studi
germanici

The Parthenon on the Danube.
Walhalla: classical ideal and national liturgy

Massimo Ferrari Zumbini

1. "Temple of the nation?"
Walhalla and the Cologne Cathedral

In Germany too the debate surrounding the "temple of the nation" has a long history which precedes national unification in 1871 by quite some time. In the search for origins one could go back to the constituent phase of the modern idea of the German nation and therefore to the images with which it expresses itself. That is, to the years of resistance against Napoleon and the wars of liberation (*Befreiungskriege*). As we shall see, in those years projects for national monuments flowered, and they came from some of the biggest architects of the age, from Schinkel to Klenze.

But to enter immediately *in medias res*, we can identify a precise date to follow and connect the various aspects surrounding the matter: 1842. In that year, and with only a few days between them, two events occurred which excited great interest and provoked heated debates around both the subject of the image of the nation, understood as the common patrimony of German speaking peoples, as well as what was to be the state organism erected to unite those peoples. On September 4th there was a large celebration, simultaneously dynastic and popular, celebrating the renewal of works after three centuries to complete the Cologne Cathedral; while on October 18th Walhalla, the monument desired by Bavaria's king to commemorate and honor the German speaking people's great persons of history and culture, was unveiled near Regensburg. In both cases therefore all of the debates, those of an artistic as well as iconographic nature, revolved around the idea of nation.

On the one hand, the renewal of works in Cologne was interpreted and felt to be a collective effort of the "German nation" and as an example of the possibility of overcoming dynastic and religious divisions. The king of Prussia, *summus episcopus* of the Lutheran Church in the Prussian territories, was actively participating and even pro-

moting the completion of the Catholic cathedral in the Rhineland, by that point a Prussian province and survivor of a bitter and violent denominational conflict. On the other, Walhalla was precisely to be a "national monument", destined to celebrate all Germans considered particularly worthy, irrespective of their territorial origins.

The link between the two events is therefore not only temporal but ideal. In both cases a model "temple of the nation" had been proposed, and it is precisely this goal, one that would unify the diverse aspects of origins and parts – dynastic, artistic, and denominational – that allows for a chronicling of the paths that are connected to these two events. These are:

a) the debate surrounding the "temple of the nation" had an international character and in the German variant explicitly recalled the great models of those countries with an ancient tradition of state: the Panthéon and above all Westminster Abbey;

b) the debate surrounding a "national style" above all regarded Walhalla and the controversy regarding the most appropriate style for a monument destined to become the "temple of the German nation"; however, it also emerged in the case of the Cologne Cathedral in as much as it was seen to be the ultimate example of the Germanic-Christian tradition and thus to be completed in Gothic style;

c) all of the history of the planning and realization of Walhalla inserted itself within a specific dynastic context and remains incomprehensible if not connected to the artistic concepts of Ludwig I, to the theories of his architect Leo von Klenze, and to the objective of uniting the dynastic celebration of the kingdom of Bavaria with the vision of a German nation understood as a *Kulturnation*;

d) in both cases, almost in their pure state and therefore with particular force, we find the aforementioned principle details; in other words, dynastic interests as well as religious contrasts. This is true for Walhalla, which is the exclusive creation of the Catholic Ludwig and where Luther's admission into the temple of the nation dedicated to all Germans stood out in particular; but also true for the Cologne Cathedral where the Prussian and the Bavarian dynasties faced each other, and where the Catholics feared for the cathedral's very nature;

e) in both cases, recalling the projects' respective births brings us back to that constitutive phase of the modern idea of the German nation; that is, to the years of resistance against Napoleon and the wars of liberation.

In any case, the ideal connection between the renewal of works on the cathedral in the Rhineland and the inauguration of Walhalla in Bavaria not only emerges from retrospective analysis but from the well documented contemporary evidence and public proclamations of the same protagonists of the two events:

> Immer wieder haben die Zeitgenossen diese beiden Nationaldenk-mäler als Zweiheit gesehen, zustimmend oder auch kritisierend. In der Presse wurde 1842 der Vorschlag gemacht, den Kölner Dom als dauernden Kultort der Nation zu säkularisieren und seinen Ausbau durch ein nationalen Ehrenspiel zu fördern, das abwechselnd in der Kathedrale und in der Walhalla stattfinden könne.[1]

These aspects all indicate 1842 as a central date in the true sense, for it looks in two directions. It looks forward because within it are contained the arguments and the contrasts that will emerge with more force following unification in 1871. It looks backward because it refers to the great hopes of national unification that accompanied the end of the French and Napoleonic domination of German territories and, with a more extended chronological movement, echoes arguments from the debate surrounding the "temple of the nation" that had come from abroad and, in particular, from the United Kingdom.

