

PAESTUM IMAGERY IN EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE

CHRISTIANE KUNST*

Abstract.-

The history of the reception of Paestum demonstrates to what extent the viewing and understanding of ancient monuments depends on the concepts for interpretation an academic community is providing. However, the reception of ancient monuments creates processes of adoption, which become entirely independent of the monuments themselves. Thus, the past frames the present, but the present alienates at the same time the perception of the past: the historical Greeks were transformed into an ideal people, a people whom Wilhelm von Humboldt wanted to educate the German mind. In consequence, historical studies cannot impart the absolute truth about the past, but rather reflect to a high degree the attempt to come to terms with the present.

Zusammenfassung.-

Die Geschichte der Rezeption der Tempel von Paestum zeigt, wie sehr das Sehen und Verstehen antiker Monumente von der Form und Gestalt sowie der Idee abhängen, die eine "scientific community" ihnen verleihen. Andererseits entstehen im Verlauf der Rezeption Aneignungsprozesse, die sich völlig verselbständigen können, wie die architektonische Umsetzung der dorischen Tempel als europäische Grundidee verdeutlicht. Damit wird die Vergangenheit zum Gestalter der Gegenwart, aber die Gegenwart verfremdet gleichzeitig die Wahrnehmung der Vergangenheit, und so werden aus den historischen Griechen die Idealmenschen, an denen noch Wilhelm von Humboldt den deutschen Geist geschult wissen wollte. Die historische Wissenschaft kann keine absoluten Wahrheiten der Vergangenheit vermitteln, sie ist vielmehr als Versuch anzusehen, die eigene Gegenwart in Perspektive zu setzen.

Key Words: Paestum, Architecture, Winckelmann, Doric Order.

Schlüsselbegriffe: Paestum, Architecture, Winckelmann, Dorische Ordnung

Genuine ancient Greek architecture became the focus of European art and scholarship as late as the 18th century. Ancient architecture in general was encapsulated in Roman architecture because of the underlying belief that it had absorbed and improved the older Greek style. Nevertheless, from the second half of the 18th century on ideas and conceptions of Greek architecture were disseminating all over the continent and became a source of varying imagery.

* Postdam Universität, Historisches Institut, Geschichte des Altertums. kunst@rz.uni-potsdam.de

The 18th century discovery of the Greek initiated another European Renaissance of antiquity. Its impact not only shaped the urban topographies of the following century in Europe, but also significantly influenced the style of American architecture from 1820 onwards¹. Remarkably, the Greek was not discovered in Greece, nor excavated there or elsewhere. The grand remains of so-called Magna Graecia were standing in plain sight in Southern Italy and Sicily, but had been ignored almost completely during earlier phases of the discovery of antiquity. Monuments belonging to this group of remains were the temples of Paestum (Poseidonia), dating to the 6th century BC², which were allegedly rediscovered all of a sudden around the middle of the 18th century (fig. 1).

This paper will analyse the conditions that created the widespread interest in the archaic architecture of Paestum, which had been disregarded such a long time. It will further discuss how focussing on Paestum completely reshaped the concepts regarding ancient architecture. Further, it will demonstrate how Paestum imagery was employed as semiotic system, telling a story of antiquity which had little to do with the real world of the past, but rather expressed contemporary concerns. The first part deals with the validity of the story of the “discovery” of Paestum and the ways in which the “new” knowledge was spread. In this context the role of Johann Joachim Winckelmann deserves a closer look, because he marked out all areas of the ensuing discussion and acted as an important circulator of knowledge of Paestum. In the second part I will concentrate on the architectural implementation and the redefinition of the Doric order, focussing on Germany as a case study.

