crusade's sack of Constantinople in 1204. Louis's purchase of these Byzantine relics was followed by his vow to lead what came to be known as the Seventh Crusade (1248-54) while the chapel was still under construction; the future saint's ambitions for this Crusade were worked into the chapel's program, and he embarked for the East shortly after the building's completion.⁵⁷⁷

As it turned out, the Seventh Crusade was a failure, as was the Eighth of 1270, which Louis also led and in the course of which he met his death: these events helped to spell the end of the Crusades and confirm the French king's saintly reputation. For Ludwig, rather than as patron of France or as patron of Gothic works, St. Louis was not only first and foremost a Crusader but also the final major link in the chain of contacts with the East that had gradually revived the artistic expression of Western spirituality. Ludwig's notion built upon the growing number of treasures brought back from the East in the course of the Middle Ages that had come to be associated with Louis IX. Among the most recent and most celebrated of these attributions was the *Baptistère de Saint Louis*, the Egyptian or Syrian inlaid basin used for French royal baptisms, presumably

⁵⁷⁷ For a general overview of the Holy Chapel's program see Daniel H. Weiss, *Art and the Crusade in the Age of Saint Louis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 4-5; on the Palatine Chapel at Palermo as one of the most important precedents for Louis IX's court chapel (a connection which was, however, probably not recognized as such by Ludwig I of Bavaria) see 19-22.

including that of his godfather [fig. 5.2].⁵⁷⁸ Muhammad ibn al-Zayn made the basin ca. 1290-1310, i.e., a generation or so after Louis IX's death; it is first documented in France in 1380 among the possessions of Charles V.⁵⁷⁹ In the first half of the eighteenth century, the first written discussion of the basin described it as having long been used for French royal baptisms and dated its manufacture back to 897 on the basis of a misread inscription.⁵⁸⁰ By the second half of the eighteenth century (apparently on the basis of free association), the increasingly famous basin was considered one of the major acquisitions made during Louis IX's Crusades and had gained its current eponym.⁵⁸¹ Ludwig had plenty of opportunity to see this work during his 1806 stay as Napoleon's young and recalcitrant guest in Paris where the basin – which unlike his godfather had survived the Revolution – remained in the treasury of the Sainte-Chapelle.⁵⁸²

Whichever of Louis's Eastern contacts and acquisitions Ludwig may have had in mind, it was St. Louis's role as Crusader that Cornelius integrated into the history of painting in the cartoons he was drawing up for the *Loggiengang* of the Pinakothek. In the program for the loggias that Cornelius wrote up with Clemens Zimmermann (who, as discussed in Chapter Three, painted the frescoes from Cornelius's cartoons), any

⁵⁷⁸ Paris, Musée du Louvre LP 16.

⁵⁷⁹ David Storm Rice, *Le Baptistère de Saint Louis* (Paris: Les Éditions du Chêne, 1951), 9.

⁵⁸⁰ Piganiol de la Force, *Description de Paris, de Versailles... et de toutes les autres belles maisons et châteaux des environs de Paris*, v. 8 (Paris, 1742), 43.

⁵⁸¹ As attested by the first illustrated discussion in A.B. Millin, *Antiquités Nationales*, v. 2 (Paris, 1791), 61-65 (with 2 plates depicting the basin). By 1866 the connection with St. Louis was considered questionable. See cat. no. 21 in Esin Atıl, *Renaissance of Islam: Art of the Mamluks* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981), 76-79, and Rice, *Baptistère de Saint Louis*, 9-11.

⁵⁸² Ludwig was a guest at Napoleon's court from February to September, 1806. See Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 129-32. In 1852 the basin was moved to the Musée du Louvre, although it was used once more (in 1856) for the baptism of Prince Napoléon-Eugène. See Rice, *Le Baptistère de Saint Louis*, 10.

association of Gothic, that is, German, architecture with Louis IX or with France was omitted. As discussed earlier, the development of the German style was reserved for a loggia in which it was portrayed specifically as instrumental to the revival of the arts in Germanic lands [**fig. 3.5 h**]. This history celebrated all Western medieval contact with the East, whether peaceful or warlike, as part of the constructive transfer of objects and ideas uniting art and religion through the centuries. The Byzantine style similarly represented the blending of East and West during this key period, which Ludwig interpreted (and the loggia frescoes depicted) as one of artistic gestation both guided by, and expressive of, spiritual development. The style was already being celebrated in the construction of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, finally fully underway, and the renovation of the sainted Bavarian Emperor Henry II's (now) Byzantine-style cathedral in Bamberg. It appears to have been in a spirit of honoring St. Louis as integral to the meeting of East and West that in 1828 Ludwig determined to honor his namesake with a Byzantine-style church of his own: the Ludwigskirche.

2. The Ludwigskirche (1828-1844): Commissions

The intention to build a church to St. Louis appears to have crystallized in Ludwig's mind shortly after he had decided against Klenze's proposal to place an image of this saint in the apse of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle. When a new parish was formed in August 1827 with St. Louis as its patron, Ludwig jumped at the chance to provide it with a church on Ludwigstraße (a street he had already named for himself), but he does not

appear to have ever considered building it in a Gothic style.⁵⁸³ According to Sulpiz Boisserée's account, Ludwig determined that the church would not be designed by Klenze, and that it would be painted in frescoes by Cornelius:

At Cornelius's house.... Heß has the commission to paint the court chapel... Cornelius would paint the church that is to be built outside the Schwabing Gate [formerly the northern entrance to Munich, beside the Residence; torn down in 1817 to make way for expansion of the city from the Residence northward, i.e., for creation of the Ludwigstraße] in the Ludwig suburb. He maintains he knows that Klenze will *not* be building it, but not who will be building it.⁵⁸⁴

Since Ludwig had also just determined, according to this account (as well as an account Gärtner had written a month earlier), that Klenze's Allerheiligenhofkapelle should be frescoed by Heß rather than covered in mosaics, perhaps it was the developing association of frescoes with the Byzantine style that led him to decide that the church housing Cornelius's frescoes should also be in this style.⁵⁸⁵ While celebrating St. Louis's role in art history as a Crusader, this decision suppressed reference to the saint's patronage of Gothic architecture as King of France.

⁵⁸³ On the formation of the parish and Ludwig's response see Frank Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche in München," *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, 3rd ser., 35 (1984): 190.

⁵⁸⁴ Sulpiz Boisserée: "Mit Cornelius zu Hause.... Heß hat den Auftrag die Hof-Kapelle zu malen.... Cornelius soll die Kirche malen, die draußen vor dem Schwabinger Tor in der Ludwigs-Vorstadt erbaut werden soll. Daß Kl[enze] sie *nicht* bauen wird behauptet er zu wissen nicht aber wer sie bauen wird." Entry for August 23, 1827, in Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 2:202.

⁵⁸⁵ On Heß receiving the Allerheiligenhofkapelle fresco commission see also Gärtner to Johann Martin von Wagner, July 22, 1827, in "Briefe Friedrich von Gärtners," ed. Brenninger et al., 307. On negotiations between Ludwig, Klenze and Heß concerning the Allerheiligenhofkapelle fresco commission see Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 60-61. Haltrich does not note Boisserée's entry or Gärtner's letter, which both document that Heß had already essentially received the commission by the summer of 1827.

3. The Byzantine Style: Orthodox or Pre-Reformation Catholic?

To choose the Byzantine style was odd less on account of the church's dedication to St. Louis, however, than because Klenze and Heß were already creating a Byzantine revival chapel in the royal palace just around the corner. Ludwig appears to have wanted a more public monument in his capital city (which had no significant German Byzantine monuments) with which to celebrate the New Greeks and their maintenance of the ancient art and architectural traditions of the early, unified Church. The Byzantine style represented for Ludwig a pre-Reformation Christianity appropriate to his understanding of Bavaria as an originally, and therefore essentially Catholic state.⁵⁸⁶ The style also evoked Greece's historical influence on German culture (as embodied by buildings such as Speyer and Bamberg Cathedrals) and Bavaria's contemporary role in helping to liberate Greece. At the same time, in producing yet another major Catholic church in the New Greek style, Ludwig was quietly underlining that this New Greek heritage was not the exclusive prerogative of the Orthodox— even though the Eastern Orthodox Church had rejected Rome's claims to authority long before Luther and Calvin, and its ruling elite had long since embraced the Ottomans as God's way of protecting them from the Papacy.⁵⁸⁷ With the Battle of Navarino in October 1827, the Greek War of Independence had turned decisively in the Greek favor and Ludwig, with most of Bavaria, exulted at the prospect of a new Greek and Christian nation.⁵⁸⁸

⁵⁸⁶ "Katholik vor der Reformation wäre ich," Ludwig told his minister of the interior the preceding winter, according to an entry in Ludwig's diary from July 4, 1830 (discussed further below).

⁵⁸⁷ Richard Clogg, *A Concise History of Greece*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 11-13.

⁵⁸⁸ As evident, for example, in the ongoing popularity of theatrical productions such as Gustav J. Krahe's *Der Fall von Missolonghi: Drama in 3 Akten* (Munich: Hübschmann,

That in contrast to his own celebration of Catholicism as the original and dominant faith in Bavaria, Ludwig viewed Greece's Christianity in generic terms and specifically its claims to a separate, Orthodox nation as subordinate to Western claims over it is suggested by Ludwig's pronouncement of 1829 that this new nation ought to be receptive to a ruler belonging to a different confession:

I should think the Greeks have gained enough, if they receive a ruler who having barely reached adolescence becomes a Greek... A new state that wouldn't exist if Christians of other confessions had not supported its people for years and years should certainly not begin with such an exclusion.⁵⁸⁹

Whether Ludwig already foresaw that his second son, Otto, might be appointed king of New Greece is not clear, but when, in 1832, this did come to pass, Ludwig remained adamant, against expectation and advice to the contrary, that Otto remain Catholic (which he did).⁵⁹⁰

Perhaps Ludwig's position in this regard had originated in the anti-clericalism of many of the European-educated Greek insurgents, who were disgusted by the corruption

1828) dedicated to King Ludwig, which has been described by Robert Arnold as "eine überaus geschmacklose Copie des Zriny." "Besonders reich blüht in Bayern das Griechendrama" though, Arnold noted, other sorts of publications were also fueling the particularly keen anticipation of (New) Greek victory in Bavaria, e.g. the series of portraits published by Karl Krazeisen (an amateur artist and general in the Bavarian army who had volunteered to help the Greek cause) as *Bildnisse ausgezeichneten Griechen und Philhellenen, nebst einigen Ansichten und Trachten* (Munich, 1828-31). See Arnold, "Der deutsche Philhellenismus," 159 and Goethe's favorable, if brief, review of the first fascicle of Krazeisen's work in *Über Kunst und Alterthum* v. 6:2 (1828), reprinted in Goethe, *Schriften zur Kunst*, 1022-23.

⁵⁸⁹ "Ich sollte meynen, die Griechen gewönnen genug, wenn sie einen Herrscher bekommen, der kaum an das Jünglingsalter gränzend, Grieche wird... Ein neuer Staat der nicht bestünde, wen nicht Christen anderer Glaubensbekenntnisse das Volk Jahre und Jahre unterstützt hätten, soll doch nicht mit solcher Ausschließung beginnen." Ludwig, as quoted in Emanuel Turczynski, *Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte Griechenlands im 19. Jahrhundert* (Mannheim: Bibliopolis, 2003), 253, citing a letter from Gise to Kobell dated Nov. 7, 1834 in Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv München / Politisches Archiv Griechenland IV.

⁵⁹⁰ Turczynski, *Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte Griechenlands*, 248-56.

of the Orthodox hierarchy and its complicity with the Ottoman rulers.⁵⁹¹ And perhaps, despite his anti-French sentiments, he had tacitly adopted the longstanding tradition in French scholarship, which saw in the former Byzantine Empire a mirror for the ideal of an autocratic Christian state, and in the Orthodox faithful, a potential to expand the reach of the Catholic Church.⁵⁹² During the Thirty Years War French scholars had worked particularly closely with Vatican librarian Leo Allatios (1586/87-1669), who shared their desire, and that of Pope Urban VIII (r. 1623-44), to bring the Orthodox Church into the Catholic fold (presumably in part to replace the territories being lost to Protestantism).⁵⁹³ Through his numerous and varied writings, Allatios, a convert from Orthodoxy to Catholicism, tried to explain the Orthodox Church to the Catholic world, while attacking

⁵⁹¹ Clogg, *A Concise History of Greece*, 13.

⁵⁹² Diether Reinsch, "Edition und Rezeption byzantinischer Historiker durch deutsche Humanisten," 47-63; here, p. 50; George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Joan Hussey, rev. ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969), 3-4; and Bunna Ebels, "Byzantium and the Middle Ages," in *Polyphonia Byzantina: Studies in Honour of Willem J. Aerts*, ed. Hero Hokwerda, Edé R. Smits, and Marinus M. Woesthuis (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1993), 339-50, here, pp. 340-41, with bibliography.

⁵⁹³ The priest Jean Morin (1591-1659) published his "historical account of the time when the [Orthodox and Catholic] faiths were one," *Histoire de la délivrance de l'église chrétienne par l'empereur Constantin*, in 1630: see Anthony Cutler, "A Baroque Account of Byzantine Architecture: Leone Allacci's *De templis Graecorum recentioribus*," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 25 (1966): 79. In 1640, Pope Urban VIII called Morin to Rome to aid in bringing about the union of the Greek and Latin churches; he became friends with Allatios, whose letters to Morin became the basis for *De templis Graecorum recentioribus*. In the same year, Allatios wrote *De libris ecclesiasticis Graecorum dissertationes duae* (Paris, 1645) in response to Gabriel Naudé (1600-53), librarian to Richelieu and Mazarin, who "sought enlightenment about the plethora of Greek liturgical books." See Anthony Cutler, introduction to *The Newer Temples of the Greeks*, by Leo Allatios, trans. Anthony Cutler (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1969), xiii-xiv.

Protestants as the true enemies of God: among these writings was the only post-Byzantine treatise on Orthodox architecture prior to the nineteenth century.⁵⁹⁴

Although Luther had quickly dropped his early interest in Byzantium as the non-Catholic, even anti-Papal heir to the early Church, there had also been efforts to bring the Ottoman Orthodox Christians into the Protestant fold, an early example being those of Martinus Crusius (Martin Kraus, 1526-1607), professor in Tübingen, who in 1573 sent a Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession to the Patriarch Jeremias II in Istanbul, followed by a number of Protestant theological treatises in 1579.⁵⁹⁵ Unfortunately for Otto, the only conversion that the majority of his new subjects would seriously contemplate was his own conversion to Christian Orthodoxy: his refusal to do so would strongly offend the citizens of the new Greek state. In the interim, however, battling the Ottomans gave the Christian confessions common cause and Ludwig could represent Byzantium as if a divide between Patriarchal and Papal authority did not exist.

⁵⁹⁴ *De templis Graecorum recentioribus* (Rome, 1645). See Cutler, introduction to *Newer Temples of the Greeks*, by Allatios, xi-xiv, and n. 20 (above).

⁵⁹⁵ See Hans-Georg Beck, "Die Byzantinischen Studien in Deutschland vor Karl Krumbacher," in *Χαλκικε: Festgabe für die Teilnehmer am XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongreß, München 15.-20. September 1958*, ed. Hans-Georg Beck (Freising: Dr. F.P. Datterer, 1958), 67-119; here, pp. 74-75, and Hans Eideneier, "Von der Handschrift zum Druck: Marinus Crusius und David Höschel als Sammler griechischer Venezianer Volksdrucke des 16. Jahrhunderts," in Hans Eideneier, ed., *Graeca recentiora in Germania: Deutsch-griechische Kulturbeziehungen vom 15. bis 19. Jahrhundert*, Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, vol. 59 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994), 93-109, here pp. 99-100. It was in fact the arrival of British and American Protestant missionaries in 1829 that first raised the issue of religious toleration in modern Greece: see John Anthony Petropulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece, 1833-1843* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 312.

4. Friedrich Wilhelm III of Prussia and the New Greek Chapel of St. Alexander Nevsky, Potsdam (ca. 1826-28)

With the inception of the Ludwigskirche project, Ludwig had three Byzantine buildings underway at once – a new chapel, a new church, and a cathedral renovation. This sudden commitment to reviving a style was unprecedented. At this time, curiously, another German ruler commissioned a New Greek building that provides a foil for many aspects of the Bavarian commissions. King Friedrich Wilhelm III of Prussia had a chapel built in Potsdam for Russians to hold their New Greek services [**fig. 5.3 a-b**]. Probably designed by Vasilii P. Stasov (1769-1848), a leading Russian architect, the tiny centrally-planned structure is essentially a cube with an eastern apse, topped by an onion dome on a high drum, with four miniature onion domes on drums at the corners.⁵⁹⁶ The pentacupolar form and its neoclassical articulation were found again shortly afterwards in Stasov's major buildings in St. Petersburg, the Cathedral of the Transfiguration of the Savior (1827-29) and the Cathedral of the Trinity (1828-35).⁵⁹⁷ The plans were prepared following the death of Tsar Alexander I on December 13, 1825, in time for Karl Friedrich Schinkel to rework them and for the ground stone to be laid on September 11, 1826.⁵⁹⁸ This was the feast day of Russia's patron saint, Alexander Nevsky (ca. 1220-1263), to whom the chapel was dedicated; the chapel was completed by the end of 1828 and

⁵⁹⁶ Karl-Heinz Otto and Anatolij Koljada, *Alexandrowka. Alexander-Newski-Gedächtniskirche* (Potsdam: Heveller, 1997), 55-57.

⁵⁹⁷ William Craft Brumfield, *A History of Russian Architecture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 368-69. The Alexander Nevsky Chapel is also said to be a miniature version of Stasov's rebuilding of the Church of the Tithes (Desjatin Church) in Kiev (1828-42; razed in 1935). See Waltraud Volk, *Potsdam. Historische Straßen und Bauten Heute*, 2nd, rev. ed. (Berlin: Verlag für Bauwesen, 1993), 67 and Otto and Koljada, *Alexandrowka. Alexander-Newski-Gedächtniskirche*, 52.

⁵⁹⁸ Bettina B. Altendorf, *Die russischen Sänger des Königs und die Kolonie Alexandrowka in Potsdam* (Berlin: Hendrik Bäbler, 2004), 33 and 119.

dedicated the following September 11.⁵⁹⁹ In exchange, Schinkel designed a New Greek church for Tsar Nicholas I (1796-1855; ruled from 1825), which was built in the park at Peterhof in the early 1830s.⁶⁰⁰

The Potsdam chapel was part of a village built as a memorial to Alexander I, which was to house the Russian military chorus Alexander had given to Friedrich Wilhelm III in 1813, during the joint Russian and Prussian campaigns against Napoleon.⁶⁰¹ Although the village and its chapel were built to celebrate Russian architectural as well as musical, military, and religious traditions, the Russian religion was not differentiated from that of the Ottoman Greeks and was called Greek or New Greek.⁶⁰² The Russian settlement around the chapel, when referred to as a confessional community, was likewise called New Greek in contemporary documents or, more formally, in the dedication placed in the ground stone, the “*apostolischer, orientalisch-katholischer Glaube*.”⁶⁰³

That Alexander Nevsky, a warrior saint famed for defeating the Teutonic Knights and for keeping the Germans at bay, should have been the patronym of this chapel in

⁵⁹⁹ Altendorf, *Die russischen Sanger des Konigs*, 119.

⁶⁰⁰ Altendorf, *Die russischen Sanger des Konigs*, 33.

⁶⁰¹ Altendorf, *Die russischen Sanger des Konigs*, 19 and 23-24.

⁶⁰² This accorded with Russia’s understanding of itself as the dominant inheritor, and protector, of the Greek, i.e., Byzantine, Church. It was the Bavarian regency that would create a separate, national Greek church in 1833, shortly after the it had gained control of the new Greek nation—partly as a barricade against Russian interference. Russia objected strenuously, and did not cease to regard itself as the defender of Orthodoxy in Greece (and elsewhere). See Petropulos, *Politics and Statecraft*, 180-84 and Turczynski, *Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte Griechenlands*, 248-53.

⁶⁰³ Altendorf, *Die russischen Sanger des Konigs*, 34, 118 and 120; Karl Baedeker, *Handbuch fur Reisende in Deutschland und dem Oesterreichischen Kaiserstaate* (Koblenz: Karl Baedeker, 1846), 487; and Oberst z. D. Bogislaw von Buttkamer, “Die Griechische Capelle des Heiligen Alexander Newsky bei der Colonie Alexandrowka,” *Mitteilungen des Vereins fur die Geschichte Potsdams*, Pt. 3 (Potsdam, 1867), xci, 97-100.

Potsdam would seem stranger if he hadn't been the namesake of the Tsar in whose honor the village was built.⁶⁰⁴ Such a dedication was antithetical to the Byzantine-German architectural connection Ludwig and his architects were reinforcing with their Byzantine revival and renovation in Bavaria, and the Potsdam chapel had no influence on their thinking or on their designs. Close architectural as well as political and even religious ties between Prussia and Russia appear to have given Prussian architects a vantage point from which to explore Byzantine (or Russian-Byzantine) architecture from an earlier date, and with different agendas than in Bavaria. Friedrich Wilhelm III's daughter, the wife of the new Tsar Nicholas, had converted to the New Greek faith, and the Prussian regime, along with the Austrian, did not support the New Greeks during their battles of the 1820s and the nation-building of the 1830s.

Already in 1833 the Prussian Franz Kugler made a notable contribution to the analysis of Byzantine architecture when he focused on ground plans as distinguishing Byzantine from Western medieval buildings. But just as the Alexander Nevsky Chapel made no impact in Bavaria at time, neither did this essay make much impact beyond Prussia.⁶⁰⁵ The significance of such distinctions did not find broad consensus for another decade or more. Thanks to Ludwig's efforts and political and architectural commitments,

⁶⁰⁴ Nevsky defeated the Teutonic Knights on April 5, 1242, at the Battle on Lake Peipus: a battle celebrated ever since as having crushed the German will to expand into Russia: see, for instance, the film *Alexander Nevsky*, directed by Sergei Eisenstein and Dmitry Vasiliev (Mosfilm, 1938).

⁶⁰⁵ Franz Kugler, "Ueber die roemisch-christlichen Bausystem, 4. Byzantinisches Bausystem, als eigenthümliche Modificierung des römisch-christlichen," *Museum. Blätter für bildende Kunst*, 1:47 (Nov. 25, 1833): 371-75. This shift in scholarship was arguably due not only to developing sophistication in architectural analysis but also to Prussian investment in drawing distinctions between West and East, while Bavarians remained invested in drawing connections – at least until mid-century. The Prussian side of this story will be addressed in a future study.

in Bavaria most of those with a stake in the subject were preoccupied not with distinguishing the history and attributes of New Greek architecture from that in German lands but with strengthening—excessively, as it turned out—their geographical and chronological continuities.

5. Ludwig's Catholic Philhellenism:

Klenze Renovates St. Salvator, Munich, as a New Greek Church (1828-30)

Though Ludwig appears to have taken no notice of the Potsdam chapel as a work of architecture, he did, perhaps coincidentally, give Munich's Greek community its own church in 1828, just as the Potsdam Chapel was completed. The Church of St. Salvator (1493-94) was a late Gothic structure that had stood largely unused since Napoleonic secularization, although Ludwig's father had offered it to the Protestant community.⁶⁰⁶ Klenze, in charge of adapting it for Greek services, designed an iconostasis that suggested a somewhat classicizing version of his Allerheiligenhofkapelle façade, while the Duchess Maria Pavlovna of Weimar, whose icons had once inspired Goethe's investigation of Byzantine art,⁶⁰⁷ arranged for a Russian donation of altar furnishings to St. Salvator's.⁶⁰⁸ The resulting interior, completed in 1830, was extraordinarily eclectic [fig. 5.4].

Munich's papal nuncio Graf d'Argenteau reported disapprovingly on St. Salvator to the cardinal who had charged him with investigating Ludwig. The nuncio saw both

⁶⁰⁶ The Protestant community had recently given the church back, according to prior agreement, as it had built a new church instead of renovating the old one. Cat. no. 128 in Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 411-412.

⁶⁰⁷ Goethe, note to Maria Pavlovna, late Feb./early March 1814, in Goethe, *Schriften zur Kunst*, 646-47.

⁶⁰⁸ Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 411-412.

Protestants and philhellenists as threats to Bavarian Catholicism and viewed Munich's leading Protestant philhellenist, Thiersch, whom Ludwig had recently appointed to a professorship, as "the utmost opponent of the Catholics."⁶⁰⁹ In an effort to satisfy the liberals Ludwig gave generous support to the Greeks while snubbing the Jesuits; furthermore, the nuncio accused Ludwig of "clearing out one of the oldest churches in Munich" for the Greeks as living quarters and then, in response to a request from the Russian tsar, furnishing it so that they could hold Greek services in it.⁶¹⁰ The nuncio evidently did not realize that the church was already empty, or that Ludwig had given it to the Greek community of his own accord. Beyond St. Salvator's altar furnishings, Russia appears to have had no discernible influence on his or his architects' considerations of New Greek art, architecture or religion.⁶¹¹ Evidently, however, Ludwig's Philhellenist Catholicism was challenging to the Catholic hierarchy; with his son's appointment to the Greek throne, it would also challenge the Orthodox hierarchy. In the meantime, through giving the Greek community a Gothic church, Ludwig retained

⁶⁰⁹ "...die Rektorwahl sei auf einen der allerschärfste Gegner der Katholiken gefallen [i.e., Thiersch]." Report of Nuncio Graf d'Argenteau, no. 285 of Nov. 11, 1829, in response to the request of Cardinal State Secretary (*Kardinalstaatssekretär*) Albani for information concerning Ludwig's antagonism towards the Collegium Germanicum, which had been reorganized under Jesuit control in 1824, as discussed and cited in Bastgen, "Ludwigs I. von Bayern 'Liberalismus' und 'Jesuitenfurcht,' 650.

⁶¹⁰ "Er habe ihnen eine der ältesten Kirchen Münchens eingeräumt. Zunächst nur zum wohnen, dann aber, auf Bitten des russischen Kaisers, zum Abhalten des griechischen Gottesdienstes." Ibid.

⁶¹¹ Conversely, Bavarian interpretations of New Greek architecture met with approval and some influence in Russia, inasmuch as when Tsar Nicholas I toured Munich with Ludwig and Klenze in 1838, he was impressed enough to commission an iconostasis from Klenze for the Orthodox Cathedral of St. Isaac in St. Petersburg, though the iconostasis that was finally built was designed by Auguste-Ricard de Montferrand. See cat. no. 166 in Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 447-49.

a monopoly on Byzantine style architecture in Munich for what were fully his own, German Catholic purposes.

6. Ludwig, Gärtner and the Purified Byzantine Style

As if to underline the larger purposefulness of the Ludwigskirche as his second Byzantine revival commission, rather than starting with a specific (and likewise eclectic) model such as the Palatine Chapel in Palermo, this time Ludwig specified that the Ludwigskirche should be built in a purified Byzantine style (*im gereinigten byzantinischen Stil*).⁶¹² Unlike at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, where he began with a specific model in mind and the merits of additional and alternative models were debated, it seems that by specifying “purified” Ludwig sought an abstract, Platonic version of Byzantine architecture. In fact, though it will be shown that a range of models was used in developing the proposals for the Ludwigskirche, these models were never justified or even named in any of the surviving documentation. The absence of allegiance to specific models supports the conjecture that by purified, Ludwig intended and Gärtner understood a timeless version rather than a historically specific realization of a Byzantine building. As such, this commission was unique.

Ludwig did not choose Klenze for this job of stylistic purification. Instead he chose Gärtner, who had judged Klenze's plan for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle so harshly in 1827. While it may be that Ludwig thought that working with Gärtner on such a commission would be less trying than working with Klenze had proven to be, it has been argued that Ludwig's primary motivation was to break the near monopoly over

⁶¹² As Gärtner stated in a letter dated Feb. 8, 1829, to Johann Martin von Wagner. See “Briefe Friedrich von Gärtners,” ed. Brenninger et al., 312.

architectural practice in Bavaria that Klenze had gained during the dozen or so years since he had begun working for Ludwig.⁶¹³ Additional motivation for the choice of Gärtner may have been to find an architect with whom Peter Cornelius would be more comfortable working.⁶¹⁴ As seen in Chapter Three, tensions had developed between Klenze and Cornelius in the course of their work on the Glyptothek, and these had continued at the Pinakothek. Further, if Cornelius's report to Sulpiz Boisserée is to be believed, Ludwig told Gärtner that "Klenze has no sense for church architecture – his work in this area has not pleased me, he is a North German [and so] has not enough soul for church commissions."⁶¹⁵ In fact, Ludwig gave Klenze no further major commissions for ecclesiastical buildings.⁶¹⁶ Though Klenze had been born in the north (in Wolfenbüttel), by "North German" Ludwig presumably meant not only that Klenze had

⁶¹³ On May 26, 1826, Ludwig wrote to his art agent in Rome, Johann Martin von Wagner, "Monopol taugt nichts! Darum wünsche ich von Ihnen einen tüchtigen Architekten zu erfahren, der mit Klenze in die Schranken treten kann." Wagner recommended Gärtner (his close friend), along with other architects. Winfried Nerdinger, "Friedrich von Gärtner—Ansichten eines Architektenlebens," 13. Klenze served at this time both as court architect (*Hofbauintendant*) and chair of the building commission of the ministry (*Vorstand der Baukommission im Ministerium*): see Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 19.

⁶¹⁴ This seems to be substantiated by Sulpiz Boisserée's note: "...Bei Cornelius im Hause. Der König hat gestern im Englischen Garten Gärtner weitläufig über die Gesinnung der hiesigen Künstler und Kunst-Freunde—auch unser—besonders in Beziehung auf Klenze und Cornelius examiniert. ‚Es gibt eben 2 Parteien‘, hat er gesagt, ‚ich weiß es; und Cornelius verträgt sich nun einmal nicht mit Klenze. Die Ludwigs-Kirche soll G[ärtner] bauen und Cornelius malen.“ Entry for Feb. 27, 1828, in Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 2:274-75.

⁶¹⁵ Ludwig's conversation with Gärtner, as recounted by Cornelius to Sulpiz Boisserée: "...Klenze hat keinen Sinn für Kirchen-Baukunst—sein Werk darüber hat mir nicht gefallen, er ist ein Nord-Deutscher hat nicht Gemüt genug für Kirchen-Arbeiten." Entry for Feb. 27, 1828, in Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 2:275. Gärtner had already received the commission by January 1828.

⁶¹⁶ Ludwig's son Otto would commission a Catholic church in Athens from Klenze in 1851, though the building, intended to reflect the style of early Roman basilicas, was only carried out in much simplified form. See cat. no. 187 in Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 488-91.

the dry, dispassionate quality generally attributed by southerners to the North German character, but specifically that he was not Catholic, though Gärtner (Catholic and born in Koblenz, then residence of his father's employer, the Prince-Bishop of Trier), was hardly more enamored of the new Catholic revivalism than Klenze.⁶¹⁷ That Gärtner warmed up to Cornelius and the Nazarenes at this time appears to reflect his awareness that a commission such as the Ludwigskirche might be forthcoming.⁶¹⁸

7. Cornelius's Christian Vision: Byzantine?

Gärtner was certainly not unfamiliar with the Brotherhood of St. Luke, since he had had extended contact with it during his study years in Rome (October 1814 through May 1817). Yet following in the footsteps of his mentor, Martin von Wagner, a classicizing painter and sculptor as well as King Ludwig's art agent in Rome, Gärtner had developed a strong dislike for the Brotherhood, and specifically for its conservative Catholicism and its public expression.⁶¹⁹ In 1818 Gärtner took enormous satisfaction in the thought that the new Bavarian constitution, to which Ludwig had contributed, would protect Bavaria from the same abhorrent zealots to whom Ludwig had taken such a liking:

The new constitution, which is splendid, will place considerable limits on the sanctimonious corps of Nazarenes, at least in our land, because specifically religion and the press are treated most liberally; 3 confessions [i.e., Catholic,

⁶¹⁷ Klenze's family was predominantly Protestant, though Klenze's father had been raised Catholic by his converted mother. On Klenze's background see Buttler, "‘Also doch ein Teutscher’? Klenze's Weg nach München," 73-74. On Gärtner's childhood and family background see Kay Thoss, "Der junge Friedrich und sein väterlicher Protegé," in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 33.

⁶¹⁸ Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 124-27.

⁶¹⁹ Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 123.

Reform and Lutheran Christians] are recognized as fully equal and accorded unlimited freedom of belief and conscience. Anyways, let them come! I scatter corrupting seed under the bunch like an evil enemy, revealing them as and wherever I can... Cornelius is expected and Langer [Johann Peter von Langer, Director of the Munich Academy 1808-24] is pleased that all is going well for his students. *Capisce?* If, however, the Corpus Nazarenorum makes its way back into an underground cave to cultivate love, then please to not miss this beautiful opportunity to exterminate the entire heap. At the most it would cost ten *baiocci* [*baiocco*: a Vatican coin in circulation until 1865] worth of sulphur.⁶²⁰

Given this venom, it might have surprised Wagner that, once Cornelius was working with Klenze and the difficulties between them became evident, Gärtner took Cornelius's side.⁶²¹ He specifically admired the frescoes of classical mythology in the Glyptothek for their heroic proportions, which he contrasted with the genre painting then popular in Munich.⁶²²

From its inception Ludwig had envisioned the Ludwigskirche as housing and framing another major fresco program by Cornelius; in this one, unlike those at the Glyptothek or the Pinakothek still underway, Cornelius would finally have a chance to

⁶²⁰ “Die neue Constitution, die vortrefflich ist, wird dem Pfaffen Corps von Nazarenern wenigstens auf unserem Boden ziemlich Grenzen stecken, da gerade Religion und Presse am liberalsten behandelt sind, 3 Religionshaltungen als völlig gleich anerkennt und unbegrenzte Glaubens- und Gewissensfreiheit gestattet ist. Übrigens mögen sie kommen! Ich streue wie ein böser Feind schon verderblichen Samen unter die Menge, decke sie auf, wie und wo ich nur kann... Cornelius wird erwartet und Langer [Johann Peter von Langer, Direktor der Münchner Akademie 1808-24] freut sich, dass es seinen Schülern immer gut gehe. *Capisce?* Wenn aber das Corpus Nazarenorum sich wieder in eine unterirdische Höhle begibt, um der Liebe zu pflegen, so versäumt doch ja diese schöne Gelegenheit nicht, dem ganzen Haufen auszutilgen. Es kostet höchstens 10 Bajock [bajocco, Währung im Vatikanstaat] Schwefel.” Friedrich von Gärtner to Johann Martin von Wagner, Munich, June 4, 1818, with bracketed editorial clarifications, in “Briefe Friedrich von Gärtners,” ed. Brenninger et al., 272. The implication of homosexuality evident in this passage would be revived in early twentieth-century condemnation of the Nazarenes (when Cornelius would be depicted as having escaped such degeneracy through returning to Germany). See Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 178.

⁶²¹ Büttner, “Gärtner und die Nazarener,” 123 and 126-27.

⁶²² Friedrich von Gärtner to Martin von Wagner, Munich, July 22, 1827, in “Briefe Friedrich von Gärtners,” ed. Brenninger et al., 307.

fully express his Christian vision.⁶²³ This vision was, of course, not mythological but precisely the religious one that had grated on Gärtner when he first encountered the Nazarenes. Expecting a grander commission (and a grander salary) than Heß, Cornelius intended to cover all the available surfaces of the church with scenes depicting the entire history of the Christian religion.⁶²⁴ Ludwig I, however, rejected this idea and limited Cornelius's frescoes to the choir, crossing and transepts, as he was not prepared to pay the required sum nor wait the projected twenty years for the completion of such a monumental project.⁶²⁵

Cornelius developed two abbreviated programs for the Ludwigskirche, and presented them to Ludwig in July 1829. Ludwig chose a Credo cycle, in which each of the frescoes illuminated one sentence of the Credo.⁶²⁶ In executing these frescoes the primary challenge Cornelius set himself was to create a version of the *Last Judgment* for the choir of the Ludwigskirche that responded to Michelangelo's monumental treatment of the same subject on the wall behind the main altar of the Sistine chapel (1536-41) [**fig. 5.5 f-g and h-1**].⁶²⁷ As Cornelius's project assumed that, like the corresponding wall in

⁶²³ Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 127.

⁶²⁴ Frank Büttner, "The Frescoes of Peter Cornelius in the Munich Ludwigskirche and Contemporary Criticism," in *Art in Bourgeois Society, 1790-1850*, ed. Andrew Hemingway and William Vaughan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 232. [Revised and translated version of Büttner, "Unzeitgemäße Größe. Die Fresken von Peter Cornelius und die zeitgenössische Kritik," *Das Münster*, 1993, no. 4:293-304.]

Apparently it is not possible to know more about Cornelius's original program, as Büttner states (n. 11) that the letter in which Cornelius outlined it was destroyed in World War Two.

⁶²⁵ Cornelius presented Ludwig with his full-scale fresco program in April 1829. Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 127.

⁶²⁶ Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 127-28 and Büttner, "Frescoes of Peter Cornelius in the Munich Ludwigskirche," 232-33. I have not found any information on the subject of Cornelius's alternative fresco program proposal.

⁶²⁷ Büttner, "Frescoes of Peter Cornelius in the Munich Ludwigskirche," 238-39.

the Sistine chapel, the choir at the Ludwigskirche would be straight-ended, this aspect of the architectural design must have already been determined.

Comparison with Michelangelo's famous work was inevitable as the very idea of such a subject for a fresco in such a location was Michelangelo's invention.⁶²⁸ That Cornelius would take on Michelangelo is surprising, however, not only because of the high stakes involved but because, according to the Nazarene aesthetic,

models could only be those works in which Christian religiosity had expressed itself most purely and perfectly, where national character manifested itself most freely. This was the case, according to the opinion of the Nazarenes, in the work of the young Raphael and his teachers, in whom the Christian spirit was not yet corrupted by the striving of art for autonomy, and in the works of Dürer's era, that... [were] unspoiled creations of the national character, not infiltrated by undue foreign influence.⁶²⁹

As has been discussed in Chapter Two, the Nazarenes had been inspired to take this direction by Friedrich Schlegel. Michelangelo was a problematic artist for a Nazarene to follow, however, as Schlegel had located the departure of art from this ideal in Michelangelo's oeuvre and influence. Indeed, except for the unusual subject, its dramatic scale and placement on a straight, windowless wall behind the main altar, and the fresco

⁶²⁸ Cordula Grewe discusses Cornelius's Last Judgment in relation to Michelangelo's in her recent article, "Historicism and the Symbolic Imaginary in Nazarene Art," *Art Bulletin* 89 no. 1 (March, 2007): 83-87. As she incorporates Büttner's thesis that this fresco (and Cornelius's entire Ludwigskirche program) demonstrates an interest in the aesthetics of Byzantine mosaics, without developing the thesis further (or citing Büttner), her interesting arguments are not directly relevant to the present discussion.

⁶²⁹ "Muster können nur die Werke sein, in denen sich die christliche Religiosität am reinsten und vollkommensten ausgesprochen hat, der nationale Charakter am freiesten in Erscheinung tritt. Dieses war nach Meinung der Nazarener in den Werken des jungen Raffael und seiner Lehrer der Fall, in denen der christliche Geist noch nicht durch das Autonomiestreben der Kunst korrumpiert war, und in den Werken der Dürerzeit, die... unverfälschte Erzeugnisse des durch nichts überfremdeten Nationalcharakters [waren]." Büttner, "Streit um die 'Neudeutsche religio-patriotische Kunst,'" 65.

medium itself, Cornelius followed little beyond generic compositional elements (the ascension of the saved on Christ's right, and the descent of the damned on his left).

Cornelius certainly followed nothing of Michelangelo's style. His golds and reds dominated the flesh tones so evident in Michelangelo's work; a hieratic composition replaced Michelangelo's dramatic tensions and turmoil, and clothed figures – with the telling exception of two men falling to their damnation – replaced Michelangelo's largely naked male figures (his women are clothed). The central figure of Christ in Michelangelo's version embodies the motion of the entire composition, his entire body extending the expression of his arms – open and unprotected to the right, where his arm is up and beckoning; observant and defended to the left, where his arm is down, warding off. The Christ in Cornelius's composition sits calmly above three angels: the flanking angels lean down to sound trumpets to those below; the central angel stares straight ahead while holding open a book which reads “uber vitae aeternae” on the right-hand page and “uber mortis aeternae” on the left. Christ merely gestures with his hands while likewise gazing out towards the viewer.

Seeking iconographic and stylistic models for the Credo cycle Frank Büttner, the primary scholar of this work, has suggested that Cornelius looked to Byzantine-style mosaics, specifically, those of San Marco in Venice, in developing this program.⁶³⁰ It might be more profitable to look at works that Cornelius would have considered as Byzantine, whether or not they fit into today's Byzantine corpus. Specifically, Cornelius's figure of Christ, with his cross-inscribed nimbus in his cloud-framed circle of gold, might be compared with that of Last Judgments such as the monumental mosaic of

⁶³⁰ Ibid., 193. Büttner does not further specify which mosaics.

the second half of the thirteenth century attributed to Coppo di Marcovaldo (active 1260s-70s) in the Baptistery of Florence [[fig. 5.5 h-2](#)]. But whether Cornelius thought of his Christ as similarly Byzantine remains difficult to judge. At least to a modern observer, in terms of perspectival illusionism, ornamental patterning, abstraction of forms, and relationship to the larger composition, Cornelius's *Last Judgment* remains closer to that of Michelangelo than to that of Coppo di Marcovaldo. Whatever the relationship to Byzantine models, in contrast to the established Nazarene approach to imitation as expressed in the late 1810s, Michelangelo is copied in various respects but not followed.⁶³¹ Rather, he is corrected in favor of the anti-sensual, anti-illusionistic aesthetic that Schlegel had advocated but Cornelius, prior to this fresco cycle, had never closely observed.⁶³²

Another innovation in Cornelius's program was the inclusion of a Crucifixion.

Schlegel had written that

The image of Mary and of the Passion of the Crucifixion are primitive and, with all their endlessly diverse expressions, variations and combinations, both the inexhaustible objects and basic viewpoints and the eternal poles of higher, true painting.⁶³³

⁶³¹ This approach echoes the distinctions Winckelmann drew between the goals of copying, or faithful imitation, and those of spiritual imitation, or following, discussed in chap. 2.

⁶³² Büttner writes that Cornelius sought "his own conception, in which he could be released from Michelangelo," in Büttner, "Frescoes of Peter Cornelius in the Munich Ludwigskirche," 240. I would argue that he chose Michelangelo in order to correct him according to Schlegel's dicta, i.e., in order to underline his opposition to Michelangelo's approach, so that searching for release was not an issue.

⁶³³ "Das Marienbild und das Kreuzesleiden, dieses sind die primitiven und mit allen ihren unendlich verschiedenen Ausdrücken, Variationen und Kombinationen auch nie zu erschöpfenden Gegenstände und Grundanschauungen, gleichsam die ewigen Pole der höhern wahrhaften Malerei." Friedrich Schlegel, "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde," 92.

Nevertheless, the Nazarenes had until this point avoided the subject of the Crucifixion, which had become unpopular among classicizing artists and contradicted the Nazarenes' own tendency to avoid emotionalism.⁶³⁴ This was the first Crucifixion painted by a member of the Brotherhood of St. Luke and as such, further underlines Cornelius's effort to visualize Schlegel's words in this cycle.⁶³⁵

A further correspondence with Schlegel's statement is that the major fresco in the north transept opposite the Crucifixion depicts Mary, holding on her lap the Christ child being adored by the Shepherds and the Magi, i.e., the Crucifixion's "eternal pole." In developing his argument that Cornelius looked to Byzantine models, Büttner has described Cornelius's image of Mary as a Theotokos who intentionally denies viewers the expected image of Mary as representative of maternal love [**fig. 5.5 i.1**].⁶³⁶ Whether or not one agrees with this contention with respect to this image or to the Byzantine Theotokos, it is worth noting that neither Cornelius nor his contemporaries seem to have noted any specifically Byzantine qualities in this program (nor, despite Cornelius's narrow depth of field and hieratic figures, are they visible to the modern observer, even when the corpus of Byzantine mosaics as defined in Cornelius's day is taken into consideration).

Other Bavarian Byzantine-style figural frescoes (including Heß's at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle) and ornamental painting (including Schwarzmann's at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle and Schwarzmann's and Gärtner's at the Ludwigskirche) of around the same time were praised as great works of art and understood as recognizably

⁶³⁴ Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:168-69.

⁶³⁵ *Ibid.*, 169.

⁶³⁶ Büttner, "Frescoes of Peter Cornelius in the Munich Ludwigskirche," 236.

Byzantine, while Cornelius's were neither. Perhaps this is in part because Cornelius's conservative interpretation of Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* demonstrating a crowded, shallow depth of field, hierarchical, relatively static composition, clothed, even anti-sensual figures, with gold (in this case, in the background rather than the clothing) dominating flesh tones, looks not to the Byzantine tradition (however defined), but to Last Judgments such as that at the Church of St. Michael and Gudula [fig. 4.3 b-c]. But perhaps this is because, rather than relying on simple keys to the Byzantine style, such as gold backgrounds, Cornelius interpreted the Byzantine tradition, as it was defined in his day, with greater subtlety.

8. Cornelius's Christian Vision and Confessional Polarization

Confessional polarization, which was well underway at the time Cornelius developed his program, appears to have strongly influenced the conception and reception of his Ludwigskirche frescoes.⁶³⁷ Of the transition that had occurred since the height of Napoleon's power, Ludwig commented in 1830:

Twenty years ago a union of the Protestants with the Catholics seemed closer than now—how divorced from the present! A union is postponed to a later date at

⁶³⁷ This discussion of Cornelius's confessional politics is at odds with that in Grewe, "Historicism and the Symbolic Imaginary," 82-83. Her discussion (82-83) contains few citations to primary or secondary materials beyond an unpublished article that which serves as her primary source (82, n. 2). I am unable, therefore, to respond to her assertions in any detail. The general outline of her argument - that Cornelius was an adherent of the Catholic Tübingen School and as such intended his Ludwigskirche fresco program first and foremost as an ecumenical statement - one which conformed with public taste when conceived ca. 1830 but not upon its completion in 1840 - was first established in 1993 by Frank Büttner in his article "Unzeitgemäße Größe. Die Fresken von Peter Cornelius" and reiterated in 1998 in Büttner, "The Frescoes of Peter Cornelius in the Munich Ludwigskirche" (neither cited by Grewe). It is not clear to me what Grewe adds to this argument, which appears to me to be based upon a narrow and selective reading of the evidence.

least. I would be Catholic before the Reformation, I said last winter to my Minister of the Interior von Schenk, making a distinction between Catholic and Jesuit.⁶³⁸

Cornelius and his friend the anti-Protestant theologian Ignaz von Döllinger were part of a conservative and Jesuit-oriented circle.⁶³⁹ Ludwig, who was biased against Protestants but more so against Jesuits, was directing his energies towards silencing Görres's circle as too Jesuitical at the time of the fresco commission, and was well aware of Cornelius's membership in this group.⁶⁴⁰ Given the increasingly charged situation, it seems that Cornelius used the fresco program to assert his continued, or even strengthened, allegiance to his circle of friends and his beliefs at least in part in defiance of Ludwig. In this vein, he included both Ignatius of Loyola (depicted in a group of key founders of orders) and Francis Xavier (depicted in a group of key missionaries), founding members of the Jesuit order, in his fresco cycle.⁶⁴¹ At the same time, in taking up the views of Schlegel more literally than he and other Nazarenes had before, in certain respects (i.e.,

⁶³⁸ “Vor 20 Jahren schien eine Vereinigung der Protestanten mit den Katholiken näher als jetzt, wie geschieden dermalen! Auf spätere Zeit wenigstens vertagt ist eine Vereinigung. Katholik vor der Reformation wäre ich, sagte ich letzten Winter zu meinem Minister des Inneren von Schenk, mache Unterschied zwischen Katholik und Jesuit.” Ludwig I, entry for July 4, 1830, in Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Ludwig I.-Archiv, Tagebuch 3,85, quoted in Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 514.