In this case as well the link is well documented as indicated by diffuse referrals to the Cologne Cathedral as a "deutsches Westminster".[2] In its turn, Walhalla's placement not in an urban environment but in the open countryside recalled the model of the *Temple of British Wor-*

---

[1] Jörg Traeger, *Der Weg nach Walhalla. Denkmallandschaft und Bildungsreise im 19. Jahrhundert* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1987), p. 144.

[2] Lars Völcker, *Tempel für die Großen der Nation. Das kollektive Nationaldenkmal in Deutschland, Frankreich und Großbritannien im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt: Lang, 2000), p. 251.

thies realized at Stowe, Buckinghamshire, by William Kent from 1731[3] onward. When one remembers that Ludwig had not only the Roman Pantheon in mind but also its modern version, the French Panthéon dedicated "*aux grande hommes*" on behalf of the "*patrie reconnaissante*", the circle is complete.

However, the principal path to follow is always the internal one, the completely German one, whether Prussian, Bavarian, or Rhenish. Over time, the English model, as well as the French, proved itself un-transferable to a German context. Westminster Abbey had utterly unique characteristics. It was the site of coronation and for five hundred years where kings had been buried. Furthermore, it was "*royal peculiar*" or under the exclusive jurisdiction of the sovereign. Its passage to "temple of the nation" had arisen very gradually within this tradition. That is to say, to its becoming both the burial and commemoration site of great representatives from the realms of politics and culture, beginning with the burial of Edmund Spenser in January 1600 to that of the relocation of Laurence Olivier's ashes in 1991. This is how Poet's Corner was founded, with a statue of Shakespeare and the tomb of Dickens, while in the nave both Newton and Darwin are buried.

However, until the middle of the 19th century Westminster also welcomed unknown persons who were only slightly linked to the church and who sometimes were simply local residents.[4] In an article significantly entitled *Imperial Walhalla* one is reminded of the fact that at Westminster "choristers and cooks among poets and princes"[5] were to be found, which also led to some shifts, as in the case of the actress Hannah Pritchard. The stone dedicated to her in 1768 was placed next to the statue of Shakespeare, only to later be removed to make room for the tomb of Samuel Johnson. This "omni-comprehensive" aspect

---

[3] Michael I. Wilson, *William Kent: Architect, Designer, Painter, Gardener, 1685-1748* (London: Routledge, 1984), p. 183 and following.

[4] Matthew Craske, *Westminster Abbey: 1720-1770: A public pantheon built upon private interest* in *Pantheons. Transformations of a Monumental Idea*, edited by Richard Wrigley and Matthew Craske (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), p. 57 and following.

[5] Anthony D.C. Hyland, *Imperial Walhalla*, in "Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians", 21 (1962), p. 129.

cohabitated with another peculiarity of the British version of the "temple of the nation", which, oddly enough, managed to exclude an entire category of "illustrious men" who instead were to find their final resting place in the "military pantheon"[6] at a different location. At Westminster one finds a sacristy dedicated to the Unknown Soldier and in Poet's Corner the writers and poets of the First World War are commemorated, yet the great figures of military history, from Nelson to Wellington,[7] are to be found in St. Paul's Cathedral.

The history of the Parisian Panthéon instead is distinguished by being rather controversial and because of its connection to the shocks and counter-shocks of the French Revolution. This not only concerned the debates surrounding which figures to celebrate but the very purpose of the building, which oscillated between Catholic church and lay temple, between *temple de la religion* and *temple de la patrie*. The new, renovated church of Saint Genevieve was Louis XV's doing and coincidentally was completed at the beginning of the revolution. The church was transformed into the Panthéon Francais and received the inscription "*Aux grands hommes – La Patrie reconnaisante*" and proceeded in this way until the first *pantheonisations*: Mirabeau in April 1791, Voltaire in July of the same year, Rousseau in October 1794. In the meantime, all the religious statues were destroyed and the interior was completely laicized, representations of Saint Genevieve being substituted with those honoring the rights of man and public education. During the Napoleonic period, the two aspects lived in a sort of double-consecration. The building was again a church, but the crypt welcomed once more only the nation's most worthy, who at that time were, above all, soldiers and politicians loyal to Napoleon.

