

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 Nerding, *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 Neuschwander, "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.