⁶³⁹ In fact, Döllinger had brought Joseph Görres into contact with the conservative Catholics around the philosopher Franz Baader, and so helped to establish the influential “conservative Catholic salon” which included Cornelius, among others, and came to be held at Görres's house. See Vanden Heuvel, *German Life in the Age of Revolution: Joseph Görres*, 294-95.

⁶⁴⁰ Ludwig's dislike of the Jesuits was expressed in his suppression of the journal *Eos* in 1829; Joseph Görres, a leading ultramontane voice, had been its editor since 1828. See Vanden Heuvel, *German Life in the Age of Revolution: Joseph Görres*, 298, and Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 563. That Ludwig was aware of Cornelius as member of this group, which he and Gärtner called alternatively the “Jesuits” and the “Congregation,” is clear from his irritated negotiations with Cornelius, via Gärtner, over the fresco contract. See Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:157-58n27.

⁶⁴¹ Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:197.

the inclusion of a Crucifixion), Cornelius's *Last Judgment* appears a fitting tribute to the most famous representative of the German Romantic spirit and of its turn towards Catholicism. Schlegel had died in January 1829, while in the midst of writing an exposition on the "fully completed and perfected understanding" (*ganz vollendete und vollkommene Verstehen*), just six months before Cornelius composed this program.⁶⁴²

Unfortunately, however, Cornelius had given his frescoes iconographic and stylistic qualities that neither Protestant nor Catholic members of the public found theologically meaningful or identifiably Byzantine. Nor did Cornelius ever touch the other fresco program specified in his contract: a series of scenes from life of St. Louis planned for the narthex, for which no cartoons survive.⁶⁴³ The only image of St. Louis actually carried out depicts him among holy kings and queens, in a group towered over by Charlemagne.⁶⁴⁴ Though Ludwig appears to have been interested in the fresco cycle's execution rather than its content, it is not surprising that he did not care for the result.⁶⁴⁵ Nor did Gärtner, who, once he had received the commission for the building, appears to have quickly lost the admiration for Cornelius he had only recently discovered. Reviewers, meanwhile, criticized Cornelius's program as too dogmatic, too Catholic, and

⁶⁴² Ernst Behler, *Friedrich Schlegel in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1966), 148-50.

⁶⁴³ Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:166.

⁶⁴⁴ Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:197-98.

⁶⁴⁵ Though he argues that Cornelius's fresco program had an ecumenical intent, Büttner notes that the inclusion of Ignatius of Loyola suggests that Ludwig never examined it carefully. In the end, Ludwig reserved his harshest criticism for the frescoes' style (with its self-conscious opposition to that of Michelangelo), stating of Cornelius at the end of the project, "a painter must paint. Otherwise I cannot use him." Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:197-98 and idem, "Frescoes of Peter Cornelius in the Munich Ludwigskirche," 245.

not sufficiently following the great style of Michelangelo.⁶⁴⁶ Unlike Heß, whose frescoes were comfortably sensual and mildly exotic, Cornelius would have no further impact on the development of Byzantine revival style that Ludwig had initiated.

9. Bavarian Byzantine Glazing

One aspect of the Byzantine revival style that was developed with Cornelius's, as well as Heß's, frescoes in mind was the glazing. As noted in the preceding chapter, grisaille windows had been made for the Ludwigskirche in 1828, but were rejected for use in the church by the start of 1829. Although Cornelius had yet to submit a fresco proposal, Ludwig had wished to ensure that the frescoes would be as visible as possible. (Perhaps due to a dark patina on the model chosen, these windows were of grey not white glass and so darker than necessary.⁶⁴⁷) This left the building without any examples of medieval revival glazing - one of the several revived art forms for which Munich was becoming known.⁶⁴⁸ It seems no evidence of the design of the 1828 grisaille glass survives, but it is tempting to believe that it was modeled on the intricately patterned, non-figural grisaille windows associated with the Cistercian order (founded 1098), which favored grisaille over figural and colored glass as being less distracting and luxurious.

⁶⁴⁶ Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:253.

⁶⁴⁷ Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 23, calls attention to the poor condition of most surviving medieval stained glass in the early nineteenth century, and the effect of this on revival efforts.

⁶⁴⁸ Sulpiz Boisserée appears to have been among the few people in Munich who were seriously examining evidence of pre-Gothic stained glass at this time. In his entry for October 18th, 1829, on a visit to St. Pantaleon, Cologne, he noted “schöne Glasmalereien byzantinische Grund-Construction mit mehreren späteren Veränderungen. An der Süd-Ost-Seite des Neben-Chors noch erhaltener Rest des Ursprünglichen —”: Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 2:428.

The patterns used by the Cistercians have been long (if perhaps inaccurately) attributed to Islamic and Byzantine sources.⁶⁴⁹

By the mid-1830s, Ludwig changed his mind concerning the appropriateness of grisaille windows for his Byzantine commissions. The terms used for such windows in contemporary documents of the Glass Institute and its patrons: *Tapeten-*, *Verzierungs-* and *mosaikartige Fenster* (wallpaper, decorative, and mosaic-like windows) imply, as does Boisserée's term "damascened" for the trial windows of 1828-29,⁶⁵⁰ that rather than the French Cistercian associations attributed to this type of window today, Byzantine or more broadly Near Eastern associations were made at the time.⁶⁵¹ The twelfth-century date of the Cistercian ban on stained glass (1134) may, however, have helped to confirm the appropriateness of such windows for Byzantine-era architecture (and even, by the mid-1840s, that the incorporation of some colored-glass elements would be also be

⁶⁴⁹ Islamic art has continued to be advocated as a source for Cistercian grisaille patterns until recently, and perhaps most forcefully, by Eva Frodl-Kraft, in a series of publications dating 1965-72. For a discussion of her arguments and a brief historiography of the association of grisaille glass with Islamic and Byzantine sources, as well as a discussion of German and Austrian examples (at the Cistercian foundations of Eberbach, Rheinhessen; Marienstatt, northeast of Koblenz; Haina, near Kassel; Namedy, near Trier; Heiligenkreuz, south of Vienna; Neukloster, northwestern Mecklenburg, and Doberan – this last example now in the Schwerin Museum), see Helen Jackson Zakin, *French Cistercian Grisaille Glass* (New York: Garland, 1979), 3-4, 89-93, and 171-76. Zakin does not explore in detail the early historiography of this idea: the earliest discussion she treats is that of L. Day, *Windows: A Book about Stained and Painted Glass*, 3rd ed. (London, 1909), 19. Her subsequent historiography consists entirely of German-language sources (see Zakin, esp. 90 n. 1). It would be interesting to know the earliest documented instance of this popular idea, whether it was primarily a German interest, and specifically whether Gärtner knew of any of the German and Austrian examples and would have made such Islamic and Byzantine associations as well.

⁶⁵⁰ Discussed in Chapter Four, above.

⁶⁵¹ For the terms used for such windows in the records of the Royal Glass Institute see Elgin Vaassen, "Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechischen Kapelle auf dem Neroberg in Wiesbaden und zu weiteren ornamentalen Verglasungen der Glasmalereianstalt des bayerischen Königs Ludwig I. in München," *Kunst in Hessen und am Mittelrhein* 30 (1990): 69-78 (the terms are scattered through the article).

appropriate for Bavarian Byzantine-style commissions⁶⁵²). Once the fresco programs for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle and the Ludwigskirche had been established, Ludwig apparently determined that in fact they required the broken, diffuse light that grisaille windows would provide.⁶⁵³

Despite Klenze's earlier assessment in *Anweisung zur Architectur* (1822/24) that Byzantine buildings had no paintings in the windows,⁶⁵⁴ Elgin Vaassen has discovered that it was at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle that, in 1836, the first grisaille glazing was installed: this consisted of white glass windows decorated with non-figural patterns in black and had a matt finish on the back [**fig. 5.5 i.2 and i.3**].⁶⁵⁵ As noted by Vaassen, who has studied these fragments in detail, the windows were composed of rhomboid, hexagonal, and circular panes; interstitial panes were painted with a leaf and the whole was framed by a wide border of similar pattern, enclosed by a zigzag lines. All of the ornament was painted in black on white (uncolored) glass that had been given a matt finish on the back (the side facing the exterior).⁶⁵⁶ By 1841 such windows had been installed at the Ludwigskirche as well.⁶⁵⁷ While they have been replaced by crude replicas, an indication of Gärtner's design for the Ludwigskirche glazing, which was very

⁶⁵² Bavarian Byzantine windows that do survive are those made for the Brunnkapelle at the saltworks in Bad Reichenhall, probably designed by Daniel Ohlmüller ca. 1834-39, which are discussed in Chapter Six.

⁶⁵³ Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 189.

⁶⁵⁴ "...kleine Fenster ohne Malereyen": Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architectur*, 11, quoted above in Chapter Three.

⁶⁵⁵ These few remains of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle windows that were otherwise destroyed in the Second World War were packed away several years ago, although a plan to restore them was under discussion. Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 189 n. 45, and Vaassen, "Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechischen Kapelle, 77 n. 29.

⁶⁵⁶ Vaassen, "Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechischen Kapelle," 77.

⁶⁵⁷ Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 189, and Vaassen, "Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechischen Kapelle," 77-78.

similar to that at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, still survives in an ink and watercolor study that focuses on his plans for the ornamental frescoes [**fig. 5 u-1**].⁶⁵⁸ These Allerheiligenhofkapelle and Ludwigskirche *Tapetenfenster* would provide models for buildings which mark the mid-century development and conclusion of the Bavarian Byzantine style, as will be treated in Chapter Six.

If the glazing was carefully considered with respect to the frescoes, in the placement of the windows Cornelius's ambitions had suffered a blow at the start, when Gärtner presented Ludwig with the revised designs for the building for official approval. Apparently without consulting Cornelius, Gärtner's modifications included a choir that, if still straight-ended, was now elongated by an additional barrel-vaulted bay which, though not as deep as the other choir bay, was windowless, providing worse lighting for the frescoes [**fig. 5.5 p; cf. preliminary plan, 5.5 I**].⁶⁵⁹ Although the fresco program was the commission's original motivation, it was clearly not at the forefront of Gärtner's thoughts. A closer look at Gärtner's background and at the progress of his work on the Ludwigskirche provides clues as to how he did conceive of the project.

10. The Evolution of Gärtner's Architectural Ideas

Unlike Klenze, Gärtner published little concerning his architectural or other ideas. Beyond the buildings themselves, and his architectural studies and preparatory drawings, Gärtner's opinions and intentions are little documented except in his letters: in his early years to his parents; later, to Johann Martin von Wagner. Conveniently for Gärtner's

⁶⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁹ In 1833, however, Gärtner did change the design of the crossing to have a barrel vault rather than a quadripartite vault, per the request of the artist to whom Cornelius assigned this fresco. Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 128.

career his father, Andreas Gärtner (1744-1826), served as the Bavarian Court Building Director (*Hofbau-Intendant*), while Wagner, to whom Friedrich became especially close, let his painting career lapse in order to serve as Ludwig's art agent and consultant in artistic and architectural matters.⁶⁶⁰ When Klenze abruptly replaced Andreas Gärtner as Court Building Director in 1818, Friedrich Gärtner's chosen career path grew more difficult. Though Wagner used his influence to help the younger Gärtner's career, Friedrich was left with a lifelong hostility towards Klenze who, for his part, having angled for Andreas's job, was not pleased to find new competition in Andreas's son.⁶⁶¹

Friedrich von Gärtner had received an architectural training as thoroughly Neoclassical as Wagner's or Klenze's, in the course of which he expressed a specific interest in acquiring technical skills. Gärtner's complaint with his training at the Munich Academy (1808-12) under Karl von Fischer had nothing to do with Fischer's emphasis on the classical canon, but with what he felt was an over-emphasis on theory.⁶⁶² Gärtner had admired instead the work of the Munich engineer Friedrich von Wiebeking (who a decade later would renovate Speyer Cathedral and write *Discipline of Theoretical and Practical Civic Architecture*, inspiring the renovation of Bamberg that Gärtner would complete).⁶⁶³ As Wiebeking did not teach at the academy, Gärtner credited most of his practical training to the months he had spent at the school of the staunchly neoclassical architect Friedrich Weinbrenner in Karlsruhe after completing his formal studies in

⁶⁶⁰ Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 123-24.

⁶⁶¹ Lieb, "Klenze und die Künstler Ludwigs I.," 658 and 661, and Hans Lehbruch, "'Gärtner liebster bester Gärtner.' Eine Karriere im Dienst des Königs," in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 95.

⁶⁶² See Herman van Bergeijk, "'Hinter dem Vorhang des schönen Lebens.' Gärtner's Begegnung mit Italien," in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 51.

⁶⁶³ Friedrich von Gärtner to his parents, Aug. 10, 1813 (Bavarian State Library, Ms. Dept. Ana 451/92), quoted in van Bergeijk, "'Hinter dem Vorhang des schönen Lebens,'" 51.

Munich.⁶⁶⁴ While in Karlsruhe Gärtner had met and discussed Weinbrenner's work with Weinbrenner's former student Georg Moller, then early in his career in Darmstadt. When Gärtner arrived in Paris he found that he agreed with Moller's estimation of Weinbrenner as the best living architect.⁶⁶⁵ Continuing his studies in Paris the following year, Gärtner met with a number of architects but admired only one, Jean-Baptiste Rondelet (1743-1829), whom he called a "great engineer in wood and stone."⁶⁶⁶

To judge by his surviving sketches and letters, even during Gärtner's final study tour—consisting of nearly three years in Italy during which his friendship with Wagner developed—he rarely diverged from his focus on classical architecture and its modern interpreters in order to attend to early Christian or medieval buildings.⁶⁶⁷ Georg Moller, though committed to Classicism in his own designs, had demonstrated far greater interest in medieval monuments during and after his study tour, resulting in significant contributions to the subject. In May and June of 1827 Gärtner was able to return to Italy.⁶⁶⁸ With no idea of the impending Ludwigskirche commission, he again paid no particular attention to Lombard or other medieval Italian buildings. He stayed in Florence for a while but unlike Klenze, he did not mention or draw San Carlo dei Lombardi; he

⁶⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶⁶ Ibid. Rondelet was already renowned for completing (1780-90) St. Geneviève (the Pantheon) in Paris after the death of Jacques-Germain Soufflot; when Gärtner arrived in Paris, the first of the five volumes of Rondelet's frequently reprinted *Traité théorique et pratique de l'art de bâtir* (1812-17) had just been published.

⁶⁶⁷ "Für eine Beschäftigung mit vorgotischer Architektur scheint es doch keine Belege zu geben." Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 205, n. 83. See van Bergeijk, "'Hinter dem Vorhang des schönen Lebens,'" 51-69.

⁶⁶⁸ For the following discussion of Gärtner's observations on this trip, see his letters to Wagner for 12 and 18 May, 10 June and 22 July, 1827, in "Briefe Friedrich von Gärtner," ed. Brenninger et al., 303-07 (published according to manuscript, not strictly chronological, order).

stopped off in Milan on his return trip, but compared to Genoa, which he loved, Milan for Gärtner was a disgusting place full of market stalls. He apparently took no notice of Sant' Ambrogio while in Milan, and did not mention Verona, Piacenza, or any other places with medieval monuments that might have influenced his subsequent plans for the Ludwigskirche (or Klenze's for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle). Gärtner's hoped-for meeting with Wagner or Ziebland in Siena never materialized, and it seems he may not have stopped off there himself (though he must have passed by when traveling between Florence and Perugia). He made no mention of Orvieto, and despite his efforts, does not appear to have come closer to Rome on this trip than Perugia and Ludwig I's nearby villa, "La Colombella," where he was Ludwig's guest. Gärtner evidently made a good impression on Ludwig and by January 1828 he learned that Ludwig would give him the commission to design the Ludwigskirche.

Gärtner had never traveled nearer the eastern Mediterranean than the Two Sicilies and Italian architecture already constituted for him the primary (and nearly exclusive) source of worthy historical examples. Thus it is not surprising that he was at least as prone as Ludwig I or Leo von Klenze to look first to Italy for inspiration for the Byzantine style of his latest commission. As he had not studied medieval Italian architecture but only that which preceded or postdated the medieval era, he seems to have relied for his initial proposals for this commission on those buildings he had studied which, according to his understanding, arguably demonstrated Byzantine influence; and on recent histories of the Byzantine style and books of plates; on local Munich architecture and local Munich architects. The information he drew from these sources was telling.

In July 1827, about half a year before receiving the Ludwigskirche commission, Gärtner had written Wagner concerning his brother-in-law Heinrich Heß: “He has also already concluded the agreement for the frescoes in the new Byzantine court chapel and will soon begin to draw the cartoons for it. I expect much of him, if the style doesn’t again constrain him all too much.”⁶⁶⁹ By “again,” Gärtner presumably is referring to Heß’s first Byzantine-style commission, at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle; it would be interesting to know what precisely about those frescoes appeared constrained to him. But if Gärtner felt that the style of Byzantine painting could be constraining, it is not evident that he felt similarly about Byzantine architecture. He seems never to have considered the Byzantine architectural style as demanding fundamental structural or spatial considerations. In any case, the basilican ground plan he chose was from the start largely determined by the need to provide broad flat surfaces for Cornelius’s fresco program; hence the unusual choice of a straight-walled—albeit elongated—choir, similarly straight-walled transepts and relatively small windows. At the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, the structure was primary and the frescoes were a later development. Though Gärtner expressed less disgust for the Byzantine style than Klenze, he also expended less energy grappling with it.

⁶⁶⁹ “Auch hat er bereits den Akkord für die Freskenmalerei in der neuen byzantinische Hofkapelle abgeschlossen und wird bald anfangen, die Kartons dazu zu zeichnen. Ich erwarte viel von ihm, wenn ihn auch wieder der Stil nicht zu sehr beschränkt.” Letter dated July 22, 1827, in “Briefe Friedrich von Gärtners,” ed. Brenninger et al., 307. Ludwig intended to give Gärtner the commission for the Ludwigskirche by September 1827, according to a letter he wrote to the Mayor of Munich. Gärtner knew of this plan by January 1828, when he wrote to Wagner to tell him about it. See Büttner, “Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche,” 190.

11. The Ludwigskirche on the Ludwigsstraße: A Byzantine Heart for Bavaria's New Political and Intellectual Establishment

The Ludwigskirche was Gärtner's first major commission.⁶⁷⁰ It was to be situated on Ludwigstraße, which Ludwig was building up as the new center of political and intellectual life for the city and the kingdom. Klenze had been in charge of planning this street for over a decade, and his War Ministry building was just being completed at the south end of it.⁶⁷¹ By 1829 King Ludwig had appointed Gärtner to the architectural oversight committee (*Baukunstauschuß*) along with Klenze, and Gärtner was edging Klenze out of further Ludwigstraße commissions.⁶⁷² The king accepted Gärtner's proposal for a state library between the War Ministry and the Ludwigskirche in 1831.⁶⁷³ By 1835 Gärtner was in charge of designing new buildings to house the university at the

⁶⁷⁰ On January 28, 1828, Ludwig had declared that Gärtner must be the architect of the church if he were going to help finance its construction; Gärtner's plans received final approval on March 11, 1829. See Birgit-Varena Karnapp, "Werkverzeichnis," in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 226-27 (cat. no. 11). Ludwig had already foreseen Gärtner as architect of the state library and Gärtner had already drawn up some proposals in 1827, but Gärtner did not receive a contract for the library until July 29, 1828, and plans for the library were not approved until Feb. 15, 1831. See Karnapp, "Werkverzeichnis," 225-26 (cat. no. 10).

⁶⁷¹ On the planning and design of Ludwigstraße (1816-29) see cat. no. 43 of Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 271-77 (cat. no. 43); on Klenze's War Ministry (*Kriegsministerium*, 1822-30), see Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 351-53 (cat. no. 80).

⁶⁷² For discussion of the progress of Gärtner's career, see Lehmbuch, "'Gärtner liebster bester Gärtner,'" 87-121; for the shift from Klenze to Gärtner as principal architect of Ludwigstraße see esp. pp. 102-06; on his appointment to the Baukunstauschuß see p. 108.

⁶⁷³ Gärtner's first proposal for a state library (*Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*) was made in 1827. Ludwig did not accept this proposal, but he did promise Gärtner the commission. The official contract followed on July 29, 1828, and Gärtner's plans were finally approved on February 15, 1831. The building was completed in 1843. Karnapp, "Werkverzeichnis," 225-26 (cat. no. 10).

north end of the street, at which point the Ludwigskirche, while still under construction, gained the additional distinction of close association with the university.⁶⁷⁴

For Klenze, Gärtner's reconceptualization of his street was a serious blow. Furthermore, the first addition to his neoclassical streetscape was to be of all things another Byzantine style church, located at its midpoint and facing the intersection with another major street (*Löwenstraße*, today *Schellingstraße*), giving it an approach that extended well beyond the confines of Ludwigstraße itself. While Klenze's Allerheiligenhofkapelle represented the religious life of the court, the Ludwigskirche commission competed with it in representative significance and exceeded it in urban prominence, despite Klenze's insistence on reorienting the Allerheiligenhofkapelle so as to give it a public entrance façade. It cannot have helped that Ludwig approved Gärtner's plans for the Ludwigskirche much more quickly than he had approved Klenze's for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, even though Klenze's plan expressed more thorough study of the same style. The Ludwigskirche's ground stone was laid, as Ludwig had specified it must be and to Gärtner's supreme satisfaction, on the feast day of St. Louis, 1829 [**fig. 5.5 z**].⁶⁷⁵

12. Gärtner Approaches Byzantium

Like Stieglitz and Klenze, who saw the Byzantine style in the West epitomized at San Marco, Gärtner began with at least one historical example in mind. A preliminary plan for the façade, probably dating to 1828, appears to be a reduced version of the

⁶⁷⁴ On Gärtner's plans for the university and related buildings (the *Universitätsforum*) see Karnapp, "Werkverzeichnis," 223-24 (cat. no. 9).

⁶⁷⁵ Karnapp, "Werkverzeichnis," 226-27.

similar façades of either Orvieto or Siena Cathedrals [**figs. 5.5 j and 5.5 k.1-k.2**].⁶⁷⁶ For such models Gärtner had the support of Stieglitz's latest history of architecture, which expanded upon his earlier scholarship to address all of architectural history. In this work, which would be widely accepted for decades, Stieglitz listed the Cathedrals of Orvieto and Siena, along with those of Spoleto and Como, as Italian buildings showing definite Byzantine influence.⁶⁷⁷ Judging from Gärtner's letters and sketches, it appears that he had not studied (and likely not even seen) these buildings during his trip to northern Italy in 1827. At least for Orvieto (the façade of which had been built under Lorenzo Maitani,

⁶⁷⁶ For the dating of this drawing see Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 201-03. On p. 204, Büttner notes a resemblance to Siena Cathedral, going so far as to call Gärtner's drawing "in ihrer ganzen Anlage der Fassade des Sieneser Domes nachgebildet." He does not note such distinctions as the absence in Gärtner's design of the prominent gables over the entrances at Siena and Orvieto, or the somewhat stronger resemblance of Gärtner's design to Orvieto; nor does he concern himself with what „Byzantine“ meant for Gärtner (or Klenze), except to state that it was equivalent to today's designation "Romanesque."

⁶⁷⁷ "Betrachten wir die Dome zu Spoleto, Siena, Orvieto, Como, und andere große Bauwerke Italiens aus den ersten Zeiten des Mittelalters, so zeigt sich der Einfluß byzantinischer Künstler deutlich. Auch wird er sichtbar in den Basiliken Roms, wo zwar die Anwendung antiker Säulen, alten Gebäuden entnommen, an das Antike erinnert, der Charakter des Ganzen aber die byzantinische Kunst nicht verkennen läßt, die überdies in den musivischen Bildern der Heiligen erscheint, welche zur Auszierung dienen." Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume*, 296. (This work was republished in 1837, the year following Stieglitz's death, and again in 1857.) Even in 1842 Kugler, in his *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Ebner und Seubert, 1842), 567, did not characterize Orvieto or Siena Cathedrals as "Gothic" (i.e., what he considered *eigentlich deutsch*), as is common today; rather, he characterized the interiors of both as neither Byzantine nor German but as "truly Italian" (*eigentlich italienisch*) – that is, a new category within medieval art and architecture – and the facades as "Italian-German" (*italienisch-germanisch*). As is evident in Stieglitz's work, the notion of a distinction between Italian and Byzantine architecture had not existed when Gärtner was planning the Ludwigskirche, when mosaics and round arches were key markers of the Byzantine style, and ground plans (beyond the inclusion of domes) were not determining characteristics; as discussed above, even Kugler did not focus on distinctions between Byzantine and Western ground plans before 1833.

starting in 1310), an illustrated monograph had long been available.⁶⁷⁸ Perhaps not coincidentally, this is the façade which Gärtner’s preparatory sketch most closely resembles—for example, in the central portal, which is larger than those to either side, and in the towers to either side of the façade, which are topped by pinnacles. The mosaics on Orvieto’s facade (not unlike those at San Marco) and the rounded arches of the central portal and the building’s interior vaulting may have independently inspired Gärtner to identify that building as Byzantine. Additionally, the dwarf arcade galleries, if more highly ornamented with their trefoil arches and quatrefoil balustrades, echo those in Lombard, Rhenish and other well-known buildings then considered Byzantine (e.g., Piacenza Cathedral [**fig. 3.9**] and San Zeno, Verona [**fig. 3.6**] as well as Speyer [**fig. 3.1 c**] and Worms [**fig. 4.7 b**] Cathedrals).⁶⁷⁹ The relationship of Orvieto’s façade to the rest of the cathedral and to its surroundings may also have suggested an appropriate model to Gärtner. Orvieto Cathedral’s entrance façade was conceived with respect to the piazza in front of it. The rest of the much simpler exterior of the building strongly contrasts with the façade on account of the lavishness of the façade’s ornament and its false front, which aggrandizes the interior elevation. Similarly, the arcade to the right in Gärtner’s drawing demonstrates that, like Maitani, Gärtner intended to concentrate his efforts with respect to

⁶⁷⁸ Guglielmo della Valle, *Storia del duomo di Orvieto dedicata alla Santità di Nostro Signore Pio Papa sesto Pontefice Massimo* (Rome : presso i Lazzarini, 1791), still cited by Franz Kugler as the source for images of Orvieto Cathedral in *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*, 568 n. 2. Della Valle’s work was apparently available in the royal collections (it is still available at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, listed with the call number 12). Kugler does not cite any corresponding source for illustrations of Siena Cathedral, and I am not aware of one that would have been available to Gärtner when he was planning the Ludwigskirche.

⁶⁷⁹ Büttner, “Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche,” 203, notes that there is a further preliminary drawing for the Ludwigskirche, which he believes is probably the earliest because an arcade frieze is sketched in above the portals on top of the earlier drawing [his fig. 12].

the external elevations almost exclusively on the entrance façade. The streetscape already determined the Ludwigskirche's exterior just as much as the frescoes already determined the interior.⁶⁸⁰

Gärtner's drawing modified the example of Orvieto by diminishing its strong verticality through strengthening the horizontal elements. Rather than stacking a series of steadily diminishing forms, Gärtner composed his central elevation of forms of alternating height: he crowned the large portal with a dwarf arcade and the equally large square framing the rose with a similarly diminutive gable. He also simplified his composition, eliminating the gables flanking the rose. Reflecting the smaller scale of the nave and aisles at the Ludwigskirche, he brought the entrances closer together, without the projecting archivolt and jambs. Gärtner emphasized the arcades above the portals by proportionally doubling their size, while giving them round rather than trefoil arches. He eliminated the tympanum over the central portal (in addition to its framing archivolt and jambs) to create a strikingly large central door opening despite the reduced overall scale. He also eliminated the lancet windows and pointed arches of the side portals and considered filling the space above these doors with smaller wheel windows in square frames (he appears to have been undecided on this point).

The reduction in scale reflects that the Ludwigskirche was to be a parish church, not a cathedral. Other changes, in particular the replacement or elimination of trefoil and

⁶⁸⁰ Büttner likewise concludes that the street façade was a determining factor from the start of Gärtner's planning in "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 204. Strong concern for the streetscape is similarly evident in Klenze's work at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle. If Klenze's studies for an entrance façade came later in the planning process, this is because Klenze had to argue for its necessity even though this meant divergence both from Ludwig's chosen model, the Palatine Chapel in Palermo, and from a traditional, eastern orientation, and even though the street in question was less prominent.

pointed arches, suggest an effort to remove what were considered “truly German,” that is, Gothic elements to create a more Byzantine look. It is unclear whether Gärtner foresaw placing any mosaics on this façade. In any event, from this drawing only the open arcades above the portals, the heavy multi-level piers at the corners and (though not an element modeled on Orvieto) the ground-level arcade to one side the façade made it into the proposals Gärtner submitted for review. In these later drawings, Gärtner abandoned such elements as the heavy square frame around the rose window and the pinnacles crowning it, the complex use of dwarf arcades, and the differently-proportioned nave and aisle entrances, leaving no obvious suggestion of Orvieto; why is not clear, though it is possible that he was influenced by a review of *Geschichte der Baukunst* that strongly criticized Stieglitz’s characterization of Orvieto, Siena and Como Cathedrals as Byzantine.⁶⁸¹ Most of Gärtner’s subsequent models for the Ludwigskirche appear to have been in Munich.⁶⁸²

⁶⁸¹ “Man kann sich aber des Verdachts kaum erwehren, daß die Vorliebe für die gothisch-deutsche Kunst den Herrn Verfasser abgehalten hat, die italienische Kunst nicht bloß zu beschreiben, sondern auch genau kennen zu lernen. Wenigstens sind es auffallende Irrthümer, wenn er (S. 296) unter den in den ersten Jahrhunderten des Mittelalters und unter dem Einfluß byzantinischer Künstler (im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes) gebauten Kirchen die Dome zu Siena, Orvieto und Como aufzählt, von denen der erste 1180 geweiht, der letzte erst 1396 gegründet ist, dieser, wo er von dem Spitzbogenstyl abweicht, nur den Uebergang in die Formen der neuern Zeit andeutet, und die sämtlich in ihrer genau bekannten Geschichte, so wie in ihren Formen keine Spur des Byzantinischen zeigen. . . .” [Karl Schnaase], review of *Geschichte der Baukunst*, 260 (in the final installment of the review, dated March 31, 1828).

⁶⁸² A fascinating, undated study of a two-towered church façade by Gärtner (*Architectur Sammlung*, Technische Universität München, Gs 422) is illustrated in Gabriele Schickel, “Ludwigskirche, Ludwigstraße, München, 1828-1844,” in *Romantik und Restauration*, ed. Nerdinger, fig. 47.5; while its relationship to the planning of the Ludwigskirche remains unclear, Büttner has remarked that this sketch could have been created as part of the overall process: Büttner, “Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche,” 204. If so, it was a highly experimental phase. Among other suggestive details is the left-hand spire, that closely resembles a jeweled papal tiara – headgear traditionally attributed to Byzantine

13. Klenze's Evaluation of Gärtner's Plans: Style as Confessional Politics

At the start of 1829 Ludwig obliged Gärtner to present his plans for the Ludwigskirche to Klenze: these were now significantly revised [**fig. 5.5 l-m**]. Klenze responded: "Gärtner showed me his plan for the Ludwigskirche — bad, I corrected some [flaws] but by far not all... Byzantinized copy of St. Michael's Church."⁶⁸³ Klenze's condemnation appears to have been directed both at the idea that Gärtner copied a model, and in this sense was producing something less than purified, and at his choice of model. While Gärtner never mentioned St. Michael's, a church built in the late sixteenth century for Munich's Jesuit college,⁶⁸⁴ and Klenze did not explain what he meant, a comparison of St. Ludwig's ground plan and façade with that of St. Michael's does suggest certain similarities, inasmuch as the nave of each consists of a barrel-vault stiffened by wide transverse arches marking the bays [**fig. 5.6 a-c**]. (In Gärtner's somewhat earlier ground plan [**fig. 5.5 l**], the aisles are divided into four bays; in the section [**fig. 5.5 n**], these have been reduced to three, equaling the number of chapels on each side at St. Michael's).

In St. Michael's, however, the barrel vault of the crossing is continuous with that of the nave and of the same type as that in the transepts and choir, while in Gärtner's

origins, through which Gärtner was perhaps intending to evoke the Byzantine roots of the Catholic Church.

⁶⁸³ "Gärtner zeigt mir seinen Plan zur Ludwigskirche schlecht, ich corrigirte einiges aber bei weitem nicht alles. Die Construction ist sehr schlecht, vordere Hauptmauer könnte einstürzen. Byzantinisierte Kopie der Michaelskirche." Leo von Klenze, *Memorabilien*, entry for January 19, 1829, quoted in Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 198.

⁶⁸⁴ St. Michael's provides a bold contrast with its contemporary, the Petrikerche of the former Jesuit College, Münster [**fig. 1-1**]. Such stylistic diversity in Jesuit architecture, as underlined in much recent research, was not, however, investigated by Klenze or any one else at this time; rather, his approach suggests the atmosphere from which would emerge the concept of a single overriding Jesuit style that is addressed in Levy, "The 'Jesuit Style,' in *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque*, 15-41.

section, the barrel vaults abut a very shallow dome on pendentives over the crossing (in his somewhat earlier ground plan, he considered using a groin vault here instead of a dome).⁶⁸⁵ The vaulting of St. Michael's thus presents a more unified main space than that of Gärtner's plan. The façades bear still less relation to one another. They do share heavy horizontal divisions between the storeys, prominent freestanding sculpture at the peak and feet of the gables and flanking the upper storeys, and no tower (though Gärtner lightly sketched in a single tower at the other end, adjoining the choir). The rhythm and variety of alternating architectural elements within the horizontal bands of St. Michael's façade is far more complex, however, than that which Gärtner designed for the Ludwigskirche. Gärtner's preliminary design, meanwhile, exhibits a more sculptural quality, with its deeply framed windows, its entrances and second storey recessed behind arcades, and a further arcade before the ground level of the side buildings (only the right-hand side building being depicted here) [**fig. 5.5 m**].

Klenze's association of Gärtner's proposal with St. Michael's may have had less to do with their resemblance to one another than with St. Michael's visual similarities to, and institutional dependence on, another church, the Gesù in Rome, designed by Giacomo da Vignola and begun in 1568 [**fig. 5.7 a-b**]. The dominant physical relationship of St. Michael's to its urban setting, its interior space with a single expansive barrel-vaulted-nave flanked by three pairs of lateral chapels in the place of aisles, short transepts with altars on the end walls, lack of a narthex, and some of the Italianate details of its design, demonstrate that even without the dramatic crossing dome originally

⁶⁸⁵ As noted in Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 200.

proposed for it,⁶⁸⁶ St. Michael's was one of the first buildings to take the Gesù, mother church of the Jesuit order, as an inspiration, and was the order's first significant church in Northern Europe.⁶⁸⁷ Built as the church of the Jesuit college of the same name and as the burial church for the Wittelsbachs, St. Michael's had become a Wittelsbach court church after the Jesuits were disbanded in 1773.

Ludwig had seemed favorably inclined towards the Jesuits around the time of the order's resurrection in 1818, according to Nuncio Count d'Argenteau.⁶⁸⁸ By 1824, however, Ludwig worried that Jesuits tried to Italianize their German students, and by 1828 he was openly expressing an extreme dislike for the order.⁶⁸⁹ By 1829, as Klenze was evaluating Gärtner's efforts, Ludwig was suppressing the journalistic efforts of the

⁶⁸⁶ When, during the construction of St. Michael's, the south tower collapsed, destroying the choir, plans for the tower, choir and crossing were redrawn so as to heighten the tower, lengthen the choir, and set a dome over the crossing – the dome possibly inspired by that at the Gesù. It is not clear whether the dome was finally omitted because of cost concerns or technical complexity, or due to its architectural novelty. See Smith, *Sensuous Worship*, 62 and 68.

⁶⁸⁷ Smith, *Sensuous Worship*, 59 and 66-68. On the design of subsequent Jesuit churches in Bavaria and the Rhineland see chap. 5, esp. pp. 121-33. On the more literal use of the Gesù as a model in Poland-Lithuania and in the Habsburg Empire see Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art*, 250-62. On the tendency (among Jesuits and non-Jesuits) to invoke the precedent of the Gesù to the point of describing Jesuit churches as “just like the Gesù” even when there was rarely more than a basic emulation of its plan see Bailey, “Le Style jesuite n'existe pas,” 45. On the Gesù as nevertheless, if anything, “Farnesi” rather than “Jesuit” in style see Clare Robertson, “Two Farnese Cardinals and the Question of Jesuit Taste,” in O'Malley, *Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts*, 147.

⁶⁸⁸ Bastgen, “Ludwigs I. von Bayern ‘Liberalismus’ und ‘Jesuitenfurcht,’” 649.

⁶⁸⁹ Among the first indications of Ludwig's shift from passive to active opposition to the ultramontanism that the Jesuits represented was his dismissal of the priest who, on the advice of Johann Michael von Sailer, Bishop of Regensburg (and once Ludwig's own professor of theology) had been charged with the education of his children. Ludwig asserted he would never allow another priest in this position. Ludwig continued to voice antagonism towards the Jesuits in particular as insufficiently supportive of the German spirit in 1834: “Teutsche Gesinnung soll in die Jugend gelegt werden, aber dieser waren die Jesuiten in Deutschland immer fremd.” Bastgen, “Ludwigs I. von Bayern ‘Liberalismus’ und ‘Jesuitenfurcht,’” 648-50 and nn. 11 and 14; on Sailer as Ludwig's theology professor see Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 96-98.

circle to which Cornelius belonged. According to his biographer Heinz Gollwitzer, Ludwig was never able to fully articulate his confessional position, which satisfied neither the conservatives nor the liberals around him, nor could he find a spokesperson to do it for him, so he relied on his architectural and other cultural programs to illustrate it.⁶⁹⁰ In likening Gärtner's plan to St. Michael's, Klenze may have been suggesting that not only Cornelius but even Gärtner was Jesuit-friendly, and instead of a purified Byzantine church, was producing one in the same New Roman style that Ludwig was at such pains to remove from Bamberg. Klenze, himself a Protestant and member of Thiersch's Philhellenic society, could not have failed to note (and almost certainly shared) Ludwig's opposition to the Jesuits and their allies, and, though Gärtner was hardly a strong candidate, it would have been convenient for Klenze to add Gärtner to their number.⁶⁹¹

14. Parallels between Gärtner's Ludwigskirche and Klenze's Byzantine Style

Klenze did not note that a much closer comparison might be made between Gärtner's façade design [**fig. 5.5 m**] and the "fifteenth-century Venetian" and final facades which Klenze himself had proposed for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle [**figs. 3.6 b and d**].⁶⁹² Not only was Klenze's final proposal known to Gärtner, who was the architect

⁶⁹⁰ Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 514,

⁶⁹¹ At this time (1824-1830) Klenze was engaged in creating a funerary monument to Ludwig's brother-in-law Eugène de Beauharnais (d. 1824) for St. Michael's with Bertel Thorvaldsen (working in Rome and dependent on Klenze for his knowledge of the church), and so was intimately familiar with its interior. See cat. no. 7.41, Thomas Weidner, "Katalog der Exponate," in Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 514-17.

⁶⁹² Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 204, suggests that Klenze's final façade design for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle may have led Gärtner to turn to Lombard

on the committee to which Klenze had had to submit it; Gärtner had been obliged to critique it and to recommended improvements (as discussed above). Assuming, as is likely, that Gärtner had seen Klenze's fifteenth-century Venetian façade proposal as well as his final design, Gärtner could have combined elements of each (particularly, the upper story of Klenze's final design [**fig. 3.6 b**] and the lower storeys of the earlier façade proposal [**fig. 3.6 d**]) to create his own façade design without taking St. Michael's (or any other model) into consideration. The similarities between Klenze's final proposal and Gärtner's proposal help to clarify which features, beyond domes in the interior, Klenze and Gärtner agreed could be considered sufficiently Byzantine for Ludwig's purposes. In particular, the upper storey of Klenze's final plan is echoed in the skew corbels at the feet of the gable and the large rose window in Gärtner's proposal. Perhaps Gärtner did not note such resemblances, either: after all, as noted in Chapter Three, in reviewing Klenze's final Allerheiligenhofkapelle proposal he had reserved his harshest criticisms for the façade.⁶⁹³

The gable, the rose window, and further details of Gärtner's façade design, at least as it was finally executed [**figs. 5.5 b-c**], were closer to Klenze's design for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle than to any other historical model. Whether Gärtner already had these details worked out, or they resulted from Klenze's corrections, is difficult to

architecture for his façade plans. Büttner puts forward a range of Lombard churches from which Gärtner might have pieced together individual details (San Michele in Pavia, and the cathedrals of Piacenza, Modena, and Crema). Despite Gärtner's earlier visits to Italy, there does not appear to be any evidence, however, that Gärtner went to such lengths or was even familiar with most of these buildings. Klenze's Allerheiligenhofkapelle designs could have provided all of the evident Lombard influence in the proposals Gärtner showed Klenze in January as well as those submitted to the architectural committee in February and accepted (with some modifications) by Ludwig in May.

⁶⁹³ Haltrich, *Leo von Klenze: Die Allerheiligenhofkirche*, 19 and 39.

determine from the sketch Klenze presumably reviewed [**fig. 5.5 m**]. If one compares San Zeno's façade [**fig. 3.7**] with Klenze's proposal [**fig. 3.6 b**], it appears that while Gärtner may have been familiar with this or other Lombard churches, it was Klenze's design that he followed. Gärtner, like Klenze, softened the edges of his gable with crocket articulation, a feature that has no precedent in any of the Lombard examples. And though there are crockets at Orvieto, they are of a very different design [**see fig. 5.5 k.1**]); the crockets of the Ludwigskirche consisted of foliate scrolls which alternate with large rosettes facing the façade plane [**fig. 5.5 c**], together creating the same effect and nearly the same profile as those Klenze had designed for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle [**fig. 3.6 b**]. Just as telling of Gärtner's reliance on Klenze's design is that his wheel window resembled Klenze's even more than Klenze's resembled the window of San Zeno, since, like Klenze, Gärtner defined the openings with bar tracery and angle lights at the ends of the radiating mullions rather than with plate tracery.

Gärtner's proposal reviewed by Klenze [**fig. 5.5 m**] shared some features of Klenze's earlier, fifteenth-century Venetian style façade proposal [**fig. 3.6 d**], such as a three-door entrance recessed behind a triple arcade, multi-level pillasters flanking the nave and aisles that are ornamented with recessed panels, and figural groups in the gables. In Gärtner's final design [**fig. 5.5 q**], the relief ornament in the gable is gone, but the arcade in the second storey (perhaps the first consistent feature in Gärtner's preparatory drawings) has become a row of five round-arched niches, which echo the five openings in the second storey of Klenze's Venetian proposal, and the niches incorporated statues, like those occupying alternate niches in the drum of Klenze's proposal. While these features were less distinctive than the shared Lombard elements, it would appear

that Gärtner was trying, like Klenze and perhaps at Klenze's behest, to move Ludwig's focus on the Byzantine style towards the Reawakening of Antiquity. At the same time, Gärtner avoided the more idiosyncratic elements which, as I have argued, Klenze derived from Piacenza Cathedral: the prominent pilasters and the narrow molding linking them **[fig. 3.6 b & 3.10 a]**.

Perhaps it is not surprising that two architects with such similar training and working in such a small architectural community for the same patron would have had similar responses to the unwished-for Byzantine style of their commissions. It is curious, however, that Klenze not disliked Gärtner's plan for the Ludwigskirche but also saw in it more similarity with a Jesuit church than with any of his own work. Gärtner had no need or cause to look to St. Michael's, even for the barrel-vaults with wide transverse arches in his proposal, because he could just as well have found them in Klenze's *Manual of Architecture for Christian Worship*, which he had closely studied.⁶⁹⁴ After using Orvieto Cathedral as a model in an early preliminary sketch, probably relying on published illustrations, Gärtner seems to have made only a few further experiments, which may or may not have drawn on further historical models, before shifting to Klenze's own work as a basis for the façade which he presented to Klenze in January 1829. Gärtner had no great love of working in medieval historical styles nor any particular knowledge of them, but he did possess a great interest in competing with Klenze for commissions or even

⁶⁹⁴ The resemblance of the vaulting in Gärtner's plan to that proposed in Klenze's publication is noted by Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 205, n. 86, where he cites plate 26 in Klenze's *Anweisung zur Architektur des christlichen Kultus*. Büttner established that Gärtner had closely studied this publication in his discussion of a drawing by Gärtner at the Kunstbibliothek, Berlin, which he showed was based on plate 11 of Klenze's *Anweisung*, (Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," **203 and n. 75**).

displacing him (as Klenze had displaced Gärtner's father). He appears to have been ready and willing to study Klenze's work closely to achieve this. What is more, Gärtner did not have a theoretical program that came into conflict with his patron's ideas. Klenze's hostility to Gärtner's work, which may have stemmed not only from this earlier personal history but also from Gärtner's recent, harsh review of the proposal for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, seems to have rendered him blind to the strong similarities between their designs.

By February 1829 Gärtner had revised his façade once again for review by the architectural committee, which included Klenze as well as King Ludwig. Presumably referring to his sections of that date [**fig. 5.5 o**], Gärtner wrote Wagner that his design was "according to the king's wishes in the purified Byzantine style. Nevertheless I did not hold myself too strictly to [this style], and placed more emphasis on that which simply expresses in general a Christian or Catholic church. But more about that soon."⁶⁹⁵ Given his reaction to Heß's commission to paint the Allerheiligenhofkapelle in a Byzantine style as potentially too constraining, Gärtner's ambivalent attitude towards his own Byzantine commission is hardly surprising.⁶⁹⁶

15. Gärtner's Purified Byzantine Style and Winckelmann's Call to Imitation

But how did Gärtner see the purified Byzantine style? Unfortunately, the details Gärtner promised Wagner are not addressed in any of the surviving correspondence.

⁶⁹⁵ Gärtner to Martin Wagner, Feb. 8, 1829, in "Briefe Friedrich von Gärtners," ed. Brenninger et al., 312. That Gärtner must have been discussing a later plan has been determined by Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 217 n. 67.

⁶⁹⁶ In the letter in n. 96 (above), dated July 22, 1827, in "Briefe Friedrich von Gärtners," ed. Brenninger et al., 307.

Gärtner did not explain in what ways he had deviated from the style's constraints – only that he had. To judge from the February 1829 section [**fig. 5.5 o**], one major concern was the crossing, and another was how far to deviate from the ornamental repertoire of the established classical canon. Gärtner's evident efforts to choose between a dramatic dome and an equally large groin vault over the crossing (as suggested by faint groins sketched in the dome and free-floating sketches of groin vaults beside the dome) continue those seen in his ground plan of late 1828 [**fig. 5.5 l and 5.5 o**]. New, however, are his efforts to choose between designs for impost, cube and foliate capitals (one Corinthian; one a flat frieze of acanthus leaves), which suggest what would now be considered Late Antique and Romanesque more than Byzantine models, but all of which might have been considered Byzantine at the time. His designs for a baldachin to be set onto a platform in the center of the crossing or, potentially, in a choir raised several steps above the floor level of the church are classicizing, with entablatures crowned by acroteria or rows of antefixes. Gärtner's interpretation of "purified" thus suggests not only a timeless rather than a historically specific version of the style (as seems to have been Ludwig's intention), but one which included classicizing details, and thus was pure in its ornament – a concern which, through Gärtner's classical training, could be traced back to Winckelmann.⁶⁹⁷

⁶⁹⁷ Johann Joachim Winckelmann's desire to "purify" the modern taste for excessive or grotesque ornament (and specifically ornamental frescoes) concludes his work on the imitation of Greek art. See Winckelmann, *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works*, 64-69.