---

[6] Holger Hoock, *The British military pantheon in St. Paul's Cathedral: the State, cultural patriotism, and the politics of national monuments, c. 1790-1820*, in *Transformations of a Monumental Idea*, cit., p. 88 and following.

[7] Similarly the 1904 project of expanding Westminster in order to commemorate the most worthy figures in the creation and defense of the British empire failed; see G. Alex Bremner, "*Imperial Monumental Halls and Tower": Westminster Abbey and the Commemoration of Empire, 1854-1904*, in "Architectural History", 47 (2004), p. 251 and following.

The successive history of the building corresponds precisely to the phases of French political history. With the return of the Bourbons, the building returned to being a Catholic church exclusively. In 1830 it once again became the Panthéon. In 1848 it was officially declared the "*Temple de l'Humanité*". Napoleon III gave it back to the Catholics, and in the Third Republic it celebrated yet again the destination *républicaine* with the great *panthéonisations* of Victor Hugo in June 1885 and Emile Zola in June 1908.[8] These few remarks should be sufficient to reveal that both models, Westminster and the Panthéon, could not find equivalents in Germany. German references to English and French precedents, which were widespread and of which we have already cited some examples, revealed themselves over the years to be primarily idealistic and political-literary utopias. For the English model presuppositions were missing while the French model simply could not be accepted. In the German territories there was no tradition of a united dynastic sacristy, there was no city capable of handling the function of ideal capital and moreover, forever and always, denominational divisions impeded the emergence of a shared memorial.

> Doch trotz der bis zum Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts ungetrübten Faszination der Idee eines deutschen Westminsters, blieb die Hoffnung derjenigen, die in einem solchen Bau eine Möglichkeit zur Annäherung oder gar Verschmelzung der beiden Konfessionen unter nationalen Voreichen sahen, unerfüllt. […] Eine nationale Denkmalskirche war und blieb eben nur möglich in einem Land wie England, wo Kirche und Staat eine Einheit bildeten. Zudem fehlte in Deutschland angesichts der großen Anzahl königlicher Grablegen des Alten Reiches, wie etwa Aachen, Berlin, Speyer, Goslar, Prag und Wien, eine einzelne nationale monarchische Grabstätte wie die Westminster Abbey.[9]

---

[8] On the various changes of destination and on the arguments surrounding the figures to welcome (and which to remove, as in the case of Mirabeau and Marat) see: Lars Völcker, *Tempel für die Großen der Nation*, cit., p. 160 and following.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 252.

This is valid obviously not only for the Cologne Cathedral as compared to Westminster, but Walhalla too could not really align itself with the Parisian Panthéon for a number of reasons. Firstly, there was a diffuse and deep-seated anti-French sentiment that prevailed above all after the Napoleonic cycle; there was hostility regarding any and every link with revolutionary events; and finally, there was the desire to connect the new temple to an open and uncontaminated landscape. The anti-French Ludwig certainly was not thinking about a "canon of illustrious men" connected to the shocks of popular movements and did not conceive of the uncertainty that could come from them.[10] The referral to the French model was therefore for the most part generic and should be interpreted as attention to the reprisal, in the modern age, of the classical tradition, transferred however to the national level, which, moreover, in reality had pre-revolutionary origins.[11]

External references are therefore of relative value. Other more solid testimonies clearly indicate the historic-ideal context from which both the projects arose: the defeat of Napoleon and the reemergence of German national sentiment. Between the battle of Leipzig and the initial phases of the Congress of Vienna, there was a period of great enthusiasm in which many proposals of renewal, and even rebirth, followed at a national level. Alongside the political-institutional proposals were literary works and artistic projects from painting to architecture. These were the initial years of that "nationalization of the masses" so carefully reconstructed by George L.

---

[10] On the "uncertainty" of the canon see: Mona Ozouf, *Le Panthéon, l'école normale des morts*, in *Les lieux de mémoire, vol I. La République*, edited by Pierre Nora (Paris: Gallimard, 1984), p. 139 and following. See also: Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink, *Die "Genese des Panthéons" – Nationalliterarische Kanonisierungs- und Ausgrenzungsprozesse im Frankreich der Spätaufklärung und der Französischen Revolution*, in *Literaturkanon – Medienereignis – kultureller Text. Formen interkultureller Kommunikation und Übersetzung*, edited by Andrea Poltermann (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1995), p. 121 and following.