When the ruins of Paestum entered the cultural awareness of Europe in the second half of the 18th century, the earlier non-observance appeared to the contemporaries extraordinary, especially given the sheer magnitude of the ruins. Accordingly, a legend telling the tale of their discovery was designed. This appeared for example in 1764 in a French travel-report written by the lawyer Pierre-Jean Grosley. Grosley tells the story of a painter’s apprentice from Naples, who had come across the temples while wandering around the region ten years earlier (ca. 1755). After having listened to his protégé’s enthusiastic report, the young man’s principal immediately hastened to Paestum. On the site he produced the first drawings of the temples, which were presented to the King of Naples, Charles III, who in turn ordered to clear the ruins from rubble³. This legend of discovery, which also found its way into the Brockhaus

¹ Kennedy, R. G., *Greek Revival America*, New York 1989.

² Mertens, D., *Der alte Heratempel in Paestum und die archaische Baukunst in Unteritalien*, Mainz 1993.

³ Lutz, Th., *Die Wiederentdeckung der Tempel von Paestum. Ihre Wirkung auf die Architektur und Architekturtheorie besonders in Deutschland*, Diss (1986) Freiburg 1991, 28ff.; Raspi Serra, J., *La fortuna di Paestum e la memoria moderna del dorico 1750-1830*, New York-Salerno-Rome 1986; Raspi Serra, J (ed.) *Paestum idea e immagine*, Modena 1990.

encyclopaedia of 1837, documents the efforts to rationalize the previous lack of interest by pretending Paestum had been hitherto unknown and had to be discovered like Pompeii, Herculaneum or Tarquinia.

Nevertheless, the temples were definitely known before 1755, without being imbued with any significance whatsoever. As early as 1740 the architect Ferdinando Sanfelice suggested to the king breaking up the ruins and reusing the blocks for construction work of the castle at Capodimonte⁴. Academic circles in Naples knew about Paestum at the latest from the first quarter of the 16th century onwards⁵. News of the temples circulated in print in various local history books. In the early 18th century interest deepened when the region of Naples became the target of an antiquity-fever after the discovery of Herculaneum in 1711. The count Felice Gazzola, commander of the artillery at Naples, initiated a kind of working group in 1746 in order to collect news on the temples, calibrate the ruins and prepare a publication of engravings⁶. Erudite correspondence disseminated further knowledge, reaching Rome and the French students of architecture holding a scholarship for the renowned Prix du Rome at the latest during the forties of the 18th century. Among them was Jacques-Germain Soufflot, who became famous at the court of Louis XV and who had visited Paestum as early as 1750, delivering a report to the academy at Lyon⁷. English travellers visited Paestum in the early fifties.⁸ While visits to Paestum increased only gradually before 1755, we are faced with a precipitate rise in numbers after 1760.

A driving force behind the European Paestum-tourism was Winckelmann's description of the ruins in his 1760 "Vorbericht" (Prereport) of the "Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten" (Remarks on the Architecture of the Ancients), which was eventually published in 1762 in Leipzig. This was the first attempt of providing a set of reliable data about the three Doric temples in print⁹.

⁴ Mustilli, D., "Prime Memorie di Paestum", in: *Studi in onore di Riccardo Filangieri III*, Neapel 1959, 105-121, 120.

⁵ Mustilli, "Prime Memorie..."; Laveglia, P., "Paestum dalla decadenza alla riscoperta fino al 1860" in: *Scritti in memoria di Leopoldo Cassese II*, Naples 1971, 181-276. Winckelmann testifies before the publication various contacts with antiquarian scholars from Naples, who knew about the temples.

⁶ D'Henry, G., "Operazioni di restauro e valorizzazione, e norme di tutela dell'area archeologica di Paestum", in: Raspi Serra, *Paestum...*, 140; Arnold, D., "Count Gazzola and the Temples at Paestum. An Influential Grand Tour Guide": *Apollo* 136, 1992, No. 366, 95-99.

⁷ Lecture to the academy of Lyon, quoted from Raspi Sera, *La fortuna...*, I, Nr. 21. Soufflot was also involved with one of the first publications by Gabriel Pierre Martin Dumont 1764 (see D'Henry, "Operazioni di restauro...").

⁸ Lutz, *Die Wiederentdeckung...*, 43-44. One of them was Lord North of Wroxton 1753.

⁹ Lutz, *Die Wiederentdeckung...*, 41.