16. Gärtner's Changes to the Approved Ludwigskirche Façade

Between April and July 1829, Cornelius was preparing his abbreviated fresco program proposals.⁶⁹⁸ Gärtner's proposal published in August [**fig. 5.5 p-q**] had been fully accepted and signed by the King by sometime in May, and the architect did not bother to redesign those areas where frescoes were no longer planned to take advantage of new options, such as more sculptural (even more Byzantine) wall arrangements, or simply more windows.⁶⁹⁹ He did make other changes, mostly to the façade. In part these changes addressed the complaints of the architectural committee, which had remarked, on accepting the plan, that the entrance hall was too classicizing and the rose window too small.⁷⁰⁰

The most dramatic change, however, was the addition of the towers flanking the west façade, with which Gärtner replaced the tower behind the choir at the end of 1829 [**fig. 5.5 r**].⁷⁰¹ Thanks to the towers, Gärtner's modification [**figs. 5.5 b-c**] defined the streetscapes (framing both the center of Ludwigstraße and the endpoint of Löwenstraße) even more strongly than the proposal already reviewed and accepted. He must have made compelling arguments for these towers, as they required additional expenditure when construction of the Ludwigskirche had already exceeded available funds.⁷⁰²

⁶⁹⁸ Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 127.

⁶⁹⁹ The changes made by Gärtner after his plan had been accepted are discussed in Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 210-11.

⁷⁰⁰ Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 205.

⁷⁰¹ This change must have been accepted by the end of 1829, though the surviving drawing dates to 1830. Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 192.

⁷⁰² The difficulties of financing the Ludwigskirche, and the many machinations involved in solving these difficulties, are a constant theme in Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche"; on Gärtner's achievement in having the additional expenditure associated with these towers approved, see p. 210.

These towers are striking additions that exhibit particular creativity on Gärtner's part, for they suggest no single precedent or even group of precedents. It has been remarked that they resemble Italian campaniles.⁷⁰³ If Gärtner thought to look at Grelot's (or other) images of Hagia Sophia [**fig. 2.2 c**] he may have come to the conclusion that its flanking monochromatic towers with conical spires and prominent balconies (i.e., the minarets constructed between 1453 and 1574, following the conversion of the church into a mosque) were the Byzantine originals of such campanili, especially if, as will become clear in the discussion of the Ludwigskirche's ornament, he neither attempted nor intended to make a clear distinction between Italian, Byzantine and Islamic forms.⁷⁰⁴

Gärtner's choice of limestone for the exterior (a decision of uncertain date) was an unusual choice of material for Munich, where medieval or medievalizing buildings were generally built of brick or dark stone, including Klenze's Allerheiligenhofkapelle, which used brown sandstone,⁷⁰⁵ while most other churches were covered in stucco. The

⁷⁰³ The tower of Florence Cathedral (upper storey built in 1350s) has been likened to those of the Ludwigskirche on account of its projecting upper balcony supported by corbelled arches. See e.g., Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 210-11). While this feature is perhaps insufficient to draw a specific link to Florence (it is also shared by the campanile of Siena Cathedral, for instance), it is suggestive of Italian campaniles more broadly.

⁷⁰⁴ That the minaret on the south corner (the first, constructed under Mehmet II) is of brick and stone cannot be seen in Grelot's image.

⁷⁰⁵ The use of sandstone for the exterior of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle was approved in 1829. See Zimmermann, "Allerheiligenhofkirche in der Residenz," 219 n.115. The material apparently intended for Klenze's Renaissance façade proposal — pale purplish stucco with marble trim—may have been an economical suggestion, rather than a preference for stucco over stone. The use of purplish stucco with sandstone trim is also suggested in Klenze's 1815 proposal for the façade of the Glyptothek, which was nevertheless eventually built in marble. See Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," fig. 34.8. Only Daniel Ohlmüller, in creating a monochromatic white (limestone?) exterior for his Byzantine Chapel at Possenhofen Palace (1834-39; discussed below) [**fig. 5.11**], and Klenze, at St. Savator, Donaustauf, with its monochromatic white (stucco?) exterior (1839; discussed above) [**fig. 24 b**] appear to have followed Gärtner's example.

whiteness of the stone suggests the classicizing aesthetic in which Gärtner had been trained. Unlike Klenze at St. Salvator, Donaustauf, Gärtner does not, however, appear to have developed his own programmatic characterizations of the Byzantine style in relation to antiquity or its rebirth.

Further evidence of Gärtner's unprogrammatic flexibility until late into the construction process is provided by the most unusual feature of the Ludwigskirche's towers, the roundels of blind tracery in sunk relief on the spires. Büttner notes that, although it is not indicated in the surviving plan for these towers [**fig. 5.5 r**], according to a cost estimate from June 1833 Gärtner had hoped to have these spires made of openwork tracery (at an unrealistically low cost).⁷⁰⁶ Gärtner's interest in openwork tracery spires seems again to reflect a directly competitive aspect of Gärtner's design process. In 1830, while construction of the Ludwigskirche was underway, the Munich architect Joseph Daniel Ohlmüller (1791-1839) was given the commission for the first, and until the end of the century, the only, major Gothic revival church in Munich, the Mariahilfkirche (Church of St. Mary's Help), which was to be the Munich showpiece for Ludwig's program of reviving stained glass. (Heinrich Heß would design the glass.) Among its most striking features, Ohlmüller's project included an openwork tracery spire based on that of Freiburg Minster [**fig. 5.8 c**].⁷⁰⁷ Gärtner's idea of putting similar openwork spires

⁷⁰⁶ Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," 211, citing Staatsarchiv München, RA 51 188.

⁷⁰⁷ Ohlmüller received the commission for the Mariahilfkirche from Ludwig in 1830; it was built 1831-39. See Gabriele Schickel, "Maria-Hilf Kirche, München/Au, 1831-39 und Friedhofsanlage, 1843," cat. no. 49 in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 272. Little more than a shell with an openwork tower survived World War II; these have been incorporated into the rebuilt structure. Georg Hauberrisser's Church of St. Paul (1892-06) was the next major church built in the Neogothic style in Munich. While Hauberrisser's New City Hall (1867-1909) was being built in an equally opulent Gothic Revival style at

atop the towers of the Ludwigskirche is odd with respect to the Byzantine style in which he supposedly was building. There appears to be no precedent for considering such spires as Byzantine: in fact, openwork spires were celebrated hallmarks of the German style. Perhaps Gärtner was trying to give a medieval, albeit German, touch to his Italian Renaissance-style towers. Klenze had also tried to push the Byzantine style towards Renaissance elements, adding Gothic motifs at the end. Perhaps as much as anything else, the desire for openwork spires reflected Gärtner's effort to outdo Ohlmüller, whom Klenze had promoted to Ludwig as an alternative to Gärtner and who had received the commission for the Mariahilfkirche over Gärtner's own, earlier proposal [**figs. 5.8 a-b**].⁷⁰⁸

Modification of the proposal for openwork towers may have been required by financial constraints rather than stylistic considerations. The rosettes which were finally carved into the Ludwigskirche's spires, which decrease in size to fit the taper of the spire, still loosely suggest the receding openwork roundels full of quatrefoils in Ohlmüller's design. At the same time they echo, whether intentionally or not, the idea advocated by Heideloff in 1833 that Byzantine style ornament required sunk rather than raised relief.⁷⁰⁹ Gärtner did manage to realize the more elaborate tracery for the central façade window from his revised façade proposal of 1830: quatrefoils and angles surrounded emarginate

the time, Ludwig I, who saw Gothic as appropriate for Nuremberg or Cologne but not (with the exception of Ohlmüller's example) for Munich, appears to have established a local tendency to avoid the style that continued through most of the century (although his son developed what was intended as a new style for Maximilian Street which included judicious amounts of Gothic ornamentation, and his grandson, Ludwig II, would build famously extravagant Gothic revival creations elsewhere in Bavaria).

⁷⁰⁸ On Klenze's recommendation of Ohlmüller to Klenze see Lieb, "Klenze und die Künstler Ludwigs I.," 660-61.

⁷⁰⁹ Boeck, *Karl Alexander Heideloff*, 351 (discussed above, chap. 3).

lights radiating from a six-petalled rosette [**figs. 5.5 b and 5.5 r**]. Round windows with similar emarginate radiating lights may be found at Worms and Mainz Cathedrals as well as in the “Byzantine” section of Freiburg Minster, although these are not framed by quatrefoils; a wreath of quatrefoils surrounds the rose window in the north transept at Bamberg. As defined by Rupprecht’s studies (which were encouraged and presumably endorsed by Klenze), this section of Bamberg was in the New Byzantine style, which transitioned from the Old Byzantine to the German style, though it is not clear whether Gärtner interpreted it in this manner.

During the construction of the towers the quatrefoil motif was repeated in the windows of the uppermost levels of the towers: [**figs. 5.5 r and b**]. At some point during the redesign process, the tympana over the doors in the published plans of 1829 and its addendum [**figs. 5.5 q-r**] were deleted and the doors themselves were set back within a triple-arched entrance porch, perhaps echoing the entrance porch of Klenze’s Renaissance façade for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, but in any event a return to Gärtner’s January, 1829, façade proposal [**fig. 5.5 c and m, and 3.6 d**]).

17. The Ludwigskirche’s Ornamental Fresco Program

Gärtner’s most surprising and last additions to the Ludwigskirche include his elaboration of its ornamental program on the exterior, and the extensive ornamental program he designed for the interior (to be executed by Schwarzmann in fresco).⁷¹⁰

Kathleen Curran has described the friezes dividing the façade into three levels as

⁷¹⁰ Not all of this ornament is original to Gärtner’s and Schwarzmann’s work: the carpet ornament in the transepts was continued into rest of church during the 1903/04 restoration. See Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:167 esp. 167n85 and 167n89.

combining eleventh- and twelfth-century Romanesque foliate ornament with Byzantine interlace [figs. 5.5 c]. These patterns have been interpreted not in the context of Gärtner's commission to produce a building in the purified Byzantine style but rather as a way of incorporating into the "Round Arch Style" (otherwise unspecified) contemporary notions of the beautiful:

The decorative string courses for the Ludwigskirche... communicate for instance an impression of that which Gärtner understood as "characteristic" ornament. Derived from sources of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but not slavishly copied, the ornament reminiscent of luxuriant Romanesque foliage as well as on deeply incised Byzantine interlace fulfills the requirements of the Round Arch style to modernize architecture through considering the contemporary ideal of beauty and functionalism.⁷¹¹

The transformation of the ancient guilloche pattern by loosening its twisted strands and shaping the spaces created between them so as to form rhomboid and lobed medallions that could be filled with other motifs – that is, bands such as those seen here – was an early development and lasting characteristic of Islamic art.⁷¹² Such bands, along with other characteristically Islamic motifs, would gain popularity in Byzantium and the West, particularly after the near-destruction of the Byzantine state during the Latin takeover of Constantinople, when

...the rise of the Italian mercantile republics linked the economies of the Byzantine, Islamic, and Frankish states of the eastern Mediterranean as never before. Not limiting themselves to transporting others' goods, the Genoese and

⁷¹¹ "Die dekorativen Gurtgesimse für die Ludwigskirche... vermitteln zum Beispiel eine Vorstellung dessen, was Gärtner unter "charakteristischem" Ornament verstand. Von quellen aus dem 11. und 12. Jahrhundert abgeleitet, jedoch nicht sklavisch nachgeahmt, erfüllte das an üppiges romanisches Laubwerk sowie an tief eingeschnittenes byzantinisches Flechtwerk erinnernde Ornament den Anspruch des Rundbogenstiles, die Architektur durch die Berücksichtigung der zeitgenössischen Idealvorstellung von Schönheit und Funktionalismus zu modernisieren." Kathleen Curran, "Gärtner's Farb- und Ornamentauffassung und sein Einfluß auf England und Amerika," in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 189.

⁷¹² Eva Baer, *Islamic Ornament* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 73.

the Venetians established factories for the production of textiles, glass, leather goods and ceramics. They catalyzed the creation of a common taste, in which the Atticisms of court art around the eastern and central Mediterranean were transformed into a popular koine and spread to these humbler media, creating an artistic lingua franca that spoke across confessional divides.⁷¹³

Given this context, the idea that the bands are typically Byzantine requires defining this koine as Byzantine. Today such a definition would be debatable. But just as Gärtner would not have recognized the later category “Romanesque” as designating art and architecture that was distinct from that of Byzantium, the idea that this interlace is expressive of a multi-confessional, eastern and central Mediterranean koine is in keeping with the understanding of Byzantine forms in Gärtner’s day, when the sources of both Islamic and Western art and architecture were considered essentially Byzantine.

Gärtner’s evident interest in integrating characteristically Islamic references into the Byzantine style of the Ludwigskirche is observable not merely in the façade friezes but throughout his interior ornamental program. It speaks to a shift in his interpretation not only of the Byzantine style and its possibilities, but of the Ludwigskirche and its symbolic value. His interest in Byzantine style as a koine contrasted sharply with Klenze’s contemporary focus on Byzantium’s roots in ancient Greece, as is especially evident in Klenze’s renovation of St. Salvator, Donaustauf. Arguably, however, Gärtner developed this ornamental program less in response to Klenze’s work along the Danube than in intentional opposition to Cornelius’s frescoes inside the Ludwigskirche.

That Gärtner used the term *inneren Ausbau*, which is closer to “interior architecture” than to the more standard English term “interior decoration,” in reference

⁷¹³ Scott Redford, “Byzantium and the Islamic World, 1261-1557,” in *Byzantium: Faith and Power (1261-1557)*, ed. Helen C. Evans (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 390.

to the development of his ornamental fresco program at the Ludwigskirche reflects the intensity with which he incorporated ornament into his conception of the building as a whole. Even the limited surviving images of Schwarzmann's work at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle (where, unlike at the Ludwigskirche, Schwarzmann was responsible for the ornamental program) help to illustrate the stronger Islamic inflection of the program at the Ludwigskirche [**figs. 3.6 g-h**].⁷¹⁴ The bands of medallions framing the soffits of the arches supporting the domes of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle are the only comparable ornament, but they were given a distinctly Italian inflection by the emphasis not on line but on fields of color, and the incorporation of green acanthus leaves modeled with strong shading in blue.

The contemporary perception of Gärtner's ornament at the Ludwigskirche is indicated by the response of Sulpiz Boisserée, a long-time friend of Cornelius who also kept up with all of the leading artists and architects of Munich. In May, 1834, following a tour with Gärtner of the ornamental additions in progress, Boisserée described them as “Arabic-Moorish-Hellenizing.”⁷¹⁵ That Boisserée, in keeping with the general opinion of the day, considered Islamic art as a whole to be a variant, if not in fact a component, of the Byzantine style is well documented. He taught Crown Prince Maximilian as much in his tutoring sessions, and he also made a note of it when others lectured on the subject of “Byzantine-Arabic” art and architecture.⁷¹⁶ In this respect, Boisserée's ideas echoed those

⁷¹⁴ Apparently no evidence survives with which to establish Schwarzmann's possible contribution.

⁷¹⁵ “Nach Mittag bei Gärtner *Ludwigs-Kirche* bestiegen arabisch- maurisch-gräzisierungende Verzierungen.” Entry for May 23, 1834, Sulpiz Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 2: 835.

⁷¹⁶ Concerning his tutelage of Crown Prince Maximilian, Boisserée listed under “Byzantinische Architectur” three buildings: “Sophie-Kirche,” Marcus-Kirche” and

of Christian Ludwig Stieglitz, who in his works of 1820 and 1827 stressed the origins of Arabic style in Byzantine art and architecture. In fact, in the later work Stieglitz placed more emphasis on the dependence of the Arabic style on the Byzantine: while in 1820 he held that the Arabic style was fully developed by the late eighth century, in 1827 he described it as blossoming in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; the Byzantine style of Italy, meanwhile, never developed an independent character.⁷¹⁷

As noted above, Stieglitz had attributed medieval German culture to Byzantine influence; likewise, he attributed the artistic as well as the mathematical, philosophical

“Moschee von Cordova.” (This suggests a lecture on the origins of Byzantine architecture and its dissemination in the Latin West and the Islamic world.) Similarly, on an evening lecture that Boisserée attended on Oct. 8th, 1841, given by the architect and art-historian Franz Mertens, Boisserée noted that Mertens similarly treated “byzantinisch-arabische” architecture as a unit. A noteworthy shift in attitude is indicated by an outburst in May, 1845, over the “Moorish” garden pavilion being designed for the King of Württemberg by Ludwig von Zanth. Boisserée opined: “Diese maurische oder arabische Bauart ist doch nichts anders als die verdorbene byzantinische von Barbaren zu ihren Bedürfnissen und zu ganz gedankenloser Pracht und Sinnenlust angewandt. Hier finden wir sie mit europäischer Bildung und Feinheit für einen Herrn nachgebildet den seine Neigung zur Behaglichkeit und Sinnenlust zur Wahl dieser uns sonst so weit entlegnen Bauart geleitet hat. / Es wird ein[en] charakteristischer Beitrag zu der bunten Reihe von Denkmalen bilden, worin sich unser nach allen Formen greifendes Jahrhundert versucht...” Boisserée does not appear to have developed this extremely negative stance towards Islamic architecture, to its relationship to Byzantine architecture, and to the taste for building in multiple styles before this date. See Boisserée, *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*, 3:585 and 787 and 4:175.

⁷¹⁷ In 1820 Stieglitz stated that the Arab rulers in the Middle East and Spain initially adopted the Byzantine style, importing Byzantine architects to build their mosques and palaces, and sending their own architects and artists to Constantinople for training. By the late eighth century, however, the Arab-ruled lands had already developed their own style: “Aber ungefähr zu Ende des achten Jahrhunderts bildete sich in den Morgenländern, unter den Arabern, eine eigene Bauart.” Stieglitz, *Von deutscher Baukunst*, 27-28. In 1827, however, he appears to have modified his position in favor of a longer period of gestation for the Arabic style; this time he described it as having blossomed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The Byzantine-influenced Italian style, by contrast, never changed: “Der arabische Styl erreichte in der Folge, im dreizehnten und vierzehnten Jahrhunderte, die höchste Pracht, indeß der byzantinisch-italische Styl sich immer gleich blieb, eine lange Reihe von Jahren hindurch in dem ganzen gebildeten Abendlande auf gleiche Weise ausgeführt.” Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst*, 297-98.

and medicinal knowledge of the Arabs and the Spanish Moors to Byzantium and its Greek inheritance.⁷¹⁸ While it is less than surprising that in looking to early Coptic art Stieglitz had found further evidence of Byzantine influence,⁷¹⁹ his incorporation of Islamic art within the designation “Byzantine” as well as his praise for the Islamic world’s grasp of Greek arts and sciences would have supported Gärtner’s use of Islamic motifs at the Ludwigskirche. To Stieglitz’s thinking, while Islam was flourishing and Rome was “sunken,” the inclusion of some of the same motifs on both medieval Italian monuments and Islamic ones proved that both cultures derived their art from Byzantium.⁷²⁰ Such an opinion conflicts with the interpretation of the history of Christian art imbedded in Cornelius’s response to Michelangelo in his fresco cycle. But to judge by Gärtner’s choices at the Ludwigskirche, he agreed with Stieglitz.

⁷¹⁸ On the sophistication not only of Arabic art and architecture, but of Arabic scholarship see Stieglitz, *Von deutscher Baukunst*, 28 and Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume*, 297.

⁷¹⁹ “Nicht weniger ging der byzantinische Style nach Aegypten und Nubien hinauf. In verschiedenen alten Tempeln dieser Gegenden sieht man, wie B e l z o n i erwähnt, auf die alten ägyptischen Sculpturen, die zuvor mit Mörtel beworfen unter andern in dem Tempel zu Essabua das Bild des Apostels Paulus. In einer koptischen Kirche in Nubien sieht man Säulencapitäle, im byzantinischen Style gearbeitet. Mit einer viereckigen Platte bedeckt, ragen unter den Ecken derselben Menschenköpfe hervor, durch kreisförmige unter einander gewundene Züge in Verbindung gebracht, wodurch Felder von verschiedenen Formen sich bilden, die mit rosenartigen Zügen besetzt sind.” Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume*, 297. For illustrations of the column capitals in a Nubian church and of the image of Paul in the temple at Essabua, Stieglitz refers the reader to the recently published work by Franz Christian Gau (1790-1853), *Neu entdeckte Denkmäler von Nubien, an den Ufern des Nils, von der ersten bis zur zweiten Katarakte : gezeichnet und vermessen im Jahre 1819 und als Fortsetzung des französischen Werkes über Aegypten* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1822), plates 45 and 43.

⁷²⁰ “Die Uebereinstimmung der Formen im Allgemeinen, beider Kunst in Italien zu den Zeiten der Gothen und Longobarden, und bei der Kunst der Araber, mit dem Kunststyle der Byzantiner, lassen den Einfluß der letztern auf jene Völker nicht verkennen, obgleich nicht immer geschichtliche Belege gefunden werden. Aber der Charakter der Zeit und der Völker, der Zustand der Cultur und örtliche Beschaffenheit, ließen in den verschiedenen Ländern in der Ausführung der Kunst manche Eigentümlichkeiten entstehen.” Stieglitz, *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume*, 297.

Gärtner studied a range of sources in Germany and Italy before drawing up his plans for the Ludwigskirche's ornament. Bamberg Cathedral appears to have been among the earliest sources he contemplated. As has been noted earlier, according to Rupprecht, Klenze had found in Bamberg "the most important clues for the architect of the Ludwigskirche, which His Majesty wants to have built in precisely this style." Though Rupprecht wrote of Klenze's views after Gärtner's visit in May, 1831, the exchanges between Klenze and Rupprecht appear to have occurred prior to, and served to instigate Gärtner's trip to investigate Bamberg's ornament for this purpose.⁷²¹ Klenze's insistence that Bamberg ought to serve as Gärtner's model suggests that he did not wish Gärtner to look beyond Germany for his Purified Byzantine style. Klenze may have hoped, thereby, to underline the distinction between Schwarzmann's and his ornamental programs for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, with its varied Italian models, and that which Schwarzmann would be painting at the Ludwigskirche. As a strictly German Byzantine church, moreover, Gärtner's Ludwigskirche might have helped to illustrate Klenze's own ideas concerning the transmission of ancient Greek culture into Rhaetia, which (as discussed in Chapter Three) Klenze appears to have been developing around this time in regards to St. Salvator, Donaustauf, and which he would realize in his renovation of that church at the end of the decade.

⁷²¹ Friedrich Karl Rupprecht, when defending his studies of Bamberg Cathedral to the Metropolitan Chapter of Bamberg Cathedral, wrote on August 2nd, 1831, of the interest of the repeated requests of Leo von Klenze, to whom he had entrusted over 50 drawings, to pursue this work "...weil solche der wichtigste Anhaltspunkt für den Architekten der Ludwigskirche sind, welche S. Majestät genau in diesem Style gebaut wissen wollen [Hervorhebungen von Rupprecht]." Staatsarchiv Bamberg Rep. K3 GII/2 14319 v. 1, letter of Aug. 2, 1831, quoted and discussed in Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine Restauration*, 50 and 51 **and nn. 591 and 621**.

According to Rupprecht, Gärtner made studies of Bamberg Cathedral and took a particular interest in the keystone Rupprecht had designed for the (Byzantine) eastern choir during this trip.⁷²² To judge by the ornament executed at the Ludwigskirche, however, Gärtner rejected most aspects of Bamberg's carved and painted architectural ornament.⁷²³ And just as Klenze had not known of the existence of the Allerheiligenkapelle at Regensburg Cathedral when designing his chapel for the Munich Residence, Gärtner appears to have overlooked important Byzantine-influenced German manuscripts available to him in the Bavarian royal library (such as those acquired in the course of secularizing the Electorate of Salzburg), and had no knowledge of the likewise strongly Byzantine-influenced wall paintings at the churches of Frauenwörth and Prüfening (like the frescoes in the Regensburg chapel, covered in whitewash at the time).⁷²⁴ If Gärtner looked to the royal library in developing his ornament for the Ludwigskirche, he appears to have examined a different range of manuscripts. For ultimately, Gärtner's ornamental program turned at least as much to the East as did Klenze's designs for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle.

⁷²² See Hans-Schuller, *Bamberger Dom. Seine Restauration*, **n. 591**, citing letters of May 6, 1831, and May 8, 1831 in Staatsarchiv Bamberg Rep. K3 GII/2 14319 v. 1.

⁷²³ Excepting possibly the wreath of quatrefoils around the rose window in the north transept.

⁷²⁴ Important Salzburg manuscripts, exhibiting what today is considered strong Byzantine influence, had been acquired by the Bavarian regime during the secularization of the Electorate of Salzburg. These appear to have played no part, however, in the efforts of Ludwig or his artists and architects to investigate the Byzantine style. The manuscripts include a pericope book of ca. 1040 (Clm. 15713); the Pericope Book of St. Erentrud, which dates to ca. 1140-60 (Clm. 15903); and the St. Erentrud Orational, which dates to ca. 1200 (MS 15902). (Salzburg was not part of Bavaria until 1810-15, but most of Bavaria had been within the archdiocese of Salzburg since Charlemagne organized the archdiocese in 798). There appears to have been no awareness of the existence of Salzburg-school derived wall paintings at Frauenwörth and Prüfening until the second half of the nineteenth century.

First, at least according to the other scholars who have discussed the Ludwigskirche's ornament, Gärtner looked to fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Italian manuscripts in the Munich collections. From these, at an unknown date, Gärtner made studies of floral ornament which have been cited as fully bearing on the ornament of the interior of the Ludwigskirche [**fig. 5.5 s**].⁷²⁵ Perhaps these floral ornaments had something to do with Gärtner's initial ideas for the Ludwigskirche's ornamental fresco program, but they had no more to do with the patterns that were actually realized than did the studies made in 1831 of Bamberg Cathedral. Gärtner did not even take these studies into account when he wrote Martin von Wagner four years later: "Before I tackle the interior decoration of the Ludwigskirche, I want to take another trip to Italy, to see Venice, Udine, Ravenna, Florence. Rome is already too far away for this and less appropriate for this style."⁷²⁶ Gärtner did not specify what he wished to see in these cities, though naturally San Marco and the fifth- and sixth-century monuments of Ravenna, as well as the cathedral (1236-1335) and Sta. Maria di Castello (ca. twelfth century and following) in Udine and Or San Michele (1380-1404, with Orcagna's tabernacle of 1346-47) in Florence were potential destinations.

⁷²⁵ "...bei der nach Gärtners Entwurf ausgeführten Fassung der Wände und Decken in der Ludwigskirche kommen die Studien nach der Miniaturmalerei voll zum Tragen." Wolfgang Burgmair, "Das Ornament und sein Vorbild," cat. no. 19 in *St. Ludwig in München. Kirchenpolitik, Kirchenbau und Kirchliches Leben*, ed. Peter Pfister, Klaus Rupprecht and Marita Sagstetter (Munich: Selbstverlag der Generaldirektion der Staatlichen Archive Bayerns, 1995), 56-57. In this entry, Burgmair is specifically discussing the narrower sheet of floral ornaments [**fig. 5.5 s, right**].

⁷²⁶ "Ehe ich an den inneren Ausbau der Ludwigskirche gehe, will ich noch einen Ausflug nach Italien machen. Venedig, Udine, Ravenna, Florenz sehen. Rom ist dafür schon zu entfernt und weniger für diesen Stil geeignet." Gärtner to Wagner, April 5, 1835, in "Briefe Friedrich von Gärtners," ed. Brenninger et al., 329.

Gärtner's goals for the Ludwigskirche's ornament were ambitious, especially considering that 1835 was already a very full year. Among other projects, Gärtner had recently been given the task of completing the renovations at Bamberg (as well as the ongoing measures at Regensburg) and, shortly after writing Wagner, he undertook the commission for a new building for the university.⁷²⁷ In September of 1835 he managed to return with Ludwig to La Colombella, but it seems the proposed itinerary for preparing the Ludwigskirche's ornament was abbreviated at best. During the course of this journey Gärtner may have made an undated study of painted vault ornament [**fig. 5.5 t**]. It has been likened to the ornament of the Arena Chapel in Padua, presumably in particular due to the blue field with stars in the webbing, as well as to the portrait busts framed in interlaced quatrefoils that cross the barrel vault [**fig. 5.9**], and to the similar ornament at Or San Michele in Florence.⁷²⁸ It is not, however, identical to either. Whether Gärtner found the ornaments in his study in other churches or they constitute independent inventions remains unclear.

⁷²⁷ Gärtner had apparently been responsible for planning and overseeing renovations at Regensburg from as early as 1828 (Loers, "Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms," 244-45), and was given the additional responsibility of completing the renovations at Bamberg on Dec. 26, 1834 (Boeck, *Karl Alexander Heideloff*, 351). Concrete planning for a new building for the university began on Apr. 11, 1835; on Aug. 25 (the Feast of St. Ludwig) of that year the ground stone had already been laid: see Karnapp, "Werkverzeichnis," 224.

⁷²⁸ "Gärtner's Zeichnung erinnert an italienische Kirchen des 14. Jahrhunderts, wie Giotto's Arena-Kapelle in Padua, oder an die Innenausmalung der Kapelle in der florentinischen Kirche Or San Michele...." Curran, "Gärtner's Farb- und Ornamentauffassung," 194. It is interesting to think that Gärtner might have been attracted to Giotto's frescoes in this context, since it is this student of Cimabue, according to Vasari, who finally "banished completely that rude Greek manner and revived the modern and good art of painting, introducing the portraying well from nature of living people..." Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, 1: 97.

Whatever its origin, this study represents quadripartite vaulting and fields of blue with gold stars, such as appears in the webs of the vaults at the Ludwigskirche [**visible in fig. 5.5 f, w and v**]. This webbing ornament is the one prominent element potentially suggestive of Louis IX's Sainte-Chapelle, where the same pattern is, if anything, even more prominent in the vaults of the upper chapel [**fig. 5.1 b**]. Since fields of blue with gold stars can be found not only there but in many other periods and places (e.g., the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia in Ravenna), the design may not have been intended to evoke a specific prior example. It is nevertheless noteworthy that the stars appear to be a late addition, inasmuch as they are not evident in Gärtner's preparatory studies for the ornamental frescoes [e.g., **fig. 5.5 u**]. Nearly all of the stone surfaces of the Sainte-Chapelle were colorfully painted and, in 1839, as the Ludwigskirche's frescoes neared completion, the Sainte-Chapelle's painted surfaces would become the subject of studies and restorations that would continue for some forty years [**fig. 5.1 c**].⁷²⁹ Potentially Gärtner's insertion of these stars into the Ludwigskirche reflected a growing awareness that architectural painting had at times played a prominent role in New Gothic architecture, and specifically at the Sainte-Chapelle, even if it was to play little role in the architecture of the New Gothic revival.

What is more certain is that the remaining ornaments in this vault study [**fig. 5.5 t**], if used as a basis for those at the Ludwigskirche, were adapted in telling ways [**fig. 5.5**

⁷²⁹ Jean-Michel Leniaud, "La restauration du décor peint de la Sainte Chapelle haute par Duban, Lassus et Boeswillwald, 1839-ca. 1881," in *Die Denkmalpflege vor der Denkmalpflege*, ed. Volker Hoffmann, Neue Berner Schriften zur Kunst 8 (Bern: P. Lang, 2005), 333-359.

u and v].⁷³⁰ Flanking the vault study, for instance, are bands of medallions containing saints and angels, connected by interlace (at the top) and interconnected geometric bands (at the bottom) in an Islamic-influenced manner often found in fourteenth-century Italian painted interiors (as again at the Arena Chapel). These are closer to Schwarzmann's designs for the Allerheiligenhofkapelle than to those finally realized at the Ludwigskirche. The closest parallels among Gärtner's bands of ornament on the soffits and frames of the arches [**fig. 5.5 y**] emphasize not only interlacing but interlocking, reciprocal, axially symmetrical and flat, unmodeled ornament, while the study presents diaper patterns, rows of identical but discrete elements, emphasis on fields of color over line, and human figures.⁷³¹

In the winter of 1835-36, Gärtner traveled to Greece with Ludwig. If Greece had any impact on Gärtner's designs, however, it was not to lead him towards sources of specifically Byzantine motifs. He focused as little on medieval monuments during this trip as he had during his first trips to Italy.⁷³² Potentially the still considerable influence of Ottoman culture on the nascent nation confirmed his prominent inclusion of what

⁷³⁰ Curran states otherwise, though it is not clear to me to which ornament, other than the web fields, she refers: "Vielleicht wurde die undatierte Zeichnung der Untersicht eines Kreuzgewölbes während einer solchen Italienreise auf Motivsuch für die Ludwigskirche ausgeführt, da es sich eigentlich um eine Nachahmung von Details aus mehreren Gewölben handelt, die Gärtner später für die Münchner Kirche verwendete." Curran, "Gärtner's Farb- und Ornamentauffassung," 193-94.

⁷³¹ See discussion in Eva Baer, "The Motifs and their Transformation," in *Islamic Ornament*, 7-72

⁷³² Alexander Papageorgiou-Venetas, "Gärtner in Griechenland," in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 134-155. It would seem that Ludwig, by contrast, did pay some attention to the Byzantine architecture of Athens, insasmuch as he is credited with insisting during this trip that the street plans be changed so as to accommodate the Kapnikarea Church (ca. 1060-70), which had been slated for destruction. See Wolf Seidl, *Bayern in Griechenland. Die Geschichte eines Abenteuers* (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1970), 125.

would today be characterized as Islamic motifs for the Ludwigskirche. This choice had a clearer relationship to Ludwig's interpretation of St. Louis, and the other Crusaders, as intermediaries between East and West, than did the figural fresco program executed by Cornelius.

Perhaps the most surprising Islamic-style ornaments at the Ludwigskirche are the panels of carpet patterns that flank Cornelius's frescoes in the transepts [**figs. 5.5 w and x-1**]. On both transept walls, above the arch of the window a Greek cross in a roundel is framed by symmetrical carpet-like panels that are filled with arabesques on intersecting geometrical fields that compare closely with Islamic examples [**fig. 5.5 x-2**].⁷³³ To either side of each window is a standing figure on a field of gold of the same size and shape as the window's bifora. The cartoons for these figures were apparently prepared by one of the leading assistants after Cornelius left the project.⁷³⁴ Below the windows, large frescos by Cornelius depicting the Adoration of the Magi and the Shepherds (north transept) and the Crucifixion (south transept) in naturalistic settings are flanked by carpet-like panels of heavily outlined geometric medallions which resemble carpet pages in illuminated Qur'ans. These are filled with arabesques similar to those in the panels over the arch of each window, but they have been more firmly subordinated to the interlocking

⁷³³ These roundels were originally to be filled with figural frescoes by Cornelius, but this idea had already been abandoned before he left the project. See Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:166.

⁷³⁴ They depict, in the north transept, Mary and the archangel Gabriel in the Annunciation, and in the south transept, Christ and Mary Magdalene, telling her *Noli me tangere*, probably from cartoons by Cornelius's favorite student, Karl Hermann, and painted by Hermann with the rest of the painting crew that had been assisting Cornelius. No designs by Cornelius survive for these spaces, although they were included in his commission. Frank Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:166.

geometrical compartments and their symmetry.⁷³⁵ What is more, the placement of these panels flanking Cornelius's imagery echoes the traditional Islamic tripartite layout of text with flanking illumination [fig. 5.5 x-2].⁷³⁶ At ground level, serving as backdrops for altars, are diaper patterns which, while they do not have a specifically Islamic character, are also less prominent. An emphasis on gold, the individual figures, and of course the Greek crosses signal the Byzantine style in the sense already established by Klenze and Heß at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, but these carpet patterns have no evident precedent there or in any of the other sources suggested for Gärtner's designs.

At least as surprising are the patterns used in the domed aisle bays, and in particular the star patterns found on the pendentives [figs. 5.5 u-1 and v]. Pendentives in the western end of the south aisle present a circle filled with an eight-pointed star formed of intersecting arches.⁷³⁷ In the preliminary plan for the eastern bay in this aisle, meanwhile, the pendentives display the six-pointed star formed of intersecting triangles that has come to be known as the Star of David, again with a rosette at the center— also typically Islamic

⁷³⁵ See "Frames and Panels" and "Geometric Interlockings" in Baer, *Islamic Ornament*, 73-84.

⁷³⁶ On the tripartite composition of traditional Islamic illumination see Richard Ettinghausen and Oleg Grabar, *The Art and Architecture of Islam: 650-1250*, Pelican History of Art (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), 246. The floral palmette extending from rectangular fields of ornament into the outer margins of manuscript pages is, however, absent from Gärtner's fields of ornament (as it is from the similarly-organized fields of ornament found in bookbindings, mosaic, stucco, etc.).

⁷³⁷ At the top of **fig. 5.5 v** it can be seen that the dome of the first (western) bay in the south aisle is filled by a sunburst pattern with a lotus bud frieze at its outer perimeter. While this is also a typically Islamic pattern, I have not been able to determine whether the painting of the aisle domes is original to Gärtner's (and Schwarzmann's) work at the Ludwigskirche, or belongs to the renovations of 1903-04, when the carpet patterns favored by Gärtner (though presumably now interpreted more specifically as Islamic and not Byzantine) remained popular and were used as a basis for expanding the Ludwigskirche's ornamental fresco program. See Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, 2:167 esp. 167n85 and 167n89.

patterns [**fig. 5.5 u-2 and u-3**].⁷³⁸ At least as executed here, emphasizing as they do the curved surfaces of the pendentives and not their sculptural expression of space, these motifs have little precedent in Byzantine or Western architecture. In Hagia Sophia, and presumably other Byzantine churches, the Ottoman Turks covered Byzantine paintings with ornamental frames much like these, though it is unclear whether Gärtner could have been aware of this.

The Islamic aspects of the ornaments of the Ludwigskirche's interior are as striking as the fact that they were accepted by contemporary observers as Byzantine, but this aspect of early nineteenth-century Byzantium has been ignored by modern observers. Perhaps this is due to the desire to understand the Byzantium of Gärtner and his contemporaries as fully equivalent to what is today known as Romanesque. Judging by what Gärtner and Schwarzmann produced, what they understood as Byzantine included Islamic motifs at least as frequently as any that would today be termed Romanesque or Byzantine. As there were next to no studies of Byzantine or Islamic architectural ornament per se available for Gärtner's use, while sources of Islamic ornament (including manuscripts in the royal library⁷³⁹ as well as luxury goods such as carpets, etc.) were

⁷³⁸ On Islamic star patterns see Baer, *Islamic Ornament*, 47-50. Duncan Haldane, *Islamic Bookbindings in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (London: World of Islam Festival Trust in association with the Victoria and Albert Museum, 1983), cat. nos. 35-41 display Islamic bindings attributed to fifteenth-century Egypt, Syria and North Africa which provide further examples of circular central medallions occupied by hexagrams with rosettes at their center very much like those of Gärtner's Ludwigskirche pendentives. On the Star of David see also the discussion in Chapter Six.

⁷³⁹ The Islamic collections in the Munich court library at the time Gärtner was designing the ornament of the Ludwigskirche include the Oriental library of Johann Albrecht Widmanstetter, purchased in 1558 and the foundation of the Islamic collection, and further purchases from private collections, works taken during the Turkish Wars, and those acquired from monastic collections during Secularization. See Helga Rebhan, "The

available and their ornament assumed to derive from Byzantium, the reliance on Islamic motifs to stand for the Byzantine East but would have been an obvious and perhaps inevitable choice.⁷⁴⁰ It seems that Gärtner did not introduce these Islamic-style patterns, however, until the church had largely been built and was approaching readiness for Schwarzmann, Cornelius and their assistants to begin painting.

18. Reception of the Ludwigskirche as Byzantine

In 1829, when the ground stone was laid, the major arts journal *Kunstblatt* had announced that the Ludwigskirche would “represent a model of the purified Byzantine-Italian style.”⁷⁴¹ It is not clear who added the modification “Italian,” or on what basis, though presumably the lithographs of the plan and elevation that were published at this time [**fig. 5.5 p-q**] would have furnished the primary available evidence. It seems likely that, even without the flanking towers, it could be seen that Italian Byzantine models predominated over German Byzantine ones, despite Gärtner’s trip to Bamberg. While today we might read the elevation as a rounded version of an Italian Gothic one such as Florence Cathedral, the idea that Florence Cathedral was Gothic was not yet established. Assertions such as that by Stieglitz (cited above) that Orvieto’s and Siena’s equally Gothic cathedrals were Byzantine still constituted current scholarship.⁷⁴²

Bavarian State Library in Munich,” in *Islamic Art in Germany*, ed. Joachim Gierlichs and Annette Hagedorn (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2004), 157.

⁷⁴⁰ This subject has been largely neglected. See Annette Hagedorn’s recent, if brief, contribution, “Discovering Islamic Art in Germany in the Nineteenth Century,” in *Islamic Art in Germany*, ed. Gierlichs and Hagedorn, 15-20.

⁷⁴¹ “...ein Musterbild des gereinigten byzantinisch-italienischen Kirchenstiles darstellen.” *Kunstblatt* no. 74 (Sept. 14, 1829), 294, as cited in Büttner, “Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche,” 212.

⁷⁴²

A few years later, when construction had progressed to the vaults, Franz Kugler, working as a journalist and architectural critic, reported on the church in his journal *Museum*, noting that this “Byzantine style ... it seems, is considered by this architect [Gärtner] ... to be the style that best conforms with the needs of our time.”⁷⁴³ He considered the straight-walled choir to be a misunderstanding of the style (although he was aware of Cornelius’s fresco program for this wall, and may have seen the cartoons on display), but he did not bother to evaluate building’s style as either a purified or an Italian version of Byzantine.⁷⁴⁴

That even Kugler, who had recently published a study distinguishing Byzantine from Western medieval plans, could accept that the church was at all Byzantine in style bespeaks the strength of the art and art-historical convictions of the day, which had not yet incorporated such observations and against which Kugler does not bother to argue in this instance.⁷⁴⁵ The degree to which Gärtner considered what Boisserée had described as “Arabic-Moorish-Hellenizing” elements in the Ludwigskirche to be Byzantine can’t now be known. When he devised the ornamental frescoes, Gärtner’s relationship with Cornelius was reaching its nadir, which perhaps helps to explain the widely divergent aesthetics of their frescoes, and maybe even what appears, at least today, to be the less

⁷⁴³ “...im byzantinischen Style, welchen dieser Baumeister [Friedrich von Gärtner] für denjenigen zu halten scheint, der mit den Bedürfnissen unserer Zeit an meisten übereinstimmt.” Franz Kugler, “Ein Besuch in München,” *Museum* v. 3:24 (1835): 191.

⁷⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 190-91. Kugler published his essay on June 15, 1835; Cornelius’s cartoons for the *Last Judgment* were displayed in Munich in May, 1835 (Büttner, *Peter Cornelius*, v. 2, 163-64).

⁷⁴⁵ Kugler does not repeat here, or even refer to, the arguments he had made in 1833 concerning the distinctions between Byzantine and Western ground plans, which long went unheeded (**see n. 29, above**).

than explicitly Christian aspect of the patterns Gärtner chose.⁷⁴⁶ In any event, Gärtner's (and Schwarzmann's) work was a great success. In 1841, after both fresco programs at the Ludwigskirche had been completed, it was the ornamental ones about which most critics were enthusiastic, asserting that they enhanced both the architecture and the Credo cycle.⁷⁴⁷ The few who were not in accord felt that the patterns and colors were jarring and compromised Cornelius's work.⁷⁴⁸

While Cornelius's frescoes had been integral to the original conception of the Ludwigskirche and determined unusual aspects of the building, such as the flat walls in the choir and transepts, both Ludwig I and Gärtner found Cornelius's work unacceptable. According to Büttner, their displeasure was due to the most innovative aspects of his compositions; more specifically, it seems that Cornelius's interpretation of Byzantium had failed to provide the sensuality and exoticism with which Heß had endowed his frescoes at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle.⁷⁴⁹ In any case, Cornelius found himself with few

⁷⁴⁶ Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 129.

⁷⁴⁷ "[Der] Ornamentschmuck, welcher den durch Cornelius geschaffenen Bilderkreis, so wie alle architektonischen Linien verfolgt, umschreibt und umziert, [ist] mit großem malerischen Sinne, Consequenz und organischer Einheit entwickelt und durchgeführt. Daß durch diese geschmackvolle Durchbildung aller Einzelheiten, sowohl in Form als Farbe die Freskomalereien nunmehr auf die glücklichste Weise an Harmonie und Einklang noch gewonnen haben, darüber herrscht nur eine Stimme." *Kunstblatt* n. 98 (1841), 408, as cited in Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 128.

⁷⁴⁸ Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 128. Büttner agrees with the minority opinion, adding that "Die Einfassung des 'Jüngsten Gerichtes' im Chor wurde von Gärtner und Schwarzmann als 'Rahmen' konzipiert und damit wurde implizit das Fresko als 'Bild' im Sinne eines Galeriebildes aufgefaßt. Cornelius hingegen hat sehr bewußt auf bestimmte Qualitäten, die damals für diese Bildkonzeption selbstverständlich waren, verzichtet, insbesondere auf die Bildräumlichkeit. Die Komposition wird betont in der Fläche entwickelt. Sie hat eine klar lesbare Flächenordnung aufgebaut und eine Wandbezogenheit des Bildes konstituiert, die weder den Gedanken an eine illusionistische Durchbrechung der Wand aufkommen läßt, noch die Vorstellung eines 'quadro riportato', mit dem die Wand bedeckt wird."

⁷⁴⁹ Büttner, "Gärtner und die Nazarener," 128-30.

defenders, and was easily lured away to Berlin by Friedrich Wilhelm IV, newly King of Prussia, following Ludwig's rejection of his work in 1840.

It was the architecture and ornamental frescoes that demonstrated what Ludwig, Gärtner, and contemporary critics considered the "purified" Byzantine style. While regarded as a "pure" style, nineteenth-century "Byzantine" was the nexus of an unusual range of geographical and chronological references which today would be considered as specific to Classical Greece, medieval and Renaissance Italy, medieval Germany, Byzantium, and the Islamic world. Like Klenze, Gärtner apparently drew on Stieglitz and his discussions of the Byzantine style in Germany and Italy and its continuation of ancient Greek traditions; on the other hand, more than Klenze, he appears to have shared Stieglitz's highly favorable view of Islamic art and architecture. Gärtner celebrated Byzantium as a positive connection between Germany and the Islamic art and architecture encountered by the Crusaders, including St. Louis. While relying more on ornament than on structure to make these connections, in the end Gärtner embraced at least as wide a geographical and chronological sweep of motifs as did Klenze at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle. In so doing, Gärtner transformed his original, classicizing concept of a purified Byzantine style to one which embraced the style as a koine of Near Eastern, Western, and classicizing motifs. Not unlike Kugler's observations of essential distinctions, his conception corresponds with today's scholarship on essential commonalities. At the same time, just like Kugler's research, Gärtner's program conveyed perspectives specific to its time and place. Bavaria had at that time no significant Muslim population, so Islamic motifs could be integrated without suggesting confessional pluralism.