[11] On the genesis of the idea of renewing the classical tradition and on the successive debates that develop during *l'Ancien Régime* see: Jean-Claude Bonnet, *Naissance du Panthéon. Essai sur le culte des grand homes* (Paris: Fayard, 1998), in particular p. 53 and following. See also: David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France. Inventing Nationalisms, 1680-1800* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2003), p. 107 and following.

Mosse[12] which constituted a decisive aspect for the study of the history of German culture in the "long 19th century", especially when connected to political-institutional events.

2. Ludwig, Bavaria and the Walhalla project

Projects for national monuments were an integral part of a new political symbolism that wanted to promote the idea of national unity (together with people's celebrations and crowd liturgies) and which addressed itself to the ruling dynasties in as much as they were indispensable to realizing the projects. Thus, the principal figures of the two monuments, the cathedral and Walhalla, were Friedrich Wilhlem IV of Prussia and Ludwig I of Bavaria.

Many artists joined in the nationalist fervor represented above all by Ernst Moritz Arndt and Ludwig Jahn, who had also inspired the first German national celebration commemorating the Battle of Leipzig,[13] were the most representative. Already in August of 1814 Peter Cornelius and other German painters working in Rome had sent a petition to Ludwig (but also to Metternich and to Hardenberg) to solicit projects for major national monuments.[14] The great architects of the age also mobilized. Karl Friedrich Schinkel presented a project for a monument commemorating the victories against Napoleon, which was in fact granted by Friedrich Wilhelm and which subsequently gave the name to the quarter of Berlin where it would be located: Kreuzberg.[15] Leo von Klenze instead proposed a *deutsches Befreiungs-*

---

[12] George L. Mosse, *La nazionalizzazione delle masse. Simbolismo politico e movimenti di massa in Germania, 1812-1933* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1975).

[13] Dieter Düding, *Das deutsche Nationalfest von 1814: Matrix der deutschen Nationalfeste im 19. Jahrhundert*, in *Öffentliche Festkultur. Politische Feste in Deutschland von der Aufklärung bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*, edited by Dieter Düding et al. (Reinbeck: Rowohlt, 1988), p. 67 and following.

[14] Monika Wagner, *Allegorie und Geschichte. Ausstattungsprogramme öffentlicher Gebäude des 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland. Von der Cornelius-Schule zur Malerei der Wilhelminischen Ära* (Wasmuth: Tübingen, 1989), p. 41.

[15] On the statues and their inscriptions that recall the battles of Leipzig and Waterloo, see Michael Nungesser, *Das Denkmal auf dem Kreuzberg von Karl Friedrich Schinkel* (Berlin: Arenhovel, 1987), p. 48 and following.

denkmal to be located in the open countryside with a view over the Rhein. There were so many proposals that even Joseph Görres, himself a protagonist of the reconstruction projects of the cathedral, criticized the excessive number in November 1814.[16] At the same time, there were also the initiatives (or rather the reactions) of the commissioners. In February 1814 Ludwig announced the open competition for Walhalla, while Friedrich Wilhelm thought of a national monument in Gothic style to be situated in Berlin.[17] These were the years when the idea of national monuments was forming and the debates surrounding the projects staked out the paths to be followed in successive decades, even after unification and into the Wilhelmine period.

> Die Idee des Nationaldenkmals ist in der Zeit und unter dem Eindruck der Französischen Revolution und der Freiheitskriege entstanden, und zwar in einer Mehrzahl von Ausprägungen der Entstehungszeit haben die Geschichte des Nationaldenkmals in Deutschland ein Jahrhundert lang fast durchweg bestimmt oder mitbestimmt.[18]

To put Walhalla specifically into context, however, one has to keep in mind both Ludwig's personality and the Bavarian context in which the project took effect. Otherwise, it is impossible to understand, for example, how already in 1807 Ludwig had conceived of a project dedicating marble busts to great figures of the German language: "dem rühmlichst ausgezeichneten Deutschen".[19] Ludwig came to the throne in 1825 after having assisted and participated in

---

[16] Adrian von Buttlar, *„Also doch ein Deutscher?" Klenzes Weg nach München*, in *Leo von Klenze. Architekt zwischen Kunst und Hof 1784-1864*, edited by Wienfried Nerdinger (Munich-London: Prester 2000), p. 81.