Right after his own visit to Paestum, Winckelmann had started to send letters full of admiration and enthusiasm from Rome to the erudite community: *das Erstaunendste und Liebste, das Ehrwürdigste aus dem ganzen Altertum*¹⁰.

His history of ancient art, first published in 1764, deeply influenced contemporary views of the superiority of Greek art. It was translated into French as early as 1766, followed by Italian (1779 and 1783/84) and English (1850).

The popularity of Paestum on the basis of the study of Winckelmann is also reflected by the flood of engravings published from 1764 onwards. After the first publication by Gabriel Pierre Martin Dumont in 1764, six volumes with plates devoted entirely to Paestum appeared in nine different editions¹¹. As frame of reference it is useful to focus on the fact that only one publication provided illustrations of the Doric buildings from mainland Greece between 1758 and 1788 - Julien-David Le Roys' work "Les Ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce" (1758)¹². The introduction of mechanical reproduction techniques accelerated the spread of knowledge on Paestum¹³. The site became an indispensable part of the grand tour or any other type of educational voyage and was thus essential to all kind of travel literature¹⁴. As a result of this, architectural models made from cork found their way over the Alps to Germany, Sweden, England and France¹⁵. For quite a long time they remained the only examples of Greek architecture in the popular cabinets of curiosities of European celebrities.

Winckelmann's visit to Paestum was presumably so influential because the antiquarian provided a model of interpretation based on his own transfiguration of the ancient Greeks. In his early writings, composed in Dresden, Winckelmann had already presented the foundations of his view on the Greeks. He deemed them to be ideal, lost in reverie concerning time and space. To Winckelmann they appeared as guardians of "guter Geschmack" (taste) and creators of an ideal art focussed on beauty¹⁶. Elements of these aesthetics were "the beautiful" as a result of Greek customs

¹⁰ Letter to Maurizio Bianconi 13th May 1758 in: Rehm, W./ Diepolder, H. (ed.) (1952-1957): *Johann Joachim Winckelmann Briefe*, I (1742-59), Berlin 1959, 430.

¹¹ Lang, S., "The Early Publications of the Temples at Paestum", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 13, 1950, 48-64.; LUTZ, 1991, 27; for a review of Dumont see 59ff.

¹² Stuart Revett's *Antiquities of Athens* published in 1762 contained no illustrations of the Parthenon temple.

¹³ Arnold, D., "Facts or Fragments? Visual Histories in the age of mechanical reproduction", in: Arnold, D.- Bending, S. (eds.), *Tracing Architecture: The Aesthetics of Antiquarianism*, Oxford 2003, 30-48.

¹⁴ Lutz, *Die Wiederentdeckung...*, 46ff. with the report of Pierre-Jean Grosley (1764).

¹⁵ Andrae, B., "Die Tempel von Paestum. Korkmodelle aus der Zeit des Klassizismus", in: *Malerei für die Ewigkeit. Die Gräber von Paestum*, exhibition catalogue from the Bucerius Kunst Forum Hamburg, München 2007.

¹⁶ Winckelmann, J.-J., *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (1764), Winckelmanns Werke in einem Band, Berlin-Weimar 1986, 188.

which were adapted to the mild climate, especially the public exposure of the naked male body, which he considered to be part of the natural, beautiful, and sublime. Further, he assumed that the beautiful as such was a result of Greek freedom. In continuation he presented the Greeks as holistic and their culture accordingly as antithesis to contemporary civilization¹⁷.

Indirectly Winckelmann assigned the temples of Paestum to the time of democratic Athens, that is to the 5th century BC. He had no idea how a Greek temple functioned and he was probably not even interested in this question, but rather relied on his sentiment. Accordingly, to name but one example, he identified the eldest of the temples – the so-called temple of Hera (fig. 2) – as a public building (a basilica or a gymnasium) on the grounds that it was missing the “religiöse Geist“ (religious spirit). Following Winckelmann, the so-called basilica was dated to the Hellenistic period. To him the Hera II-temple (fig. 3) was truly outstanding, which led him to the conviction that it must be the temple of Poseidon, relying on the assumption that the place name (Poseidonia) must have derived from the most important divinity. He considered this temple to be the link to the ideal people, the Greeks, who therein represented themselves in their originality and uniqueness.