Gärtner was particularly happy collaborating with Schwarzmann. Their Byzantine style incorporated a broad range of sources, and was not understood as simply an exotic import. The apparent but unspoken distinction between the German Byzantine style of Bamberg and the Italian and Eastern Mediterranean version which Gärtner chose for the Ludwigskirche (echoing Klenze's work at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle despite Klenze's efforts to push Gärtner towards Bamberg) meant that the Bavarian Byzantine revival style in Munich developed by Klenze and "purified" by Gärtner, included ornament which today would normally be labeled Islamic. Yet both Klenze and Gärtner accepted that the Byzantine style, even if variously inflected, was native not only to Italy and the Eastern Mediterranean, but also to Germany. Carl Heideloff's *Der kleine Byzantiner*, published during construction of the Ludwigskirche and dedicated by Heideloff to Friedrich von Gärtner, underlined this point: one which would have significant implications for the style's utility elsewhere.

Chapter Six Progeny and Significance of Bavarian Byzantium

1. Bavarian Byzantium in the 1830s: Confessional Politics in Greece and the Emergence of Competing Byzantiums

Almost from the moment of Ludwig's accession to the Bavarian throne, he commissioned artists and architects to attempt the first significant revival of Byzantine art and architecture. He initiated the creation and restoration of what he understood as the Byzantine style to demonstrate how the Catholic Church would be re-integrated into his regime in harmony with his German, Philhellenic, and broadly Eastern rather than Western-oriented (i.e., French) interpretation of Bavaria's past and future. Ludwig's Byzantine revival projects thus provided his primary illustrations, or visual syntheses, of his confessional and cultural political views. In constructing the Allerheiligenhofkapelle and the Ludwigskirche, and in restoring Bamberg Cathedral as well as through smaller-scale projects, his artists and architects took to heart the need to strengthen and clarify historical and geographical connections between Bavaria and the early Church, the East, and ancient Greece. These artists also integrated their own conceptions of Byzantium into their work, leading to a range of visual and intellectual articulations all of which were understood as Byzantine at the time.

In the process of developing their Byzantine projects, these early-nineteenth century artists and architects negotiated between the desire to base their work on visual evidence derived from what they understood to be Byzantine monuments and the desire to invent the evidence based on what they believed must be Byzantine because it integrated elements from the cultures for which Byzantium served as a bridge. The idea of Byzantium served them as both an object of investigation and vehicle for integration,

making it a productive concept for both intellectual and artistic expression. Because Byzantium was so little known, the dichotomy between the researched and invented Byzantiums was not at first apparent: leading scholarship, such as the works of Christian Ludwig Stieglitz, offered little to dissuade the mingling of these approaches. Bavarian Byzantium was thus historicizing to the extent that the artists and architects tried to be true to empirical evidence provided by established monuments, as did Klenze at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, or provided by new discoveries, as did Rupprecht at Bamberg Cathedral. At the same time, it was inventive inasmuch as it was understood not as the visual culture of a particular time and place but as the bridge that must link the modern Kingdom of Bavaria to the times and places from which Ludwig and his artists and architects derived their cultural and political identity. This is apparent at Gärtner's Ludwigskirche and Klenze's renovation of St. Salvator, Donaustauf.

Given the productivity permitted by this combination of historicism and invention, it might seem surprising that Ludwig ceased to commission major Byzantine revival buildings or renovations upon the end of the Greek War of Independence and the appointment, in 1832, of his second son Otto to the Greek throne. This abandonment of his Byzantine revival in part reflects the growing awkwardness of Ludwig's German Catholic claims to Byzantium. Greece was experiencing a painful confessional divide between King Otto's loyalty to the Catholic Church, supported by Ludwig, and his subjects' demand that Otto convert to the Orthodox Church, supported by Russia. Ludwig was deeply implicated in this confessional divide because Otto was still a minor when he arrived in Greece. Until 1835 the Greek regime was conducted by a regency appointed by Ludwig and largely populated and financed by Bavarians.

One of the regency's first and most conflict-ridden decisions was to declare the Orthodox Christians of Greece to be under its (Catholic) control rather than the control of the Ecumenical Patriarch in Istanbul. This move broke with all tradition, created common cause among the growing numbers of Greeks who were frustrated with the regime, infuriated Russia, and was not accepted by the Patriarch for many years.⁷⁵⁰ That the Byzantine orbit had encompassed early medieval German lands, that Byzantium had served as a conduit between the ancient Greek and Bavarian cultures, and that the Byzantine Church had maintained the primitive but deep spirituality of the early Church, of which the Catholic Church was the rightful heir, were apparently still compelling ideas to Ludwig and his artists and architects. They maintained steady progress in completing their Byzantine revival projects, and introduced a few new ones, such as St. Salvator, Donaustauf and others further afield that will be considered below. But Ludwig now moved in an international political and cultural arena in which these ideas were at best controversial.

When they visited Otto in Greece, Ludwig and his artists and architects kept their focus squarely on the revival of antiquity. It was largely due to Ludwig's insistence that the regency decided in 1833 to move the Greek capital to Athens. It was with his assistance that Athens was transformed from a war-torn village into a dignified metropolis, through a building campaign that celebrated the city's classical past to the

⁷⁵⁰ Charles A. Frazee, *The Orthodox Church and Independent Greece 1821-1852* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 119-24 and John Anthony Petropoulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece 1833-1843* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968), 180-92.

near-exclusion of its Byzantine and Ottoman inheritance.⁷⁵¹ This was true both with respect to the surviving monuments – many Byzantine and Ottoman buildings were unceremoniously destroyed – and with respect to the construction of new buildings, most of which were classicizing. Thanks to these Bavarian-led efforts it was neoclassical, not Byzantine revival architecture, that established the de facto Greek national style.⁷⁵²

Even Klenze and Gärtner failed to consider the Byzantine monuments before them in relation to the Byzantine-revival buildings they were completing in Munich. This suggests that they had no interest in confronting, much less reconciling, the sharp distinctions between Bavarian and Orthodox Byzantium.⁷⁵³ It is striking that only one architect appears to have attempted to introduce Bavarian Byzantium into Greece:

Theophil Hansen (1813-91), a Dane who had trained in Berlin under Schinkel and who had only recently joined his brother, the Copenhagen-trained architect Christian Hansen (1803-83), in Athens.⁷⁵⁴ Remarkably, the occasion for this attempt was Otto's decision of

⁷⁵¹ For an overview of these developments see Alexander Papageorgiou-Venetas, "'Ottonopolis' oder das Neue Athen. Zur Planungsgeschichte der Neugründung der Stadt im 19. Jahrhundert," in Baumstark, *Das neue Hellas*, 69-90.

⁷⁵² Eleni Bastéa, *The Creation of Modern Athens: Planning the Myth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 147.

⁷⁵³ Until ca. 1850, specific interest in the Byzantine architecture of Greece appears to have been stronger in France than in German lands, as exemplified in André Couchaud, *Choix d'églises byzantines en Grèce* (Paris: Lenoir, 1842). It appears that it was not until ca. 1850 that the Byzantine monuments of Greece began to be presented in detail in a German publication: this was in Ludwig Förster's *Allgemeine Zeitung* and perhaps reflects Förster's collaboration with Theophil Hansen following Hansen's move to Vienna (discussed below). A fascinating French echo of the earlier efforts to identify Byzantine architecture in German lands can be found in Félix de Verneilh, *L'Architecture Byzantine en France. Saint-Front de Périgueux et les églises à coupoles de l'Aquitaine* (Paris: Librairie Archéologique de Victor Didron, 1851).

⁷⁵⁴ Denmark, before the Prussian-Danish War of 1864 (when Denmark had to hand Schleswig-Holstein over to Prussia), was to a large extent culturally and politically integrated with German lands (particularly the northern, Protestant-ruled ones). On account of its significant German-speaking population, Denmark was a member of the

1840, made belatedly and under protest, to construct a building in Athens worthy of the status of a national (Orthodox) cathedral.⁷⁵⁵ Theophil Hansen's design, to which Eduard Schaubert (1804-60), a fellow Schinkel student, contributed to an unspecified degree,⁷⁵⁶ would have given a Bavarian stamp to this fraught project. To judge from the only surviving evidence [**fig. 6.1 a**], an exterior view from the southwest, their monumental design strongly echoed not only Italian models but also Gärtner's Ludwigskirche, which

German Bund, and many Germans from other lands came to study in Copenhagen, while many Danes studied in other German lands. The most important Danish architects working in Greece were the Hansen brothers. For a discussion of Byzantine revival architecture that focuses on their contributions (to the exclusion of Bavaria, etc.) see Villad Villadsen, "Studien über den byzantinischen Einfluß auf die europäische Architektur des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Hafnia: Copenhagen Papers in the History of Art* 5 (1978): 43-77.

⁷⁵⁵ Bastéa, *Creation of Modern Athens*, 161-62.

⁷⁵⁶ Contemporary accounts identify the architects simply as Hansen and Schaubert: see *Kunstblatt* (1843): 71, and F. Stauffert, "Die Anlage von Athen und der jetzige Zustand der Baukunst in Griechenland," *Allgemeine Bauzeitung, Ephemeriden* no. 4 (1844): 90, both quoted in Villadsen, "Studien über den byzantinischen Einfluß," 46 nn. 6 and 8. For this reason, and because a relevant letter by Theophil Hansen, archived in Copenhagen and cited in Villadsen (46), has not been integrated into the larger discussion, the identification of the primary architect initially charged with designing the Cathedral as Christian or Theophil Hansen, and the identification of the surviving plan as intended for the Orthodox Cathedral or for a Catholic church, has long been unclear (see, e.g., Alexander Papageorgiou-Venetas, "Öffentliche Bauten des neuen Athen," cat. 427 in Baumstark, *Das neue Hellas*, 568). This situation appears to be solved by Bastéa, *Creation of Modern Athens*, 161-65, esp. 162 n. 81. For an image of Theophil Hansen's plan (with a caption that reads Christian Hansen), see Manos Biris and Maro Kardamitsi-Adami, *Neoclassical Architecture of Greece*, trans. David Hardy (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2004), fig. 146; for the same plan attributed to Theophil Hansen but identified as the Catholic church, see Margit Bendtsen, *Sketches and Measurements: Danish Architects in Greece 1818-1862* (Copenhagen: Aarhus University Press, 1993), 317. There is little surviving evidence that Theophil Hansen ever took an interest in Byzantine architecture (as opposed to Byzantine revival architecture) equivalent to that of his brother Christian, though a case for this is made in Villadsen, "Studien über den byzantinischen Einfluß," 49-50. After leaving Athens for Vienna in 1846, Theophil nevertheless introduced his own version of Byzantine revival architecture to Habsburg Austria, e.g. at the Heeresgeschichtliches Museum of the Arsenal in Vienna (1849-56), designed in collaboration with Ludwig Förster (1797-1863; architect and founder of the *Allgemeine Bauzeitung*), and in his reconstruction of Vienna's Greek Orthodox church (1857-58).

was nearing completion in King Otto's childhood home, Munich. This is evident in such otherwise unlikely features as the triple-arcaded open entrance portico, the substantial rose, and the twin towers and their relationship to the gables of both the west façade and the southern transept.⁷⁵⁷ It is noteworthy that Theophil's brother Christian, established in Athens from the start of Otto's reign and almost the only architect working there who had immediately taken a serious interest in the city's Byzantine buildings, did not get the commission.⁷⁵⁸ Despite the opportunity to celebrate the Byzantine inheritance of his kingdom on its own terms, Otto (or whoever advised him) appears to have introduced Bavarian Byzantine elements into the cathedral's design so as to celebrate Byzantium as the bridge by means of which his Catholic and Bavarian culture and the Orthodox and Greek culture of his subjects might be reconciled.

In 1843 the first coup d'état of Otto's regime led not only to a constitution but also to the replacement of many of his foreign-born officials with Greek ones; among these were state architects and engineers.⁷⁵⁹ Theophil Hansen's and Schaubert's plans for the cathedral were already on hold due to a major budget crisis; by 1846, when construction was resumed, the commission had been transferred to Dimitrios Zezos, with input (after Zezos's death in 1857) by François-Louis-Florimond Boulanger (1807-75). Zezos and Boulanger reworked the cathedral's design in a manner that, while still Italianate (e.g., now with a polychrome exterior of alternating light and dark horizontal

⁷⁵⁷ Bastéa, *Creation of Modern Athens*, 163, seems to assume that Hansen's design was not intended to look Byzantine. The contemporary accounts of Hansen's (and Schaubert's) plans, however, describe it as "byzantinisch" (*Allgemeine Bauzeitung*, 1844) or even as "rein byzantinisch" (*Kunstblatt*, 1843), both quoted in Villadsen, "Studien über den byzantinischen Einfluß," 46 nn. 6 and 8.

⁷⁵⁸ See Bendtsen, *Sketches and Measurements*, 245-89.

⁷⁵⁹ Biris and Kardamitsi-Adami, *Neoclassical Architecture of Greece*, 86.

bands), toned down resemblance to the Ludwigskirche. The result, completed in 1867 as Annunciation Cathedral, the Metropolitan Cathedral of Athens, was taken as a model for subsequent Greek Byzantine revival buildings [fig. 6.1 b].⁷⁶⁰

Perhaps it is because even the Greek-born architects remained foreign-trained that their interpretation of Byzantine architecture continued to reflect the Italian models so prominent in Western European interpretations of the style. It was Russia that had an academy of art and a university where some were beginning to take an interest in its neglected Byzantine and Byzantine-influenced art and architecture. Tsar Nicholas I, cousin to Ludwig I by way of Ludwig's stepmother (though Nicholas was more closely allied with Prussia through his wife, as discussed in Chapter Five), determined to draw on this development by patronizing his own Byzantine revival monuments. He could thus demonstrate his cultural and political authority as heir to the Byzantine Empire, of which the new Greek kingdom was a remnant.

The Russian Byzantine revival also combined historicizing and creative elements in a manner that appears less than convincingly Byzantine today. The relative clarity of Nicholas I's political program and the codification of its visual representation nevertheless made for a powerful challenge to the complex message and representations of Byzantium being produced in Bavaria. It was not the direct encounter with Greece, therefore, but the emergence of Byzantine revival art and architecture conceived of as

⁷⁶⁰ Papageorgiou-Venetas, "Öffentliche Bauten des neuen Athen," cat. 427 in Baumstark, *Das neue Hellas*, 568. Christian Hansen remained in Athens through the end of the 1840s. His Eye Hospital (1847-54) reflected his unusually close study of the Byzantine architecture of Greece, and was the only secular Byzantine revival building built in Athens, but it does not appear to have been broadly influential: see Alexander Papageorgiou-Venetas, "Entwurf zum Augenspital in Athen. Aufriß der Fassade und Querschnitt," cat. 425 in Baumstark, *Das neue Hellas*, 566-67, and Papageorgiou-Venetas, "'Ottonopolis' oder das neue Athen," 83 fig. 11.

embodying the Russian national style that would most firmly underline the empirical weaknesses of the German Byzantine framework that Schlegel had invented, even Goethe had accepted, and which Ludwig had made his own.

Despite this development, Bavaria's more varied and creative responses to the idea of Byzantium continued to bear fruit – even if some of this fell far from the tree Ludwig had planted. For those who did not need to negotiate the increasingly articulated Greek and (especially) Russian claims to represent Byzantium, the Bavarian Byzantine style remained productive, if less as an object of investigation than as a vehicle for integration. The liminal quality of Bavarian Byzantium as a time and place between ancient and Gothic, East and West, that had permitted Ludwig to synthesize complex and seemingly dichotomous loyalties, suggested a creative potential not limited to his confessional and political program. Whether Ludwig clearly recognized this or not, at first he successfully controlled this potential by introducing a new historicizing style – Moorish revival – for the population of Bavaria whose political and confessional position was perhaps the most complex, that is, its Jewish communities. While Ludwig's Moorish revival style was accepted within Bavaria, beyond Bavaria and so beyond Ludwig's reach it was in fact his Byzantine revival style that soon emerged as best suited to represent the multifaceted confessional and political positions of the growing German Jewish communities.

The dual quality of Bavarian Byzantium as both empirically and theoretically derived thus gave way to a Russian Byzantine revival that was more stringently based on an empirically-based norm, and to a Jewish Byzantine revival that was more fully expressive of the creative potential of art and architecture as a cultural bridge. Even if

Ludwig no longer described it explicitly as such, he returned to his Byzantine revival style towards the end of his reign in his elaborate renovation of Speyer Cathedral. This suggests that he had not abandoned his interest in the style's visual and semantic potential. It was in the midst of this renovation, however, that he accepted the inevitability of the shift to a more empirically-based historicism – an approach to art and architecture rooted in the professionalization of the discipline of art history.

To consider the broader significance of Ludwig's Byzantium, therefore, entails at least a brief look at instances where, even after Otto's accession to the Greek throne, artists and architects found ways to build on the historical revival that Ludwig had called into existence upon his own accession to the Bavarian throne. The major instances are threefold: 1) the continued development of Byzantine revival glazing by Bavaria's Royal Glass Institute, and its brief impact on the development of a new and otherwise unrelated Byzantine revival style in Russia under Nicholas I; 2) Ludwig's declaration of a second historicizing style, Moorish revival, for Bavarian synagogues, which informed the development of a Byzantine revival style for synagogues built beyond Bavaria; 3) Ludwig's last major project in his Byzantine revival style, the frescoes of Speyer Cathedral. Though not termed Byzantine, these frescoes explicitly provided Speyer with the polychrome interior that had been proposed for Bamberg Cathedral and remained the missing component of its Byzantine renovation. This project returned the question of the existence and significance of a German Byzantium back to the Rhineland where Schlegel had introduced it almost four decades earlier and where it now came to its end.

2. The Bavarian-Byzantine Meets the Russian-Byzantine Revival Style

Among the few new Bavarian commissions in the Byzantine style in the 1830s were Daniel Ohlmüller's Byzantine Chapel at Schloss Possenhofen (ca. 1834-39), built for the family of Ludwig's half-sister Ludowika [**fig. 6.2**],⁷⁶¹ and the Brunnkapelle (Spring Chapel; also called the *Salinenkapelle*, or Saltworks Chapel) in the campus of the General Mining and Salt Works Administration (*General-Bergwerks- und Salinenadministration*) at Bad Reichenhall. The Brunnkapelle, attributed to Daniel Ohlmüller, was presumably designed between 1834, when a fire destroyed Bad Reichenhall, and Ohlmüller's death in 1839, i.e., around the same time as the Byzantine Chapel at Possenhofen [**fig. 6.3 a-d**].⁷⁶² Both of these chapels reflect interpretations of the Byzantine style drawn from the Byzantine revival buildings being completed in Munich without suggesting any awareness of the newly accessible Byzantine buildings of Greece. At least one, however, reflected the brief Russian interest in the Bavarian Byzantine style contemporary with Russia's codification of its own, differently conceived, revival of the Byzantine style.

It would be interesting to know whether the patron or the architect determined the Byzantine style of the chapel at Possenhofen. Perhaps surprising, given Klenze's support for Ohlmüller and the rivalry between Gärtner and Ohlmüller for the Mariahilfkirche commission, is that the exterior of the Byzantine Chapel, with its pale monochrome

⁷⁶¹ Gabriele Schickel, "Typisierung und Stilwahl im Sakralbau," in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 64-65. Schloss Possenhofen was abandoned in the 1920s, and has since been converted into private apartments. I have been unable to determine the chapel's original glazing or interior design, or the degree to which these remain intact.

⁷⁶² Antonia Gruhn-Zimmermann, "Die neue Salinenanlage in Reichenhall nach dem Stadtbrand von 1834," catalogue no. 89 in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 324-29, esp. 327-28 and figs. 89.4-89.6.

exterior façade, square steeple with an octagonal spire, round-arch bifora windows, and flanking wings that define the façade of the church strictly in relation to the street, is modeled more on Gärtner's Ludwigskirche than on Klenze's Allerheiligenhofkapelle.⁷⁶³

The polychrome exterior of the Brunnkapelle, of orange brick with light stone trim, conforms to the exterior of the other Mining and Salt Works Administration buildings at Bad Reichenhall. In other respects the exterior of the Brunnkapelle does suggest the Allerheiligenhofkapelle as a model, due to its lack of a steeple and the profile created by the narrow aisles flanking the central section, but the square frame of the rose, with angle lights at the corners, has no precedent at either of the Munich Byzantine revival churches. Although today Klenze's domed pier-and-vault plan at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle is among the most credibly Byzantine aspects of Bavaria's Byzantine revival, it appears to have inspired no imitators. The interior of the Brunnkapelle is no exception and strongly suggests a miniature Ludwigskirche in its overall conception and ornamental program **[fig. 6.3 d]**.⁷⁶⁴

In place of a straight-ended choir with elaborate figural frescoes as at the Ludwigskirche, the Brunnkapelle has purely ornamental frescoes on the rounded apse behind its altar. It is the three prominent windows set into this apse that provide the figural elements, standing figures of Christ between Sts. Rupert and Korbinian attributable to Heinrich Heß **[fig. 6.3 d]**.⁷⁶⁵ These figures, composed of colored glass, are set against backgrounds of foliate-patterned white glass framed by red and green zigzag

⁷⁶³ As discussed in Schickel, "Typesierung und Stilwahl," 64, and Gruhn-Zimmermann, "Die neue Salinenanlage," 327-28.

⁷⁶⁴ As noted in Gruhn-Zimmermann, "Die neue Salinenanlage in Reichenhall," 327.

⁷⁶⁵ Elgin Vaassen, "Kaulbach pinxit – Hess invenit – Ainmiller in vitro fecit. Kaulbach skizzierte, was Hess erfand und Ainmiller auf Glas malte," *Kultur und Technik. Zeitschrift des Deutschen Museums München* 1 (1985): 19-21.

borders. The grisaille backgrounds surrounding these figures are of the same type installed at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle in 1836 and at the Ludwigskirche in 1841 as *Tapetenfenster*.⁷⁶⁶ The nave and rose windows, which contain no figural elements, are filled with somewhat more complex patterns of the same type, and framed by matching zigzag borders [**fig. 6.3 e-f**].⁷⁶⁷

The Byzantine revival glazing at the Brunnkapelle is among the most intriguing features of this chapel. It was installed in 1849, a decade after Ohlmüller's death and five years after the building was otherwise complete (though the building would not be dedicated until 1851). The effort lavished on this glazing, rather than on the chapel's frescoes, may be due to the fact that the Royal Glass Institute, as a subdivision of the Royal Porcelain Manufactory at Nymphenburg, was in turn subordinate to the General Mining and Salt Works Administration.⁷⁶⁸ The dependent relationship further suggests that, despite the windows' belated installation, the desire to showcase the Glass Institute's capabilities was probably integral to the design from the beginning. Whatever the cause for the delay, the windows that finally arrived demonstrate both the continuity and the evolution of ideas concerning Byzantine-revival stained glass since the first, aborted, trial at the Ludwigskirche in 1828-29.

To judge from the Brunnkapelle's glazing, not only patterned white glass but also individual standing figures in colored glass had come to be considered appropriate to Byzantine revival buildings. It is conceivable that the windows depicting the Prophets in the nave of nearby Augsburg Cathedral [**fig. 4.7**], though not yet published, had

⁷⁶⁶ Discussed in Chapter Five.

⁷⁶⁷ Vaassen, "Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechischen Kapelle," 77-78 and Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 189 n. 45.

⁷⁶⁸ Vaassen, "Kaulbach pinxit – Hess invenit," 17.

contributed to this development in the Byzantine revival style. But if the new figural and polychrome elements in these windows could have been suggested by Augsburg's Prophet windows, these and additional features of the Brunnkapelle's choir windows, such as the icon-like effect of the figures' frontal gaze (especially that of Christ), all appear to have been drawn on the example of the Royal Glass Institute's most recently filled and most prestigious Byzantine revival commission.

A short time before Munich's Royal Glass Institute completed the Brunnkapelle windows, its artists and artisans had created a single, monumental window of the Resurrected Christ for the choir of the Cathedral of St. Isaac of Dalmatia in St. Petersburg (1818-52). St. Isaac's quincunx ground plan, traditional to Russian-Byzantine architecture except for its one-bay extensions to the east and west, and its otherwise classicizing, Renaissance and Baroque stylistic features, had been designed by the French architect Auguste Ricard de Montferrand [**fig. 6.4 a-c**].⁷⁶⁹ Even in the midst of this eclecticism, the inclusion of stained glass in an Orthodox cathedral was unusual. Klenze, who in 1839 had been asked to design the interior, first proposed the window. As will be addressed below, this happened just as Orthodox architecture was under new pressure to reflect the Byzantine style. Apparently at this moment the Bavarian version of this style was intriguing. Although Klenze's ideas were otherwise rejected, in 1841 Munich's Royal Glass Institute received the commission for the window, which was designed by Heinrich Heß.

⁷⁶⁹ Elgin Vaassen, "Affaires de Russie. Ein Glasfenster für die St. Isaak-Kathedrale," *Weltkunst* 52, no. 20 (Oct. 15, 1982): 2917-2919, and Vaassen, *Bilder auf Glas*, 195.

The completed window, installed in 1843, still provides one of the more dramatic elements of St. Isaac's luxurious and colorful interior.⁷⁷⁰ Placed over the altar, directly behind the Holy Gates (the central doors of the iconostasis), its monumental image of Christ is fully visible to the congregation only when the Holy Gates are wide open. His stern bearded face with its fixed frontal gaze bears a family resemblance to the Christ at the Brunnkapelle, but his marked *contrapposto* and toga trimmed with a wide jeweled border more explicitly mix classicizing with Byzantinizing elements. The result not only suits St. Isaac's overall eclecticism but also specifically underlines Byzantium's combined classical Greek and Christian inheritance in a manner that echoes Klenze's ideas as recently expressed in his renovation of St. Salvator, Donaustauf.

The sky-blue background of St. Isaac's window echoes the bright coloring of the interior as a whole. Though no *grisaille* elements were included, the window's conceptual unity with the iconostasis suggests that Bavarian ideas of Byzantine revival glazing were influencing Russian interpretations of a central experiential aspect of their architectural tradition – the opening of the Holy Gates. A further indication of the sudden intensity of interest in reviving Byzantine craftsmanship was the dispatch of artisans from Russia to Rome to be trained as mosaicists, simultaneous with the stained glass commission. Upon their return, the mosaicists integrated yet another Byzantine-revival medium into St. Isaac's fabric, the medium which Ludwig had been unable to afford for his first

⁷⁷⁰ Klenze had also proposed the inclusion of stained glass windows in the cathedral's dome. Vaassen, "Affaires de Russie," 2917 n. 3, where she cites a letter from Klenze to Ludwig I dated June 9, 1839, in which Klenze mentions that he had been asked to design the interior. See also William Craft Brumfield, *A History of Russian Architecture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 402 n. 48.

Byzantine-revival efforts but which, unlike stained glass, would take root in Russia as a characteristic feature of its Byzantine revival style.⁷⁷¹

Whether the stained-glass window at St. Isaac's was accepted in Russia at the time as truly Byzantine in style or not, in Germany the Brunnkapelle and its windows were accepted as Byzantine into the twentieth century, at least in the popular literature.⁷⁷² While the relatively small scale and remote location of Possenhofen's Byzantine Chapel and the Brunnkapelle suggest declining momentum behind the development of the Byzantine revival style in Bavaria, in the primary instance of direct contact between the Bavarian Byzantine style and that of Russia, once again it would be the stained glass elements that were most fully adopted from the Bavarian example.

Nicholas I and his wife Alexandra Fedorovna, née Princess Charlotte of Prussia, acceded to the Russian throne in the same year that Ludwig and Therese had acceded to the throne of Bavaria. From the start Tsar Nicholas (reigned 1825-55) patronized a loosely interpreted Gothic revival style for his domestic buildings (e.g., the Cottage he commissioned for Alexandra from the architect Adam Menelaws, built 1826-29), and his family participated in medieval pageants that demonstrated their membership in the chivalric (Gothic) culture of the West.⁷⁷³ But even before his accession to the throne Nicholas had looked to Byzantine architecture as the source of Russia's own distinctive but neglected medieval heritage.⁷⁷⁴ Rather than to San Marco and other buildings in Italy, when he and his architects looked beyond Russia for this architecture they looked directly

⁷⁷¹ Brumfield, *History of Russian Architecture*, 401-402.

⁷⁷² Karl Baedeker, *Süd-Deutschland* (Leipzig: Karl Baedeker, 1903), 293.

⁷⁷³ Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy*, vol. 1: *From Peter the Great to the Death of Nicholas I* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 338-42; Brumfield, *History of Russian Architecture*, 394.

⁷⁷⁴ Wortmann, *Scenarios of Power*, 1:382.

to Constantinople and the Holy Land, as documented by Maxim Nikiforovich Vorobiev (1787-1855) in paintings exhibited at Russia's Academy of Art from 1823 to 1827.⁷⁷⁵

Nicholas's efforts to define the Russian medieval heritage culminated on March 25, 1840, when he announced that "the taste of ancient Byzantine architecture should be preserved, by preference and as far as possible" in the construction of Orthodox churches throughout his empire.⁷⁷⁶ In the following year (when Klenze's interior design for St. Isaac's was rejected, except for the stained glass), the Tsar designated Constantine Ton's designs for the Church of Christ the Savior in Moscow as the proper guide for expressing the ancient Byzantine taste [**fig. 6.5 a-c**]. Ton had designed the church in 1832 and published the plans in a large album in 1838, the year before construction began; thanks to the enormity and lavishness of the project, still greater than that of St. Isaac's Cathedral in Petersburg, construction would continue until 1883.⁷⁷⁷ (The building would be razed in 1931-32.)

From today's perspective the exterior of Ton's design for Christ the Savior, with its combination of classicizing and medieval Russian and Western forms, appears as eclectic as St. Isaac's, or as Bavaria's Byzantine revival buildings, and demonstrates little attention to the building's plasticity or external expression of internal structure.⁷⁷⁸ Ton's design, with its cruciform centralized plan supporting a dome on massive piers, nevertheless drew on nascent scholarship on early Russian architecture and was

⁷⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁷⁶ Richard Wortman, "The Russian Style in Church Architecture as Imperial Symbol after 1881," in *Architectures of Russian Identity 1500 to the Present*, ed. James Cracraft and Daniel Rowland (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 102.

⁷⁷⁷ Brumfield, *History of Russian Architecture*, 397-98.

⁷⁷⁸ Brumfield compares the design to that of the Cathedral of the Don Mother of God at Donskoi Monastery. Brumfield, *History of Russian Architecture*, 398-99. See also Wortman, "Russian Style in Church Architecture," 102.

understood by contemporaries as expressive of Russia's Byzantine heritage.⁷⁷⁹ Already in 1835 Ton had asserted that the "Byzantine style, having become intimately linked with elements of our nationality (*narodnost'*) from distant times, created our church architecture, examples of which we do not find in other countries."⁷⁸⁰ In combination with the monumentality and iconographic program of Christ the Savior, his new Byzantine revival style announced Russia's reclamation of its Byzantine heritage, which exemplified the ideal relationship of the Church to the state and its ruler. In many respects this echoes Ludwig's use of the Byzantine revival style to announce the post-Napoleonic status of Church, state and ruler in Bavaria. Unlike Ludwig I, however, Nicholas I had no difficulty articulating his understanding of these relationships through other means. His doctrine of "official nationality," epitomized in his slogan "orthodoxy, nationality, and autocracy," was amplified and made tangible by his building program but did not require art and architecture to illustrate its internal coherence.⁷⁸¹

The Bavarian Byzantine revival style was soon fused with the Russian Byzantine revival style in what is today known as the Russian Orthodox Church of St. Elizabeth, a building traditionally termed the Griechische Kapelle (as at Potsdam, Greek was the term for Orthodox), built in Wiesbaden as a burial chapel for Grand Princess Elizabeth Mikhailovna Romanova (1826-45) and her infant daughter [**fig. 6.6 a**].⁷⁸² Elizabeth Mikhailovna was the granddaughter of Tsar Paul (ruled 1796-1801) and the niece of both

⁷⁷⁹ Brumfield, *History of Russian Architecture*, 397-98.

⁷⁸⁰ Wortmann, *Scenarios of Power*, 1:382.

⁷⁸¹ Brumfield, *History of Russian Architecture*, 398 n. 30; Wortman, "Russian Style in Church Architecture," 101.

⁷⁸² As noted in Chapter Five in the discussion of the Alexander Nevsky Chapel, Potsdam, Orthodox Christianity and its architecture were understood broadly as Greek, or New Greek, at this time and not as national denominations or traditions.

Alexander I (ruled 1801-25) and Nicholas I (ruled 1825-55). She had met Adolf V, Duke of Nassau from 1839 to 1866 (who would rule as Adolf I, Grand Duke of Luxemburg from 1890 to 1905), during his visit to Russia in 1843. This was the year Heß's window was installed at St. Isaac's – an event which made an impression on the couple, to judge by what followed. They married in St. Petersburg in January 1844, and she died in childbirth in Wiesbaden one year later. Duke Adolf V spent her considerable dowry on the construction of an appropriate burial chapel, which he situated on top of a hill in view of his residence, and which soon became a regional landmark.

Adolf's first choice of architect for this commission was Heinrich Hübsch (1795-1863). Hübsch was an intriguing choice for this commission. He was one of the few German architects whose interest in the Byzantine style (as documented in a drawing of an Athenian church he gave to Karl Friedrich von Rumohr⁷⁸³) drew on Byzantine-style buildings from within the former Byzantine realm that he had actually seen, and he had done so long before the arrival of Otto in Greece in 1833. Hübsch had traveled to Greece at the time of the study trip to Italy (1817-20) that followed his training under the classicist architect Friedrich Weinbrenner in Karlsruhe. By 1827 Hübsch had succeeded Weinbrenner (under whom Georg Moller, author of *Denkmaehler der deutschen*

⁷⁸³ “Von Herrn Professor Hübsch zu Frankfurth erhielt ich, kurz nach Beendigung seiner fruchtbaren Reise durch Griechenland, die Seitenansicht einer Kirche in den Umgebungen von Athen, mit dem Bedeuten, daß in jenen Gegenden dieselbe Anlage sich häufig wiederhole.” Karl Friedrich von Rumohr, *Italienische Forschungen*, 3 vols., originally published 1827-31; reprint, edited and with an introduction entitled “Carl Friedrich von Rumohr als Begründer der neueren Kunstforschung” by Julius von Schlosser (Frankfurt a/M: Frankfurter Verlags-Anstalt A.-G., 1920), 3:609.

Baukunst and state architect in Darmstadt, had also trained and Gärtner had briefly studied) as the new state architect of the Grand Duchy of Baden.⁷⁸⁴

The following year Hübsch published *In What Style Should We Build?*, an essay in which he directly rejected his now deceased teacher's strict classicism. He had evidently been sufficiently torn between his classical training and the widespread enthusiasm for the Gothic style that, for reasons different than Schlegel under Napoleon or Ludwig of Bavaria in Palermo, came to the similar conclusion that the middle ground between the classical Greek and Gothic styles was the Western version of the Byzantine.⁷⁸⁵ It both suited the German climate (like Gothic) and possessed elegant simplicity (like that of classical Greece). But rather than valorizing the style within an historical framework such as that established by Stieglitz, or by Klenze at St. Salvator in Donaustauf, Hübsch presented it as an incomplete but promising framework for further development.

In advocating for the “so-called New Greek, pre-Gothic or Round Arch Style (*der sogenannte neugriechische, vorgothische- oder Rundbogen-Styl*), Hübsch stated that he preferred the term round-arch style; for the later “so-called New Gothic or Old German Style” (*der sogenannte neugotische oder altdeutsche Styl*) he preferred the term Pointed Arch Style (*Spitzbogenstyl*).⁷⁸⁶ His erasure of the geographic designations associated with these styles (though not that of classical Greece) was not without precedent, but it

⁷⁸⁴ Heinz Schmitt, “Heinrich Hübsch. Ein biographischer Abriß,” in *Heinrich Hübsch 1795-1863. Der große badische Baumeister der Romantik*, ed. Institut für Baugeschichte der Universität Karlsruhe (TU), Wulf Schirmer, Hanno Brockhoff, and Werner Schnuchel (Karlsruhe: C. F. Müller, 1983), 16.

⁷⁸⁵ Heinrich Hübsch, *In welchem Style sollen wir bauen?* (Karlsruhe: Chr. Fr. Müller, 1828); reprint, with an afterword by Wulf Schirmer ([s.n.]: Karlsruhe, 1983).

⁷⁸⁶ Hübsch, *In welchem Style*, 34 and 39.

served his less overt purposes. It helped to couch his re-positioning of the New Greek / pre-Gothic / Round Arch style as the one authentic and worthy German style (at the expense of the Gothic) as if he were motivated primarily by utilitarian concerns such as suitability of materials and structure to the German climate. Certainly these were among his concerns.⁷⁸⁷

Kugler would nevertheless associate Hübsch's work with Gärtner's in a review of the Ludwigskirche in *Kunstblatt* the following year: "the Byzantine style ... it seems, is considered by this architect [Gärtner] (as it is by Mr. Hübsch in Karlsruhe) to be the style that best conforms with the requirements of our time."⁷⁸⁸ That subsequent to this review their work continued to be viewed as linked is suggested by a note of Sulpiz Boisserée dated 1841:

Complaints... about the great harm which Gärtner and Hübsch are creating through their mish-mash of Byzantine-Romanesque-German, because the young

⁷⁸⁷ The significance of the New Greek style for Heinrich Hübsch cannot be fully addressed here.

⁷⁸⁸ "Die Architekturen, welche von Hrn. Gärtner ausgeführt werden, — die Ludwigskirche, die Bibliothek, u. s. w. sind im byzantinischen Style, welchen dieser Baumeister (wie Hr. Hübsch in Karlsruhe) für denjenigen zu halten scheint, der mit den Bedürfnissen unserer Zeit an meisten übereinstimmt. Die einfachen Bogenfenster seiner Paläste, die eigenthümlichen Gesimse dieses Baustyles haben allerdings etwas Imponirendes; auch bildet sich seine Kirche in ihrer Hauptanlage, in ihren Verhältnissen und Hauptformen, würdig und bedeutend. Doch traten dem Berichterstatter auch hier [as also in regard to Klenze's buildings] Missverständnisse des erwähnten Baustyles entgegen. Hinter dem Altarraume nemlich schliesst die Kirche willkürlich und unmotivirt durch eine gerade Wand ab; während die mittelalterlichen Gebäude dieses Styles in der halbrunden Altarnische einen ebenso vollendeten wie beruhigenden Abschluss finden. Ebenso glauben wir in den bereits ausgeführten Gliederungen unharmonische und willkürliche Zusammenstellungen bemerkt zu haben. Ein freieres Urtheil wird jedoch erst nach der Vollendung des Baues und nach seiner Befreiung von den verhüllenden Gerüsten möglich sein." Franz Kugler, "Ein Besuch in München," *Museum* v. 3 (1835): 191, as translated in Hermann, "Introduction," *In What Style Should We Build*, 22-23.

architects imitate it so easily and thereby achieve some appearance of novelty for the masses.⁷⁸⁹

Being associated with Gärtner appears to have annoyed Hübsch, who accused Gärtner of being slapdash as a result of being overworked.⁷⁹⁰ But Hübsch, while he had hardly abandoned his earlier commitment to the Round Arch style, had in fact given it an increasingly Bavarian interpretation, particularly in adding an opposition between frescoes and stained glass to his list of reasons why his chosen style was superior.

According to Sulpiz Boisserée Hübsch opined, when both were visiting Rome in 1838,

that the Old German art of building was a decline of the Byzantine Round-Arched... The main failing in the Old German architecture for him [Hübsch] is that it offers no room for frescoes – and that the stained glass gives poor illumination.

That one can have room enough for fresco painting, and that even the Italians retained stained glass for their later buildings modeled on Roman ones – that he doesn't take into consideration. Enough—he once chose the Round Arch Style and now must groan over everything else.⁷⁹¹

Seven years later, even though Hübsch had been Adolf V's first choice as architect for a Byzantine style chapel, Adolf ended up rejecting the proposal Hübsch

⁷⁸⁹ Sulpiz Boisserée's entry on the architect C. Ludwig Zanth's visit to see him and his brother Melchior in Munich: "Klagen ... über das große Verderben welches Gärtner und Hübsch durch den Misch-Masch von Byzantinisch- Romanisch- Deutschem hervorbringen, weil die jungen Architekten das so leicht nachahmen und dabei für die Menge doch einigen Schein von Neuheit erlangen können." Boisserée, *Tagebücher* 3:745-46, entry for June 11, 1841.

⁷⁹⁰ "Morgens Besuch v. Baudirector Hübsch – Klagen über Gärtner – er will alles bauen hat die Hände zu voll und muß hudeln." Boisserée, *Tagebücher* 3:438, entry for Nov. 14, 1838.

⁷⁹¹ "...er meint in der altdeutschen Bau-Kunst sei ein Verfall der byzantinische rundbogigen..." Boisserée was unimpressed... there followed a long discussion of an arch in Florence Cathedral... "Der Haupt-Fehler ist ihm an der altdeutschen Bau-Kunst daß sie keine Räume für Freskobilder darbeite — und daß die Glas-Malereien eine schlechte Beleuchtung geben. —// Daß man Räume genug für Fresko-Malereien haben kann, und daß selbst die Italiener die Glas-Malerei für ihre spätern den römischen nachgebildeten Gebäude beibehalten haben, das bedenkt er nicht. Genug, er hat sich einmal für den Rundbogenstil entschieden und nun muß er auf alles andere schelten..." Boisserée, *Tagebücher* 3:451.

submitted. For Adolf, whose primary experience of the Byzantine style had been the medieval and revival architecture of Russia, Hübsch's interpretation evidently had insufficient merit. His pride affected, Hübsch argued that he should be given another chance. Concluding that Adolf planned to give the commission to a Russian architect, he wrote that certainly a German architect, and particularly one with a solid reputation such as his, would do a better job than any Russian one.⁷⁹² Adolf gave the commission, however, to Philipp Hoffmann (1806-89), who had studied under Friedrich von Gärtner in Munich before working under Georg Moller on Adolf's new palace in Wiesbaden (1837-41).⁷⁹³ Adolf sent Hoffmann in 1846-47 to study the rapidly evolving architecture of St. Petersburg and Moscow, especially that of Ton.⁷⁹⁴

Hoffmann returned to Wiesbaden with a deeper basis for comparison of the Bavarian and Russian Byzantine revival styles than anyone except Klenze. Unlike Klenze, Hoffmann was inclined to take the Russian version seriously. Adolf quickly approved Hoffmann's plan. It is perhaps an indication of Hoffmann's Munich training, however, that in 1849-50 he did not go back to Russia but rather traveled to Italy, via Munich, to seek inspiration (and marble) for the Griechische Kapelle's interior.

To fully elaborate on Hoffmann's unique re-interpretation of the Byzantine revival style would require further analysis of Russian developments, but an important point here is that the Bavarian Byzantine revival components of building were notably

⁷⁹² Heinrich Hübsch, quoted in Paulgerd Jesberg, "Die Griechische Kapelle. Symbol der Romantik und Wahrzeichen für Wiesbaden. Aus russisch-orthodoxer Gläubigkeit in italienisch-byzantinischer Schönheit," in *Philipp Hoffmann 1806-1889. Ein nassauischer Baumeister*, ed. Paulgerd Jesberg (Wiesbaden: NOBEL, 1982), 101.

⁷⁹³ Georg Moller, who had studied under Friedrich Weinbrenner before writing his *Denkmaehler der deutschen Baukunst* (1815-43) and becoming state architect of Hesse-Darmstadt, as discussed in Chapters Three and Five, above.

⁷⁹⁴ Vaassen, "Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechischen Kapelle," 69.

limited. Beyond the prominent corbel arcade below the cornice, the primary Bavarian Byzantine feature of the chapel was the glazing, installed in 1854. This consisted of foliate-patterned grisaille windows (*Tapetenfenster*) like those of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, the Ludwigskirche, and the Brunnkapelle [fig. 6.6 b], and a stained glass Resurrection of Christ, modeled on that of St. Isaac's Cathedral and likewise placed over the altar, behind the Holy Gates.⁷⁹⁵ The iconostasis was painted by Karl Timoleon von Neff (1805-76), professor at the Academy of Art in St. Petersburg, who also contributed to Montferrand's Cathedral of St. Isaac and Ton's Church of Christ the Savior.⁷⁹⁶

The fullest expression of the development of Bavarian Byzantine revival stained glass was thus created for what was essentially a Russian Byzantine revival building on the Rhine. More than Russian interest in Bavaria's Byzantine revival style per se, this convergence reflects the dramatic success of Ludwig's efforts to revive the art of stained glass that had begun when Napoleon was still at the height of his power (1808) and had brought Munich international renown as a center for this revival. While incorporated into the Russian revival style as interpreted by a student of Gärtner, the glazing was installed outside Bavaria and Russia, and did not rule the further development of either style. The Griechische Kapelle was the culmination of the effort to develop Byzantine-revival stained glass, the last medium integrated into Ludwig's Byzantine revival.

Already challenged by confessional tensions with Greece, the visual and theoretical credibility of Ludwig's revival of Byzantine art and architecture was made all

⁷⁹⁵ Vaassen, "Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechischen Kapelle," 74 and 76-78.

⁷⁹⁶ Nikolai Artemoff, *Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche auf dem Neroberg in Wiesbaden*, Kunstführer 1432 (Munich: Schnell & Steiner, 1984), available online at <http://www.rocor.de/Roka/rokawiesbaden.html> (accessed September 14, 2007).

the more complex by the mid-century importation of Russian Byzantinism into German lands. The synagogue on the Michelsberg, Wiesbaden (1863-69), which Philipp Hoffmann designed on a pentacupular Greek cross plan and capped with onion domes, closely echoed distinctive elements of the Griechische Kapelle and was initially criticized, in the official assessment of the building office, as looking too much like a church [**fig. 6.7**].⁷⁹⁷ The horseshoe-arch window and door openings may have been added in response to this assessment, so as to diffuse the church-like character. Nevertheless the result still reflected the Russian Byzantine style that Hoffmann had studied at its source. In creating such a design Hoffmann appears to have intentionally used the Russian version of Byzantine revival as an alternative to the Bavarian version in the buildings for which the Byzantine revival style had become most popular: synagogues.

3. Ludwig's Creation of a Moorish Revival Style for Synagogues and its Impact on the Development and Spread of the Byzantine Revival Style

Before the Byzantine chapels at Possenhofen and Bad Reichenhall were underway, Ludwig had initiated a new deliberateness in the use of architectural styles. This appears to have affected how the Bavarian Byzantine revival style was conceptualized and received, both in Bavaria and beyond. Ludwig charged the Architectural Committee of the Chief Construction Authority (*Obersten Baubehörde*), established in 1829-30, with coordinating and clarifying Bavarian policies in architectural

⁷⁹⁷ Harold Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland: Geschichte einer Baugattung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (1780-1933)*, 2 vols. (Hamburg: Hans Christian, 1981), 307-08 and fig. 224.

matters. The committee was led by Klenze and Gärtner, and also included Ohlmüller as well as Georg Friedrich Ziebland.⁷⁹⁸

At this time, Klenze and Gärtner were still actively engaged in completing the Allerheiligenhofkapelle and the Ludwigskirche, while Heideloff (not on the committee) was taking Rupprecht's place in the restorations at Bamberg. In line with this new mission, Klenze would immediately embark on his design for SS. Michael and John the Baptist, Eltmann, as a model Byzantine-style church, while re-envisioning St. Salvator, Donaustauf, as a demonstration of the transfer of Greek culture into German lands. One of the committee's first determinations was that in addition to the furnishings (e.g., the Torah shrine) and other requirements (e.g., separate entrances for women and men) that already distinguished Jewish from Christian houses of worship, such buildings should also differ from one another in style. The official in the Duchy of Hesse-Nassau who, in the 1860s, would describe Hoffmann's synagogue design as looking too much like a church, was thus echoing an idea Ludwig had codified in Bavaria more than three decades earlier.