[17] Frank-Lothar Kroll, *Friedrich Wilhelm IV. und das Staatsdenken der deutschen Romantik* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1990), p. 123.

[18] Thomas Nipperdey, *Nationalidee und Nationaldenkmal in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* (1968), now in Thomas Nipperdey, *Gesellschaft, Kultur, Theorie. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur neueren Geschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1976), p. 170.

[19] Jörg Traeger, *Der Weg nach Walhalla. Denkmalllandschaft und Bildungsreise im 19. Jahrhundert*, cit., p. 14.

the great, and simultaneously devastating, Napoleonic cycle. The relationship of the heir apparent with his father Max Joseph I was difficult, precisely because he did not share the politics of the king as regarded Napoleon. Max Joseph had brought Bavaria to Napoleon's side. Ludwig was strongly against this choice and tried, to no avail, to counter it. The idea of Walhalla first arose precisely in relation to the dramatic situation of the German territories and in particular to that of Prussia after the grand victories of Napoleon at Jena and Auerstedt, which brought the French emperor through the triumphal entrance to Berlin on October 27, 1806. Ludwig was in Berlin at the beginning of 1807 and therefore personally experienced that period he himself defined as "Deutschlands tiefster Schmach"[20] and which reinforced both his anti-French sentiments and his desire to contribute to the rebirth of German dignity.

However, Max Joseph's pro-Napoleon stance had its own historical logic, which was closely tied to two principle, long-standing aspirations of the dynasty: to attain the dignity of "King of Bavaria" and to unify the unadjoined and scattered territories of his domain (*territoria non clausa*, in the language of the time). In any case, the dynasty certainly had a glorious history. It was among the continent's oldest and had dominated the Bavarian territories since 1180, it boasted two emperors of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, and it had even arrived as far as Scandinavia where for more than half a century after the abdication of Christina in 1654 the kings of Sweden belonged to it. Still, at the beginning of the 19th century, Max Joseph was not the king of Bavaria but the prince-elector and, in addition, came from a secondary branch of the dynastic family which was in no position to reach the two aforementioned objectives on its own.[21] Napoleon therefore represented the great opportunity with which to be delivered from the imperial predominance of the Hapsburgs and to unify the territory, thanks as well to

---

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] On the complex dynastic lines that brought the Pfalz-Zweibrücken branch to the Bavarian throne, see Heinz Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern. Königtum im Vormärz. Eine politische Biographie* (Munich: Ludwig, 1986), p. 44 and following.

those newly taken ones from the Hapsburgs that Napoleon gave the Bavarians as a gift for their loyalty.

The stages of Max Joseph's strategy followed quickly one after the other. The decisive year was 1805.[22] In August the alliance with Napoleon was drawn up with the treaty of Bogenhausen. In October Napoleon was received with triumphal splendor in Munich on the road which that November would lead him to victory in Vienna and which would culminate in December with the victory of Austerlitz. At that point, while all that remained of the old Reich was dissolving, Max Joseph received the *plenitude de la souverainité* and was able to proclaim himself King of Bavaria even if only "thanks to Napoleon", an ironic but not baseless criticism played up by his contemporaries. Furthermore, Bavaria offered Napoleon his first opportunity to ally himself to the old dynasties. After long negotiations, the recently proclaimed king of Bavaria agreed to the marriage of his first daughter Auguste with Eugène Beauharnais.

By that point the alliance was consolidated and was further strengthened by joining the Confederation of the Rhine. Bavaria participated in the war against Prussia, fighting in 1806 in Silesia and Pomerania and in 1809 once again at Napoleon's side in the war against Austria. The heaviest toll was that which struck the Bavarian troops in the Russian campaign. After the Battle of Borodino and until their return home at the end of the tragic retreat, 30,000 Bavarian troops fell, and there were only 3000 survivors. But here there was another dramatic turn of events as Bavaria once again changed sides. At the last moment, only ten days before the Battle of Leipzig, Bavaria abandoned Napoleon and joined its former adversaries, signing the treaty of Ried on October 8, 1813. The following year it even participated in the invasion of France, contributing to the defeat of Napoleon in the Battles of Brienn-sur-Aube and Arcis-sur-Aube up until the allied entrance into Paris in March 1814.