Winckelmann’s interpretation laid the foundation of the practice of viewing the Doric temple as archetype of all architecture. Scholars were still searching for the prototype of architecture¹⁸ and the Doric temple began to replace the older archetype, the “primitive hut”, which had been favoured by the baroque architects on the basis of reading Vitruvius. Le Corbusier wrote in 1922 about the Parthenon: “*Die Formen sind so völlig losgelöst von den Erscheinungen der Natur ..., sie sind so trefflich ausstudiert auf die Ansprüche, die Sonne und Baustoffe stellen, dass es aussieht, als wären sie durch die Natur selbst dem Himmel und der Erde verbunden. Hier haben wir für unser Auffassungsvermögen eine ebenso naturgegebene Tatsache wie die Tatsache ‘Meer’ oder die Tatsache ‘Gebirge’*”¹⁹.

Winckelmann arrived at his assessment of Paestum by no means from examining the temples themselves. When he travelled in May 1758 from Rome to Paestum, his judgement of Greece, which he admittedly never visited himself²⁰, was already formed. The famous dictum characterizing Greek art as product of “edle Einfalt und stille

¹⁷ Demandt, A., “Winckelmann und die Alte Geschichte“ (1982/1986), in: Demandt, A., *Geschichte der Geschichte. Wissenschaftshistorische Essays*, Köln 1997, 119-133; Sünderhauf, E.S., *Griechensehnsucht und Kulturkritik. Die deutsche Rezeption von Winckelmanns Antikenideal 1840-1945*, Berlin 2004, 84ff.

¹⁸ Rykwert, J., *On Adam’s House in Paradise. The Idea of the primitive Hut in Architectural History*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA 1981.

¹⁹ Le Corbusier, *Ausblick auf eine Architektur (Vers une architecture 1922)*, Braunschweig 1982, 155.

²⁰ Butler, E.M., *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany*, Boston 1958, 34-35 on offers to go there.

Größe” (noble simplicity and quiet grandeur) was written in Dresden. However, it did not derive, as often claimed, from studying the famous Saxon collection of antiquities, which he hardly knew²¹, but from studying Greek literature and contemporary illustrations.

The fundamental importance of Roman literature to Winckelmann’s reception of Greece and the Greeks has hitherto not been studied. I would go so far as to suggest Winckelmann’s idea of the superiority of Greek art was mediated by the Roman classicism of the early Empire. His perception of the Greek temple as embodiment of naturalness, simplicity and originality, deriving from the proportions of the human body, originated in antiquity. To Vitruvius the Doric temple symbolized male *puissance*. On the development of the order of columns he notes: “Thus the Doric order obtained its proportion, its strength, and its beauty from the human figure²²”. Vitruvius considered the Doric column a representation of the unadorned male character – the naked male body (Vitr. 4, 1, 7). Winckelmann enthusiastically adopted this view and circulated the Vitruvian image of the Greek temple: depicting the Doric capital as a swelling muscle, which powerfully carries the weight placed on it. This image is particularly recognizable in the bulky columns at Paestum. The influence of this body orientated concept of looking at Greek temples is still evident in modern scholarship. Gottfried Gruben, professor of History of Architecture at the TU Munich, wrote in his 2001 revised text book “Griechische Tempel und Heiligtümer”: *Die griechische Plastik ist denn auch der Schlüssel, ihre Gesetze sind zugleich die dieser Architektur [of the temples], einer plastischen, einer körperhaften Architektur, die aus dichten greifbaren Gliedern, aus Quadern, Säulen und Balken gefügt ist, in der sicheres Stehen, Tragen und Lasten ein organisches Ganzes ausmachen, in der nicht das Hohle, das Räumliche, sondern das Substanzielle, fest Umrissene, eben das Plastische geformt ist*²³.