Gärtner's design for a synagogue at Ingenheim, a town southwest of Speyer [[map 1](#)], became the first expression of this new deliberateness in the Bavarian use of architectural styles. This synagogue was to be among the most important in Bavaria. At the time it was constructed, over thirty percent of Ingenheim's population was Jewish; it

⁷⁹⁸ Gabriele Schickel, "Typisierung und Stilwahl im Sakralbau," in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 54-67, and Schickel, "Synagoge, Ingenheim/Pfalz, 1829-1832," catalogue no. 73 in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 309. Ziebland had just returned from two years in Italy studying Roman basilicas in preparation for taking over the Apostelkirche commission that, as discussed in Chapter Three, had originally been given to Klenze (the patronym of which was later changed to St. Boniface). Ohlmüller, meanwhile, received in 1830 the commission for the Mariahilfkirche, which Gärtner had failed to win (as discussed in Chapter Five).

was the largest Jewish community in the Bavarian Rhine District (in 1837 renamed the Rhenish Palatinate), which was in turn the Bavarian region with the largest Jewish population.⁷⁹⁹ A classicizing plan for the synagogue, with Doric entablature and pilasters, had been made by the regional engineer (*Bezirksingenieur*) Wolff of the construction office (*Baubüro*) in nearby Landau. The Architectural Commission (*Baukunstausschuß*) in Munich required that it be simplified and the classicizing style be made more consistent. Unfortunately, no image survives of either the original or the revised versions of Wolff's plan.⁸⁰⁰ His revised version was subsequently rejected by the district government (*Kreisregierung*), as well as by the local Jewish community. The district worried that it would still cost more than the Jewish community's means, while both the district and the community agreed that it would provide insufficient natural light and further, at least according to the district, the Jewish community missed the "over-laden decoration" of the earlier plan.⁸⁰¹

⁷⁹⁹ See Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 80, and for a recent discussion with bibliography, Stefan Fischbach and Ingrid Westerhoff, eds., "...und dies ist die Pforte des Himmels". *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, Gedenkbuch der Synagogen in Deutschland 2 (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2005), 105-108. The Upper and Middle Rhine was one of the two densest areas of Jewish population in German lands in 1815 (the other being the formerly Polish Duchy of Posen, which had become part of Prussia); Swabia, however, had, on average, larger Jewish communities compared to Franconia and the Rhineland. Steven M. Lowenstein, "The Beginnings of Integration, 1780-1870," in *Jewish Daily Life in Germany, 1618-1945*, ed. Marion A. Kaplan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 95 and 97.

⁸⁰⁰ Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 106-07.

⁸⁰¹ "Als nun auch Vertreter der Kultusgemeinde Wünsche und Einwände gegen die Planung vorgebracht hatten, sah sich die Kreisregierung veranlaßt, 'da die Kosten größtentheils aus Privatmitteln zusammengetragen werden, ein Verhältnis, welches von Seiten der Verwaltung Rücksichten erheischt, über die man sich nur bei besser dotirten Stiftungen hinwegsetzen könnte', am 15. April 1830 noch einmal an den Baukunstauschuß zu schreiben. Unter anderem hieß es darin, daß dem, 'wie es scheint, wohlbegründeten Begehren' nach mehr Licht nur durch eine zweite Fensterreihe oder, wenn der Gurt an der Seitenfacade unterbleibt, durch höhere, in beide Stockwerke

Gärtner undertook a new design for the synagogue in which he attempted to satisfy everyone involved. In the text accompanying the final plans, Gärtner wrote that

...in the design of this new proposal the greatest possible care has been taken to address all of the objections brought forward by the community representatives, [which were] based in part on the ceremony and worship [requirements] of the Israelites.⁸⁰²

But more than this, Ingenheim's synagogue became the first expression of the new Bavarian architectural policy. With Ludwig I's active (and possibly decisive) participation, Gärtner invented a Moorish revival style for this building. Designed and constructed from 1830 to 1832, this synagogue became the prototype for most synagogues built in Bavaria during the remainder of Ludwig's reign. This broke not only with the use of the neoclassical style of Wolff's plans but also with that of the first synagogue built in Munich since 1380,⁸⁰³ designed by Klenze's frequent collaborator, the French architect Jean-Baptiste Métivier (1781-1857).⁸⁰⁴ Construction of this synagogue,

greifende Fenster entsprochen werden' könne, andererseits aber die 'israelitische Gemeinde [...] von den älteren, mit Dekorationen überladenen Projekte nur ungern abzugehen' schien. 'Man kann ihr die Vorliebe zu prunkhaften Ausstattungen, abgesehen von Betrachtungen anderer Art schon daraus nicht zu Gute halten, weil sie nach dem Zeugnisse des Land-Kommissariats gar nicht im Stande ist, kostspielige Bauten zu Ziel zu führen, wenn gleich die Schilderung des Vorstandes ganz andere Erwartungen hervorrufen sollen.'" Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 107-08.

⁸⁰² "...Bei dem Entwurfe dieses neuen Planes auf die Beseitigung aller von den Gemeinde-Vorstehern angebrachten, zum Theil auf das Ceremonial und den Kultus der Israeliten gegründeten Einwendungen die möglichste Rücksicht genommen worden ist." Friedrich von Gärtner, as cited by Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 108.

⁸⁰³ The medieval synagogue of Munich had been converted into a pilgrimage church following the expulsion of the Jews in 1442, and secularized in 1803. Elisabeth Angermair, et al., *Beth ha-Knesseth—Ort der Zusammenkunft: zur Geschichte der Münchner Synagogen, ihrer Rabbiner und Kantoren; eine Veröffentlichung des Stadtarchivs München* (Munich: Buchendorfer, 1999), 26-27.

⁸⁰⁴ Jean-Baptiste Métivier, born in Reims, came to Munich in 1811. In 1836 he would become court architect to Eugène de Beauharnais, Duke of Leuchtenberg (for whom

begun in July 1824, was well underway when Ludwig I came to the throne.⁸⁰⁵ It echoed the break Ludwig had made with churches in the neoclassical style in 1818, when he told Klenze that the classicizing Apostelkirche he had commissioned two years earlier would have to be redesigned. (In fact, Métivier's design echoed Klenze's proposal for that church.⁸⁰⁶) The choice of a Moorish style to make this break reflected rapidly developing

Klenze had designed the Leuchtenbergpalais discussed in Chapter One). Ludwig I and Queen Thérèse attended the dedication of the Munich synagogue on April 21, 1826. This building, built on Theaterstraße (later Westenriedstraße), won widespread praise: its most unusual features were the ceiling, composed of a single coffered barrel vault that extended to the outer walls and did not match the curve of the shallow eastern apse, and Egyptianizing palm capitals on the columns supporting the women's balcony. This synagogue was demolished in 1887, when it was replaced by a much larger building in a more prominent location (and in a Romanesque revival style, as discussed below). See Angermair, *Beth ha-Knesseth*, 36 and 39-41; Birgitte Langer, "Leo von Klenze als Innenarchitekt und Möbelentwerfer," in Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 157 and 158; Hubert Bauch, et al., *Denkmäler jüdischer Kultur in Bayern*, Arbeitsheft 43 (Munich: Bayerisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege, 1994), 11-14; and Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, esp. 37-57, 62-63, and figs. 41-46.

⁸⁰⁵ Angermair, *Beth ha-Knesseth*, 39.

⁸⁰⁶ Hammer-Schenk suggests a politically-motivated resemblance between Métivier's design and that of the meeting room of the Great Synhedrion of 1807 (the assembly of 71 Jewish scholars called together by Napoleon) in Paris's city hall, and that of the room redesigned by Klenze in 1819 for the meetings of the Bavarian Ständeversammlung (estates-assembly). Both Paris city hall's meeting room and that of the Bavarian Ständeversammlung were classicizing but neither resembled Métivier's synagogue, with its combination of coffered barrel-vault and coffered apse the same height and width as the nave – features specific to Klenze's design for the Apostle Church originally to be built across from his Glyptothek (discussed in Chapter Three) and to what I believe is Klenze's likely model, C.F. Hansen's Vor Frue Kirke in Copenhagen. See Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 51-52 and figs. 56-57; for Klenze's design for the Ständeversammlung see Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 332-34; for his Apostle Church design see Hildebrand, "Werkverzeichnis," 277-80. A barrel vault covered the nave of the neoclassical Alte Synagoge, Hannover, completed 1826 (see Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 35, 49, and fig. 54). Because the vault was not coffered, there was no apse, and the Torah shrine was recessed into the wall between pilasters that suggested the colonnades on the north and south sides continued across the eastern end, Hannover's Alte Synagoge bore a much closer resemblance to the Synhedron meeting room than did the synagogue designed by Métivier. The close resemblance suggests that Métivier was tacitly extending not only Klenze's design to Jewish architecture but also

ideas concerning the Islamic style – a style that was still hardly distinguished from the Byzantine. Gärtner had yet to complete the ornament of the Ludwigskirche at the time of the Ingenheim commission, and it appears that his solutions for the Ingenheim synagogue helped him develop the Ludwigskirche's ornamental program.

Ludwig's and Gärtner's choice of Moorish was not, however, simply a whim but reflected evolving scholarship on the subject, and Gärtner's Moorish revival style was similarly not pure invention but an interpretation of the published illustrations of Moorish monuments currently available. In England, scholarly opinion concerning the origins of the Gothic in Islamic (or Moorish) Spain lingered into the mid-nineteenth century. Though in German lands this notion faded in favor of Byzantine origins for the Gothic style, even there it continued to color how Moorish art was viewed. This is evident in publications on Moorish architecture that incorporated illustrations with presumably unintentional Gothicizing distortions.⁸⁰⁷ Such works focused almost exclusively on the Great Mosque at Cordova and the Alhambra in Granada. The first significant publication in this genre was Juan de Villanueva's and Pedro Arnal's *Arab Antiquities of Spain* (*Antigüedades árabes de España*) of ca. 1780.⁸⁰⁸ Its title played on Stuart and Revett's

Klenze's arguments in his *Manual* of 1822/24, that the classical style was the only one appropriate for Christian architecture (as discussed in Chapter Three).

⁸⁰⁷ Tonia Raquejo discusses, for instance, David Urquhart's discussion of the Spanish origins of the Gothic style in *The Pillars of Hercules* (London, 1850), which appears to be the last serious presentation of this theory. She also demonstrates Gothicizing distortions in major illustrated works on the architecture of Islamic Spain. She attributes these distortions to the ongoing influence of the theory that these buildings had inspired the creation of Gothic architecture: artists looked for, and to some degree invented, Gothic elements in the Moorish buildings they documented. Tonia Raquejo, "The 'Arab Cathedrals': Moorish Architecture as Seen by British Travellers," *The Burlington Magazine* v. 128, no. 1001 (1986): 556; 559-63.

⁸⁰⁸ Michael Scholz-Hänsel, "'Antigüedades árabes de España.' Wie die einst vertriebenen Mauren Spanien zu einer Wiederentdeckung im 19. Jahrhundert verhalfen," in *Europa*

ongoing and highly successful publication of *The Antiquities of Athens*, the first volume of which had appeared thirteen years earlier.⁸⁰⁹ Meanwhile, upon visiting Granada in 1807, the French Romantic writer François-René de Chateaubriand (1768-1848) was among the first to describe the Alhambra as being the Moor's equivalent of the Parthenon.⁸¹⁰ Through such works Moorish monuments, presented by an international range of observers as comparable to those of the ancient Greeks, provided a prestigious heritage for the Gothic style that paralleled the ancient Greek heritage attributed to the Byzantine style.

A British publication, James Cavanah Murphy's (posthumous) *The Arabian Antiquities of Spain* (1815) [**fig. 6.8 a-c**], closely modeled on Villanueva's and Arnal's *Arab Antiquities of Spain*, provided further illustrations, this time with commentary, of the Great Mosque at Cordova and the Alhambra.⁸¹¹ Murphy's work was more widely available in Germany than that by Villanueva and Arnal, and German scholars typically relied upon it.⁸¹² Historical accounts of the history of Islamic Spain, such as Jean-Pierre

und der Orient 800-1900, ed. Gereon Sievernich and Hendrik Budde (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Lexicon Verlag, 1989), 368-82 and 886, esp. 370-71.

⁸⁰⁹ James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, *The Antiquities of Athens, Measured and Delineated*, 3 vols. (1762, 1787, 1794; reprint, New York: Benjamin Bloom, 1968). Villanueva's and Arnal's illustrations were exacting, but presented without commentary, as nobody could be found who was competent to provide a comparably scholarly text.

⁸¹⁰ Chateaubriand's comparison is noted in John Sweetman, *The Oriental Obsession: Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture 1500-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 119 n. 19, and described as a comparison "that was often to be made" in Girault de Prangey, *Impressions of Granada and the Alhambra*, trans. Elizabeth MacDonald, intro. John Sweetman (Reading, UK: Garnet, 1996), viii.

⁸¹¹ James Cavanah Murphy, *The Arabian Antiquities of Spain*, edited with descriptions by T. H. Horne (London: Cadell and Davies, 1815). Scholz-Hänsel, "Antigüedades árabes de España," 369-70.

⁸¹² Although illustrations of the Alhambra by Murphy in *The Arabian antiquities of Spain* provide several of Raquejo's examples of Gothicizing views of Spanish Islamic art (Raquejo, in "Moorish Cathedrals," figs. 5-6 and 8-10), Murphy's work was taken as

Chavis de Florian's *Short History of the Moors of Spain* (*Précis historique sur les Maures d'Espagne*), translated into German in 1825, also contributed to European interest in the subject at this time.⁸¹³ While from the 1790s increasing numbers of Germans traveled to Spain and published their accounts, few if any focused on the architecture they saw; German architectural historians seem to have relied almost entirely on British and French publications into the mid-nineteenth century.⁸¹⁴ Alexandre, Comte de Laborde's *Picturesque and Historical Travels in Spain* (*Voyage pittoresque et historique de l'Espagne*), published in Paris in 1812, was still being cited along with Murphy by Kugler and other German scholars into the 1840s.⁸¹⁵ The first German-language publication to treat Moorish architecture in depth was José Caveda's *History of Architecture in Spain* (*Geschichte der Baukunst in Spanien*) published in Stuttgart in 1858.⁸¹⁶

Towards the end of the Greek Wars of Independence, after Philhellenism had peaked and enthusiasm for the Ottomans had correspondingly ebbed, these romanticized images of Moorish architecture — ambiguously situated, like the Byzantine, between the poles of

authoritative as late as 1842 by as notable a scholar as Franz Kugler, who cited it in his discussion of Islamic Spain in his *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* (Berlin: Ebner & Seubert, 1842), 402 n.1. (Owen Jones's more accurate *Plans, Elevations, Sections and Details of the Alhambra*, 2 vols., 1842-1845, did not appear in time to serve Kugler as a resource.)

⁸¹³ See Scholz-Hänsel, "Antigüedades árabes de España," 369.

⁸¹⁴ Werner Brüggemann, "Die Spanienberichte des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts und ihre Bedeutung für die Formung und Wandlung des deutschen Spanienbildes," in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens*, vol. 12, ed. Johannes Vincke; Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft, Series 1 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1956), 47-48.

⁸¹⁵ Kugler, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*, 402 n. 1, and Karl Friedrich Schnaase, *Geschichte der bildenden Künste im Mittelalter* (Düsseldorf: Julius Buddeus, 1844), 81.

⁸¹⁶ Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 252-53.

Greek and Gothic — gained new currency throughout Europe.⁸¹⁷ While German Romantics embraced Spain for its devout Catholicism, this did not prevent them from admiring its pre-Reconquista Moorish inheritance.⁸¹⁸ Those sections of the Alhambra that had been preserved by the Habsburgs had fallen into disrepair following loss of the Spanish throne to the Bourbon dynasty in 1700; withdrawing Napoleonic troops quickened the destruction when they dynamited the towers in 1812, to limit its military utility to the victorious Spanish forces.⁸¹⁹ The building's rediscovery by growing numbers of Romantic artists and authors from Washington Irving, who moved in to the Alhambra in 1829, to Victor Hugo prompted an international campaign for its historic preservation.⁸²⁰ This campaign, already a success in 1830, led to the rebuilding and re-naming of much of the Alhambra's historic fabric, in the name of preservation, to fit Romantic notions of what it might have been.⁸²¹

Ludwig thus introduced a non-Christian revival style for his non-Christian subjects in the midst of growing interest in Moorish monuments and their restoration. The Moorish style was both better documented and less flexible than the Byzantine. At the

⁸¹⁷ The French occupation of Algeria (1830) further contributed to a new level of curiosity about, and a proprietary attitude towards, "Moorish" culture.

⁸¹⁸ In this they followed Baretti, who had defended the Reconquista in 1770. Brüggemann, "Spanienberichte des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts," 79-80.

⁸¹⁹ Darío Cabanelas Rodríguez, "The Alhambra: An Introduction," in *Al-Andalus: The Art of Islamic Spain*, ed. Jerrilynn D. Dodds (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992), 132.

⁸²⁰ Hugo had lavishly praised the Alhambra in his poem "Granade" of 1828, published in 1829 in his poem-cycle *Les Orientales*. On Hugo see Scholz-Hänsel, "Antigüedades árabes de España," 372, who cites Andrés Soria, "La Alhambra de Victor Hugo," *Cuadernos Alhambra*, vol. 1 (1965), p. 120. On Irving see Cabanelas Rodríguez, "Alhambra: An Introduction," 132.

⁸²¹ James Dickie, "The Alhambra: Some Reflections Prompted by a Recent Study by Oleg Grabar," in *Studia Arabica et Islamica: Festschrift for Ihsan 'Abbas on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Wadad al-Qadi (Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1981), 127-49.

same time, because the Arabic style was understood as the continuation of the Byzantine style in the former Byzantine realm (i.e., the East), the new Moorish revival style for synagogues had to be based explicitly on Spanish monuments in such a way as to be unambiguously non-Byzantine, i.e., exotic, but differentiated enough from the Arabic style so as to be specific to the non-Christian West. Rather than parsing what might be specifically Byzantine or Islamic contributions to art and architecture (a question that would hardly be asked for another generation), Gärtner and Ludwig thus attempted through this new revival style to distinguish between Islamic styles. While it might seem that the pre-Reconquista Spanish synagogues would have inspired Ludwig's interest in this subject, like most other buildings of Islamic Spain, these had not yet been published and do not appear to have been a factor.⁸²²

That the publications of Murphy and Laborde informed the creation of Moorish revival style is evident from Gärtner's designs for the Ingenheim synagogue's exterior, to which Ludwig contributed [**Fig. 6.9 b-c**]. Gärtner's preliminary sketch [**fig. 6.9 a**] was truer to these prototypes than his final design: the western entrances were set into a small open foyer entered through a horseshoe arch, which was in turn set into a rectangular field of ornament. The whole seems to have been a simplified version of the similarly framed façade of the mihrab added by al-Hakam in 961-76 to the Great Mosque at Cordova [**fig. 6.8 a**]. The erroneous belief, asserted in Murphy's caption, that this mihrab

⁸²² The 1837 vol. of Girault de Prangey's *Monuments Arabes et Moresques de Cordove, Séville et Grenade*. 3 vols. (Paris: Veith et Hauser, 1836-39) published the first illustrations of the synagogues in Cordova and Seville, and vol. 1 of Patricio de la Escosura. *España artística y monumental* (Paris, 1842), 44-45 and 71-72, published the first illustrations of the two synagogues in Toledo, according to Carol Herselle Krinsky, *Synagogues of Europe* (New York: Architectural History Foundation; Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985), 85 n. 199.

had formerly enshrined the Koran in a manner not unlike a Torah shrine may have helped to suggest the appropriateness of this design for the synagogue. The capped merlons of Gärtner's initial plan for the synagogue are identical to those found in Murphy's illustration of the Alhambra's Puerta del Vino: the similarities between this portal and the mihrab façade perhaps suggested these merlons to Gärtner as especially appropriate for the synagogue's cornice [**fig.6.8 b**]. (In their placement along the gable, these merlons underline the degree to which Gärtner here, as at the Ludwigskirche, understood style as something to be applied to a pre-determined structure, without regard to functional significance.) The horseshoe-arched biforium above the synagogue's entrance in the initial proposal follows the form of the Puerta del Vino [**fig. 6.8 b and 6.9 a**], while more elaborate biforium in the finished plan incorporates the polylobed arches of al-Hakam's mihrab [**fig. 6.8 a and 6.9 b**]. The horseshoe-arched window frames on the synagogue's side walls, meanwhile, are simplified versions of the most ubiquitous motif at Cordova, found in the first mosque and its later additions [**fig. 6.8 c**].⁸²³

Among its other distinctions, this building was not only the first synagogue in a Moorish revival style but also the first to use the Mosaic Tablets on the apex of the entrance façade. In developing this feature of his design, Gärtner dropped the rest of the Moorish merlons from his initial plan so that the Tablets stood out clearly. He removed the cap from over the Tablets, replacing it in the final design with acroteria. Perhaps these classicizing elements were added to underline that the Ten Commandments were part of a shared Judeo-Christian cultural tradition, not to be exoticized. Whatever Gärtner's

⁸²³ Gärtner's plan for ornamentally-arranged Hebrew inscriptions over the men's entrance, presumably inspired by Arabic inscriptions such as those over the Cordova mihrab, were not carried out. Of course it is possible that various elements of other, less frequently illustrated buildings provided examples on which Gärtner might have drawn.

specific reasoning at Ingenheim, Mosaic Tablets soon became an identifying feature of synagogue buildings.

Gärtner was not as innovative, however, in plans for the synagogue's interior. Beyond the basic elevation, with horseshoe arches over the columns supporting the balcony. Gärtner passed the design of the interior on to his former student August von Voit (1801-70) [**Fig. 6.9 d**].⁸²⁴ That Gärtner and Ludwig I did not pursue the complexities of developing a Moorish synagogue interior from Murphy's and Laborde's plates indicates that the primary audience for their distinctive new synagogue style was not the Jewish community but Ingenheim's Christian population, which would not necessarily see the interior. Voit filled in classicizing details, possibly incorporating elements from the designs for the interior that had already been prepared by Wolff at the district office in Landau.⁸²⁵

In the final design, the primary positive indications of the Ingenheim synagogue's Moorish style were the repeated use of the horseshoe arch, the mihrab-like entrance foyer, and the geometric tracery in the windows. The interior executed by Voit added no further Moorish elements, unless he added the windows of the eastern wall (for which no drawing has survived.) Photos document that these windows were round openings

⁸²⁴ Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 419 n. 118, among others, cite Hans-Jürgen Kotzur, *Forschungen zum Leben und Werk des Architekten August von Voit*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg, 1978), as having clarified Gärtner's role in designing this building.

⁸²⁵ At the time, Voit was serving in Speyer as Civil Building Inspector (*Zivilbauinspektor*) for the Rhenish Palatinate. See Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 106, and 108. The Ingenheim synagogue was largely destroyed in November 1938 and the remains were later removed. The few repairs and alterations it underwent during its existence are listed on p. 106; the interior photo, from 1928, apparently documents the original appearance to a substantial degree. Voit would later work in Munich designing the Neue Pinakothek (1846-53) for Ludwig I, and the Glaspalast (1854) for Maximilian II.

containing glazing in a simple interlocking geometric square-on-square pattern that is typically Islamic. The room was painted neoclassical white; to the colonnettes flanking the Torah shrine (crowned with acroteria) were added Egyptianizing palm capitals.⁸²⁶ The capitals of the columns supporting the women's gallery (as per Gärtner's plans) appear to represent an ambiguous blend of medieval or Renaissance models.⁸²⁷

Although all of the ornament is different from that at the Ludwigskirche, it is the use of the windows as the primary bearers of Moorish motifs and the near absence of other polychromy in the interior that most strongly contrast with the design Gärtner was developing for the Ludwigskirche. Even though Ingenheim was far from Munich, the absence of ornamental polychromy in its exemplary Moorish revival style allowed Gärtner, whether intentionally or not, to unambiguously integrate what he and Boisserée seem to have understood as Byzantine-Islamic ornamental polychromy into the Byzantine revival decorative program at the Ludwigskirche, which was still in progress. With Ludwig's and Voit's input, Gärtner had created a Moorish revival style that did not require him to distinguish between Byzantine and Arabic ornament – a distinction that was hardly possible given the lack of research on either subject at this time. He was thus free to use any ornament from the East, rather than restricting his choice to what was

⁸²⁶ To judge from Hammer-Schenk's examples, these seem to have been only the second set of such capitals in nineteenth-century Europe, the first being those used by Métivier on the Torah shrine of the Munich synagogue. Almost simultaneously, the synagogue of the Hochdeutsche Israelitische Gemeinde in Altona received many Egyptianizing elements, including palm-leaf capitals that were similar to those Métivier had used in a renovation of 1832 planned by O.J. Schmidt (Hammer-Schenk notes these capitals in *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 80-81 and fig. 65).

⁸²⁷ Per Hammer-Schenk, 80, these are "Palmettenkapitellen" reminiscent of Italian Renaissance churches. This may be so for the general form, but the vegetal ornament seems closer to Carolingian or Ottonian, examples. Voit probably considered the capitals to be Byzantine / New Greek.

found at Bamberg and other German-Byzantine monuments, as Klenze was suggesting he should.

For the next decade and more, Bavarian Moorish revival synagogues continued to be characterized by the use of horseshoe arches, spare ornament and largely monochrome, if not always white, interiors.⁸²⁸ The series of Bavarian Moorish synagogues Voit built for other towns in the Bavarian Rhine District, such as Kirchheimbolanden (1835-36) [**figs. 6.10 a-b**] and Speyer (1836-37) [**fig. 6.11 a-c**], and the many anonymously designed synagogues based on those of Gärtner and Voit, further suggest that Gärtner had provided as much as those involved knew of (or found useful in) Moorish design for Bavarian synagogues.⁸²⁹ Gärtner's unusual combination of horseshoe-arch windows and stepped gables, while not followed by Voit, was surprisingly popular. It was quickly copied in Bavarian Swabia at Binswangen in 1835,⁸³⁰ and in the Rhenish Palatinate at Böhl in 1839.⁸³¹ In other iterations of Gärtner's and Voit's Moorish revival style, horseshoe arches came to be combined with Bavarian Byzantine revival features such as round-arch friezes at the roofline (e.g., Kirchheimbolanden); at the same time, the interiors become more consistent with the exteriors in having horseshoe-arched, rather than (increasingly out of date) neoclassical Torah shrine niches (at Kirchheimbolanden in 1836 [**6.10 a**], Speyer in 1837 [**6.11 b**], and Ingelheim am Rhein (1841; photo taken after the 1892 renovation) [**fig. 6.12**]).

⁸²⁸ The interior of the Speyer synagogue was painted grey: Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 354.

⁸²⁹ See Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 208-10 for Voit's synagogue at Kirchheimbolanden and 352-56 for his synagogue at Speyer.

⁸³⁰ See Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland* 261 and fig. 184.

⁸³¹ See Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 122.

Most of the evidence for the design of the Bavarian Moorish revival style synagogues was destroyed with the buildings in 1938. That which survives for Voit's Speyer synagogue reflects the innovative approach to revival-style glazing that Ludwig had patronized even before 1818, when he brought Frank to Munich. Voit inserted round windows with six-pointed star tracery along the sides at balcony level, at the top of the eastern wall, and in the horseshoe arch over the entrance. Through the unusually heavy, angular tracery he presumably intended to suggest the window grills common in Islamic architecture rather than Gothic stained glass. This appears to be the earliest use of the Star-of-David motif for window glazing in Central European synagogue architecture [**fig. 6.11 a-b**]; while it had a long Jewish as well as Islamic tradition, the motif was just at this time, and through new applications such as this, being transformed into a symbol of Judaism.⁸³²

Voit also designed stained glass windows for the east wall. These were apparently the only windows in the Speyer synagogue containing colored glass; at least one survives [**fig. 6.11 c**].⁸³³ Unlike the grisaille and stained glass windows being produced in Munich for Byzantine and Gothic revival buildings, the surviving Speyer window is of a single sheet of white glass with no leading, stained or painted in yellow and red with foliate patterns in the lower section and an eight-pointed star in the interlaced strap-work style

⁸³² Gerschom Scholem, "The Star of David: History of a Symbol," trans. Michael A. Meyer, in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken, 1971), 278-80. An immediate Bavarian precedent for the choice of the Star of David for the Ingenheim synagogue could be found in the ceremonial stone (Hochzeitsstein) of the synagogue at Sulzbach (Upper Palatinate, 1822-24), where its use seems to derive from the already established use of the Star of David on Jewish community seals. See Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 46-47 and fig. 50 and Scholem, 278.

⁸³³ Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 354-55.

especially popular in the western part of the Islamic world.⁸³⁴ It would be interesting to know if this Moorish revival style glass was produced for other synagogues.⁸³⁵ At the same time, the combination of six- and eight-pointed star motifs at Speyer makes it unclear whether Voit (or the Ingenheim congregation) understood the Star of David as symbolic of Judaism or simply a traditional and appropriately non-figural, non-Christian, diffusely Eastern ornament.⁸³⁶ From what can be discerned from a later photo [**fig. 6.11 b**], the horseshoe arch windows in the east wall were eventually replaced with windows displaying, at least in the lower portion, grisaille patterns. How closely these resemble the Byzantine revival type is difficult to say. The survival of the window(s) designed by Voit in 1837 is perhaps due to this replacement. The new windows were apparently produced after it was no longer necessary to carefully distinguish the Bavarian Byzantine and Bavarian Moorish revival styles.

⁸³⁴ Baer, *Islamic Ornament*, 81.

⁸³⁵ This window is reproduced in Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, where the caption reads “Ornamentiertes Buntglasfenster in der Ostwand der Synagoge von August von Voit von 1837 in Speyer”; to judge from the color photograph this window appears to have survived the destruction of the building in 1938. Its survival is apparently a recent discovery as the window not otherwise mentioned in the text and beyond the photo credit (Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Mainz, Archiv), no further information about it appears to have been published to date.

⁸³⁶ That the Star of David could be considered generically Eastern or even Byzantine at this time is suggested not only by the inclusion of eight-pointed stars in the stained glass, but by the inclusion of Stars of David on the pendentives of one of the aisle domes designed by Gärtner ca. 1835 for the Ludwigskirche [**fig. 5.5 u**], just as the Speyer synagogue was completed. Hammer-Schenk, who apparently had no knowledge of the stained glass in the Speyer synagogue, asserts, however, that the use of the Star of David at Speyer denoted the building’s Jewish character in *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 260. Perhaps, in fact, Voit’s use of the Star of David in the tracery of these windows (which, unlike the eight-pointed stars in the stained glass, was clearly visible from the exterior) served as an alternative and in this sense an equivalent marker to Gärtner’s placement of the Ten Commandments on the west façade gable at Ingenheim (a symbol absent from Speyer). Perhaps it was in part through Voit’s innovative use of it at Speyer that the six-pointed star would come to be associated strongly enough with Judaism to be chosen by Theodor Herschel to stand for his Zionist movement at the end of the century.

At least occasionally the Bavarian government simply mined Gärtner's Ingenheim design for motifs to impose on other synagogue proposals.⁸³⁷ At the same time, its Moorish style coincided with, and was soon adapted to suit, changes in the meaning of synagogues taking place within Jewish communities in and beyond Bavaria.⁸³⁸ From the late 1810s and 1820s, inspired by the same Enlightenment philosophers and theologians who had encouraged changes in Protestant worship, both Orthodox and Reform Jews began to view the synagogue in new ways. More than referring to the sacred, ancient Temple in Jerusalem and offering facilities for sacred activities, the synagogue came to be understood as a place sacred in itself.⁸³⁹ Beyond this, synagogues were increasingly viewed as public representations of the Jewish community within the architectural fabric of the larger, predominantly Christian society.⁸⁴⁰

⁸³⁷ For instance, peculiar results were obtained when "Moorish" motifs from Ingenheim (including the stepped gable!) were rather carelessly imposed on the Byzantine/Round Arch design for a synagogue in Binswangen, Bavarian Swabia (built 1836-37 by the mason (Mauermeister) Leonhard Christa; renovated as a community center in 1996). See Bernd Vollmar, "Dorfsynagogen im neomaureschen Stil am Beispiel von Binswangen (Lkr. Dillingen) und Hainsfarth (Lkr. Donau-Ries)," in Bauch, *Denkmäler jüdischer Kultur in Bayern*, 93-95.

⁸³⁸ The fruitfulness of Ludwig's and Gärtner's introduction of the Moorish style at Ingenheim directly contrasts with that of their subsequent intervention at Würzburg, where even though the synagogue could only be built in a location hidden from the street Ludwig required that it be built in an Egyptianizing style that, furthermore, required smaller windows than the community desired. While the Altona congregation had commissioned an Egyptianizing interior renovation in 1832, the Würzburg synagogue, designed by the Kunstbauausschuß and built 1838-41 with Gärtner's input, seems to have spelled an end to synagogues in this style. See Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 66-71, including n. 154.

⁸³⁹ Michael A. Meyer, "'How Awesome is this Place!': The Reconceptualisation of the Synagogue in Nineteenth-Century Germany," *Year Book* (Leo Baeck Institute) 41 (1996): 59-63.

⁸⁴⁰ In this respect, Meyer seems to be less aware of architectural, as opposed to theological, developments of the mid-19th century Central European synagogue. Specifically, during the 1830s-40s, synagogues did not generally attempt to resemble Roman basilicas; the Bavarian Moorish style had already been introduced, and external

The question of how to express these changes drove stylistic innovations in synagogue architecture from within, as well as from without, the Jewish community. The Moorish revival style seems to have satisfied not only the Bavarian regime, but many in the Bavarian Jewish community and beyond. It was quickly incorporated into the interior, and not merely the exterior, designs of synagogues modeled on Ingenheim and built throughout the Rhenish Palatinate, Bavarian Swabia, and beyond Bavaria. The architects and congregations of these provincial buildings, like Voit, do not appear to have maintained Ludwig's and Gärtner's focus on the style's Iberian origins, and so likely regarded it more generically as Islamic, or perhaps Eastern. For those who did not wish to portray the Jewish community as essentially foreign, however, the Bavarian interpretation of the Byzantine style as equally Eastern and German offered an enthusiastically received alternative to the Bavarian Moorish revival that has been frequently misinterpreted in later studies on the subject.

4. Semper's and Rosengarten's Byzantine Synagogues in Dresden and Kassel

At the same time as Voit's synagogues were being built, synagogues were being constructed in other German lands in what was described as a Byzantine style. This was a new development. While this is not the place for a detailed treatment of the complex history of synagogues, it is noteworthy that rather than offering a substantially different or greater knowledge of the Byzantine style than that found in Bavaria, the versions seen in these synagogues appear to have accepted Bavarian Byzantine churches—especially

markers to indicate that synagogues were synagogues became commonplace See Meyer, "Reconceptualisation of the Synagogue," 57-58.

the Ludwigskirche, the renovations at Bamberg, and (to a lesser extent) the Allerheiligenhofkapelle—as authoritative. Because Gärtner’s Moorish revival style was spare enough in its use of ornament to harmonize with and even incorporate neoclassical features, there was no need to develop refined stylistic distinctions between its ornamental program and that of the already lavish Bavarian Byzantine revival. This left open the possibility of even more lavish interiors and greater integration of more or less specifically Arabic elements into the interpretation of Byzantine style.

Two of the most influential non-Bavarian synagogues of this decade were built by Albert Rosengarten (b. 1809) in Kassel (1834/1836-39) and by Gottfried Semper in Dresden (1838-40). In 1834 Albert Rosengarten’s design was chosen for a synagogue in Kassel, the seat of Hesse-Kassel [**fig. 6.13 a-c**].⁸⁴¹ Without naming the Ingenheim synagogue, the council of Kassel’s Jewish community had specifically rejected the Moorish style, along with the classical and Egyptian styles, as inappropriate for synagogue architecture. The council preferred instead what it referred to as the Byzantine or Roman style that had been in use in the Near East before the destruction of the Temple of Solomon, had continued in use through the formation of Christianity, and therefore was the style of the earliest churches as well as of what it termed the first non-Solomonic synagogues.⁸⁴²

Construction of the Kassel synagogue, which could not begin until 1836, was completed in 1839 and a year later Rosengarten published his design in the *Allgemeine*

⁸⁴¹ See esp. Harold Hammer-Schenk, “Die Architektur der Synagoge von 1780 bis 1933,” in *Die Architektur der Synagoge*, ed. Hans-Peter Schwarz (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1988), 177-84.

⁸⁴² Report of the Council of Kassel’s Jewish community, August, 1833, Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 99 n. 244 and 102 n. 249, and note from the community elders of August 4, 1834, Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 100 n. 246.

Bauzeitung.⁸⁴³ Rosengarten, himself a member of Kassel's Jewish community, echoed the council in asserting that it was the round-arched, basilican style of the first Christian churches that was most appropriate for synagogues, as it was that which the Jews had probably used under Roman rule. He preferred the geographically unspecific term "Round Arch" for the style.⁸⁴⁴ He likewise stressed that the Greek style was not more appropriate for synagogues than for churches, and Gothic was too expensive and too Christian, but he differed from the committee in asserting that the Moorish style did contain useful, non-figural ornament.⁸⁴⁵ His resulting plan incorporated vaguely Islamic ornament in a basilica with a barrel-vaulted nave and transverse arches that broadened at their apex, hinting at more complex vaulting. The synagogue was commonly interpreted as Byzantine in style by those who followed his example, and so helped to set Byzantine as the style for synagogues outside of Bavaria into the 1850s, as will be discussed further below.

The Byzantine-style synagogue designed by Gottfried Semper was completed in Dresden in 1840 [**fig. 6.14 a-d**].⁸⁴⁶ Begun in 1838, Semper's building, like Rosengarten's, displayed a German-Byzantine exterior: the interior incorporated Eastern ornament that to a modern observer appears even more strongly Islamicizing than that at the Ludwigskirche, and modern scholars have tended to interpret it as such, while

⁸⁴³ Albert Rosengarten, "Die neue Synagoge in Cassel," *Allgemeine Bauzeitung* 5 (1840): 205-07 and plates 349-53.

⁸⁴⁴ Rosengarten, "Die neue Synagoge in Cassel," 206.

⁸⁴⁵ Rosengarten, "Die neue Synagoge in Cassel," 205-06.

⁸⁴⁶ See Hammer-Schenk, "Die Architektur der Synagoge von 1780 bis 1933," 185-91, and Winfried Nerdinger and Werner Oechslin, eds., *Gottfried Semper 1803-1879. Architektur und Wissenschaft* (Munich: Prestel; Zurich: GTA, 2003), 181-86.

interpreting the exterior as Romanesque.⁸⁴⁷ As noted in Chapter Four, Semper had taken particular interest in the polychromy of Bamberg Cathedral, and so it is perhaps not surprising that the interior of his Dresden synagogue was richly painted [**fig. 6.14 c-d**]. At the same time, the ornamental vocabulary of the interior does appear to have drawn on the Alhambra, among other sources, thus undermining Gärtner's new distinction between Byzantine and Moorish (though it is not clear that Semper knew of the Ingenheim synagogue or Bavaria's new Moorish revival style).⁸⁴⁸ Such discontinuities were not noted by his audience. A guide to Dresden of 1845 reads:

The Temple of the Israelites. This building rises opposite the east end of Brühl Terrace, erected by the splendid Semper in a pure Byzantine style. It would impress more by far, if it were not situated half blocked from view. Its harmonious and beautifully decorated interior corresponds to its exterior appearance almost beyond expectation.⁸⁴⁹

That the building could be described not only as in a pure Byzantine style but also as demonstrating an impressive harmony between interior and exterior corresponds less to modern assumptions about what "Byzantine" looked like than to Bavarian Byzantine interpretations such as that at the Ludwigskirche. Semper evidently interpreted this ornament much as the Byzantine style had been interpreted in Bavaria: as a link between the East and Germany. This integrative approach appears to have reflected the progress

⁸⁴⁷ See especially Krinsky, *Synagogues of Europe*, 276-79.

⁸⁴⁸ See Krinsky, *Synagogues of Europe*, 278 and Nerdinger and Oechslin, *Gottfried Semper*, 184.

⁸⁴⁹ "Der Tempel der Israeliten. Dem östlichen Ende der Brühlschen Terrasse gegenüber erhebt sich dieses 1838 und 1839 von dem trefflichen Semper in reinem byzantinischen Style errichtete Gebäude. Es würde bei weitem mehr imponieren, wenn es nicht halb verdeckt gelegen wäre. Sein harmonisches und schön dekoriertes Innere entspricht seiner äußeren Erscheinung fast über Erwartung." Ferdinand Thal, *Neuester und vollständiger Führer durch Dresden und seine Umgebung* (Dresden: H. H. Grimm, 1845), 9. I wish to thank Christiane Hertel for this reference.

towards Jewish emancipation in Saxony at the time the synagogue was designed and built.⁸⁵⁰

Intentionally or not, the work of Klenze, Gärtner, Heß, and Schwarzmann in Munich suggested an importance of the Holy Land extending beyond not only its specifically Byzantine, but also its specifically Christian heritage. This gave meaning to the revival style Ludwig had initiated beyond Bavaria to those who also wished to express both international and German national sympathies. In particular, the popularity of the Byzantine revival style for synagogue architecture helped to transform it from an expression of Ludwig's return to pre-Reformation Catholicism into a pan-confessional style of sacred art and architecture capable of broad application and interpretation.

5. Ludwig's Last Essay in his Byzantine Revival: The Interior of Speyer Cathedral

Ludwig had not forgotten Gärtner's suggestion of 1837 that he ought to repaint Bamberg Cathedral's interior to completely restore it to its Byzantine state; he had, moreover, been considering the appropriate iconographic program of such a project.⁸⁵¹ Six years later the possibility of realizing Gärtner's suggestion arose. On June 13, 1843, having traveled with his artists to compare Bamberg and Speyer Cathedrals, the king determined that painting Speyer's interior was more urgent.⁸⁵² This lavish project,

⁸⁵⁰ Simone Lässig, "Emancipation and Embourgeoisement: The Jews, the State, and the Middle Classes in Saxony and Anhalt-Dessau," in *Saxony in German History*, ed. James Retallack (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), 106-07.

⁸⁵¹ Jochen Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, Veröffentlichung zur Bayerischen Geschichte und Kultur Nr. 11/86 (Munich: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 1986), 14.

⁸⁵² Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, 15-16, 19. Zink concludes that Ludwig decided to have the interior of Speyer painted rather than the interior of Bamberg because Speyer's wall surfaces were more appropriate. The evidence he presents, however, shows

realized in 1844-53 and overseen by Gärtner until his death in 1847, was carried out in what was essentially the Byzantine revival style that Ludwig had initiated in the 1820s, and presumably approximated what he would have commissioned for Bamberg [**fig. 3.2 e-f**].⁸⁵³ Ludwig sought out Heinrich Heß for the figural frescoes but Heß, ready to retire, recommended Johann Schraudolf, his assistant at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle.⁸⁵⁴ He and Joseph Schwarzmann, who had painted the ornament at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle and the Ludwigskeiche, modeled their work on their Allerheiligenhofkapelle frescoes.⁸⁵⁵

Neither the contract with Schraudolf nor Ludwig's letters mention the Byzantine style, but only that the frescoes were to be painted on gold ground – the chief Byzantinizing feature of Heß's work at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle – and further, that they should be painted in the “strict” style that Ludwig associated with early Raphael and

that Ludwig still hoped to have the interior of Bamberg painted once Speyer was complete. He was in too much of a hurry to get to work on Speyer (though painting it was estimated to cost more and to take longer) to wait the five years the artists said it would take to paint Bamberg.

⁸⁵³ The project also included grisaille windows, or *Tapetenfenster*, for the choir. These were described in the older literature as having been produced under Max Ainmiller in the royal glass workshop in Munich, but their origin remains a mystery. Elgin Vaassen has found no mention of such a commission in the records of the workshop or in Ainmiller's journal. See Vaassen, “Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechischen Kapelle auf dem Neroburg in Wiesbaden,” 77 n. 28.

⁸⁵⁴ To prepare for the project, Ludwig sent Schraudolf to Italy for eight months, where Schraudolf studied the monuments of Ravenna, Perugia, Florence and Rome. Jochen Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, 22.

⁸⁵⁵ Heß, Schraudolf and Schwarzmann were just concluding the frescoes for the interior of the Church of St. Boniface, another of Ludwig's major Munich commissions, inspired by Sant'Apollinare in Classe and Sant'Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna, and San Paolo fuori le mura in Rome (which had burned down in 1823). How Ludwig and these artists conceived of this church, built according to plans by Georg Friedrich Ziebland in 1834-50, in relation to the specifically Byzantine revival commissions, is worthy of further attention.

with Heß's work at the Allerheiligenhofkapelle.⁸⁵⁶ To create optimal surfaces for the expansive fresco cycles, the existing wall plaster and many of the original moldings were removed, and many niches and windows were filled in.⁸⁵⁷ Some architectural historians took the opportunity to examine the stone fabric of the building while it was fully exposed, and some began to raise objections.⁸⁵⁸ (Most of the frescos were removed during restoration work in the 1950s, and now there are those who regret the loss of the frescoes.) The king, though, remained committed to his plan, and the new Bishop of Speyer, Nikolaus von Weis (bishop 1842-69), enthusiastically supported his interventions and provided the iconographic program devoted to the cathedral's patron saints: the Virgin, Pope Stephen I (believed to have been beheaded by the Roman Emperor in 257) and Bernard of Clairvaux (who, in Speyer on Christmas Day 1146, convinced Holy Roman Emperor Conrad III to take up the unsuccessful Second Crusade).⁸⁵⁹

Mary, *Patrona Bavariae*, Pope Stephen, a representative of the pre-Constantinian Church who had already insisted upon the primacy of Rome in theological matters, and Bernard of Clairvaux, an advocate of the Crusades and, as of 1830, a Doctor of the Church, all seem suited to Ludwig's overall vision of the significance of Byzantium as expressed in Ludwig's other Byzantinizing projects. As usual, however, Ludwig did not concern himself with the iconographic details, remaining focused instead on the style of

⁸⁵⁶ The contract is published in Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, 20. For Ludwig's injunctions to Schraudolf to paint in a strict style see Wilhelm Winkler, "Der Briefwechsel zwischen König Ludwig I. von Bayern und Johann Schraudolph über die Ausmalung des Domes zu Speyer," in *Kaiserdome und Liebfrauenmünster zu Speyer. Beiträge zum Domjubiläum 1030-1930*, Dombauverein, ed. (Speyer: Dombauverein, 1930), 130 and 134.

⁸⁵⁷ Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, 18 and 22.

⁸⁵⁸ Neuenschwander, "Art History of Speyer," 52 and 64-65.

⁸⁵⁹ Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, 16, 21-22, 24.

their execution. In the process, the signs of Speyer's age that Ludwig had asked Klenze and Wiebeking to maintain in their restorations of 1818-21 were hidden or overwhelmed. The building became a canvas that reflected the broader Byzantine program that he had initiated following his Christmas in Palermo in 1823, but it seems that Ludwig never explicitly described this final commission in his Byzantine revival style as Byzantine. Those who were less concerned than Ludwig about the cultural politics of Greece and Russia still thought of Speyer Cathedral and this revival style as Byzantine,⁸⁶⁰ but Ludwig now employed it without openly competing with Russia's and Greece's increasingly persistent and compelling claims to the Byzantine inheritance. At the same time, the use of his Byzantine revival style at Speyer in the summer of 1843 appears to have been so urgent to Ludwig because it sent the right message in several directions—regional, national and international—all of which were central to the king's interests and all of which were in rapid transition at that moment.