At the end of this tortuous path, Bavaria had realized all of the objectives of its strategy and had remained steadfast notwithstand-

---

[22] Peter Schmid, *1805 - das Jahr der Entscheidung*, in *1806 - Bayern wird Königreich*, edited by Alois Schmid (Regensburg: Pustet, 2006), p. 82 and following.

ing its alliances.[23] The new kingdom of Bavaria at that point did not only have a consolidated territory without any more *exclave*, but had also increased its territory and population by almost one third. To the nucleus of its original territory (Altbayern) were added the territories and cities of Franconia, Swabia and the Palatinate (in the part that was not already a part of Bavaria); from Bamberg to Bayreuth, Regensburg to Würzburg, and Augsburg to Nuremberg. The growth was not only quantitative (more than one million additional inhabitants), but also involved a heterogeneity of governmental traditions, dynastic loyalties and denominational affiliations.

> Bayern hatte von 1803 bis 1816 die Gebiete von etwa 230 ehemaligen Reichsständen erworben, geistliche und weltliche Territorien, darunter Fürstentümer, Stadtrepubliken und reichsritterschaftliche Zwergherrschaften, katholische, lutherische und reformierte und jüdische, bayerische, fränkische, schwäbische und pfälzische Bewohner.[24]

Bavaria had reached its definitive territorial shape, which has more or less remained unchanged up until today (with only tiny changes, for example, that of the departure of Coburg in 1920). However, it found itself faced with difficulties of integration. It is enough to think of the old, proud tradition of Nuremberg, that imperial and Protestant city, or rather, the Protestant territories of Franconia which in part had been governed up until that time by a branch of the Prussian dynasty;[25] or of the resistance prominent in Swabia, in cities like Augsburg, but also in the agrarian regions of the Allgäu.[26]

---

[23] On the complex diplomatic and military affairs that mark these decisive years for Bavaria's ascent, see Eberhard Weis, *Montgelas. Zweiter Band. Der Architekt des modernen bayerischen Staates, 1799-1838* (Munich: Beck, 2005), p. 661 and following.

[24] Alois Schmid (edited by), *Handbuch der Bayerischen Geschichte. Band IV: Das Neue Bayern. Von 1800 bis zur Gegenwart. Erster Teilband: Staat und Politik* (Munich: Beck, 2003), p. 101.

[25] On Franconia, see Wolfgang Wüst, *Franken unter Bayerns Krone. Integration im langen 19. Jahrhundert*, in *1806-Bayern wird Königreich*, cit., p. 170 and following.

[26] On Swabia, see Rolf Kießling, *Schwabens Weg in das Königreich Bayern. Zwischen Integrationsbereitschaft und Traditionsbewusstsein*, in *1806-Bayern wird Königreich*, cit., p. 147 and following.

The problems this new Bavaria had to confront were clear and from 1825 onward were to be Ludwig's responsibility:

a) to develop a new dynastic loyalty in the territories that had come from other dynastic affiliations;

b) to achieve the best cohabitation possible between the different religious denominations;

c) to justify Bavaria's not entirely clean course through the years from the ascension of Napoleon through to the Congress of Vienna.

The double-face of alliances was fresh in contemporaries' minds. In the years of restoration and the celebration of the principle of legitimacy it was difficult to ignore the fact that the Kingdom of Bavaria was a creation of France and owed its very existence to Napoleon.

In der europäischen Auseinandersetzung zwischen dem Frankreich der Bourbonen und der Revolution und den Habsburgern war Bayern der geborene Verbündete Frankreichs, immer dazu geeignet, als Puffer oder vorgeschobener Posten gegenüber dem habsburgischen Erbfeind zu dienen. Bayern hat diese Rolle in einem entscheidenden Moment der europäischen Umwälzungen gespielt, und es ist reich dafür belohnt worden. Das moderne Bayern – so kann man konstatieren – ist eine französische Schöpfung.[27]

All of these objectives were ever present in Ludwig's complex and imposing artistic project, which began prior to his ascension to the throne in 1825 and continued after his abdication in 1848. His artistic ideals were formed above all thanks to his travels in Italy.[28] On his first trip to Rome in 1804-1805 he strengthened his classical bent and enjoyed close relationships with Canova and Thorvaldsen. On his second stay between 1817 and 1818 he went all the way to Palermo but primarily acknowledged his new sensibility for medieval art to

---

[27] Winfried Schulze, *Bayern und die französische Revolution: Machterweiterung und innere Reform*, in *Bayern mitten in Europa. Vom Frühmittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Alois Schmid and Katharina Weigand (Munich: Beck, 2005), p. 263.