Contemporary travel literature from the 18th century provides the main evidence for the process of adopting Winckelmann’s perspectives all over Europe. The descriptions of Paestum, however, contain almost repetitive and bland expressions of appreciation²⁴. The authors’ discomfort with what they had seen on the site of Paestum is quite apparent. They turn to standardised expressions to evade their own feelings: “*bewunderungswürdig; Majestät, edle Simplizität, das Ehrfurcht erregt; hoher Charakter erhabener Einfalt; einfache Erhabenheit*”²⁵ The sober voice of the British

²¹ Zimmermann, K. (ed.), *Die Dresdener Antiken und Winckelmann*, Berlin 1977 (Schriften der Winckelmann-Gesellschaft 4) see especially the contributions by H. Protzmann and K. Zimmermann.

²² Vitr. 4,1,6: *ita dorica columna virilis corporis proportionem et firmitatem et venustatem in aedificiis praestare coepit*

²³ Gruben, G., *Griechische Tempel und Heiligtümer* (1966), 5th comp. rev. ed. Darmstadt 2001, 8.

²⁴ Lutz, *Die Wiederentdeckung...*, 54.

²⁵ Lutz, *Die Wiederentdeckung...*, 51/ 134.

architect James Adam about Paestum (1761) characterizes quite well his view on the general ecstasy: “the famous antiquities so much talked of of late as wonders but with curiosity apart, don’t merit half the time the trouble they have cost me. They are an early unenriched Doric and scarcely provide two good views, so much for Paestum”²⁶. The travel books attest the conflict between what people did see and what they expected or wanted to see. Winckelmann’s ideas of the Greeks did not really work for Paestum. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, who travelled to Paestum in 1787²⁷, wrote in his diary, later published as *Italian Journey*, for the 23rd March 1787: “*Von einem Landmann ließ ich mich indessen herumführen; der erste Eindruck konnte nur Erstaunen erregen. Ich befand mich in einer völlig fremden Welt. Denn wie die Jahrhunderte sich aus dem Ernsten in das Gefällige bilden, so bilden sie den Menschen mit, ja sie erzeugen ihn so. Nun sind unsere Augen und durch sie unser ganzes inneres Wesen an schlankere Baukunst hinangetrieben und entschieden bestimmt, so daß uns diese stumpfen, kegelförmigen, enggedrängten Säulenmassen lästig, ja furchtbar erscheinen. Doch nahm ich mich bald zusammen, erinnerte mich der Kunstgeschichte, gedachte der Zeit, deren Geist eine solche Bauart gemäß fand, vergegenwärtigte mir den strengen Stil der Plastik, und in weniger als einer Stunde fühlte ich mich befreundet, ja ich pries den Genius, daß er mich diese so wohlerhaltenen Reste mit Augen sehen ließ, da sich von ihnen durch Abbildung kein Begriff geben läßt. Denn im architektonischen Aufriß erscheinen sie eleganter, in perspektivischer Darstellung plumper als sie sind; nur wenn man sich um sie her, durch sie durch bewegt, theilt man ihnen das eigentliche Leben mit; man fühlt es wieder aus ihnen heraus, welches der Baumeister beabsichtigte ja hineinschuf*”.

Goethe’s description does not reflect a widespread acceptance of the Doric order, but how he himself acquired an appreciation of Paestum by a rational process. Goethe rather bears witness of the uneasiness, which the experience of Paestum created and which is equally apparent in other travel reports. Faced with the sanctuaries, Goethe turns to Winckelmann²⁸, and the “Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums” (The History of Ancient Art), published in 1764. This is the “genius” who taught him to see and thus allowed him to appreciate Paestum, which first was anathema to him. In spite of this he declared almost with relief about a month later when visiting the doric tem-

²⁶ Diary Note dated 21 November 1761 quoted in: Fleming, J., *Robert Adam and his Circle in Edinburgh and Rome*, London 1962, 293ff. It still must be noted that James Adam acted together with his brother Robert as one of the so-called “chief offenders” against the English Palladianism and was considered to be an enunciator of artistic Graecis.