As has been noted, the largely Prussian-funded campaign to complete Cologne's Gothic Cathedral that had begun in 1842 preceded and appears to have had a bearing on Ludwig's decision to choose Speyer over Bamberg for his next major fresco program.⁸⁶¹ The Prussian campaign celebrated the Gothic style as the true German style, and the northern Rhenish region that the Congress of Vienna had given to Prussia. Friedrich Wilhelm IV (ruled 1840-58; d. 1861) had initiated the monumental project at the start of

⁸⁶⁰ As evident, for instance, in Carl Heideloff's ongoing and widely translated publications, such as his bilingual *Les Ornaments du moyen âge. Die Ornamentik des Mittelalters. Eine Sammlung auserwählter Verzierungen und Profile byzantinischer und deutscher Architektur*, 2 vols. (Nuremberg: J.A. Stein, 1843-47), which also appeared in English under the title *Collection of Architectural Monuments of the Middle-Ages in the Byzantine and Gothic Styles* (1844-47).

⁸⁶¹ E.g., Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, 16-17.

his reign in large part to mollify the citizens of Cologne, who were still outraged by the policies of Friedrich Wilhelm III, which they perceived as anti-Catholic, and specifically by the treatment of their archbishop, who had maintained a traditional Catholic teaching and ended up in prison.⁸⁶² As an outstanding expression of the German spirit, Cologne Cathedral was interpreted, at least by Franz Kugler, the preeminent Protestant Prussian art historian and an official in Friedrich Wilhelm IV's regime, as representing a Germany beyond confessional divisions. In the first edition of his *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*, published in Berlin in 1842 as the first and perhaps most influential handbook of its kind, Kugler reiterated his position that all Gothic art was Germanic. He did not refer directly to the recent scholarship on vaulting technology which demonstrated that Gothic architecture originated in France,⁸⁶³ but simply asserted that vaulting began in Germany and was developed in those regions of France and Italy that were under Germanic

⁸⁶² The confessional and cultural politics that led up to the completion of Cologne Cathedral are treated in depth in Michael J. Lewis, *The Politics of the German Gothic Revival: August Reichensperger* (New York: The Architectural History Foundation, Inc.; Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993). Friedrich Wilhelm IV also took a great interest in Byzantine art and architecture as representative of the early church and of caesaropapism: see Robert S. Nelson, "Romantics and the Throne, 1840-1860: Prussia and France," in *Hagia Sophia, 1850-1950: Holy Wisdom Modern Monument* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 29-45. The Prussian king was also interested in it in connection with contemporary Russia, both through the buildings his father, Friedrich Wilhelm III, had built in Potsdam, and as an expression of the faith to which his beloved sister Charlotte had converted upon marrying into the Russian royal family. See Wasilissa Pachomova-Göres and Burckhardt Göres, "Friedrich Wilhelm IV und Rußland. Aspekte eines neuen Themas," in *Friedrich Wilhelm IV. Künstler und König zum 200. Geburtstag*, ed. Preußische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg (Frankfurt a/M: H.W. Fichter, 1995), 158-68.

⁸⁶³ Franz Kugler, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Ebner & Seubert, 1842), 435, cited in Barbara Miller Lane, *National Romanticism and Modern Architecture in Germany and the Scandinavian Countries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 52.

influence, by which he meant Normandy and Lombardy. Moreover, he emphasized that great architecture required great central authority.⁸⁶⁴

The Catholic political and clerical leaders in Cologne and elsewhere, including Joseph Görres, originally a Rhinelander though long since established in Munich, did not tend to view the cathedral or its style as equally representative of German Protestants. Ludwig's renovation of Speyer Cathedral offered an alternative that suited his understanding of what was both German and Catholic in the region of the Rhineland,⁸⁶⁵ and also promoted the region as a destination for the growing numbers of tourists traveling the Rhine by steamboat. Their journeys almost always included Cologne and the growing spectacle that was the completion of its cathedral, but tended not to include the Palatinate which was short of urban spectacles and upstream from the most dramatic Rhenish scenery.

Beyond the desire to compete with the popular success of the Prussian completion of Cologne Cathedral, Ludwig's project to renovate Speyer Cathedral served his interests within Bavaria and with regard to his son's troubled regime in Greece. The Bavarian Rhineland, a confessionally mixed region, was renamed the Bavarian Palatinate in 1837 to suggest continuity with the pre-Napoleonic, Wittelsbach-ruled Electorate with which it vaguely corresponded.⁸⁶⁶ The new emphasis on a regional identity was well received there, but enthusiasm for Ludwig's regime was not correspondingly strong.

⁸⁶⁴ See Neuenschwander, "Art History of Speyer," 61.

⁸⁶⁵ The nineteenth-century historiography and renovations of Aachen Cathedral, generally regarded as a Byzantine building which (like Cologne) was situated in the Prussian Rhineland, make for an interesting comparison with Speyer in this regard, as I will address in a future study.

⁸⁶⁶ To celebrate the diversity of his kingdom as a strength, Ludwig had all of the administrative districts of Bavaria re-named to reflect ancient aristocratic or ethnic

The Palatinate was known for its radical politics. Ludwig had not forgotten the Hambacher Fest that immediately followed the appointment of Otto as King of Greece in 1832. It was above all at this gathering in the Palatinate, inspired by Greece as the birthplace of democracy, that Germans rallied in favor of a more democratic form of government—for themselves, if not for Greece. Ludwig had a particular interest in promoting a non-classical, non-democratic Greek style in this region of Bavaria, where opposition to ongoing military and financial aid to Otto's regime had not ceased. Much of the Palatinate's population continued to resent Ludwig's promotion of the Catholic Church and his growing conservatism, and sought a stronger constitution.⁸⁶⁷ This was nowhere more the case than in Speyer, which was not only the largest city but predominantly Protestant.⁸⁶⁸ In these respects, political circumstances in the Palatinate paralleled Greek resentment of Otto's Catholicism and efforts to acquire a constitution in Greece.

Otto's autocratic regime has been termed caesaropapist on account of his position as head of the Greek Church. He sought some measure of popular support through making concessions to irredentists who hoped to liberate those Greeks still living under Ottoman rule by reclaiming former Byzantine lands, and ultimately to (re)claim

identities as of Jan. 1, 1838. These names replaced those that had been given under Montgelas, which had been derived in the French fashion exclusively from the rivers that ran through the districts and had been intended to erase historical and regional differences. Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern*, 361-64.

⁸⁶⁷ In 1847 heightened confessional tensions would finally ease with the resignation of Minister Karl von Abel, a very conservative Catholic, after a decade of leadership in Ludwig's government. See Hermann-Joseph Busley, "Das pfälzisch-bayerische Verhältnis in der Revolutionszeit 1848/49," in *Die Pfalz und Bayern 1816-1956*, ed. Hans Fenske (Speyer, 1998), 71.

⁸⁶⁸ T.C.W. Blanning, *The French Revolution in Germany: Occupation and Resistance in the Rhineland, 1792-1802* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 241, 245. In 1818 the major reformed denominations joined to form the Protestant Union.

Constantinople as the rightful Greek capital.⁸⁶⁹ This approach was so unpopular with the Protecting Powers (England, Russia, and France) that Ludwig's oldest son, Crown Prince Maximilian, traveled to Athens to help mediate the situation.⁸⁷⁰

At the same time that Otto was exploring this dream of reviving Byzantium, he lived in fear of the celebrations held each year on March 25, the traditional anniversary of the Greek Revolution because, like the Hambacher Fest, they rekindled the liberal views of the Revolutionary era. These celebrations were particularly troublesome in 1842.⁸⁷¹ Otto's position was further weakened in the spring of 1843 when, in an effort to control Otto, the Protecting Powers jointly refused to ease the burden of Greece's semiannual debt payments, forcing him to make drastic budget reductions.⁸⁷² Fears about the intentions of non-Orthodox Westerners in Greece, fuelled by the presence of non-Orthodox missionaries, had also risen to a peak.⁸⁷³ When Ludwig announced the renovation of Speyer on June 13, 1843, the fragility of Otto's situation was obviously fragile, but presumably still salvageable. It was not quite four months later, on September 3, that the coup d'état finally compelled Otto to grant a constitution, to replace many Bavarians in his regime with Greeks, and eventually to take the cathedral commission away from Theophil Hansen. In the meantime, a further curious, if unintentional, parallel between Speyer and Athens occurred with the sudden arrival of a Bavarian-tinged Byzantium.

⁸⁶⁹ Petropoulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece*, 360-62.

⁸⁷⁰ Petropoulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece*, 365-66.

⁸⁷¹ Petropoulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece*, 423-24.

⁸⁷² Petropoulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece*, 435-39.

⁸⁷³ Petropoulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece*, 424-27.

While Theophil Hansen's design for Athens Cathedral had already gone by the wayside, at the time of Ludwig I's abdication during the upheavals of 1848 the fresco project at Speyer was still very much underway. Ludwig's successor, Maximilian II, threatened to cut off the enormous expenditures still being lavished on this project. Ludwig countered that political as well as artistic reasons dictated that there should be no disruption which might indicate to the Radical Party of the Palatinate that the Bavarian regime was uncertain about its distant possession.⁸⁷⁴ Schraudolf articulated this same political purpose behind the frescoes in a letter to Klenze.⁸⁷⁵ Meanwhile, perhaps worried that Ludwig would not press Maximilian hard enough for the money to complete his work in Speyer, Schraudolf wrote to praise Ludwig's gift of stained glass to Cologne Cathedral, while reminding him of the competitive value of Speyer Cathedral as a Rhenish monument that had already begun to attract tourists to Ludwig's own kingdom.⁸⁷⁶

While working at Speyer, Joseph Schwarzmann received a further commission for ornamental painting in the interior of the new Central Synagogue in nearby Mannheim [**fig. 6.15 a-b**]. Designed by Ludwig Lendorff and Heinrich Lang and built in 1851-55, for its declared Byzantine style the Mannheim synagogue drew on a combination of the renovated Speyer cathedral, and Semper's Dresden and Rosengarten's Kassel synagogues. The two octagonal domes have a precedent in the single octagonal dome of Semper's synagogue, but also in Speyer's dome, while the dwarf arcade frieze on the

⁸⁷⁴ Ludwig I to Leo von Klenze, May 5, 1849, quoted in Zink, "Zur Vollendung des Kölner und des Speyerer Doms," 181.

⁸⁷⁵ Winkler, "Der Briefwechsel zwischen König Ludwig I. von Bayern und Johann Schraudolph," 136.

⁸⁷⁶ Winkler, "Der Briefwechsel zwischen König Ludwig I. von Bayern und Johann Schraudolph," 133.

synagogue's facade more specifically references the dwarf arcades on Speyer. And finally, in painting the interior of this synagogue, Schwarzmann covered it with designs that were essentially the same as those that he had just employed in Speyer. Thus, echoing the description of the Ludwigskirche, at its dedication ceremony the synagogue was celebrated as true to the Byzantine style (*"getreu dem byzantinischen Stil"*).⁸⁷⁷

In the meantime, while it is not clear that any Bavarian provincial churches followed the model of Klenze's design for a Byzantine-style Catholic church in Eltmann [**fig. 3.11**], a striking Islamicized version was created around 1850 by a student of Gärtner, Eduard Bürcklein,⁸⁷⁸ as a synagogue for Heidenheim, another Franconian town (this time in Mittelfranken, until 1837 known as the Rezatkreis) [**map 1 and fig. 6.16 a-b**].⁸⁷⁹ Perhaps unintentionally echoing Klenze, Bürcklein published this synagogue in 1854

⁸⁷⁷ Wilfried Röbling, "Mannheim," in *Badische Synagogen aus der Zeit von Großherzog Friedrich I. in zeitgenössischen Photographien*, ed. Franz-Josef Ziwes (Karlsruhe: G. Braun, 1997), 72.

⁸⁷⁸ On Eduard Bürcklein, sometimes confused with his more famous brother Friedrich, see Vollmar, "Dorfsynagogen im neomaureschen Stil," 96. Likewise Heidenheim in Mittelfranken, just northeast of Bavarian Swabia, should not be confused with the larger town of the same name in the Swabian Alps in Württemberg.

⁸⁷⁹ Eduard Bürcklein, "Synagoge in Heidenheim," *Allgemeine Bauzeitung* 19 (1854): 389-91 and plates 656-58; Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 261-63 and figs. 185-86. Hammer-Schenk (261-62) notes that the Heidenheim Synagogue is identical to churches in the round-arch style except for stylistic adaptations and the omission of a tower, but he does not note that Klenze's Byzantine-style church in Eltmann appears to have provided the primary basis for Bürcklein's design. The relationship of the tympanum to the course of moulding running across the façade is actually closer in the Heidenheim plan to that of the Allerheiligenhofkirche than to the plan for St. Michael und Johannes der Täufer, Eltmann. Bürcklein incorporates both the Tablets of the Law and a Star-of-David oculus in the gable, and the tympanum and remaining windows display horseshoe arches, as required by the Moorish revival synagogue style, but he does not add any further Islamic embellishments, omitting for instance the engaged columns and rectilinear decorative frame of the Cordova mihrab, the Ingenheim portal, and the portals of the unrealized plans for a synagogue in Kreigshaber by Johann Moninger, ca. 1846. On Moninger's Kriegshaber plan see Hammer-Schenk, "Die Architektur der Synagoge von

as a model for future buildings.⁸⁸⁰ He adapted Klenze's design to synagogue requirements by pairing the Western entrance to the ground floor with an identical entrance to the women's gallery, dividing the long windows on the sides into ground- and gallery-level rows, inserting interlaced Star-of-David tracery in the oculus, and replacing the cross above the western gable with the Mosaic tablets. He also incorporated Moorish elements into Klenze's Byzantine design by omitting the round-arch frieze and using horseshoe-shaped instead of round-arched windows [**fig. 6.16 a**]. The most prominent arch, however, was a blind pointed horseshoe arch (a drop-arch, but widening above the springing before coming to a point), unlike the arches used at Ingenheim. This created a tympanum over the Western portal. An inscription in Hebrew was set into the tympanum.⁸⁸¹ Bürklein's published plans appear to have been used at least twice, for synagogues built in Hainsfarth in 1857 and in Remagen in 1869.⁸⁸²

1780 bis 1933," 198, and Gabriele Schickel, "Synagoge, Kriegshaber bei Augsburg, Entwurf 1846," catalogue no. 74 in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 310.

⁸⁸⁰ Bürklein, "Synagoge in Heidenheim." As Klenze had not yet articulated his developing anti-Semitic views, it seems unlikely that Bürklein intended to provoke Klenze with this design out of loyal to the recently deceased Gärtner, who had been Klenze's nemesis. See Dirk Klose, "Klenzes späte Hinwendung zu antisemitischen Kulturtheorien," in *Klassizismus als Idealistische Weltanschauung*, Miscellanea Bavarica Monacensia 172 (Munich: Kommissionsverlag UNI-Druck, 1999), 221-49.

⁸⁸¹ According to Hammer-Schenk, citing Eduard Bürklein and Ludwig Klassen, this blind arch gave the building "besonders seinen eigenthümlichen, fast mysteriösen Charakter." Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, 261.

⁸⁸² For discussion of the Hainsfarth synagogue in relation to Bürklein's plans for Heidenheim see Vollmar, "Dorfsynagogen im neomaureschem Stil," 95-99. Judging by the illustration in Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland* on p. 317, the synagogue in Remagen (downstream from Koblenz, in what was then the Prussian Rhineland) also closely followed the design of the Heidenheim synagogue as published by Bürklein. The Remagen synagogue (burned to a shell in 1938; the shell removed at the end of World War II) was dedicated in 1869; initial steps towards its construction began with a building permit in 1862.

6. The Transition to Romanesque: Hübsch's Westwork at Speyer Cathedral

The Bavarian Byzantine revival style culminated at Speyer Cathedral, Mannheim Central Synagogue, and Heidenheim's synagogue. These campaigns were undertaken as stylistic terminology was shifting in response to a growing tendency to interpret Byzantium not as a connection to ancient Greece and the East, but as an exotic style distinct from that of the West. A key element in this shift appears to have been Kugler's *Handbook* of 1842. Kugler specifically rejected the term "Byzantine" for Western medieval architecture as leading to great confusion; he preferred "Romanesque," and had already introduced his arguments as to the distinctions to be made between Byzantine and Romanesque ground plans as early as 1833 in an article that had made no discernable impression in Bavaria or among non-specialists elsewhere.⁸⁸³

In his *Handbook* Kugler was also among the first, if not the first, German scholar to describe a specifically Russian-Byzantine style.⁸⁸⁴ This style, he asserted, was basically the same as the Byzantine, but degraded by Mongol influence and with clumsier, narrower, more dimly-lit interiors. The identification of Byzantine and Russian art and architecture that occurred during the Napoleonic period thus came to an inglorious end just as Nicholas I was promoting his new national revival style with increasing vigor, not only in Russia but in lands bordering Prussia (specifically, Congress Kingdom Poland) where he wished to demonstrate Russian authority.⁸⁸⁵

⁸⁸³ Franz Kugler, "Ueber die roemisch-christlichen Bausysteme," *Museum* 1, no. 47 (November 25, 1833): , and Kugler, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*, 416-17 n. 1 (on 300 n. 4 Kugler refers the readers of his handbook back to the article of 1833).

⁸⁸⁴ Kugler, *Handbuch*, 366-69.

⁸⁸⁵ Piotr Paszkiewicz, "An Imperial Dream: The 'Russification' of Sacral Architecture in the Polish Lands in the 19th Century," *Umeni* 49, no. 6 (2001): 531-2 and 535.

By the 1850s, developments such as the renovation of Hagia Sophia, which led Friedrich Wilhelm IV to sponsor the documentation and publication of its plans and of its temporarily uncovered mosaics, spearheaded a more scholarly approach to Byzantine art and architecture. The Bavarian Byzantine style and its progeny were no longer used as models and appeared anachronistic or illegible. At the same time, the Byzantine style did not cease to be understood as the source of the Islamic style, which was regarded with greater respect than the Russian. This is the case, for instance, in a handbook by Albert Rosengarten, architect of the Kassel synagogue, first published in 1857 and reprinted in both German and translated editions.⁸⁸⁶ Like Kugler, Rosengarten described “Russo-Byzantine” architecture as a hybrid degradation of the Byzantine style.⁸⁸⁷ Decades earlier, in the 1830s, while advocating the Round-Arch style, Rosengarten had been among the first to argue against the use of orientalizing motifs in German synagogue architecture.⁸⁸⁸ The growing East-West divide, which the term “Byzantine” could no longer bridge, now had an impact on synagogue architecture which he probably could not have predicted. In place of the Byzantine revival style derived from the style Ludwig had originated in Bavaria a fully westernized Romanesque revival style would compete within a generation with an Islamic revival style that was far more lavish than the Moorish revival style created by Gärtner for Bavarian synagogues.⁸⁸⁹

⁸⁸⁶ Albert Rosengarten, *Die Architektonischen Stylarten* (Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1857), 157-58.

⁸⁸⁷ Rosengarten, *Die Architektonischen Stylarten*, 150. See also W. Eugene Kleinbauer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture: An Annotated Bibliography and Historiography* (Boston: Reference Publications in Art History, 1992), xxxii-xxxiii.

⁸⁸⁸ Harold Hammer-Schenk, “Synagogen,” in *Berlin und seine Bauten*, Teil VI: *Sakralbauten* (Berlin: Verlag für Architektur und technische Wissenschaften, 1997), 281.

⁸⁸⁹ A major example of the Romanesque revival style was the new Munich Hauptsynagoge completed according to Albert Schmidt’s designs in 1887 following

At the conclusion of the interior frescoes of Speyer Cathedral in 1853, Ludwig announced a second major renovation project for Speyer: a westwork to replace the baroque antechamber [fig. 3.2 g]. Despite the intensity of Ludwig's investment in the Byzantine revival he had initiated, in the course of this project he re-interpreted Speyer, and the revival style of the westwork, as Romanesque. Even in Munich, by the later 1840s the buildings he had built as "Byzantine" were no longer described as such, but as exhibiting a "Romanesque-Round Arch" style.⁸⁹⁰ Perhaps because Gärtner was now deceased, and Ludwig had already given up on Klenze for such commissions, Ludwig turned to Heinrich Hübsch for this project.

Hübsch had similarly continued to invest his energies in interpreting Byzantine architecture in a manner that was no longer accepted as Byzantine. The westwork which Hübsch built between 1854 and 1857, despite its idiosyncrasies, demonstrated a new level of comprehension of, and sympathy with, the emergent concept of the Romanesque style. While he now distinguished Romanesque from Byzantine, his designs called for

twenty years of planning: see the discussion in Hammer-Schenk, "Die Architektur der Synagoge," 231-35. An opulent example of the Islamic revival style was the synagogue erected in Kaiserslautern (in the Bavarian Palatinate, west-northwest of Speyer) according to Ludwig Levy's designs at around the same time (1883-86); see the discussion in Fischbach and Westerhoff, *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 198-201. The Munich synagogue was demolished in June, 1938 and the Kaiserslautern synagogue in September of the same year. i.e., both in advance of the general demolition of German synagogues of 9-10 November 1938 – which gives some indication of the prominence of these buildings within their respective cities.

⁸⁹⁰ The earliest example of this seems to be Rudolph and Hermann Marggraff's *München mit seinen Kunstschatzen und Merkwürdigkeiten, nebst Ausflügen in den Umgegend, vornehmlich nach Hohenschwangau und Augsburg* (Munich: Joseph A. Finsterlin, 1846), e.g., 126, 133, 158. M.A. Gessert's *Die fünf neuen Kirchen Münchens in Bildern und Beschreibungen* (Munich, 1847) describes an art-historical scheme behind the stylistic choices Ludwig made in planning the churches he commissioned for Munich, which I have not seen but apparently also omits any reference to Ludwig's original focus on the Byzantine style.

Byzantine ornamental painting in the entrance hall, presumably to tie the Byzantine style of the nave to the westwork.⁸⁹¹ Despite the westwork's free and flexible historicism, in making the transition to the Romanesque style Hübsch abandoned his youthful rejection of all historical imitation. His quotation of a variety of other, mostly later, Romanesque buildings, such as the westwork's central rose window which is, like that of the Allerheiligenhofkirche, akin to that of San Zeno Maggiore [**fig. 3.7**] (though with a square frame not unlike that at Ohlmüller's Brunnkapelle), and his preference for detail over the severity of other contemporary westworks, might seem ahistorical today. That, however, is not how Hübsch regarded his design.⁸⁹² In fact, the westwork may be considered among the first explicitly neo-Romanesque projects.⁸⁹³ Moreover, along with Ludwig, he embraced the new German nationalist interpretation of Romanesque architecture.⁸⁹⁴ Contemporary restorations of Romanesque monuments elsewhere, such as Maria Laach (which in 1828, contemporary with Rupprecht's work at Bamberg, Hübsch had cited as his favorite Western New Greek building), helped to give the Romanesque style the pan-German patriotic cast that even Kugler was celebrating in his newly revised *Handbook*.⁸⁹⁵

⁸⁹¹ Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, 131.

⁸⁹² Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, 129.

⁸⁹³ Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, 125, gives a very critical overview of Hübsch's citations, overlooking that such attentiveness to historical precedents in neo-Romanesque style, unlike for neo-Gothic style, was still new.

⁸⁹⁴ Neuenschwander, "Art History of Speyer," 46.

⁸⁹⁵ Original construction of Maria Laach, 1093-1230. Hübsch had publicly called upon the King of Prussia (then Friedrich Wilhelm III) to undertake restorations here in 1828 in *In What Style*, calling Maria Laach an example of the fully-developed Round-Arch style, that is, the Western variant of the New Greek style, and the most beautiful church he had ever seen. Hermann, ed., *In What Style*, 91.

As Western European buildings came to be termed “Romanesque” and ceased to be associated with Greece, the new term did not weaken the by then well-established political use of the style. The king and his architect recognized the increasing internationalism of art and architectural historicism as a forum for defining national identities and allegiances. They pointed to the recently established French origins of Gothic when describing Speyer’s Romanesque style as truly German and, by implication, Speyer’s cathedral as the truly German alternative to Cologne’s.⁸⁹⁶ In so doing, Hübsch rejected his earlier anti-historicism and described his work as having always focused on the Romanesque style.

Kugler’s use of the term “Romanesque,” which he himself had brought into common currency with the first edition of the *Handbook* in 1842, was not a whim. It was based on his study of the differing ground plans and structure of medieval buildings in the Greek East and the Latin West.⁸⁹⁷ With this terminology he shifted the focus from the Byzantine to the Roman influence on Western plans and structures.⁸⁹⁸ The distinction between Romanesque and Byzantine was not only academic. Even Kugler engaged an ethnically-charged opposition between East and West, particularly in reference to Russian architecture, which had implications beyond the scholarly realm. Political motivations for such an opposition existed, specifically in Prussia, at the time Kugler was writing his *Handbook*. By 1856 Kugler would go so far as to retract his statement that

⁸⁹⁶ Neuenschwander, “Art History of Speyer,” 46.

⁸⁹⁷ See Neuenschwander, “Art History of Speyer,” 59.

⁸⁹⁸ Kugler, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*, cited in Neuenschwander, “Art History of Speyer,” 2:11 n. 77.

Gothic was German, asserting instead that it was French: Romanesque, it turned out, was the principal Germanic style.⁸⁹⁹

Thus when Speyer's westwork was completed in 1857, Ludwig and Hübsch finally found themselves again at the forefront of art and architectural historicism. Byzantine was now an exotic style, not to be associated with Germany or true Germans. Ludwig's mid-century renovations at Speyer Cathedral provide a barometer of the rapidity with which the geopolitical, confessional and art historical significance of Byzantium shifted at mid-century. Rather than embodying the ancient Greek, Eastern and pre-Reformation Christian cultural inheritance of German lands, it now represented the foreignness of Eastern Europe. Under Napoleon, identification with the West as the source of German culture had seemed a liability, inasmuch as the West was identified with Rome and France. Now, at least for the moment, it was identification with the East that appeared more problematic.

7. Conclusion. Ludwig I's Byzantium: Between Empiricism and Invention

We believe, correctly, that we understand the Byzantine style and its historical parameters better than did the artists, architects and scholars of the early nineteenth-century. I would contend, however, that discarding the earlier interpretations as incorrect has led to further incorrect interpretations, at least of early nineteenth-century art, architecture and historiography. The early nineteenth-century understanding of Byzantium that began in Ludwig I's Bavaria profoundly impacted the fabric of buildings

⁸⁹⁹ Kugler, *Geschichte der Baukunst*, cited in Barbara Miller Lane, *National Romanticism and Modern Architecture in Germany and the Scandinavian Countries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 52.

renovated or created as Byzantine, and equally shaped their interpretation. I would argue that the earlier interpretations are not external to these works and so should not be discarded.

The buildings Ludwig created or renovated as Byzantine were monumental but small in number. During the later 1820s, the king commissioned two buildings and the restoration of one cathedral. Through the exploration and production of these works his artists and architects created a framework for further elaboration that might today be called Bavarian Byzantine. For the interiors of both of the new commissions Ludwig turned to frescoes rather than mosaics for practical reasons, though frescoes became a hallmark of the style. In bringing Peter Cornelius to Munich, Ludwig patronized the revival of the art of fresco painting almost from its inception. In the frescoes he painted at the Ludwigskirche, however, Cornelius designed his own program in a manner that was dubiously Byzantine according to the terms of his day, in order to express ideas that were ultimately at odds with Ludwig's.

It was the Bavarian painters Heinrich Maria von Heß, Johann Schraudolf and Joseph Schwarzmann who established the Byzantine painting style for Ludwig. Their counterparts, the architects Leo von Klenze and Friedrich von Gärtner, developed what they considered a Byzantine Revival style using Italian, not German models. Both the Allerheiligenhofkapelle and the Ludwigskirche presented contact with the East as a source of artistic and spiritual regeneration for the West, and especially for the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. Klenze, who took a far more historically informed approach than did Gärtner, supported Friedrich Rupprecht in his efforts to discover empirical evidence of the Byzantine style in painting and sculpture. At the same time,

Ludwig's Gothic, or German-style restoration and building projects, in particular the restoration of Regensburg Cathedral and the construction of the Mariahilfkirche, played a key role in creating a Gothic revival style that distinguished Byzantine from Gothic revival features in both wall treatments and stained glass.

The ideological motivations of Ludwig and his artists and architects coincided, and even overlapped with the desire to employ restorations and revival styles as opportunities to reflect and produce knowledge. Their Byzantine renovation and revival works were not created with a narrow intent. From today's vantage point, however, it is clear that these nineteenth-century artists and architects often discovered what they expected to find rather than what was there, and so perpetuated misperceptions in attempting to master them. Their work does not sit comfortably within scholarly trajectories such as that mapped out by W. Eugene Kleinbauer for the historiography of Byzantine architecture.⁹⁰⁰

It is through such struggles, nevertheless, that Byzantium gradually came to be known. Each of the major players in the cultural projects considered in this dissertation worked with a unique constellation of concerns and had his own definition of the Byzantium being revived or restored. While in all cases these Byzantiums functioned as places of cultural connection, from project to project the connections being drawn differed and were sometimes at odds with one another. This was due not only to the developing art-historical knowledge they reflected and produced, but also to broader debates concerning the use of historical models in contemporary art and architecture.

⁹⁰⁰ W. Eugene Kleinbauer, "Prolegomena to a Historiography of Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture," xxiii-cxxiii.

Schlegel's introduction of the idea of Byzantine-influenced medieval architecture had raised the question whether Byzantium represented a bridge between Germany's present and its past, or between Germany and its neighbors. This question was first explored through art and architecture when Ludwig I came to the Bavarian throne in the midst of the Greek Wars of Independence. During the course of the next half-century, the answers he had found were re-interpreted so as to address the concerns of others in Bavaria, in Russia, and among the Jewish populations of other German lands. These later works help to clarify the tensions present in the works produced for Ludwig, which attempted to blend empirical and inventive approaches to historicism.

It is the Russian works which more strongly suggest Byzantine art and architecture as understood today. But if the Byzantine character of Ludwig's buildings and of many subsequent synagogues may seem less convincing, they do not reflect ignorance or whim. These buildings used the past to create a present that mirrored perceived reality as truthfully and clearly as possible. If we wish to examine those perceptions, we need to take seriously historical understandings that now appear obsolete, for only then can we appreciate the productive interplay between art and history evident in the art, architecture, and scholarship of the early nineteenth century, and consider how each helped to situate the viewer or reader within a world that has deeply affected our own. It is tragic that so many of these works have to be examined through secondary evidence; due, in most cases to war and wanton destruction, a significant number are no longer with us today. Such loss is in itself a powerful incentive to reflect on the currency of the interplay between empirical and invented evidence. It is this interplay that allows

us, in turn, to attempt to create the art and scholarship that we believe to be true, while staying fully engaged with how situated it remains in the time and place in which we live.

Bibliography

- Aerts, Remieg. "Dull Gold and Gory Purple: Images of Byzantium." In *Polyphonia Byzantina: Studies in Honour of Willem J. Aerts*, edited by Hero Hokwerda, Edé R. Smits, and Marinus M. Woesthuis, 311-24. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1993.
- Allatios, Leo. *The Newer Temples of the Greeks*, translated with an introduction by Anthony Cutler. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1969.
- Altendorf, Bettina B. *Die russischen Sänger des Königs und die Kolonie Alexandrowka in Potsdam*. Berlin: Hendrik Bäbeler, 2004.
- Anderson, Margaret Lavinia. "The Limits of Secularization: On the Problem of the Catholic Revival in Nineteenth-Century Germany." *The Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 647-70.
- Angermair, Elisabeth, Andreas Heusler, Eva Ohlen, Brigitte Schmidt and Tobias Weger. *Beth ha-Knesseth—Ort der Zusammenkunft: zur Geschichte der Münchner Synagogen, ihrer Rabbiner und Kantoren; eine Veröffentlichung des Stadtarchivs München*. Munich: Buchendorfer, 1999.
- Applegate, Celia. *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990.
- Arnold, Franz. "Der deutsche Philhellenismus: Kultur- und literarhistorische Untersuchungen," *Euphorion: Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, Suppl. vol. 2 (1896): 71-181.
- Artemoff, Nikolai. *Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche auf dem Neroberg in Wiesbaden*. Kunstführer 1432. Munich: Schnell & Steiner, 1984. Available online at < <http://www.rocor.de/Roka/rokawiesbaden.html>>.
- Atil, Esin. *Renaissance of Islam: Art of the Mamluks*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981.
- Backmeister, Ilka. "Biographisches Überblick." In Nerdinger, Leo von Klenze. *Architekt*, 182-94.
- Baedeker, Karl. *Handbuch für Reisende in Deutschland und dem Österreichischen Kaiserstaate*. 3rd ed. Koblenz: Karl Baedeker, 1846. A facsimile of this edition. Freiburg im Breisgau: Karl Baedeker, [n.d].
- Baedecker, Karl. *Süd-Deutschland*. Leipzig: Karl Baedeker, 1903.
- Baer, Eva. *Islamic Ornament*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.

- Bailey, Gauvin Alexander. “‘Le Style jésuite n’existe pas’: Jesuit Corporate Culture and the Visual Arts.” In O’Malley, *Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts*, 38-89.
- Barclay, David. *Frederick William IV and the Prussian Monarchy 1840-1861*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Bastéa, Eleni. *The Creation of Modern Athens: Planning the Myth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Bastgen, Hubert. “Ludwigs I. von Bayern ‘Liberalismus’ und ‘Jesuitenfurcht’. Nuntiaturreportagen aus dem Jahre 1829.” *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* 49 (1929): 646-51.
- Bauch, Hubert, Peter Böttger, Karl-Theodor Engelhardt, Annette Faber, Wolfram Lübbecke, Ursula Mandel, Alexander Rauch, et al. *Denkmäler jüdischer Kultur in Bayern*. Arbeitsheft 43. Munich: Bayerisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege, 1994.
- Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, Renate. “Die 30er und 40er Jahre des 19. Jahrhunderts.” In Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, *Die Altäre des Bamberger Domes*, 254-60.
- Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, Renate, with Bruno Neundorfer, Bernhard Schemmel and Walter Milutzki. *Die Altäre des Bamberger Domes von 1012 bis zur Gegenwart*. Veröffentlichungen des Diözesanmuseums Bamberg 4. Bamberg: Bayerische Verlagsanstalt, 1987.
- Baumstark, Reinhold, ed. *Das neue Hellas. Griechen und Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I.* Munich: Hirmer, 1999. Catalogue of an exhibition held at the Bavarian National Museum, Munich, Nov. 9, 1999 – Feb. 13, 2000.
- Becksmann, Rüdiger. *Deutsche Glasmalerei des Mittelalters. Eine exemplarische Auswahl*. Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen, 1988.
- Becksmann, Rüdiger. “Die Glasgemälde im Gotischen Haus zu Wörlitz: zum Stand ihrer Erforschung und Edition.” *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 56/57 (2002/03): 163-80.
- Becksmann, Rüdiger. “Glasmalerei.” Catalogue no. 400 in *Die Zeit der Staufer. Geschichte, Kunst, Kultur*, edited by Reiner Hauss herr, 1:278-79. Stuttgart: Württembergisches Landesmuseum, 1977. Catalog of an exhibition held in Stuttgart at the Altes Schloss and the Kunstgebäude, March 26 – 5 June 1977.
- Behler, Ernst. *Friedrich Schlegel in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1966.

- Behler, Ernst. "Die italienische Renaissance in der Literaturtheorie der Brüder Schlegel." In *Romantik und Renaissance. Die Rezeption der italienischen Renaissance in der deutschen Romantik*, edited by Silvio Vietta, 176-95. J.B. Metzler: Stuttgart and Weimar, 1994.
- Bendtsen, Margit. *Sketches and Measurements: Danish Architects in Greece 1818-1862*. Copenhagen: Aarhus University Press, 1993.
- Bielmeier, Stefanie. *Gemalte Kunstgeschichte. Zu den Entwürfen des Peter von Cornelius für die Loggien der Alten Pinakothek*. Miscellanea Bavarica Monacensia 106. Munich: Commissionsverlag UNI-Druck, 1983.
- Billinger, Robert D., Jr. *Metternich and the German Question: States' Rights and Federal Duties, 1820-1834*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1991.
- Biris, Manos, and Maro Kardamitsi-Adami. *Neoclassical Architecture of Greece*. Translated by David Hardy. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2004.
- Bizzarro, Tina Waldeier. *Romanesque Architectural Criticism: A Prehistory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Blair, Sheila S., and Jonathan M. Bloom, *The Art and Architecture of Islam 1250-1800*, corrected ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Blanning, T.C.W. *The French Revolution in Germany: Occupation and Resistance in the Rhineland, 1792-1802*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Blanning, T.C.W. *Reform and Revolution in Mainz 1743-1803*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Blaschke, Olaf. "Das 19. Jahrhundert: Ein Zweites Konfessionelles Zeitalter?" *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 26 (2000): 38-75.
- Boeck, Urs. *Karl Alexander Heideloff*. Mitteilungen des Verein für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg 48. Nuremberg: Verein für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg, 1958.
- Böhm, Elga. "Matthias Joseph de Noël (1782-1849). Erster Konservator des Kölner Museums 'Wallrafianum.'" *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 41 (1980): 159-221.
- Boisserée, Sulpiz. *Geschichte und Beschreibung des Doms von Köln, nebst Untersuchungen über die alte Kirchenbaukunst....* Stuttgart: privately printed and J.G. Cotta, 1823.
- Boisserée, Sulpiz. *Tagebücher, 1808-1854*. 5 vols. Edited by H.-J. Weitz. Darmstadt: Eduard Roether, 1978-95.

- Boisserée, Sulpiz, et al. *Sulpiz Boisserée*, edited by Mathilde Boisserée. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1862.
- Bott, Gerhard. "Kronprinz Ludwig in altdeutscher Tracht in Rom." In Erichsen and Puschner, *Aufsätze*, 171-84.
- Breuilly, John. "Historians and the Nation." Chap. 3 in *History and Historians in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Peter Burke. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2002.
- Brix, Michael. *Nürnberg und Lübeck im 19. Jahrhundert. Denkmalpflege Stadtbildpflege Stadtumbau*. Studien zur Kunst des 19. Jahrhunderts 44. Munich: Prestel, 1981.
- Brüggemann, Werner. "Die Spanienberichte des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts und ihre Bedeutung für die Formung und Wandlung des deutschen Spanienbildes." In *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens*, vol. 12, edited by Johannes Vincke, 1-146. Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft, Series 1. Münster: Aschendorff, 1956.
- Brumfield, William Craft. *A History of Russian Architecture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Brush, Kathryn. *The Shaping of Art History: Wilhelm Vöge, Adolph Goldschmidt, and the Study of Medieval Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Bürcklein, Eduard. "Synagoge in Heidenheim." *Allgemeine Bauzeitung mit Abbildungen* 19 (1854), text vol. columns 389-91; plates vol. nos. 656-58.
- Burgmair, Wolfgang. "Das Ornament und sein Vorbild." Catalogue no. 19 in *St. Ludwig in München. Kirchenpolitik, Kirchenbau und Kirchliches Leben*, edited by Peter Pfister, Klaus Rupprecht and Marita Sagstetter, 56-57. Munich: Selbstverlag der Generaldirektion der Staatlichen Archive Bayerns, 1995. Catalog of an exhibition held in Munich at the Staatliche Archive Bayerns, Sept. 19—Nov. 5, 1995.
- Büsching, Johann Gustav Gottlieb. Review of Bernhard Hundeshagen, *Der alten gothischen Kapelle zu Frankenberg Grundriß, Aufriß und Durchschnitt, nebst Gedanken über die sogenannte gothische Kirchenbaukunst*. In *Museum für Altdeutsche Literatur und Kunst* 2 (1811): 355-69.
- Buttlar, Adrian von. "'Also doch ein Teutscher?': Klenzes Weg nach München." In Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 72-83.
- Buttlar, Adrian von. Introduction to Klenze, *Anweisung zur Architektur des Christlichen Kultus, Faksimile-Neudruck*, 5-27.

- Buttlar, Adrian von. "Klenzes Beitrag zur Polychromie-Frage." In Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, *Ein griechischer Traum*, 213-25.
- Buttlar, Adrian von. *Leo von Klenze. Leben – Werk – Vision*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1999.
- Büttner, Frank. "The Frescoes of Peter Cornelius in the Munich Ludwigskirche and Contemporary Criticism." In *Art in Bourgeois Society, 1790-1850*, edited by Andrew Hemingway and William Vaughan, 229-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Büttner, Frank. "Gärtner und die Nazarener." In Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 123-32.
- Büttner, Frank. "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche in München." *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, 3rd ser., 35 (1984): 189-218.
- Büttner, Frank. "Der Streit um die 'Neudeutsche religio-patriotische Kunst.'" *Aurora* 43 (1983): 55-76.
- Büttner, Frank. *Peter Cornelius. Fresken und Freskenprojekte*, 2 vols. Vol. 1, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1980; vol. 2, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999.
- Büttner, Frank. "Unzeitgemäße Größe. Die Fresken von Peter Cornelius und die zeitgenössische Kritik." *Das Münster* 1993, no. 4:293-304.
- Cabanelas Rodríguez, Darío. "The Alhambra: An Introduction." In *Al-Andalus: The Art of Islamic Spain*, edited by Jerrilynn D. Dodds. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992.
- Cavafy, Constantine P. *Collected Poems*, translated by Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard and edited by George Savidis, rev. ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Clark, Christopher M. "The Politics of Revival: Pietists, Aristocrats, and the State Church in Early Nineteenth-Century Prussia." In *Between Reform, Reaction and Resistance: Studies in the History of German Conservatism from 1789 to 1945*, edited by Larry Eugene Jones and James Retallack, 31-60. Providence, RI: Berg, 1993.
- Clogg, Richard. *A Concise History of Greece*. 2nd ed. (1st ed., 1992). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Conzen, Kathleen Neils. "Immigrant Religion and the Republic: German Catholics in Nineteenth-Century America." *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute*, 35 (Fall 2004): 43-56.

- Curran, Kathleen. "Gärtners Farb- und Ornamentauffassung und sein Einfluß auf England und Amerika." In Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 185-217.
- Curran, Kathleen, "The German *Rundbogenstil* and Reflections on the American Round-Arched Style." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 47:4 (1988): 351-73.
- Curran, Kathleen. *The Romanesque Revival: Religion, Politics, and Transnational Exchange*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.
- Cutler, Anthony. "A Baroque Account of Byzantine Architecture: Leone Allacci's *De templis Graecorum recentioribus*." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 25 (1966): 79-89.
- Dehio, Georg. *Baden-Württemberg*, Revised by Friedrich Piel. *Handbuch der Deutschen Kunstdenkmäler* [1]. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1964.
- Dehio, Georg. *Der Bamberger Dom*. Munich: R. Piper, 1924.
- Dehio, Georg. *Handbuch der deutschen Kunstdenkmäler. München*. Revised by Ernst Götz, Heinrich Habel, Karlheinz Hemmeyer and Friedrich Kobler. Expanded extract from *Bayern IV: München und Oberbayern*. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1996.
- de Prangey, Girault. *Impressions of Granada and the Alhambra*. Translated by Elizabeth MacDonald with an introduction by John Sweetman. Reading, UK: Garnet, 1996.
- Dickie, James. "The Alhambra: Some Reflections Prompted by a Recent Study by Oleg Grabar." In *Studia Arabica et Islamica: Festschrift for Ihsan 'Abbas on his Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Wadad al-Qadi, 127-49. Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1981.
- Dilly, Heinrich. *Kunstgeschichte als Institution. Studien zur Geschichte einer Disziplin*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979.
- Doumanis, Nicholas. *Italy: Inventing the Nation*. London: Arnold Publishers and Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Dümler, Christian. *Der Bamberger Kaiserdom. 1000 Jahre Kunst und Geschichte*. Bamberg: Fränkischer Tag, 2005.
- Eichner, Hans. "Germany: Romantische – Romantik – Romantiker." In *'Romantic' and its Cognates: The European History of a Word*, edited by Eichner, 98-156. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

- Eikemeier, Peter. "Die Erwerbungen altdeutscher und altniederländischer Gemälde." In Renger, *"Ihm, welcher der Andacht Tempel baut...."* 56-67.
- Endres, Rudolf. "Franken und Bayern im Vormärz und in der Revolution von 1848/49." In Erichsen and Puschner, *Aufsätze*, 199-217.
- Erichsen, Johannes. "'Aus dem Gedächtnis ins Herz'. Zum Verhältnis von Kunst, Geschichte und Politik unter König Ludwig I." In Erichsen and Puschner, *Aufsätze*, 385-417.
- Erichsen, Johannes, and Uwe Puschner, eds. *Aufsätze*. One of three unnumbered volumes of "*Vorwärts, vorwärts sollst du schauen....*" *Geschichte, Politik und Kunst unter Ludwig I*, edited by Claus Grimm. Veröffentlichungen zur Bayerischen Geschichte und Kultur 9/86. Munich: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 1986. (The other volumes of Grimm, "*Vorwärts, vorwärts sollst du schauen....*," are series nos. 8/86, *Katalog zur Ausstellung*, edited by Johannes Erichsen and Michael Henker with Evamaria Brockhoff, and 10/86, *Schauspiele von König Ludwig I.*, transcribed by Ursula Huber and edited by Johannes Erichsen.)
- Ettinghausen, Richard, and Oleg Grabar. *The Art and Architecture of Islam, 650-1250*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.
- Faber, Annette. "Restaurierung St. Salvator bei Donaustauf, 1839-1842." Catalogue no. 28 in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 197-98.
- Fiorillo, Johann Dominick. "Fragmente zur Geschichte der Malerey und Bildhauerey in Deutschland, von den Zeiten Carls des Großen, bis zum Anfang des funfzehnten Jahrhunderts," in Fiorillo, *Kleine Schriften artistischen Inhalts*, 1:1-82.
- Fiorillo, Johann Dominick. *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland und den vereinigten Niederlanden*, vol. 1. Hannover: Bei den Brüdern Hahn, 1815. Facsimile reprint, Fiorillo, *Sämtliche Schriften* 6. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1995.
- Fiorillo, Johann Dominick. *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste von ihrer Wiederauflebung bis auf die neuesten Zeiten*. Vol. 2, *Geschichte der Malerey in Venedig, der Lombardey (Ferrara, Modena, Reggio, Parma, Mantua, Mailand, Cremona, Bologna). Sizilien, Ligurien und Piemont*. Göttingen: Johann Friedrich Röwer, 1801. Facsimile reprint, Fiorillo, *Sämtliche Schriften* 2. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1997.
- Fiorillo, Johann Dominick. *Kleine Schriften artistischen Inhalts*, 2 vols. Göttingen: bey Heinrich Dieterich, 1803-06. Facsimile reprint, Fiorillo, *Sämtliche Schriften* 10-11. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1997.
- Fiorillo, Johann Dominick. "Versuch einer Geschichte der bildenden Künste in Rußland." In Fiorillo, *Kleine Schriften artistischen Inhalts*, 2:1-104.