[28] On the relationship with Italy, see Heinz Gollwitzer, *Politik und Kultur in Bayern unter Ludwig I. Studien zur bayerischen Geschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, cit., p. 159 and following.

have been cultivated in Rome with the Nazarenes. Bavaria and in particular Munich became objects of a great experiment in which "the art of governance" expressed itself, and even integrated itself, with "the governance of art":[29] a realistic *Kunstkönigtum* not dissociated from the political reality like that to come of Ludwig II. For this considerable project Ludwig called upon artists from Munich who were already plotting the new face of the Bavarian capital and were decorating all the new buildings. Among them it is important to mention the architects Leo von Klenze, Friedrich von Gärtner and Georg Friedrich Ziebland as well as the painters Peter von Cornelius, Julius Schnorr von Carolsfeld, and Heinrich Maria von Heß. It is easy to understand why many artists constantly celebrated Ludwig as a great protector of the arts. In fact, in 1850, two years after his abdication, Ludwig was still represented as the modern personification of a patronage analogous to that of Leo X and Rafael.[30] There were difficulties and critiques of Ludwig the heir prince and then of Ludwig, King of Bavaria. Indeed, the pompous and self-congratulatory definition of Munich as the "Athens on the Isar" was contrasted by the accusation of the capital being bound in "harlequin's garb" ("Harlekinsjacke der Stadt München").[31] Nevertheless, the amplitude of the project and the tenacity of its realization are impressive. Today it would of course be impossible to reconstruct, visually and in all its complexity, Ludwig's Munich, above all due to the devastation of the Second World War. There are buildings that were completely destroyed and then reconstructed *ex novo* like the *Neue Pinakothek*; palaces that underwent great amputations like the royal palace (*Residenz*); and structures that have been restored but today remain without their large cycles of frescoes like the *Gliptothek*.[32] However, it is

[29] On the analogies between the two "kingdoms", see Heinz Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern. Königtum im Vormärz*, cit., p. 753 and following.

[30] *"Vorwärts, vorwärts sollst du schauen...". Geschichte, Politik und Kunst unter Ludwig I.*, edited by Johannes Erichsen (Munich: Haus der bayerischen Geschichte, 1986), p. 28 and following.

[31] Heinz Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern. Königtum im Vormärz*, cit., p. 764.

[32] For a photographic documentation and an iconographic analysis of the original state of the interior, see Adrian von Buttlar, *Leo von Klenze. Leben-Werk-Vision* (Munich: Beck, 1999), p. 124 and following.

possible to retrace the essential moments of the ideal triangle that Ludwig realized in architecture and in painting and into which Walhalla inserted itself: *classical art, Christianity and the patriotic worship of history.*

The classical ideal is the most obvious and was realized through two parallel paths: the Greek and the Renaissance. In the first case, the most inconspicuous and quasi-paradigmatic example is represented by the justly entitled square of the *Königsplatz*. In accordance with Ludwig's precise, binding indications, Karl von Fischer's project, which was later to be taken up by Klenze, completed a series of buildings celebrating classical Greece, a sort of Acropolis within the Bavarian city. On one side there is the Gliptothek, which was inaugurated in 1830, its façade characterized by Corinthian columns and statues of great personalities like Phidias and Pericles.[33] At the center of the pediment frieze, Athena, represented as protector of the plastic arts, naturally could not be missing. On the opposite side of the square, in 1848 the architect Ziebland finished the Corinthian style temple which houses the collection of ancient art (*Staatliche Antikensammlung*). The Propylaea with its Doric columns is placed between the two "temples of art". Initially conceived of by Klenze as an entranceway to the city, it was finished however only in 1862 when the city had already extended far beyond that point.