²⁷ Koch, H., *Vom Nachleben des Vitruv*, Baden-Baden 1951 (Deutsche Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 1), 57-59.

²⁸ In his entry on 26th April Goethe calls Riedesel’s travel guide and Winckelmann his silent companions. Goethe’s dependence on Winckelmann is also reflected in his own work: *Winckelmann und sein Jahrhundert*, Tübingen 1805 (reprint Hildesheim 2005).

ple of Concordia at Agrigent: “*seine schlanke Baukunst nähert ihn schon unserem Maßstabe des Schönen und Gefälligen, er verhält sich zu denen von Paestum wie Göttergestalt zum Riesenbilde*”²⁹. Winckelmann’s treatment of Paestum acted as a stimulant and left its imprint on learned circles. One reviewer of Thomas Major’s reconstruction of the temple of Poseidon exclaimed in 1768 in the periodical “Göttingische Anzeigen von Gelehrten Sachen” (p. 1052): “*Welch edle Einfalt ist dieß*”. Thus, Winckelmann had enjoined on the beholder of the temples to acknowledge them as evidence of the grand mind of a noble nation.

Why was it so difficult to see in Paestum the grand mind of a noble nation, as Winckelmann demanded? What vexed the beholder? To Goethe: “these obtruse, conical closely set masses of columns” appeared “irksome nay terrible”. The columns at Paestum contradicted the traditional aesthetically balanced order of antiquity. Within a few years, however, the Doric column – without base and with concave grooves – became the symbol of Greek grandeur³⁰.

During the process of adaptation the Doric temple was segmented in its structural and ornamental elements and simultaneously reduced to the column as its symbol³¹. In this way it became possible to redefine the traditionally used Doric column of Vitruvian origin³², which had been employed in the architecture of the absolutist rulers, for a civic reception. Pretending the true form of the Doric column had been found, it became available for a more civic interpretation, which encoded the column to signify originality, simplicity, and truth.

As embodiment of the natural sphere the Doric column was first used in landscape gardening. At Weimar in the duchy of Sax-Weimar/Germany, the “Roman house” (Römisches Haus), a garden house in the shape of a classical temple, was built for duke Carl August by Johann August Arens (1791-1797) under the supervision of Goethe. The basement contains of a *cryptoporticus* with Paestum type columns. The mighty columns underlined the originality of the Doric order³³ and staged at the same time a historical progression from the Doric of the basement to the Roman temple above. The Doric was thus seen as the basis of contemporary architecture. The same concept appears in neoclassical architecture, which favoured the Doric order in aiming at purity of design. Neoclassicism³⁴ first gained influence in France through the students trained at the French Academy who had been in contact with Winckelmann’s ideas. From Paris it spread to London and the European North.

²⁹ Italienische Reise, Girgenti 25.4. 1787.

³⁰ Pevsner, N./ Lang, S., “Die Wiederentdeckung der dorischen Ordnung im frühen Klassizismus” (engl. 1968), in: Pevsner, N. (ed.) *Architektur und Design*, München 1971, 155-173.

³¹ See the contemporary debate Semper/Böttcher: What is construction, what is ornament.

³² Forssman, E., *Der Dorische Stil in der deutschen Baukunst*, Freiburg/Brsg. 2001.

³³ Meninghoff, T./ Watkin, D., *Deutscher Klassizismus. Architektur 1740-1940*, Stuttgart 1989, 78.

³⁴ Wiebenson, D., *Sources of Greek Revival Architecture*, London 1969.