- Firmenich-Richartz, Eduard. *Sulpiz und Melchior Boisserée als Kunstsammler. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Romantik*. Vol. 1 [the only volume published]. Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1916.
- Fischbach, Stefan, and Ingrid Westerhoff, eds. “...und dies ist die Pforte des Himmels”. *Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*. Gedenkbuch der Synagogen in Deutschland 2. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2005.
- Fischer, Manfred F. “Creator et Conservator: Der Denkmalpfleger.” In Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 157-73.
- Frank, Mitchell Benjamin. *German Romantic Painting Redefined: Nazarene Tradition and the Narratives of Romanticism*. Aldershot, UK, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001.
- Frankl, Paul. *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations through Eight Centuries*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- Frankl, Paul. *Peter Hemmel. Glasmaler von Andlau*. Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1956.
- Frazer, Charles A. *The Orthodox Church and Independent Greece 1821-1852*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Frölich, Marie and Hans-Günther Sperlich. *Georg Moller. Baumeister der Romantik*. Darmstadt: Eduard Roether, 1959.
- Gärtner, Friedrich von. “Die Briefe Friedrich von Gärtners an Johann Martin von Wagner,” edited by Georg Brenninger with Mary Anne Eder, Angelika Fox, and Birgit-Verena Karnapp, assisted by Maria Kinigadner, Regina Prinz, Uwe Schatz, and Gabriele Schickel. In Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 263-338.
- Geary, Patrick J. *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Gensichen, Sigrid. “Das Heidelberger Schloss. Fürstliche Repräsentation in Architektur und Ausstattung.” In *Heidelberg. Geschichte und Gestalt*, edited by Elmar Mittler. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1996, 130-61.
- Gierlichs, Joachim, and Annette Hagedorn. *Islamic Art in Germany*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2004.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. “Style as Inclusion, Style as Exclusion.” In Jones and Galison, *Picturing Science, Producing Art*, 27-54.

- Glaser, Hubert. “‘Schwung hatte er, wie Keiner!’ König Ludwig I. von Bayern als Protektor der Künste.” In *Ludwig I. und die Neue Pinakothek*, edited by Herbert W. Rott, 11-41. Cologne: Pinakothek-Dumont, 2003.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Schriften zur Kunst*. Edited by Christian Beutler. Vol. 13 of Goethe, *Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche*, 28. August 1949, edited by Ernst Beutler. Zurich: Artemis, [1949].
- Goldberg, Gisela. “Ursprüngliche Ausstattung und Bilderhangung der Alten Pinakothek.” In Renger, “*Ihm, welcher der Andacht Tempel baut....*” 140-75.
- Gollwitzer, Heinz. *Ludwig I. von Bayern. Konigtum im Vormarz – eine politische Biographie*. Munich: Suddeutscher Verlag, 1986.
- Gombrich, Ernst. “The Evidence of Images: I. The Variability of Vision.” In *Interpretation: Theory and Practice*, edited by Charles S. Singleton, 35-68. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969.
- Gombrich, Ernst. “The Values of the Byzantine Tradition: Goethe’s Response to the Boisseree Collection.” In Weisberg and Dixon, *The Documented Image*, 291-308.
- Gotz, Norbert. “Carl Alexander Heideloff und der ‘Typus der Stadt Nurnberg.’” In Erichsen and Puschner, *Aufsatze*, 535-50.
- Grelot, Guillaume Joseph. *Relation nouvelle d’un voyage de Constantinople enrichie de plans levez par l’auteur sur les lieux et de figures....* Paris: Rocolet; Foucault, 1680. Translated by John Phillips as *A late voyage to Constantinople containing an exact description of the Propontis and Hellespont....* London: printed by John Playford, to be sold by Henry Bonwicke, 1683.
- Grewe, Cordula. “Historicism and the Symbolic Imaginary in Nazarene Art.” *Art Bulletin* 89 no. 1 (March, 2007): 82-107.
- Gruhn-Zimmermann, Antonia. “Die neue Salinenanlage in Reichenhall nach dem Stadtbrand von 1834.” Catalogue no. 89 in Nerding, *Romantik und Restauration*, 324-29.
- Hagedorn, Annette. “Discovering Islamic Art in Germany in the 19th Century.” In Gierlichs and Hagedorn, *Islamic Art in Germany*, 15-20.
- Hall, Marcia B. *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

- Haltrich, Günther-Alexander. *Leo von Klenze. Die Allerheiligenhofkirche in München. Miscellanea Bavarica Monacensia 115*. Munich: Kommissionsverlag UNI-Druck, 1983.
- Hamdorf, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Klenzes archäologische Studien und Reisen, seine Mission in Griechenland." In *Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, Ein griechischer Traum*, 117-212.
- Hammer-Schenk, Harold. "Die Architektur der Synagoge von 1780 bis 1933." In *Die Architektur der Synagoge*, edited by Hans-Peter Schwarz, 157-285. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1988.
- Hammer-Schenk, Harold. "Synagogen." In *Berlin und seine Bauten*, part 6: *Sakralbauten*, ed. Marcus Cante, 273-91. Berlin: Verlag für Architektur und technische Wissenschaften, 1997.
- Hammer-Schenk, Harold. *Synagogen in Deutschland: Geschichte einer Baugattung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (1780-1933)*. 2 vols. Hamburg: Hans Christian, 1981.
- Hans-Schuller, Christine. *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine 'Restauration' unter König Ludwig I. von Bayern (1826-31)*. Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2000. [The note numbers in the text and in the endnote section cease to be congruent with note 739 (as numbered in text) and 740 (as numbered in endnote section).]
- Hartt, Frederick. *History of Italian Renaissance Art: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture*, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall; New York: Harry Abrams, 1987.
- Heideloff, Karl Alexander. *Der kleine Byzantiner. Taschenbuch des byzantinischen Baustyles zum Handgebrauch für Architekten und technische Lehranstalten*. Nuremberg: Riegel und Wiessner, 1837.
- Hemmerle, Josef. *Die Benediktinerklöster in Bayern. Germania Benedictina 2: Bayern*. Augsburg: Kommissionsverlag Winfried-Werk 1970.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried. *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* 3-4. Riga and Leipzig: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, 1787-91. Reprinted in vol. 14 of *Herders Sämtliche Werke*, edited by Bernhard Suphan. Berlin: Wiedmannsche Buchhandlung, 1909.
- Hermann, Wolfgang. Introduction to *In What Style Should We Build? The German Debate on Architectural Style*, edited and translated by Wolfgang Hermann, 1-60. Santa Monica: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1992.
- Hersey, George L. *High Renaissance Art in St. Peter's and the Vatican: An Interpretive Guide*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

- Heym, Sabine. “‘Solch eine Schloßkapelle...’ Zu bau und Ausstattung der Allerheiligen-Hofkirche.” In *Die Allerheiligen-Hofkirche der Münchener Residenz. Geschichte – Zerstörung – Wiederaufbau*, edited by Kurt Faltlhauser, 13-23. Munich: Bayerisches Staatsministerium der Finanzen, Presse- und Öffentlichkeitsarbeit, [2003].
- Hildebrand, Sonja. “Werkverzeichnis.” In Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 195-499.
- Hollanda, Francisco de. “Michelangelo on Flemish Art,” excerpted from “Four Dialogues,” appended to Hollanda, *Tratado de Pintura Antigua* (written ca. 1541-48; published posthumously). Reprinted in English in *Italian Art 1500-1600: Sources and Documents*, edited and translated by Robert Klein and Henri Zerner. 33-35. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Hubel, Achim. “Die beiden Restaurationen des Bamberger Domes. Zur Geschichte der Denkmalpflege im frühen 19. Jahrhundert.” *Bericht des historischen Vereins Bamberg* 121 (1985): 45-90.
- Hubel, Achim. *Die Glasmalereien des Regensburger Domes*. Munich: Schnell und Steiner, 1981.
- Irmscher, Johannes. “Neograeca in Germania im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert.” In *Graeca recentiora in Germania: Deutsch-griechische Kulturbeziehungen vom 15. bis 19. Jahrhundert*, edited by Hans Eideneier, 199-218. Wolfenbütteler Forschungen 59. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994.
- Jesberg, Paulgerd. “Die Griechische Kapelle. Symbol der Romantik und Wahrzeichen für Wiesbaden. Aus russisch-orthodoxer Gläubigkeit in italienisch-byzantinischer Schönheit.” In *Philipp Hoffmann 1806-1889. Ein nassauischer Baumeister*. Edited by Paulgerd Jesberg, 99-124. Wiesbaden: NOBEL, 1982.
- Jones, Caroline A., and Peter Galison, eds. *Picturing Science, Producing Art*. New York and London: Routledge, 1998.
- Karge, Henrik. “Das Frühwerk Karl Schnaases. Zum Verhältnis von Ästhetik und Kunstgeschichte im 19. Jahrhundert,” In Kosegarten, *Johann Dominicus Fiorillo*, 402-19.
- Karge, Henrik. “Renaissance. Aufkommen und Entfaltung des Stilbegriffs in Deutschland im Zuge der Neorenaissance-Bewegung um 1840.” In *Neorenaissance: Ansprüche an einen Stil. Zweites Historismus-Symposium Bad Muskau*, edited by Walter Krause, Heidrun Laudel and Winfried Nerdinger, 39-66. Muskauer Schriften 4. Dresden: Verlag der Kunst, 2001.
- Karge, Henrik. “Zwischen Naturwissenschaft und Kulturgeschichte. Die Entfaltung des Systems der Epochenstile im 19. Jahrhundert.” In *Stilfragen zur Kunst des*

- Mittelalters. Eine Einführung*, edited by Bruno Klein and Bruno Boerner, 39-60. Berlin: Reimer, 2006.
- Karnapp, Birgit-Varena. "Werkverzeichnis." In Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 221-61.
- Kaufmann, Thomas DaCosta. *Toward a Geography of Art*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004.
- Kimmig, Manfred. "Der Ludwigs-Donau-Main-Kanal." *Ausstellungskatalog zur gleichnamigen Ausstellung im Fembohaus in Nürnberg aus Anlaß der Einweihung des Staatshafen Nürnberg am Main-Donau-Kanal, September 1972*. Nuremberg: Stadtarchiv Nürnberg, 1972. Also available online at http://kanaldoku_ausstellungskat.pdf.
- Kleinbauer, W. Eugene. "Prolegomena to a Historiography of Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture." In *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture: An Annotated Bibliography and Historiography*, xxiii-cxxiii. Boston: GK Hall, 1992.
- Klenze, Leo von. *Anweisung zur Architectur des christlichen Kultus*. Munich, 1822 [issued in 1824]; 2nd ed., 1834. A facsimile of the first edition with an introduction by Adrian von Buttlar. Nördlingen, Dr. Alfons Uhl, 1990.
- Klenze, Leo von. *Aphoristische Bemerkungen gesammelt auf seiner Reise nach Greicehmland*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1838.
- Klose, Dirk. "Klenzes späte Hinwendung zu antisemitischen Kulturtheorien." in *Klassizismus als Idealistische Weltanschauung. Miscellanea Bavarica Monacensia 172*. Munich: Kommissionsverlag UNI-Druck, 1999.
- Klose, Dirk. "Theorie als Apologie und Ideologie – Leo von Klenze als Kunstphilosoph und Theoretiker." In Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 116-27.
- Kosegarten, Antje Middeldorf, ed. *Johann Dominicus Fiorillo: Kunstgeschichte und die romantische Bewegung um 1800*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 1997.
- Krautheimer, Richard. *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, 4th ed. Revised by Krautheimer and Slobodan Curcic. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Krinsky, Carol Herselle. *Synagogues of Europe*. New York: Architectural History Foundation; Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985.
- Krüger, Jürgen. *Rom und Jerusalem. Kirchenbauvorstellungen der Hohenzollern im 19. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995.
- Kugler, Franz. "Ein Besuch in München." *Museum* 3:24 (1835): 189-92.

- Kugler, Franz. *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*. Stuttgart: Ebner und Seubert, 1842.
- Kugler, Franz. *Kleine Schriften über neuere Kunst und deren Angelegenheiten*. Vol. 3 of *Kleine Schriften und Studien zur Kunstgeschichte*. Stuttgart: Ebner und Seubert, 1854.
- Kugler, Franz. Review of *Anweisung zur Architectur des christlichen Cultus*, 2nd ed. (1834). *Museum* 2:40 (Oct. 6, 1834): 313-23.
- Keisch, Klaude, with Max Kunze, eds. *Italia und Germania. Deutsche Klassizisten und Romantiker in Italien*. Beiträge der Winckelmann-Gesellschaft 3. Berlin: National Gallery, 1975. Published in conjunction with the exhibition held at the Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, National-Galerie, the Winckelmann-Museum, Stendal, and in the Kunstsammlungen zu Weimar, 1975-76.
- Lane, Barbara Miller. *National Romanticism and Modern Architecture in Germany and the Scandinavian Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Lane, Barbara Miller. "National Romanticism in Modern German Architecture." In *Nationalism in the Visual Arts*, edited by Richard Etlin, 110-47. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1991.
- Lang, Karl Heinrich Ritter von. *Hammelburger Reise*. Vol. 8: *Achte Fahrt, oder meine Begebenheiten am Hofe des Fürsten Ypsilandi in Griechenland*. Ansbach: privately printed, 1826.
- Langer, Birgitte. "Leo von Klenze als Innenarchitekt und Möbelentwerfer." In Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 156-73.
- Lässig, Simone. "Emancipation and Embourgeoisement: The Jews, the State, and the Middle Classes in Saxony and Anhalt-Dessau." In *Saxony in German History*, edited by James Retallack, 99-134. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Lehmbruch, Hans. "'Gärtner liebster bester Gärtner.' Eine Karriere im Dienst des Königs." In Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 87-121.
- Leinz, Gottlieb. "Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Gotik." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 44 (1981): 399-444.
- Le Vieil, Pierre. *L'art de la peinture sur verre et de la vitrerie par feu*. Académie Royale des Sciences. Descriptions des Arts et Métiers 14. [Paris]: de l'Imprimerie de L.F. Delatour, 1774. Reprinted in *Descriptions des arts et métiers faites ou approuvées par Messieurs de l'Académie royale des sciences de Paris* 13. Neuchâtel, 1781.

- Levy, Evonne. *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004.
- Lewis, Michael J. *The Politics of the German Gothic Revival: August Reichensperger*. New York: The Architectural History Foundation, Inc.; Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993.
- Lieb, Norbert. "Klenze und die Künstler um Ludwig I. Aus dem Schriftwechsel des Königs und des Architekten." In *Festschrift für Max Spindler zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by Dieter Albrecht, Andreas Kraus and Kurt Reindel. 657-76. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1969.
- Lockwood, William Burley. *Indo-European Philology, Historical and Comparative*. London: Hutchinson, 1969.
- Loers, Veit. "Die Barockausstattung des Regensburger Doms und seine Restauration unter König Ludwig I. von Bayern (1827-29)." In Schwaiger, *Der Regensburger Dom. Beiträge zu seiner Geschichte*, 229-66.
- Loers, Veit. "Walhalla und Salvatorkirche. Romantische Architektur und ästhetische Landschaft im Vormärz." In *Die Walhalla. Idee, Architektur, Landschaft*, edited by Jörg Traeger, 61-82, with illustrations scattered throughout the volume. Regensburg: Bernhard Bosse, 1979.
- Lowenstein, Steven M. "The Beginnings of Integration, 1780-1870." In *Jewish Daily Life in Germany, 1618-1945*, edited by Marion A. Kaplan, 93-171. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Mallgrave, Harry Francis. *Gottfried Semper: Architect of the Nineteenth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Mallgrave, Harry Francis. Introduction to Gottfried Semper, *The Four Elements of Architecture and Other Writings*, trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Wolfgang Hermann, 1-44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Marchand, Suzanne L. *Down From Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750-1970*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Marggraff, Rudolph, and Hermann Marggraff. *München mit seinen Kunstschatzen und Merkwürdigkeiten, nebst Ausflügen in den Umgegend, vornehmlich nach Hohenschwangau und Augsburg*. Munich: Joseph A. Finsterlin, 1846.
- Mergel, Thomas. "Mapping Milieus Regionally: On the Spatial Rootedness of Collective Identities in the Nineteenth Century." In *Saxony in German History: Culture, Society, and Politics, 1830-1933*, edited by James Retallack. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000.

- Meyer, Heinrich [W.K.F., pseud. (i.e., Weimarer Kunstfreunde)]. “Neu-deutsche religio-patriotische Kunst.” *Ueber Kunst und Alterthum in den Rhein und Mayn Gegend* 1, pt. 2 (1817): 7-62. Reprinted in Goethe, *Schriften zur Kunst*, 708-27.
- Meyer, Michael A. “‘How Awesome is this Place!’: The Reconceptualization of the Synagogue in Nineteenth-Century Germany.” *Year Book* (Leo Baeck Institute) 41 (1996): 51-63.
- Moller, Georg. *Denkmaehler der deutschen Baukunst*, 3 vols. Darmstadt: bei Heyer und Leske, 1815-43. Vol. 1, plates with introduction, 1815; vol. 1, text, n.d. (not before 1819 thru as late as 1821); vol. 2, 1822-31; vol. 3, 1843.
- Morper, J. F. “Ein unbekanntes Gutachten Joseph Martin von Reiders zur Domrestauration von 1828.” *Bamberger Blätter für fränkische Kunst und Geschichte: Beilage zum Bamberger Volksblatt* 7, no. 8 (1930): 29-31.
- Morton, Marsha. “German Romanticism: the Search for a ‘Quiet Place.’” In *Negotiating History: German Art and the Past*, edited by Jay A. Clarke, 9-23. Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 2002.
- Müller, Bernd. *Architekturführer Heidelberg. Bauten um 1000-2000*. Sonderveröffentlichungen des Stadtarchivs Heidelberg 10. Mannheim: Edition Quadrat, 1998.
- Muncker, Franz. Entry on Karl Heinrich Ritter von Lang in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, v. 17. Munich: Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1883; reprint: Berlin: Dunker und Humblot, 1969, 606-13.
- Murphy, James Cavanah. *The Arabian Antiquities of Spain*, edited with descriptions by T. H. Horne. London: Cadell and Davies, 1815.
- Nerdinger, Winfried. “Friedrich von Gärtner—Ansichten eines Architektenlebens,” In Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 9-25.
- Nerdinger, Winfried, ed. *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben 1791-1847, mit den Briefen an Johann Martin von Wagner*. Munich: Klinkhardt und Biermann, 1992.
- Nerdinger, Winfried, ed. *Leo von Klenze. Architekt zwischen Kunst und Hof 1784-1864*. Munich: Prestel, 2000. Ausstellungskataloge des Architekturmuseums der Technischen Universität München und des Münchner Stadtmuseums 11. Catalog of an exhibition held in Munich at the Münchner Stadtmuseum, May 12 – Sept. 3, 2000.

- Nerdinger, Winfried, ed., with Antonia Gruhn-Zimmermann. *Romantik und Restauration. Architektur in Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I. 1825-1848*. Ausstellungskataloge der Architektursammlung der Technischen Universität München und des Münchner Stadtmuseums 6. Munich: Hugendubel, 1987. Catalog of an exhibition held in Munich at the Münchner Stadtmuseum, Feb. 27 – May 24, 1987.
- Nerdinger, Winfried, and Werner Oechslin, eds., *Gottfried Semper 1803-1879. Architektur und Wissenschaft*. Munich: Prestel; Zurich: GTA, 2003.
- Neumeyer, Alfred. “Die Erweckung der Gotik in der deutschen Kunst des späten 18. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der Romantik.” *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 49 (1928): 75-185.
- Neundorfer, Bruno, and Walter Milutzki. “Das 20. Jahrhundert.” in Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, *Die Altäre des Bamberger Domes*, 292-98.
- Neuenschwander, Brody. “The Art History of Speyer,” 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1986.
- Nimmen, Jane van. “Friedrich Schlegel’s Response to Raphael in Paris.” In Weisberg and Dixon, *The Documented Image*, 319-33.
- Nussbaum, Norbert. *German Gothic Church Architecture*. Translated by Scott Kleager. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- O’Malley, John W. “The Historiography of the Society of Jesus: Where Does it Stand Today?” In O’Malley, *Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts*, 3-37.
- O’Malley, John W., Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Steven J. Harris and T. Frank Kennedy, eds. *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- Ostrogorsky, George. “The Development of Byzantine Studies.” Introduction to *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Joan Hussey, rev. ed., 1-21. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969.
- Otto, Karl-Heinz, and Anatolij Koljada. *Alexandrowka. Alexander-Newski-Gedächtniskirche*. Märkische Reisebilder. Potsdam: Heveller, 1997.
- Papageorgiou-Venetas, Alexander. “Entwurf zum Augenspital in Athen. Aufriß der Fassade und Querschnitt.” Catalogue no. 425 in Baumstark, *Das neue Hellas*, 566-67.
- Papageorgiou-Venetas, Alexander. “Gärtner in Griechenland.” In Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 134-155.

- Papageorgiou-Venetas, Alexander. “‘Ottonopolis’ oder das Neue Athen. Zur Planungsgeschichte der Neugründung der Stadt im 19. Jahrhundert.” In Baumstark, *Das neue Hellas*, 69-90.
- Paszkiwicz, Piotr. “An Imperial Dream: The ‘Russification’ of Sacral Architecture in the Polish Lands in the 19th Century.” *Umeni* 49, no. 6 (2001): 531-45.
- Petropulos, John Anthony. *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece 1833-1843*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Philipp, Klaus Jan. “Christian Ludwig Stieglitz (1756-1836). Der Beginn der Architekturgeschichtsschreibung in Deutschland zwischen Klassizismus und Romantik.” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, Bauhaus-Universität Weimar* 42 no. 2/3 (1996): 115-19.
- Pope, Alexander. *Moral Essays*. Edited by William Warburton. Vol. 3 of *Works of Alexander Pope: Esq., in Nine Volumes Complete; with his Last Corrections and Improvements as they were Delivered to the Editor a Little Before His Death*. London: J. and P. Knapton, H. Lintot, J. and R. Tonson, and S. Draper, 1851.
- Popp, Justus, and Theodor Bülow, *Les trois âges de l’architecture gothique, représentés par des exemples choisis à Ratisbonne... ouvrage traduit de l’allemand, et accompagné des quarante-huit planches de l’édition originale et d’une planche additionnelle complétant la théorie*. Paris: Librairie de l’architecture de Bance aîné, 1841. French translation of: *Die Architectur des Mittelalters in Regensburg dargestellt durch den Dom, die Jakobskirche, die alte Pfarre und einige andere Ueberreste deutscher Baukunst*. Regensburg: privately printed, 1834-39. [Part 1: *Dt. Baustyl*; part 2: *Byzant. Baustyl*; part 3: *Dt. Baustyl*; part 4: *Dt. Baustyl, Uebergangs-Styl*; part 5: *Dt. Baustyl*; part 6: *Byzant. Baustyl*; part 7: *Uebergangs-Styl*; parts 8 and pt. 9: *Dt. Baustyl*. Parts 1-6 were published in 1834 and parts 7-9 in 1839.]
- Propper, Maximilian von. “Goethes Verhältnis zur russischen Ikonenmalerei. Analyse einer Legende.” *Goethe. Neue Folge des Jahrbuchs der Goethe-Gesellschaft* 25 (1963): 27-69.
- Raasch, Susette. *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms im 19. Jahrhundert. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg* 14 (1980): 137-304.
- Raguin, Virginia Chieffo. “Revivals, Revivalists, and Architectural Stained Glass.” *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 49, no. 3 (Sept., 1990): 310-29.
- Ramaswamy, Sumathi. *Lost Land of Lemuria: Fabulous Geographies, Catastrophic Histories*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004.

- Raquejo, Tonia. "The 'Arab Cathedrals': Moorish Architecture as Seen by British Travellers." *The Burlington Magazine* v. 128, no. 1001 (1986): 555-63.
- Rebhan, Helga. "The Bavarian State Library in Munich." In Gierlichs and Hagedorn, *Islamic Art in Germany*, 157-60.
- Redford, Scott. "Byzantium and the Islamic World, 1261-1557." In *Byzantium: Faith and Power (1261-1557)*. Edited by Helen C. Evans, 388-96. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004. Catalog of an exhibition held in New York at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, March 23 – July 4, 2004.
- Renger, Konrad, ed. "*Ihm, welcher der Andacht Tempel baut....*" *Ludwig I. und die Alte Pinakothek. Festschrift zum Jubiläumsjahr 1986*. Munich: Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, 1986.
- Riasanovsky, Nicholas. *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959.
- Rice, David Storm. *Le Baptistère de Saint Louis*. Paris: Les Éditions du Chêne, 1951.
- Ritter, Carl. "Die Ruinen am Rhein," *Rheinisches Archiv für Geschichte und Literatur*, 1 (1810): 199-220.
- Robertson, Clare. "Two Farnese Cardinals and the Question of Jesuit Taste." In O'Malley, *Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts*, 134-47.
- Robson-Scott, W.D. *The Literary Background of the Gothic Revival: A Chapter in the History of Taste*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Rode, Herbert. "Ramboux' Plan einer Glasgemäldegalerie – ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte des Städtischen Museums Köln." *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 29 (1967): 335-37.
- Rosengarten, Albert. *Die Architektonischen Stylarten*. Braunwchweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1857.
- Rosengarten, Albert. "Die neue Synagoge in Cassel." *Allgemeine Bauzeitung* 5 (1840): 205-07 and plates 349-53.
- Rößling, Wilfried. "Mannheim," in *Badische Synagogen aus der Zeit von Großherzog Friedrich I. in zeitgenössischen Photographien*, edited by Franz-Josef Ziwes. Karlsruhe: G. Braun, 1997, 70-73.
- Rumohr, Karl Friedrich von. *Italienische Forschungen*, 3 vols. Originally published 1827-31; reprint, edited and with an introduction entitled "Carl Friedrich von

- Rumohr als Begründer der neueren Kunstforschung” by Julius von Schlosser. Frankfurt am Main: Frankfurter Verlags-Anstalt, 1920.
- Sauer, Fritz. *Das Heidelberger Schloß im Spiegel der Literatur. Eine Studie über die entwicklungsgeschichtlichen Phasen seiner Betrachtungsweise*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter’s Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1910. Heidelberg Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte 27. A facsimile edition published together with a facsimile of Sauer, *Beiträge zur entwicklungsgeschichtlichen Betrachtung des Heidelberger Schlosses. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter’s Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1910. Nendeln, Lichtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1977. The inclusion of the dissertation, constituting the first three chapters of *Das Heidelberger Schloß* (with the addition of an autobiographical note by the author) is not indicated on the cover or opening pages of the reprint edition.
- Sauerländer, Willibald. “From Stylus to Style: Reflections on the Fate of a Notion.” *Art History* 6 (1983): 253-70.
- Schapiro, Meyer. “Style.” In *Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory*, edited by A.L. Kroeber, 287-312. International Symposium on Anthropology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Schemmel, Bernhard. “Entwürfe für den Pfarraltar von 1826/29. Domrestaurierung und Pfarraltar 1826/31.” In Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, *Die Altäre des Bamberger Doms*, 242-53.
- Schemmel, Bernhard. *Friedrich Karl Rupprecht 1779-1831*. Catalog of an exhibition held in Bamberg at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, Dec. 1981 – Feb. 1982. Bamberg: Staatsbibliothek, 1981.
- Schickel, Gabriele. “Maria-Hilf Kirche, München/Au, 1831-39 und Friedhofsanlage, 1843.” Catalogue no. 49 in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 269-76.
- Schickel, Gabriele. “Synagoge, Kriegshaber bei Augsburg, Entwurf 1846.” Catalogue no. 74 in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 310.
- Schickel, Gabriele. “Typisierung und Stilwahl im Sakralbau.” In Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 54-67.
- Schickel, Gabriele. “Synagoge, Ingenheim/Pfalz, 1829-1832.” Catalogue no. 73 in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 309.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, edited by Hans Eichner. Vol. 4 of *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, edited by Ernst Behler with Hans Eichner and Jean-Jacques Anstett. Munich: Thomas, 1959.

- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Briefe auf einer Reise durch die Niederlande, Rheingegenden, die Schweiz, und einen Theil von Frankreich." *Poetisches Taschenbuch auf das Jahr 1806*. Berlin: Friedrich Unger, 1806. Revised by Schlegel and republished as "Grundzüge der gotischen Baukunst" in *Friedrich Schlegels sämtliche Werke* 6. Vienna: Jakob Mayer, 1823. Both versions reprinted together in Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, 153-204. Page references are to *Ansichten und Ideen*.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Dritter Nachtrag alter Gemälde." *Europa* ser. 2, vol. 2, no. 4 (1805): 109-45. Revised by Schlegel and republished in *Friedrich Schlegels sämtliche Werke* 6, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, no. 1, 163-220. Vienna: Jakob Mayer, 1823. Both versions reprinted together in Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, 116-52. Page references are to *Ansichten und Ideen*.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Nachricht von den Gemälden in Paris," *Europa. Eine Zeitschrift*, ser. 1, vol. 1, no. 4 (1803): 108-57. Revised by Schlegel and republished in *Friedrich Schlegels sämtliche Werke* 6, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, no. 1, 1-61. Vienna: Jakob Mayer, 1823. Both versions reprinted together in Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der Christlichen Kunst*, 9-47. Page references are to *Ansichten und Ideen*.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Schloß Karlstein bei Prag," *Deutsches Museum* 2:10 (1812): 357-65. Revised by Schlegel and republished in *Friedrich Schlegels sämtliche Werke* 6, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst* vol. 3, *Vermischte Aufsätze*, no. 1, 303-11. Vienna: Jakob Mayer, 1823. Both versions reprinted together in Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der Christlichen Kunst*, 207-12. Page references are to *Ansichten und Ideen*.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Vom Raffael." *Europa. Eine Zeitschrift*, ser. 1, [vol. 2], no. 1 (1803): 3-19. Revised by Schlegel and republished in *Friedrich Schlegels sämtliche Werke* 6, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, no. 1, 62-80. Vienna: Jakob Mayer, 1823. Both versions reprinted together in Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der Christlichen Kunst*, 48-60. Page references are to *Ansichten und Ideen*.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Zweiter Nachtrag alter Gemälde." *Europa* ser. 2, vol. 2, no. 1 (1805): 1-41. Revised by Schlegel and republished in *Friedrich Schlegels sämtliche Werke* 6, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, no. 1, 107-62. Vienna: Jakob Mayer, 1823. Both versions reprinted together in Schlegel, *Ansichten und Ideen von der christlichen Kunst*, 79-115. Page references are to *Ansichten und Ideen*.
- Schleiß, Max Joseph. *Fest-Rede bei der feyerlichen Einweihung der neu erbauten Kirche zu Eltmann am 29. September 1838 durch den hochwürdigsten Herrn Bischof*

- Friedrich von Gross zu Würzburg*. Würzburg: Commerzien-Assessor Bonitas sel. Witwe, 1838. Facsimile reprint, Eltmann: Kath. Pfarramt, 1988.
- Schmitt, Heinz. "Heinrich Hübsch. Ein biographischer Abriß." In *Heinrich Hübsch 1795-1863. Der große badische Baumeister der Romantik*, edited by the Institut für Baugeschichte der Universität Karlsruhe (TU), Wulf Schirmer, Hanno Brockhoff, and Werner Schnuchel, 10-21. Karlsruhe: C. F. Müller, 1983. Catalog of an exhibition held in Karlsruhe at the Prinz-Max-Palais, Dec. 17, 1983 – March 25, 1984.
- [Schnaase, Karl.] Review of *Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume bis in die neuern Zeiten*, by C. L. Stieglitz. In *Berliner Conversations-Blatt für Poesie, Literatur und Kritik* 2 (1828): no. 60: 238-39, no. 61: 243-44, no. 62: 248, no. 63: 251-52, and no. 65: 257-60.
- Schnaase, Karl Friedrich. *Geschichte der bildenden Künste im Mittelalter*. Düsseldorf: Julius Buddeus, 1844.
- Scholem, Gerschom. "The Star of David: History of a Symbol," translated by Michael A. Meyer. In *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*, 257-81. New York: Schocken, 1971.
- Scholz-Hänsel, Michael. "'Antigüedades árabes de España'. Wie die einst vertriebenen Mauren Spanien zu einer Wiederentdeckung im 19. Jahrhundert verhelfen." In *Europa und der Orient 800-1900*, edited by Gereon Sievernich and Hendrik Budde, 368-82 and 886. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Lexicon Verlag, 1989.
- Schrapel, Claudia. "Verzeichnis der Schriften von Johann Dominicus Fiorillo." In Kosegarten, *Johann Dominicus Fiorillo*, 478-81.
- Schwaiger, Georg, ed. *Der Regensburger Dom. Beiträge zu seiner Geschichte*. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg 10. Regensburg: Verein für Regensburger Bistumsgeschichte, 1976.
- Schwieger, Frank. *Johann Claudius von Lassaulx, 1781-1848. Architekt und Denkmalpfleger in Koblenz*. Neuss: Gesellschaft für Buchdruckerei, 1968.
- Seidl, Wolf. *Bayern in Griechenland. Die Geschichte eines Abenteuers*. Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1970.
- Seroux d'Agincourt, Jean Baptiste Louis Georges. *Histoire de l'art par les monuments, depuis sa décadence au IV^e siècle jusqu'à son renouvellement au XVI^e*. 5 vols. Paris: Treuttel et Würtz, 1823. (The first installments had appeared in 1809-14; following the author's death, the installments ceased and the work was published as a whole. Karge, "Renaissance. Aufkommen und Entfaltung," 42 n. 13.)

- Sheehan, James J. *German History 1770-1866*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Smith, Jeffrey Chipps. *Sensuous Worship: Jesuits and the Art of the Early Catholic Reformation in Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Smyth, Carolyn. *Correggio's Frescoes in Parma Cathedral*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, *Ein griechischer Traum. Leo von Klenze der Archäologe*. Munich: Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, 1985. Catalog of an exhibition held in Munich at the Glyptothek, Dec. 6 1985 – Feb. 9, 1986.
- Staatliche Museen zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz. *Nationalgalerie Berlin. Das XIX. Jahrhundert: Katalog der Ausgestellten Werke*. Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz and E.A. Seemann, 2001.
- Steub, Ludwig. *Ueber die Urbewohner Rätens und ihren Zusammenhang mit den Etruskern*. Munich: Verlag der literarisch-artistischen Anstalt, 1843.
- Stieglitz, Christian Ludwig. *Encyklopädie der bürgerlichen Baukunst, in welcher alle Fächer dieser Kunst nach alphabetischer Ordnung abgehandelt sind. Ein Handbuch für Staatswirthe, Baumeister und Landwirthe*. 5 vols. Leipzig : C. Fritsch, 1792-98.
- Stieglitz, Christian Ludwig. *Die Geschichte der Baukunst vom frühesten Alterthume bis in die neuesten Zeiten*. Nuremberg: Friedrich Campe, 1827. 2nd (posthumous) ed. 1837; 3rd ed. 1857.
- Stieglitz, Christian Ludwig. *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*. Leipzig: G. Fleischer, 1820.
- Strobel, Richard. “Der Domkreuzgang mit seinen Kapellen und Anbauten.” In Schwaiger, *Der Regensburger Dom: Beiträge zu seiner Geschichte*, 119-34.
- Sweetman, John. *The Oriental Obsession: Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture 1500-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Thal, Ferdinand. *Neuester und vollständiger Führer durch Dresden und seine Umgebung*. Dresden: H. H. Grimm, 1845.
- Thoss, Kay. “Der junge Friedrich und sein väterlicher Protégé.” In Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 26-39.
- Traeger, Jörg. *Mittelalterliche Architekturfiktion. Die Allerheiligenkapelle am Regensburger Domkreuzgang*. Munich: Schnell und Steiner, 1980.

- Traeger, Jörg. *Der Weg nach Walhalla: Denkmallandschaft und Bildungsreise im 19. Jahrhundert*. 2nd ed. Regensburg: Bernhard Bosse and Mittelbayerischen Zeitung, 1991.
- Talvacchia, Bette. "Raphael's Workshop and the Development of a Managerial Style." In Hall, *Cambridge Companion to Raphael*, 167-85.
- Tronzo, William. *The Cultures of His Kingdom: Roger II and the Palatine Chapel in Palermo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Turczynski, Emanuel. "Bayerns Anteil an der Befreiung und am Staatsaufbau Griechenlands." In Baumstark, *Das neue Hellas*, 43-55.
- Turczynski, Emmanuel. *Die deutsch-griechischen Kulturbeziehungen bis zur Berufung König Ottos*. Südosteuropäische Arbeiten 48. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1959.
- Turczynski, Emmanuel. *Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte Griechenlands im 19. Jahrhundert. Von der Hinwendung zu Europa bis zu den ersten Olympischen Spielen der Neuzeit*. Peleus. Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Griechenlands und Zyperns, 16. Bibliopolis: Mannheim and Möhnese, 2003.
- Vaassen, Elgin. "Affaires de Russie. Ein Glasfenster für die St. Isaak-Kathedrale." *Weltkunst* 52, no. 20 (Oct. 15, 1982): 2917-2919.
- Vaassen, Elgin. *Bilder auf Glas. Glasgemälde zwischen 1780 und 1870*. Kunstwissenschaftliche Studien 70. Munich and Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1997.
- Vaassen, Elgin. "Die ersten Fenster für den Regensburger Dom aus der königlichen Glasmalereianstalt, Gründung König Ludwigs I., aus dem Jahre 1828." In *Diversarum Artium Studia. Beiträge zu Kunstwissenschaft, Kunsttechnologie und ihren Randgebieten. Festschrift für Heinz Roosen-Runge zum 70. Geburtstag am 5. Oktober 1982*, edited by Helmut Engelhart and Gerda Kempter, 165-84. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert, 1982.
- Vaassen, Elgin. "Kaulbach pinxit – Hess invenit – Ainmiller in vitro fecit. Kaulbach skizzierte, was Hess erfand und Ainmiller auf Glas malte." *Kultur und Technik. Zeitschrift des Deutschen Museums München* 1 (1985): 14-21.
- Vaassen, Elgin. "Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechischen Kapelle auf dem Neroberg in Wiesbaden und zu weiteren ornamentalen Verglasungen der Glasmalereianstalt des bayerischen Königs Ludwig I. in München." *Kunst in Hessen und am Mittelrhein* 30 (1990): 69-78.
- Vanden Heuvel, Jon. *A German Life in the Age of Revolution: Joseph Görres, 1776-1848*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001.

- van Bergeijk, Herman. "‘Hinter dem Vorhang des schönen Lebens.’ Gärtners Begegnung mit Italien." In Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 51-69.
- Vasari, Giorgio. *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*. 2 vols. Translated by Gaston du C. de Vere, with an introduction and notes by David Ekserdjian. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996. An abridged version of Vasari, *Vite de' più eccellenti architetti, pittori et scultori italiani*, rev. ed., 1568 (1st ed., 1550).
- Villadsen, Villad. "Studien über den byzantinischen Einfluß auf die europäische Architektur des 19. Jahrhunderts." *Hafnia: Copenhagen Papers in the History of Art* 5 (1978): 43-77.
- Volk, Waltraud. *Potsdam. Historische Straßen und Bauten Heute*. 2nd, rev. ed. Berlin: Verlag für Bauwesen, 1993.
- Vollmar, Bernd. "Dorfsynagogen im neomaurischen Stil am Beispiel von Binswangen (Lkr. Dillingen) und Hainsfarth (Lkr. Donau-Ries)." In Bauch, *Denkmäler jüdischer Kultur in Bayern*, 91-101.
- Wackenroder, Wilhelm Heinrich, and Ludwig Tieck, *Herzensergießungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders*. Berlin: Johann Friedrich Unger, 1797. Reprinted with an afterword by Richard Benz, Universal-Bibliothek Nr. 7860 [2]. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 1979.
- Weidner, Thomas. "Katalog der Exponate." In Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 500-24.
- Weis, Eberhard. "Die politischen und historischen Auffassungen Ludwigs I. in der Kronprinzenzeit." In Erichsen and Puschner, *Aufsätze*, 11-28.
- Wiess, Daniel H. *Art and the Crusade in the Age of Saint Louis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Weisberg, Gabriel P. and Laurinda S. Dixon, eds. *The Documented Image: Visions in Art History*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1987.
- Wiebeking, Carl Friedrich von. *Theoretisch-practische bürgerliche Baukunde, durch Geschichte und Beschreibung der merkwürdigsten antiken Baudenkmahle und ihrer genauen Abbildungen bereichert*. 11 vols. Munich: Zängl, 1821-26.
- Wilson, Peter H. *The Holy Roman Empire, 1495-1806*. New York: St. Martin's, 1999.
- Winckelmann, Johann Joachim. *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Mahlerey und Bildhauer-Kunst*. First published in 1755. 2nd, expanded ed., Dresden and Leipzig: Im Verlag der Waltherischen Handlung, 1756. Second

- edition translated by Elfriede Heyer and Roger C. Norton as *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture* (La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1987). Citations are to the Open Court edition.
- Winckelmann, Johann Joachim. *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*. Dresden: Waltherische Hof-Buchhandlung, 1764. Translated by Harry Francis Mallgrave as *History of the Art of Antiquity*, with an introduction by Alex Potts (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2006).
- Winter, Irene. "The Affective Properties of Styles: An Inquiry into Analytical Process and the Inscription of Meaning in Art History." In Jones and Galison, *Picturing Science, Producing Art*, 55-77.
- Winterfeld, Dethard von. *Der Dom zu Worms*. 4th ed. Königstein im Taunus: Langewiesche, 2003.
- Wolff-Wintrich, Birgitte. "Kölner Glasmalereisammlungen des 19. Jahrhunderts." In *Lust und Verlust. Kölner Sammler zwischen Trikolore und Preußenadler*, edited by Hiltrud Kier and Frank Künter Zehnder, 341-54. Cologne: Wienand, 1995.
- Wortman, Richard. "The Russian Style in Church Architecture as Imperial Symbol after 1881." In *Architectures of Russian Identity 1500 to the Present*, edited by James Cracraft and Daniel Rowland, 101-16. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- Wortmann, Richard. *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy*, vol. 1: *From Peter the Great to the Death of Nicholas I*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Wünsche, Raimund. "Johann Martin von Wagner." Catalogue no. 3 in Baumstark, *Das neue Hellas*, 211-12.
- Yeats, William Butler. *A Vision: An Explanation of Life Founded upon the Writings of Giraldus and upon Certain Doctrines Attributed to Kusta ben Luka*. London: privately printed for subscribers only by T. Werner Laurie, 1925. Reprinted in *A Critical Edition of Yeats's A Vision (1925)*. Edited by George Mills Harper and Walter Kelly Hood. London: MacMillan, 1978. Citations are to the MacMillan edition.
- Zakin, Helen Jackson. *French Cistercian Grisaille Glass*. New York: Garland, 1979.
- Zietz, Peer (text), and Uwe H. Rüdénburg (photographs). *Franz Heinrich Schwechten. Ein Architekt zwischen Historismus und Moderne*. Stuttgart: Edition Axel Menges, 1999.
- Zimmermann, Florian. "Allerheiligenhofkirche in der Residenz, München." Catalogue no. 35 in Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 216-20.

Zink, Jochen. *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*. Veröffentlichung zu Bayerischen Geschichte und Kultur 11/86. Munich: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 1986.

Zink, Jochen. "Zur Vollendung des Kölner und des Speyerer Doms. Mittelalterrezeption und frühe deutsche Denkmalpflege." In *Mittelalter-Rezeption II. Gesammelte Vorträge des 2. Salzburger Symposions: Die Rezeption des Mittelalters in Literatur, Bildender Kunst und Musik des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Jürgen Kühnel, et al., 169-93 and figs. 1(Z)-12(Z). Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, no. 358. Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1982.

Zuber, Karl-Heinz. *Der "Fürst Proletarier" Ludwig von Oettingen-Wallerstein (1791-1870). Adeliges Leben und konservative Reformpolitik im konstitutionellen Bayern*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1978.

LIST OF PLATES

1. MAPS

Map 1. The Kingdom of Bavaria in 1819, with districts and their capitals in black; additional Bavarian cities and towns mentioned in this dissertation designated in red, and additional non-Bavarian cities and towns noted in this dissertation designated in purple. (“Das Werden des neuen Bayern. 1819. Königreich Bayern nach dem Wiener Kongreß und seinen Folgeverträgen”). [Max Spindler, ed., *Bayerischer Geschichtsatlas* (Munich: Redaktion Gertrud Diepolder, 1969), 36, map d, with additions.]

Map 2. Munich, showing buildings built under Ludwig I in the years 1820-50 (Gustav Wenng, “Übersicht aller unter der hohen Aegide S. Maj. des Königs Ludwig I. entstandener Bauten in den Jahren 1820-50”). [Franz Schiermeier, “*Relief der Haupt- und Residenzstadt München*”. *Das Stadtmodell von Johann Baptist Seitz 1841-1863*, ed. Renate Eikermann (Munich: Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, 2000), 27.]

Buildings mentioned in this dissertation include:

- Frauenkirche, (labeled “Frauen K.”) at the center of the city (in the Kreuz Viertel, labeled “KV”).
- St. Michael, built for the former Jesuit College just west of center, and numbered “4,” in the Kreuz Viertel (on Neuhauser Gasse, in the city center running towards the NW).
- Glyptothek (labeled as such), northwest of the city (in the Maximilians Vorstadt, on Brienner Straße).
- Pinakothek (labeled as such), north-northwest of the city (in the Maximilians Vorstadt, on Barer Straße, running from the western edge of the city center to the northeast),
- Residence (labeled “Residenz,” in the Gagenauer Viertel, labeled “G.V.”) at the northeast corner of the city center, with the Allerheiligenhofkapelle (labeled “Allerh. K.”) on its eastern side.
- Ludwigskirche (labeled “Ludwigs K.”), north of the Residence (along Ludwigstraße, running from the Residence to the northeast).
- Mariahilfkirche (labeled “Mariahilf Pl. u. Kirche”), southeast of the city, across the Isar, at the center of the Au suburb (“Vorstadt AU”).
- Nymphenburg is situated to the northwest of Munich, a short distance beyond the area covered by this map.

2. ILLUSTRATIONS

Chapter One

Fig. 1.1. Petrikirche (1590-97) of the former Jesuit College, Münster. Exterior. [Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004), fig. 55.]

Chapter Two

Fig. 2.1. Correggio, *Assumption of the Virgin*, detail of fresco in dome of Parma Cathedral (1526-30). [Carolyn Smyth, *Correggio's Frescoes in Parma Cathedral* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), colorplate II.]

Fig. 2.2

- a. Hagia Sophia (originally the patriarchal church of the Byzantine Empire; from 1453 a mosque; from 1934 a museum), Istanbul; architects Anthemios of Tralles and Isidorus of Miletus (532-37). Ground plan from Guillaume Joseph Grelot, *A Late Voyage to Constantinople*, trans. John Phillips (London, 1683), fig. V (p. 90).
- b. Hagia Sophia. Ground plan. [Richard Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, 4th ed., revised by Krautheimer and Slobodan Curcic (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1986), fig. 164 (p. 207).]
- c. Hagia Sophia, exterior view from the northwest. [Grelot, *Late voyage to Constantinople*, fig. VI (p. 104).]
- d. Hagia Sophia, interior of nave looking east. [Grelot, *Late voyage to Constantinople*, fig. VIII (p. 121).]

Fig. 2.3 a. “S^{te} Sophie de Constantinople, S^t Marc, et autres églises de Venise construites dans le style grec moderne. X^e et XI^e siècles.” Far left: Hagia Sophia. 1. Ground plan (based on Grelot, with post-Byzantine additions largely removed): “ce plan, ainsi rapproché de celui de S^t Marc de Venise, gravé N^o 13, aidera à faire reconnaître ce qu’en ont emprunté les architectes de cette dernière église.” 2. Elevation of the exterior façade: “d’après les dessins de M. Boscher, architecte français.” Far right: San Marco, Venice. 13. Ground plan: “en comparant le plan de cette église avec celui de S^{te} Sophie de Constantinople, gravé N^o 1, on peut juger de ce que les architectes grecs, qui l’ont élevée, ont emprunté des formes de ce temple, et jusqu’à quel point il peut leur avoir servi de modèle.” **14. Section showing interior elevation.** [Seroux d’Agincourt (1823), 4, plate 26; captions quoted from 3:24.]

- b. San Marco, Venice, Anonymous, possibly Byzantine architect (begun in 1063 under Doge Domenico Contarini). Ground plan. [Otto Demus, *The Mosaic Decoration of San Marco, Venice*, ed. Herbert L. Kessler (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), fig. 1.]

- c. San Marco,, west façade [Ettore Vio, ed., *The Basilica of St. Mark in Venice* (Antella, Florence, Italy: Scala; New York: Riverside, 1999), fig. 32].
- d. San Marco, interior view looking east to choir. [Vio, *Basilica of St. Mark*, fig. 16.]

- Fig. 2.4 a. St. Aposteln (Holy Apostles), Cologne (begun between 1021-36; completed after 1190): left, ground plan including the collegiate buildings demolished in 1835; right, section through the upper storey of the trefoil. Originally published by W. Ewald and H. Rahtgens in 1916. [Hiltrud Kier and Ulrich Krings, *Die Romanischen Kirchen in Köln* (Cologne: Vista Point, 1985), 56.]
- b. St. Aposteln. Exterior: aerial view from the northeast. [Kier and Krings, *Die Romanische Kirchen in Köln*, 60, pl. 11.]
 - c. St. Aposteln. Interior looking east into crossing and trefoil choir. [Kier and Krings, *Die Romanische Kirchen in Köln*, 58, pl. 9.]

- Fig. 2.5 a. St. Gereon's Church, Cologne (second half of the 4th c.; 11th c. – ca. 1248). Ground plan including the collegiate buildings demolished in 1821 (plan based in part on H. Rahtgens, 1911, and S. Boisserée, 1833/44). [Kier and Krings, *Die Romanische Kirchen in Köln*, 78.]
- b. St. Gereon's, exterior from the southwest, anonymous watercolor, ca. 1844. [Norbert Nussbaum, *German Gothic Church Architecture*, trans. Scott Kleager (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), fig. 12.]
 - c. St. Gereon's, Cologne, watercolor of interior of the decagon in 1838, showing baroque additions. [Kier and Krings, *Die Romanische Kirchen in Köln*, fig. 15.]

Chapter Three

- Fig. 3.1 Kreuzkapelle, Karlstein Castle (begun 1348), interior to choir. [Nussbaum, *German Gothic Church Architecture*, 132.]

- Fig. 3.2 a. Speyer Cathedral, ca.1030-1106, with later additions and restorations including, to recover from the fire of 1689, the reconstruction of the western end of the nave and the creation of a western antechamber, both by Franz Ignaz Michael Neumann in 1772-78. Gound plan. [Hans Weigert, text; Walter Hege, photography, *Die Kaiserdome am Mittelrhein Speyer, Mainz und Worms* (Berlin" Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1933), fig. 1.]
- b. Speyer Cathedral, exterior from the southwest in 1840 (i.e., as restored by Klenze and Wiebeking 20 years earlier), with the western antechamber (1772-78) designed by Franz Ignaz Michael Neumann. [Wolfgang Eger, ed., *Geschichte der Stadt Speyer*, 2nd, corrected edition (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1983), 2:51, fig. 4.]

- c. Speyer Cathedral, exterior view of eastern end from the southeast. [Hans Erich Kubach, *Der Dom zu Speyer*, 3rd, rev. ed. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988), fig. 8.]
- d. Speyer Cathedral. Interior to the east: lithograph by Peter Wagner after a drawing by Carlo Ignazio Pozzi, ca. 1840 (i.e., as restored by Klenze and Wiebeking twenty years earlier). [Jochen Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer* (Munich: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 1986), fig. 79.]
- e. Speyer Cathedral. Dome with frescoes by Johann Schraudolf and Joseph Schwarzmann (1846-53; removed in the 1950s). [Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, plate 23.]
- f. Speyer Cathedral. Choir and apse with frescoes by Johann Schraudolf and Joseph Schwarzmann (1846-53; removed in the 1950s). [Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, plate 43.]
- g. Speyer Cathedral. Exterior view of westwork designed by Heinrich Hübsch (1854-58). [Zink, *Ludwig I. und der Dom zu Speyer*, 120.]

- Fig. 3.3 a. Norman Palace (with Palatine Chapel), Palermo. The chapel was built by 1143. Ground plan. [William Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom: Roger II and the Palatine Chapel in Palermo* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), fig. 6.]
- b. Palatine Chapel. [William Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom: Roger II and the Palatine Chapel in Palermo* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), fig. 6.]
- c. Palatine Chapel. Interior east to nave and choir. [Tronzo, *Cultures of His Kingdom*, fig. 7.]
- d. Palatine Chapel. Interior west to nave and throne. [Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, 9.]
- e. Palatine Chapel. Pavement of south aisle. [Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, Plate II.]
- f-1. Palatine Chapel. Wainscoting of south aisle. [Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, fig. 34.]
- f-2. Mamluk ablaq reciprocating lotus lanceolée motifs ablaq (ablaq: “joggled voussoirs and lintels in black and white stone arranged alternately”: arguably the most characteristic Mamluk form of ornament). [Eva Baer, *Islamic Ornament* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 80, n. 201 and fig. 100.]

Fig. 3.4 Monreale Cathedral, exterior of eastern apses. [Sandro Chierichetti, *The Cathedral of Monreale*, trans. Donald Mills (Palermo: Perna Cartoleria, 1979), 7.]

Fig. 3.5 a. Pinakothek, Munich, architect Leo von Klenze. (Called the Alte Pinakothek following construction of the Neue Pinakothek, 1843-46). Ground stone laid 1826; dedicated 1836; ground floor, loggias and exterior sculpture completed 1842. All images prior to wartime destruction. Ground plan. [Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, fig. 46.7.]

- b. J.A. Weiß, exterior of the Pinakothek from the southeast ca. 1840-50.
[Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, fig. 46.14.]
- c. Klenze, plans for display of Greek pottery on Pinakothek ground floor.
[Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, fig. 46.8.]
- d. Pinakothek. Photo of the *Loggiengang* on the south side of the upper floor.
Interior view looking west, with murals designed by Peter Cornelius and carried out by Clemens Zimmermann and assistants. [Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, fig. 46.13.]
- e. Peter Cornelius, cartoon for details of the dome of Pinakothek loggia 24, “Era of Charlemagne,” showing Charles Martel battling the Saracens and the missionary work of St. Boniface. [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, fig. 47.]
- f. Cornelius, cartoon for dome of Pinakothek loggia 2, “Crusades.” [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, fig. 7.]
- g. Cornelius, cartoon for the dome of Pinakothek loggia 3, “Cimabue,” showing Cimabue being given by his father to a Greek painting master, and observing Greek painters execute their craft [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, fig. 9.]
- h. Cornelius, cartoon for details of the dome of Pinakothek loggia 23, “German Architecture in the Middle Ages,” showing architects at work before the gates of a great city (bottom), and Meister Gerhard presenting a model of Cologne Cathedral to Archbishop Konrad von Hochstaden (top). [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, fig. 45.]
- i. Cornelius, cartoon for the lunette of Pinakothek loggia 23, “Honoring the Saints in the Middle Ages,” representing the defeat of Milan and removal of the relics of the Magi to Cologne. [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, fig. 46.]
- j. Cornelius, cartoon for details of the dome of Pinakothek loggia 22 (theme of loggia: the development of Byzantine-German painting), here showing Wilhelm von Köln and Stephan Lochner. [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, figs. 43.]
- k. Cornelius, cartoon of details of the lunette of Pinakothek loggia 22 (theme of loggia: the development of Byzantine-German painting), here representing Zeitblom and Holbein the Elder. [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, figs. 44.]

- Fig. 3.6 a. Allerheiligenhofkapelle, Munich, Leo von Klenze, architect. Ground stone laid 1826; dedicated 1837. (All images prior to wartime destruction.) Ground plan. [Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, fig. 98.5,]
- b. Allerheiligenhofkapelle. Entrance (eastern) façade. [Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 98.4.]
 - c. Photo of eastern side of Munich Residence, with entrance façade of Allerheiligenhofkapelle. [Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 98.6.]
 - d. Klenze, proposal for entrance façade, Allerheiligenhofkapelle, intended to suggest the Rebirth of Antiquity in fifteenth-century Venice. Rejected Feb. 1827. [Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 98.3.]

- e. Klenze, plan for pavement, Allerheiligenhofkapelle. [Kurt Falthäuser, ed., *Die Allerheiligen-Hofkirche der Münchner Residenz: Geschichte – Zerstörung - Wiederaufbau*, ed (Munich: Bayerisches Staatsministerium der Finanzen, Presse- und Öffentlichkeitsarbeit, [2003?]), 17.]
- f-1. Klenze, early longitudinal section (1826) with plan for the mosaics. [Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 35.5.]
- f-2. Klenze, early transverse section (1826) of the Allerheiligenhofkapelle, showing interior to west (with choir and apses), including design of proposed mosaics (detail). [Norbert Lieb and Heinz Jürgen Sauermost, eds., *Münchens Kirchen: mit e. chronolog. Verz. d. bestehenden Kirchenbauten* (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1973), 194.]
- g. Allerheiligenhofkapelle. Interior to west (high altar) with frescoes by Heinrich Heß. Water color by Franz Xaver Nachtmann (1839). [Falthäuser, *Allerheiligen-Hofkirche der Münchner Residenz*, 12.]**
- h. Allerheiligenhofkapelle. Photo of interior to southwest. [Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, 98.7.]

Fig. 3.7. Basilica of San Zeno Maggiore, Verona (1125-35). Entrance façade (and adjacent campanile). [Wikipedia commons.]

Fig. 3.8. San Carlo dei Lombardi, Florence, 1349-1404; orig. dedicated to St. Ann; rededicated to St. Charles Borromeo in 1616 (six years after his canonization). Entrance façade. [Wikipedia commons; see also Alberto Busignani and Raffaello Bencini, *Le Chiese di Firenze [3]: Quartiere di Santa Croce* (Florence: Sansoni, 1982). 155-58.]

Fig. 3.9 a. Abbey church of S. Pietro in Vildobone (last quarter of the twelfth century). Entrance façade. [Angiola Maria Romanini, *L'Architettura Gotica in Lombardia*, vol. 2. (Milan: Casa Editrice Ceschina, 1964), plate 127 b.]
 b. S. Pietro in Vildobone. Portal. [Photo, Umberto Pini, by permission.]

Fig. 3.10 a. Cathedral of Piacenza (ca. 1122-1233). Entrance façade. [Wikipedia commons].
 b. Piacenza Cathedral. Ground plan. [Stefano Fermi, *The Medieval Churches of Piacenza*, L'Italia Monumentale 26 (Milan: E. Bonomi, 1912), fig. 1.]

Fig. 3.11. Catholic church in Eltmann (Lower Franconia), architect Leo von Klenze, designed 1830-31, constructed 1835-38. Ground plan, transverse section, west façade, and exterior elevation of the south side. Bayerische Hauptstaatsarchiv, Abgabe Oberste Baubehörde. [Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, fig. 57.2.]

Fig. 3.12 a. Conrad Wiesner, *Die Salvatorkirche bei Donaustauf*, 1817, showing the church as renovated in the seventeenth century and prior to Klenze's nineteenth-century renovations. [Regensburg, Museen der Stadt, reproduced in Jörg Traeger, *Der Weg nach Walhalla: Denkmallandschaft*

- und Bildungsreise im 19. Jahrhundert*, 2nd ed. (Regensburg: Bernhard Bosse and Mittelbayerischen Zeitung, 1991), fig. 138.]
- b. Leo von Klenze, proposal for renovating of St. Salvator, Donaustauf, in the Byzantine style (1839) [Munich, Stadtmuseum, Maillinger Sammlung II/1630/1, reproduced in Traeger, *Der Weg nach Walhalla*, fig. 62a].
- c. Klenze, *Salvatorkirche und Walhalla*, 1839. Note the farmhouse with Germanic crossed roof beams in the foreground between the church and the Walhalla. [Regensburg, Museen der Stadt, inv. no. 1965/14, reproduced in Traeger, *Der Weg nach Walhalla*, plate IX b.]

CHAPTER FOUR

- Fig. 4.1. Albert Christoph Reindel. model drawing of Schöner Brunnen (Beautiful Fountain), ink and watercolor, 1822-23. [Michael Brix, *Nürnberg und Lübeck im 19. Jahrhundert. Denkmalpflege Stadtbildpflege Stadtumbau, Studien zur Kunst des 19. Jahrhunderts* 44 (Munich: Prestel, 1981), fig. 63.]
- Fig. 4.2 a: Gothic House, Wörlitz (probably designed by Friedrich Wilhelm von Erdmannsdorff; constructed 1773-74), with Neuer Turm (1789-90) and Rittersaal and Kabinette (1786-90 and 1811-13). [Rudiger Becksmann, “Die Glasgemälde im Gotischen Haus zu Wörlitz: zum Stand ihrer Erforschung und Edition.” *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 56/57 (2002/03): 163-180, fig. 3.]
- b. Gothic House, Wörlitz, window, Französisches Kabinett (“French Chamber”) XII, ca. 1790, with inset stained glass panels. [Becksmann, “Die Glasgemälde im Gotischen Haus zu Wörlitz,” fig. 10.]
- Fig. 4.3 a. Cathedral of St. Michael (formerly the Collegiate Church of Sts. Michael and Gudula), Brussels. Window of Charles V and Isabelle of Portugal (detail), designed by Bernard Van Orley, executed by Jean Hack (?), 1537. [Jean Helbig and Yvette Vanden Bemden. *Les vitraux de la première moitié du XVIe siècle conservés en Belgique: Brabant et Limbourg*, ed. Ministère de l'éducation nationale et de la Culture, Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi, Belgique 3 (Ledeberg : Impr. Erasmus, 1974), fig. 46.]
- b. Cathedral of St. Michael, Brussels. Window of Erard de la Marck, Prince-Bishop of Liège: *Last Judgment*, anonymous, 1528. [Helbig and Vanden Bemden. *Les vitraux de la première moitié du XVIe siècle conservés en Belgique: Brabant et Limbourg*, fig. 33.]
- c. Cathedral of St. Michael, Brussels. Window of Erard de la Marck, *Last Judgment* (detail). [Helbig and Vanden Bemden. *Les vitraux de la première moitié du XVIe siècle conservés en Belgique: Brabant et Limbourg*, fig. 37.]

- Fig. 4.4 a. Stained glass panel of Moses and the Burning Bush (above), with a self-portrait of the artist Gerlachus signing his name (inset below), from the Middle Rhine (Koblenz?), ca. 1150-60. The portrait of Gerlachus was probably transferred to this panel from another panel in the series. [Rüdiger Becksmann, *Deutsche Glasmalerei des Mittelalters. Eine exemplarische Auswahl* (Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen, 1988), plate 2 (for original arrangement of panels, see fig. 2.1).]
- b. Stained glass panel of Christ as the blossom of the Tree of Jesse, from the Middle Rhine (Koblenz?), ca. 1150-60. [Becksmann, *Deutsche Glasmalerei des Mittelalters*, plate 2.]

Fig. 4.5. Heidelberg Castle, Glockenturm (defensive tower constructed at the start of the fifteenth century; the three upper stories added in 1530 and 1681-83). [Bernd Müller, *Architekturführer Heidelberg. Bauten um 1000-2000*, Sonderveröffentlichungen des Stadtarchivs Heidelberg 10 (Mannheim: Edition Quadrat, 1998), 13.]

Fig. 4.6. Gothic tower in memory of the Wars of Liberation, Nassau, commissioned 1814; construction begun 1815; architect Christian Zais, based on the concept of patron Karl vom Stein, possibly with input from Johann Claudius von Lassaulx. [Frank Schwieger, *Johann Claudius von Lassaulx, 1781-1848. Architekt und Denkmalpfleger in Koblenz* (Neuss: Gesellschaft für Buchdruckerei, 1968), plate 47.]

Fig. 4.7. Stained glass panels of the prophets Daniel and Hosea, ca. 1100, from the nave of the Cathedral of Christ and Mary, Augsburg (the original ornamental stained glass frames were removed during the renovations of 1655-58). [Becksmann, *Deutsche Glasmalerei des Mittelalters*, plate 1.]

- Fig. 4.8 a. Cathedral of Sts. Peter and George, Bamberg, consecrated 1237. Ground plan in 1826 (on the eve of renovations under Ludwig I). [Christine Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine 'Restauration' unter König Ludwig I. von Bayern (1826-31)* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2000), fig. 3 (p. 35).]
- b. Friedrich Karl Rupprecht, exterior of Bamberg Cathedral from the northeast, 1821 (preceding renovations under Ludwig I). [Staatsbibliothek Bamberg I S 21 d, reproduced in Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom*, fig. 1 (p. 26).]
- c. Bamberg Cathedral. Interior looking east to nave and Georgenor (St. George's Choir), ca. 1672-83 (following 17th-century renovations); oil painting by Georg Adam Arnold. Diocesan Museum, Bamberg, on loan from the Bavarian National Museum. [Wikipedia commons.]
- d. J.G. Poppel and E. Gerhardt, interior of Bamberg Cathedral looking west from the Georgenor through the nave to the Peterschor (St. Peter's Choir: location of the high altar after 1835), 1837 (at the conclusion of the renovations under Ludwig I). [Christian Dümmler, *Der Bamberger*

Kaiserdum. 1000 Jahre Kunst und Geschichte (Bamberg: Fränkischer Tag, 2005), p. 60.]

- e. Bamberg Cathedral. Eastern choir (Georgenchor), northern screen: painting on the back of the wing of the Angel of the Annunciation, ca. 1200. [Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom*, fig. 12 (p. 99).]
- f. Friedrich Karl Rupprecht, paint traces on the wing of the Angel of the Annunciation on the northern screen of the eastern choir (Georgenchor), Bamberg Cathedral, 1829. Ink drawing with watercolor. [Archiv des Erzbistums Bamberg Rep. 2, Rupprecht-Zeichnungen, Mappe 2 no. 95, reproduced in Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom*, fig. 11 (p. 98).]
- g. Bamberg Cathedral. Eastern choir (Georgenchor), southern screen; eastern series of reliefs of apostle pairs with traces of paint, ca. 1200. [Dümler, *Der Bamberger Kaiserdum*, p. 65.]
- h. Rupprecht, paint traces on the southern screen of the eastern choir (Georgenchor), Bamberg Cathedral, 1829. Ink drawing with watercolor. [Archiv des Erzbistums Bamberg Rep. 2, Rupprecht-Zeichnungen, Mappe 2 no. 81, reproduced in Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom*, fig. 16 (p. 106).]
- i. Rupprecht, paint traces on lunette above easternmost apostle pair on the southern screen of the eastern choir (Georgenchor), Bamberg Cathedral, 1829. Ink drawing with watercolor. [Archiv des Erzbistums Bamberg Rep. 2, Rupprecht-Zeichnungen, Mappe 2 no. 85, reproduced in Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom*, fig. 20 (p. 107).]
- j-1. Bamberg Cathedral. South transept looking north to southern screen of western choir (Peterschor). [Dethard von Winterfeld, *Der Dom in Bamberg*, vol. 1: *Die Baugeschichte bis zur Vollendung im 13. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Gebrüder Mann, 1979), fig. 291.]
- j-2. Bamberg Cathedral. South transept, south wall. [Winterfeld, *Dom in Bamberg* 2, fig. 57.]
- k. Rupprecht, second proposal for a parish altar, Bamberg Cathedral, 1826. Wash drawing. [Renate Baumgärtel-Fleischmann with Bruno Neundorfer, Bernhard Schemmel and Walter Milutzki, *Die Altäre des Bamberger Domes von 1012 bis zur Gegenwart*, Veröffentlichungen des Diözesanmuseums Bamberg 4 (Bamberg: Bayerische Verlagsanstalt, 1987), cat. no. 104 (p. 247).]
- l. Rupprecht, second proposal for a parish altar at Bamberg Cathedral, detail of the left profile showing St. Kunigunde, 1827. [Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, *Altäre des Bamberger Domes von 1012 bis zur Gegenwart*, cat. no. 105 (p. 249).]
- m. Bamberg Cathedral. Photo of painted vaulting of apse of western choir (Peterschor) ca. 1240, as restored in the 1970s. [Dümler, *Der Bamberger Kaiserdum*, 46.]
- n. Karl Alexander Heideloff, first proposal (Dec. 1833-Jan. 1834) for high altar in western choir (Peterschor; location of high altar at this time), Bamberg Cathedral. [Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, *Altäre des Bamberger Domes von 1012 bis zur Gegenwart*, cat. no. 121.]

- o. Aachen Cathedral, pulpit of Henry II, ca. 1002-14. [Peter Lasko, *Ars Sacra 800-1200*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), fig. 174.]
- p. Heideloff, proposal (1834) for altar in eastern choir (Georgenchor; location of secondary altar at this time), Bamberg Cathedral; published in Heideloff, *Der christliche Altar archäologisch und artistisch dargestellt* (Nuremberg, 1838), plate 3. [Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, *Altäre des Bamberger Domes von 1012 bis zur Gegenwart*, 279 (cat. no. 129).]
- q. Heideloff, second proposal (1834) for high altar in western choir (Peterschor; location of high altar at this time), Bamberg Cathedral. [Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, *Altäre des Bamberger Domes von 1012 bis zur Gegenwart*, cat. no. 123.]
- r. Friedrich Panzer, rear view of completed high altar (1835-37) in eastern choir (Georgenchor, location of high altar from 1835), Bamberg Cathedral. [Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, *Altäre des Bamberger Domes von 1012 bis zur Gegenwart*, cat. no. 127.]

- Fig. 4.9 a. Cathedral of St. Peter, Worms, 1130-81 (re-opened as a parish church following the Napoleonic era; raised to the status of a Basilica minor in 1925). Ground plan. [Weigert and Hege, *Kaiserdome am Mittelrhein*, fig. 13.]
- b. Worms Cathedral. Exterior of western apse. [Weigert and Hege, *Kaiserdome am Mittelrhein*, plate 68.]
 - c. Wall painting of St. Christopher, late twelfth century, on the east wall of the north transept, by the northeast crossing pier. [dombauverein-worms.de.]
 - d. Wall paintings in Worms Cathedral as drawn by Christian Ludwig Stieglitz and published in Stieglitz, *Von altdeutscher Baukunst*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Gerhard Fleischer, 1820), [vol. 2], *XXXIV Kupfer zur Altdeutschen Baukunst von Stieglitz*, pl. 21, figs. 5-6. Caption, [vol. 1], p. 215: “Zwey Wandgemählde aus dem Dom zu Worms. Die Maria ist ein Theil eines großen meist verblichenen Gemählde an der Mauer, die männliche Figur steht allein an einem Pfeiler gemahlt.”

- Fig. 4.10 a. Cathedral of St. Peter, Regensburg, ca. 1273-ca. 1520, with later additions. Ground plan. [Hans Koepf, *Deutsche Baukunst von der Römerzeit bis zur Gegenwart* (Stuttgart: Deutscher Fachzeitschriften- und Fachbuch-Verlag, 1956), fig. 165; indication of approximate compass direction has been added to this figure.]
- b. Regensburg Cathedral. Pre-1850 photo of western façade. [Susette Raasch, *Restauration und Ausbau des Regensburger Doms im 19. Jahrhundert. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg* 14 (1980): fig. 3.]

- Fig. 4.11 a. Frauenkirche (Church of Our Lady), Munich, 1468-94 (architect Jörg Ganghofer), Munich. Ground plan. [Nussbaum, *German Gothic Church Architecture*, fig. 199; indication of approximate compass direction has been added to this figure.]

- b. Frauenkirche. Exterior from the southeast. [Nussbaum, *German Gothic Church Architecture*, fig. 200.]
- c. Peter Hemmel and workshop, Scharfzandt window, ca. 1488-93, Frauenkirche. Detail of tracery at top. [Paul Frankl, *Peter Hemmel. Glasmaler von Andlau* (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1956), plate 192.]
- d. Peter Hemmel and workshop, Scharfzandt window, Frauenkirche. Birth of Christ (central scene of a series of three vertically arranged scenes). [Frankl, *Peter Hemmel*, plate 194.]

Fig. 4.12. Jakobskirche, Regensburg. Interior, exemplifying the Byzantine style, as depicted in Justus Popp and Theodor Bülow, *Les trois âges de l'architecture gothique, représentés par des exemples choisis à Ratisbonne... ouvrage traduit de l'allemand, et accompagné des quarante-huit planches de l'édition originale et d'une planche additionnelle complétant la théorie* (Paris: Librairie de l'architecture de Bance aîné, 1841), Book 6, pl. 4.

Fig. 4.13. Ruppertkirche (formerly the parish church of the Abbey of St. Emmeram), Regensburg. Interior, exemplifying the Transitional style, as depicted in Popp and Bülow, *Les trois âges de l'architecture gothique*, Book 4, pl. 2 (detail).

Fig. 4.14 a. Karl Alexander Heideloff, *Der kleine Byzantiner. Taschenbuch des byzantinischen Baustyles zum Handgebrauch für Architekten und technische Lehranstalten* (Nuremberg: Riegel und Wiessner, 1837). Cover showing right (front): Charlemagne, and left (back): Louis the German.

- b. Heideloff, *Der kleine Byzantiner*, plate 12 b. Caption (pp. 18-19): "ein Kapitäl aus der sogenannten Kaisercapelle auf der Burg zu Nürnberg. Die grossartige Composition lässt mit Recht schliessen, dass solche der Zeit Heinrich II. (1007) angehört; so wie der Charakter übereinstimmend mit dem des Bamberger Domes ist."
- c. Nuremberg Castle, Imperial Chapel, lower chapel, eagle capital. [*Kaiserburg Nürnberg. Amtlicher Führer*, ed. Erich Bachmann and Albrecht Miller (Munich: Bayerische Verwaltung der Staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen, 1994) ill. p. 45.]
- d. Heideloff, *Der kleine Byzantiner*, plate 21. Caption (also to plate 21; p. 20): two of three images of "Kapitäl und Fries von der schönen Stiftskirche zu Limburg an der Lahn. Diese Kirche ist eines der ältesten Gebäude, die Ornamentik an derselben von höchster Vollendung."
- e. Heideloff, *Der kleine Byzantiner*, plate 28. Caption (p. 21): "a. Kragstein von der Abtey St. Denis. b. Fries, ebendaher. Die Ornamente sind feiner und zarter gehalten als gewöhnlich die, welche in Deutschland gefunden werden. Das feine Material mag dies begünstiget haben; dennoch ist der Effect der Abtey St. Denis nicht so grossartig, als der, welchen der Dom zu Bamberg hervorbringt."

- f. Heideloff, *Der kleine Byzantiner*, plate 13. Caption (also to plates 14-16; p. 19): one of four “verschiedene Muster von Kalkgemälden in den Feldern (Kappen) der Gewölbe des Peterschor im Dom zu Bamberg. Die Motive sind überaus schön gedacht und sinnreich aufgelöst und gewiss aus der Zeit Otto des Heiligen, welcher im Jahre 1108 nach einem Brande die Kirche mit Malerei verschönert haben soll. Der Verfasser hat als Restaurateur des Domes viele Spuren dieser frühern Malerei nebst Vergoldung entdeckt, deren Ornament emit denen der Sculptur ganz übereinstimmten. — Die Farbe des Plafond, von welchem unsere 4 Motive genommen sind, ist röthlicht grau gehalten, der Grund hingegen sticht ins violette; die Ornamente selbst haben einen warmen röthlichten Ton, mit Conturen von gebranntem rothen Oker.”
- g. Detail of top center quadrant of fig. 4.6 m, the painted vaulting of the apse of western choir (Peterschor) ca. 1240, Bamberg Cathedral, showing the pattern reproduced by Heideloff in fig. 4.13 f.

CHAPTER FIVE

Fig. 5.1 a. Sainte-Chapelle, Paris (1243-48; restored following damage during the French Revolution). Exterior from the southwest. [Paul Frankel, *Gothic Architecture*, revised by Paul Crossley (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2000), fig. 102.]

b. Interior view, upper chapel. [Photo: B. Didier, Wikipedia Commons.]

Fig. 5.2 a. Baptistère de Saint-Louis as published in A. B. Millin, *Antiquités nationales* (Paris, 1791), vol. 2. [D. S. Rice, *Le Baptistère de Saint Louis* (Paris: Les Éditions du Chêne, 1951), plate 1.]

b. Detail of exterior, Baptistère de Saint-Louis. [Paris, Musée du Louvre LP 16. In Esin Atıl, *Renaissance of Islam: Art of the Mamluks* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981) cat. no. 21.]

Fig. 5.3 a. Gebauer, *Friedrich Wilhelm III auf dem Pfingstberg* (1828), showing the Russian colony an Alexander Nevsky Chapel, Potsdam, in the background. Stiftung Preußische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg. [Bettina B. Altendorf, *Die russischen Sänger des Königs und die Kolonie Alexandrowka in Potsdam* (Berlin: Hendrik Bäbeler, 2004), 41.]

b. Chapel of St. Alexander Nevsky, Potsdam, 1826-28 (dedicated Sept. 11. 1829), photo of exterior ca. 2004. [Altendorf, *Die russischen Sänger des Königs*, 118.]

Fig. 5.4. St. Salvator, Munich, 1493-94. Interior as restored by Leo von Klenze, 1828-30. [Nerdinger, *Leo von Klenze. Architekt*, fig. 128.2.]

- Fig. 5.5 a-1. Ludwigskirche, Munich, architect Friedrich von Gärtner. Commissioned 1828; ground stone laid Aug. 25, 1829; Cornelius's frescoes completed June 1836-40; Schwarzmann completes Gärtner's designs for the ornamental frescoes in 1841; dedicated Sept. 8, 1844. Ground plan indicating pavement design. [Winfried Nerdinger, ed., *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben 1791-1847, mit den Briefen an Johann Martin von Wagner* (Munich: Klinkhardt und Biermann, 1992), 266, detail.]
- a-2. Ludwigskirche. Groundplan. [Georg Dehio, *Handbuch der deutschen Kunstdenkmäler. München*, rev. Ernst Götz, Heinrich Habel, Karlheinz Hemmeyer and Friedrich Kobler (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1996), 65.]
- b. Ludwigskirche. Western façade from the southwest. Photo, Kinold, 1992. [Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 94.]
- c. Ludwigskirche. Western façade, close-up of central section with main entrances. [Photo, Kinold, 1992. Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 133 (detail).]
- d. Albert Emil Kirchner, watercolor of western façade of Ludwigskirche from the northwest, on the feast day of St. Louis(?), 1843. [Stiftung Staatlicher Schlösser und Gärten, Potsdam-Sanssouci, Aquarell-Sammlung, inv. no. 1561. Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 12.]
- e. Ludwigskirche. Exterior from the southeast. [Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 226, top.]
- f. Ludwigskirche. Interior looking east to choir. [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, fig. 55.]
- g. Peter Cornelius, *Last Judgment*, ca. 1835-40. Fresco on the eastern wall of the choir, Ludwigskirche. [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, fig. 56.]
- h-1. Michelangelo, *Last Judgment*, 1535-41. Fresco, Sistine Chapel, Vatican. [Carlo Pietrangeli, ed., *Paintings in the Vatican*, trans. Frank Dabell with Alexandra Bonfante-Warren (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1996), plate 366.]
- h-2. Coppo die Marcovaldo (attributed). *Last Judgment* (detail), second half of the thirteenth century. Mosaic, Baptistery of Florence, dome. [Frederick Hartt, *History of Italian Renaissance Art: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture*, 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall; New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994), plate 19 (detail).]
- i.1. Peter Cornelius, *Adoration of the Magi and Shepherds, or Theotokos*, ca. 1835-40., ca. 1835-40. Fresco on the north wall of the northern transept, Ludwigskirche. [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, fig. 65.]
- i.2. Allerheiligenhofkirche, Munich. Remains of the glazing installed in 1836 as photographed *in situ* in 1985. [Vaassen, "Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechische Kapelle auf dem Neroberg in Wiesbaden und zu weiteren ornamentalen Verglasungen der Glasmalereianstalt des bayerischen Königs Ludwig I. in München," *Kunst in Hessen und am Mittelrhein* 30 (1990): fig. 5.]

- i.3. Allerheiligenhofkirche. Remains of glazing installed in 1836, detail. [Vaassen, “Zur ehemaligen Verglasung der griechische Kapelle auf dem Neroberg in Wiesbaden, fig. 6.]
- j. Ludwigskirche. Preliminary sketch, façade, 1828. Pencil and wash. [Technische Universität München, Gärtner-Sammlung 1, 27, reproduced in Frank Büttner in München, “*Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, 3rd ser., 35 (1984): fig. 11.]
- k.1. Cathedral of Orvieto, façade (begun 1310), designed by Lorenzo Maitani and others. [Wikipedia Commons].
- k.2 Cathedral of Siena, façade (1284-99), designed by Giovanni Pisano and others. [James Snyder, *Medieval Art: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture 4th-14th Century* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1988), fig. 596.]
- l. Ludwigskirche. Preliminary sketch, ground plan. prob. late 1828. Pencil and wash. [Technische Universität München, Gärtner-Sammlung 1, 26, recto, reproduced in Büttner, “Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche,“ fig. 8.]
- m. Ludwigskirche. Preliminary sketch, west façade, Jan. 1829, Pencil and watercolor. [Münchner Stadtmuseum, Meillinger-Sammlung 11, 1183. Büttner, “Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche,“ fig. 7.]
- n. Ludwigskirche. Preliminary sketch, section, Jan. 1829, “barrel-vault plan.” [Architektursammlung, Technische Universität München, reproduced in Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, fig. 53].
- o. Ludwigskirche. Preliminary sketch, section with groin-vaulted nave and domed crossing (which still assumes Cornelius’s full-scale fresco program), Feb. 1829. [Büttner, *Peter Cornelius. Fresken*, vol. 2, fig. 54.]
- p. Ludwigskirche. Final plan (apparently that approved by Ludwig in May, 1829), ground plan and section. Lithograph published on the occasion of the ground-stone-laying ceremony, August 25, 1829. [Technische Universität München, Gärtner-Sammlung, from the lithographs of Anton Mühe, Gärtner’s construction manager, iv, 424, reproduced in Büttner, “Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche,“ fig. 4.]
- q. Ludwigskirche. Final plan, west façade. Lithograph published on the occasion of the ground-stone-laying ceremony (this page with a hand-written note “zum Gedenken an den 25ten August 1829”). [Technische Universität München, Gärtner-Sammlung, from the lithographs of Anton Mühe, Gärtner’s construction manager, iv, 425, reproduced in Büttner, “Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche,“ fig. 5.]
- r. Ludwigskirche. Addendum to final plan: west façade with flanking towers added and more elaborate tracery in the rose window, 1830. Ink on transparent paper. [Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, Print Collection, inv. FP 14444, reproduced in Büttner, “Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche,“ fig. 19.]
- s. Friedrich von Gärtner, undated studies of floral ornament. Pencil and watercolor. [Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität München, Gärtner-Sammlung 223 and 224, reproduced in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 192.]

- t. Friedrich von Gärtner, undated study of painted vault ornament. Pencil and watercolor. [Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität München, Gärtner-Sammlung 219, reproduced in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 193.]
- u-1. Ludwigskirche. Preliminary watercolor of the view from the eastern end of the south aisle, looking across the nave to a chapel in the north aisle (left), to the ambo (center) and the crossing (right), with ornamental frescoes by Joseph Schwarzmann, absent Peter Cornelius's figural frescoes. [Münchner Stadtmuseum, inv. no. Z 805, reproduced in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 122].
- u-2. Frontispiece of Ilkhanid Qur'an, dated 1313. Cairo, National Library, 72, pt. 23, ff. 11v-21. [Baer, *Islamic Ornament*, fig. 102.]
- u-3. Bookbinding, Köprülü, 1311, Baghdad, 1205. Leather. Istanbul. Suleimaniye Library. [Ettinghausen and Grabar, *Art and Architecture of Islam*, fig. 354.]
- v. Ludwigskirche. View of the south aisle from its western end, looking east, with ornamental frescoes by Schwarzmann and figural frescoes by Cornelius. [Photo, Curran, 1991, reproduced in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 196].
- w. Ludwigskirche. View through crossing to north wall of north transept, with ornamental frescoes by Schwarzmann and figural frescoes by Cornelius. [Photo, Curran, 1991, reproduced in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 199.]
- x-1. John Gregory Crace, south wall of south transept, Ludwigskirche, Munich, 1843. Watercolor. [Royal Institute of British Architects, London, reproduced in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 198.]
- x-2: Qur'an stand elaborately carved with arabesques, ca. 1278-79, Konya. [Baer, *Islamic Ornament* fig. 22.]
- x-3. Illuminated frontispiece from Kalila wa Dimna, Herat, October 1429, showing traditional tripartite division with (inscribed) elongated medallions in the narrow rectangular side panels flanking a central medallion. [Baer, *Islamic Ornament*, plate H.]
- y. John Gregory Crace, ornamental frescoes at the springing of the ribbing of a groin vault, Ludwigskirche, Munich, 1843. Watercolor. [Royal Institute of British Architects, London, reproduced in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 197.]
- z. "Gärtner as Triumphantor." Caricature of Gärtner at ground-stone-laying ceremony for Ludwigskirche. [Munich. Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität München, Gärtner-Sammlung 1.29, reproduced in Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 314.]

Fig. 5.6 a. St. Michael's Church (*Jesuitenkirche St. Michael*), Munich, designed by Friedrich Sustris and Wendel Dietrich with Wolfgang Miller, 1583-97; renovations to the facade, chapels and transept windows, 1697. Built for Munich's Jesuit college and as a burial church for the Wittelsbachs;

- following the dissolution of the Jesuit order in 1773 a Wittelsbach court church; since 1921 again a Jesuit church. Ground plan (final plan as built). Upper half of plan shows ground level; lower half of plan shows vaulting. Engraved by François Cuvilliers the Younger in 1770 after a drawing from ca. 1700. [Smith, *Sensuous Worship*, fig. 32 (compass direction added).]
- b. St. Michael's, Munich. Southern (entrance) façade, pre-1944. [Jeffrey Chipps Smith, *Sensuous Worship: Jesuits and the Art of the Early Catholic Reformation in Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), fig. 36.]
- c. St. Michael's, Munich. Interior looking north to choir, pre-1944 photograph. [Smith, *Sensuous Worship*, fig. 37.]

Fig. 5.7 a. Gesù, Rome, ground plan and longitudinal section. [Wolfgang Lotz, rev. Deborah Howard, *Architecture in Italy 1500-1600* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), fig. 179.]

- b. Gesù, interior to choir. [Smith, *Sensuous Worship*, fig. 42.]

Fig. 5.8 a. Friedrich von Gärtner, proposal for the Mariahilfkirche, Au (a suburb just southeast of Munich), 1827. Ground plan. [Büttner, "Planungsgeschichte der Ludwigskirche," fig. 8.]

- b. Gärtner, proposal for the Mariahilfkirche, façade, 1827. [Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität München, Gärtner-Sammlung 1.4. Nerdinger, *Friedrich von Gärtner. Ein Architektenleben*, 222.]

- c. Daniel Joseph Ohlmüller, preparatory sketch for the Mariahilfkirche, Au, ca. 1830. Ink and watercolor. [Winfried Nerdinger, ed., with Antonia Gruhn-Zimmermann, *Romantik und Restauration. Architektur in Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I. 1825-1848* (Munich: Hugendubel, 1987), 217 (cat. no. 49.6).]

Fig. 5.9. Arena Chapel (Cappella Scrovegni), Padua. Interior with frescoes (ca. 1305-06) by Giotto (ca. 1267-1337). [Fred S. Kleiner and Christin J. Mamiya, *Gardner's Art through the Ages*, 12th ed. (Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2005), fig. 19-8.]

CHAPTER SIX

Fig. 6.1 a. Theophil Hansen, design for a cathedral in Athens. [Margit Bendtsen, *Sketches and Measurements: Danish Architects in Greece 1818-1862* (Copenhagen: Aarhus University Press, 1993), 317, left column.]

- b. Theophil Hansen, Demetrios Zazos, and François-Louis-Florimond Boulanger, architects. Annunciation Cathedral, Athens, 1861 (with the small Panagía Gorgoëpikoos, ca. 1180-1204, to the right). [Detail of Eleni Bastéa, *The Creation of Modern Athens: Planning the Myth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), fig. 54.]

Fig. 6.2. Byzantine Chapel at Possenhofen Palace, attributed to Daniel Ohlmüller, architect, ca. 1834-39 [i.e., between purchase of the site by Duke Maximilian Joseph in Bavaria (*Herzog Maximilian Joseph in Bayern*, 1808-88) in 1834 and death of Ohlmüller in 1839]. Façade, photographed in 1900. [Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 65 (detail).]

Fig. 6.3 a. Hauptbrunnhaus (main spring house of the saltworks) with Brunnenkapelle, Bad Reichenhall, design attributed to Daniel Ohlmüller, architect, ca. 1834-39 [i.e., between the fire that destroyed Bad Reichenhall in 1834 and the death of Ohlmüller in 1839]; chapel completed in 1844 and dedicated in 1851. Plan showing upper story of Hauptbrunnhaus connecting with Brunnenkapelle. [Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 89.5 (detail).]

b. Hauptbrunnhaus with Brunnenkapelle, attrib. Ohlmüller. Section showing façade of Brunnenkapelle behind and rising above that of the Hauptbrunnhaus. [Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 89.2.]

c. Brunnenkapelle, attrib. Ohlmüller. Side view of Brunnenkapelle with transverse section of Hauptbrunnhaus and supply to the water system (detail). [Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 89.4 (detail).]

d.1. Brunnenkapelle, attrib. Ohlmüller. Interior to choir. [Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, 89.6.]

d.2. Brunnenkapelle, glazing of choir windows. [Vaassen, “Zur ehemaligen Verglasung,” fig. 3.]

e. Brunnenkapelle, glazing of nave windows. [Vaassen, “Zur ehemaligen Verglasung,” fig. 7.]

f. Brunnenkapelle, glazing of nave windows. [Vaassen, “Zur ehemaligen Verglasung,” fig. 8.]

Fig. 6.4 a. Auguste Ricard Montferrand, architect. Cathedral of St. Isaac of Dalmatia, St. Petersburg, Russia (1818-58). Plan. [Brumfield, *History of Russian Architecture*, fig. 532.]

b. Montferrand, St. Isaac’s, exterior, south view. [Brumfield, *History of Russian Architecture*, fig. 533.]

c.1. Montferrand, St. Isaac’s, interior to the east. [Wikipedia Commons, by permission.]

c.2. Montferrand, Holy Gates of the iconostasis at St. Isaac’s, opened to view of stained glass window of the Ascension of Christ by the Royal Glass Institute, Munich (installed 1843). [Wikipedia Commons, by permission.]

Fig. 6.5 a. Konstantine Ton, architect. Church of Christ the Savior, Moscow (1832; 1839-83; consecrated in 1889; razed in 1931). Plan. [Brumfield, *History of Russian Architecture*, fig. 529.]

b. Ton, Christ the Savior, Moscow. West façade, ca. 1890. [Brumfield, *History of Russian Architecture*, fig. 528, T. A. Slavina, *Konstantin Ton* (Leningrad, 1989), 118.]

- c. Ton, Church of Christ the Savior, Moscow. Interior to east. [Slavina, *Konstantin Ton*, 119.]

Fig. 6.6 a. Philipp Hoffmann, Russian-Orthodox Church of St. Elizabeth, traditionally termed the “Griechische Kapelle,” Wiesbaden (1847-55). Photo of western façade taken between 1890 and 1905. [Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Photochrom Prints Collection, reproduction number LC-DIG-ppmsca-00641. "Images in this collection are considered to be in the public domain."]

- b. Hoffmann, Griechische Kapelle, Wiesbaden. Panels from the original glazing, installed 1854. [Vaassen, “Zur ehemaligen Verglasung,” fig. 1.]

Fig. 6.7. Philipp Hoffmann, architect: synagogue, Wiesbaden, c. 1870. [Ursula Woeckel, “Pilipp Hoffmann. Über Persönlichkeit, Lebensweg und Werk,” in *Philipp Hoffmann 1806-1889. Ein nassauischer Baumeister*, ed. Paulgerd Jesberg (Wiesbaden: NOBEL, 1982), fig. 10.]

Fig. 6.8 a. Façade of the mihrab added in 961-76 to the Great Mosque at Cordova, as illustrated in James Cavanah Murphy, *The Arabian Antiquities of Spain*, edited with descriptions by T. H. Horne (London: Cadell and Davies, 1815), plate 6.

- b. Puerta del Vino at the Alhambra, as illustrated in Murphy, *Arabian Antiquities of Spain*, plate 18.

c. Hypostyle hall of the Great Mosque at Cordova, as illustrated in Murphy, *Arabian Antiquities of Spain*, plate 5.

Fig. 6.9 a. Ingenheim synagogue, Friedrich von Gärtner and August von Voit, 1830-32. Gärtner, preliminary study for façade. [Nerdinger, *Romantik und Restauration*, fig. 73.1.]

- b. Ingenheim synagogue, plan for entrance and side facades, ground plan, and interior elevation. [*Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 107 top.].

c. Ingenheim synagogue, exterior from the southwest, photo, pre-1938. [*Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 106.].

- d. Ingenheim synagogue, interior to the east, photo, pre-1938. [*Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 107, bottom.].

Fig. 6.10 a. Kirchheimbolanden, synagogue, August von Voit, architect, 1835-36. Undated and unsigned plan. [*Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 208, bottom.].

- b. Kirchheimbolanden, synagogue, photo taken in 1924. [*Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 209, top left.].

Fig. 6.11 a. Speyer synagogue. August von Voit, architect, 1836-37. Exterior from southwest, photo, pre-1938. [*Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 353.].

- b. Speyer synagogue, interior, eastern wall, photo, pre-1938. [*Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 355 top left.]
- c. Speyer synagogue, stained glass window, August von Voit, 1837. [*Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 21.]

Fig. 6.12. Ingelheim am Rhein, synagogue (1840). Photo of the eastern wall taken after the 1892 renovation. [*Synagogen Rheinland-Pfalz — Saarland*, 195.]

- Fig. 6.13 a. Albert Rosengarten, architect, synagogue, Kassel (completed in 1839). Plan. [Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, fig. 86.]
- b. Rosengarten, Kassel synagogue, façade from the southwest. [Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, fig. 84.]
 - c. Rosengarten, Kassel synagogue, interior to the east. [Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, fig. 85.]

- Fig. 6.14 a. Dresden, synagogue, Gottfried Semper, architect; completed in 1840. Plan. [Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, fig. 104.]
- b. Dresden, synagogue. West façade. [Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, fig. 102.]
 - c. Dresden, synagogue. Longitudinal section. [Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, fig. 103.]
 - d. Dresden, synagogue. Photo of interior to the northeast. [Carol Herselle Krinsky, *Synagogues of Europe* (New York: Architectural History Foundation; Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985), fig. 130.]

- Fig. 6.15 a. Synagogue, Mannheim, Ludwig Lendorff and Heinrich Lang, architects (1851-55). Façade from the northwest. [Franz-Josef Ziwes, ed., *Badische Synagogen aus der Zeit von Großherzog Friedrich I. in zeitgenössischen Photographien* (Karlsruhe: G. Braun, 1997), 71.]
- b. Synagogue, Mannheim, interior to east. [Ziwes, ed., *Badische Synagogen*, 73.]

- Fig. 6.16 a. Synagogue, Heidenheim (Middle Franconia), architect Friedrich Bürklein, 1849-50. Exterior view, published in *Allgemeine Bauzeitung*. [Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, fig. 185.]
- b. Synagogue, Heidenheim, interior elevation. [Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland*, fig. 186.]