Closely connected to garden houses were Doric designs for botanical institutions as, for instance, in Uppsala/Sweden, where the French architect Louis-Jean Desprez designed the conservatory of the university's New Botanical Garden in 1792. Desprez had been one of the students honoured with the Prix du Rome. He had widely studied ancient sites in the South of Italy, among them the temples of Paestum. Another example appears in Munich/Bavaria. The portal to the Old Botanical Garden, erected in 1811 by Emanuel J.V. Herigoyen³⁵, who had been trained in Paris and Vienna, was designed in the Doric style. The architecture of various spas on the Baltic seacoast around 1800 also reflects the association of the Doric with naturalness.³⁶ The Doric Elisenbrunnen as central architectural building of the hot springs at Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen) (1824-26), designed by Karl Friedrich Schinkel, provides a further case in point.

Apart from naturalness, male strength was considered to be characteristic of the Doric. In this context the Doric order and particularly columns of the Paestum type remained an important image for town gates and guard houses. Reference to Paestum is made at the so-called Barrières in Paris, erected in 1789 by Claude Nicholas Ledoux³⁷ for the tax farmers (*ferme générale*). They were built to limit the avoidance of taxes on goods transported to the city of Paris and Ledoux tried to express solemnity and magnificence with his design. The Barrières were not without controversy at their time, which resulted in them being nearly destroyed entirely during the French revolution. A letter in the German *Journal des Luxus und der Moden* 1798 written by Wilhelm v. Wolzogen, privy councillor at Weimar and friend of Friedrich Schiller, shows again that Ledoux's intention worked quite well in German eyes: *An vielen dieser Gebäude sind Säulenordnungen angebracht, die von den gewöhnlichen abweichen, es sind meist sogenannte Paestumssäulen... die ganze Ordnung hat jenes Gepräge von Stärke und Einfachheit, das die roheren Zeiten der Erfindung unserer jetzigen verfeinerten Ordnung vollkommen charakterisiert... Nähert man sich erwartungsvolle der Stadt, so bereitet diese einfache Architektur auf jene Verfeinerung, die man in dem innern Paris antrifft, vor. An den Barrieren sehe ich die Baukunst in ihrer Kindheit und Einfalt; an der Colonnade vom Louvre vergleiche ich ihre Ausbildung und Verfeinerung*.³⁸ The

³⁵ Reidel, H., *Emanuel Joseph von Herigoyen. Königlich bayerischer Oberbaukommissar. 1746-1817*, München 1982, fig. 208-10. This work is particularly noteworthy as first attempt to imitate ancient polychromic design. Herigoyen also designed the entrance to the house of a gardener with columns of the Paestum type (Regensburg 1808), see Lutz, *Die Wiederentdeckung...*, 165; Reidel, *Emanuel Joseph von Herigoyen...*, fig. 166.

³⁶ Heiligendamm 1806 see Stutz, R./Grundner, T., *Bäderarchitektur in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern*. Rostock 2004.

³⁷ Vidler, A., *Claude-Nicolas Ledoux Architecture and Utopia in the Era of the French Revolution*, Boston-Berlin-Basel 2006.

³⁸ *Journal des Luxus und der Moden* 13, 1798, 78-79.

concept became commonly accepted in Germany, which can be demonstrated by the examples of several new city gates in the Doric style: for example Friedrich Weinbrenner's Ettlinger Gate in the city of Karlsruhe (1803) or Peter Joseph Krahe's Neue Hauptwache at Braunschweig (1804-1806), a guard house with jail, quoting the temple of Poseidon at Paestum.³⁹

Furthermore, during the following generation (from 1820) the Doric portico was also used as architectural element of houses built for the bourgeois German elite. Here the Doric column represented involvement of this social class in the ideals of education and fashion, which were rooted in the general Greek revival. The earliest example is the House of the publisher Friedrich Vieweg in Braunschweig (1804). The elegant homes of Hamburg's merchant dynasties equally demonstrate by their reception of Doric columns a new identity based on antiquity⁴⁰.

Unlike the Doric column, which functioned as an ornament, the structure of the Doric temple was exploited in Germany during the 19th century as a practically religious national building type, which unified simplicity, strength and originality. Prussia and Bavaria appear to have competed in Doric interpretations of this kind. Designs of Hans Christian Genelli (1786) and Friedrich Gilly (1796) for a monument commemorating Frederick the Great should be mentioned here. This applies equally to two projects by Leo von Klenze: the Walhalla (1830-1842) near Regensburg and the hall of fame in Munich (1843-1854). In his architectural drawing, Gilly placed a Doric temple on a colossal bottom section and designed a kind of *temenos* with triumphal gates. It was meant to embody "Schlichte Schönheit", as an accompanying text stated⁴¹.

The desire of Louis II, king of Bavaria, to erect a Greek inspired building as German hall of fame provoked some criticism. After his journey to Paestum and Sicily together with his architect Klenze 1817/18, the king was convinced that Walhalla had to be a modern counter part to the temples of the South⁴². This clearly demonstrates that Paestum was perceived as national legacy of the ancient Greeks⁴³. Winckelmann believed that the Greeks had to be perceived as a unity and as national role model for

³⁹ Examples of Doric designs are: Adolf von Vagede's Ratinger Tor/Düsseldorf (1810) designed as Doric twin-temple and Karl Friedrich Schinkel's Neue Wache/Berlin (1816-1818).

⁴⁰ House Jenisch in Hamburg/Flottbeck (1828-1834), designed by Franz Forsmann, and the Landhaus Baur in Hamburg Blankenese (1826-1836), designed by Johann Matthis Hansen and Ole Jörgen Schmidt. Both houses contain a four-columned portico leading to the garden.

⁴¹ Arenhövel, W. (ed.), *Berlin und die Antike. Katalog zur Ausstellung aus Anlaß des 150jährigen Bestehens des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, Berlin 1979.

⁴² Menninghoff/ Watkin, *Deutscher Klassizismus...*, 160.

⁴³ The Propylaea (1846-1860) on the Königsplatz/Munich could be mentioned here. They were built by Louis to commemorate the Greek struggle for freedom, but belong to the gate-type rather the national monument-type, as they lead to the square between the two museums.

Germany. In the following, the increasing occupation with mainland Greece and its antiquities lead to a marginalization of the Greek component of Paestum by the end of the 19th century. On the basis of increasing nationalist tendencies, the existence of Greek culture was considered to be limited to Greece itself. All of Magna Graecia, which had played a key-role in the rediscovery of Greece, was thus reduced to “colonial” Greece, causing a reassessment of the temples of Paestum. They were no longer perceived as prototype of Greek architecture, which was instead associated with the Athenian Parthenon, but as departure from the Greek ideal and as result of the amalgamation of Greeks with the native population⁴⁴. Turning to the Parthenon as ideal architectural type – still valid for modernist architects as shown above – enabled people to reconcile Winckelmann’s demand on the Greek as such and the reality felt by visiting Paestum.

Towards the end of the 19th century Schinkel tried in vain to evoke Greek architecture once again as uniting element for creating a European identity: “*Europäische Baukunst ist gleichbedeutend mit griechischer Baukunst in ihrer Fortsetzung. Keine Maskerade, das Nothwendige der Construction schön gestalten ist Grundsatz griechischer Architektur und muß Grundsatz bleiben für deren Fortsetzung*“. Still the Doric code remained for a long time present in the mind of the educated public. The design for the headquarters of the Chicago Tribune in 1922 by the Viennese architect Adolf Loos demonstrates this vividly, to name but one example. The building was to take the form of a single colossal Doric column. Architectural theorists have suggested interpreting the column as newspaper column. In my view, however, the imagery employed by Loos was deeply rooted in the European perception of the Doric and points at one of the central characteristics of the Doric code: simplicity and truth – a newspaper’s obligation⁴⁵.

⁴⁴ Dinsmoor, W., *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, London 1902, cp 3.

⁴⁵ For the significance of truth for Loos see, Posener, J., “Adoolf Loos 1870-1933. Ein Vortrag”, *Akademie der Künste Anmerkungen zur Zeit* 23, Berlin 1984, 13f.



Fig. 1. Paestum, photograph from 1890.



Fig 2. Paestum, temple of Hera, so-called Basilica.



Fig 3. Paestum, temple of Hera, so-called Poseidon temple.