The examples for the revival of Renaissance models are also striking: from the facade of the *Residenz* that echoes that of the Palazzo Pitti, to Gärtner's Field Marshal's Hall (*Feldherrnhalle*), finished in 1844, which is a copy of the Signoria of Florence. The circle closes when the two poles are united by the *Ludwigstraße*, the central artery named after the king, which begins at the square with the Field Marshal's Hall and finishes with the Arch of Victory (*Siegestor*), finished by Gärtner in 1852, which echoes the Arch of Constantine.

Ludwig's activities in the field of religious buildings goes far beyond the traditional participation of Christian dynasties in the construction of churches. This activity reveals its larger and more historically significant meaning only when understood in the context

---

[33] On the Glipothek, see James J. Sheehan, *Geschichte der deutschen Kunstmuseen. Von der fürstlichen Kunstkammer zur modernen Sammlung* (Munich: Beck, 2002), p. 101 and following.

of the political situation of Bavaria that Ludwig had to face after ascending the throne. The heir prince had developed, both due to inclination and education, political and religious tendencies often at odds with those of his father. The former's opposition to the alliance with Napoleon has already been mentioned. But Ludwig, as opposed to his father, did not adhere to Masonry, and even supported the opposition against the politician who for almost twenty years (1799-1817) had dominated Bavarian politics and had been the main force behind the reforms inspired by Enlightenment ideas: Count Montgelas.[34]

It is not by chance that Ludwig's ascension to the throne was greeted in 1825 as a new hope for the Catholic reawakening of Joseph Görres,[35] who by that point in time was the most combative exponent of political Catholicism and who in 1827 was summoned to the University of Munich on Ludwig's behalf. Even if carefully and in accordance with the Constitution of 1818, the new king tended to modify the situation that consolidated itself after the secularization of 1803.[36] It is enough to recall that Ludwig favored the return of religious orders, in particular that of the Benedictines, and founded 132 convents. In fact, Ludwig supported the project of Görres and his circle for the "*Regeneration der Bavaria Sancta*".[37]

In this context the construction of churches desired by Ludwig was set; from the royal chapel (*Allerheiligen-Hofkirche*) annexed to the *Residenz* in 1837 and the first church to be built after secularization, to that of the church where Ludwig himself wanted to be buried, Saint Boniface, in 1850. However, for the churches destined to restore the Bavarian tradition the predominant point of reference remained Italy. For the royal chapel Ludwig referred Klenze to the example of the Palatine Chapel of Palermo; for the Basilica of Saint

---

[34] On the reforms led by Montgelas, see Eberhard Weis, *Montgelas, Zweiter Band. Der Architekt des modernen bayerischen Stattes*, cit., p. 507 and following.

[35] *Handbuch der Bayerischen Geschichte. Band IV: Das Neue Bayern. Von 1800 bis zur Gegenwart. Erster Teilband: Staat und Politik*, cit., p. 135.

[36] On the abolition of the convents, see in particular Eberhard Weis, *Montgelas. Zweiter band. Der Architekt des modernen bayerischen Staates*, cit., p. 149 and following.

[37] Heinz Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern. Königtum im Vormärz*, cit., p. 523 and following.

Boniface (also a Benedictine convent) he even referred Ziebland to Saint Paul Outside the Walls. Ludwig's project went beyond the noted "alliance between the throne and altar". The king intervened directly and decisively led the alliance of religion and art, as indicated by Cornelius in the decoration for the frescoes (in the end completed by Zimmermann) of the loggia of Klenze's *Alte Pinakothek*, which had been inspired by Bramante.[38] Ludwig's intention was quite clear even before termination of the work and was justly defined as

> Die himmlische Weihe der christlichen Kunst, Weltbürgerlichekeit in der Bildung, Nationalität im Leben, den Bund der Kirche und der Geschichte mit der Kunst [...].[39]

The third element of Ludwig's ideal triangle, the patriotic cult of history, was expressed in many ways and inspired a large number of Ludwig's artistic initiatives. There were three main principles: the celebration of the Bavarian dynasty's role from the Middle Ages onward, the exaltation of the wars of liberation in their anti-French and anti-Napoleonic role, and political Philhellenism.

The great cycle of frescoes that decorated the throne rooms in the royal palace, entrusted in 1835 to Carolsfeld, was in fact dedicated to personalities like Charles the Great and Frederick Barbarossa but was also centered on idealistic themes dear to Ludwig. On the one hand, the relationship between *Imperium* and *Ecclesia* was emphasized with parallel inscriptions; on the other hand, the fact that the Wittlesbach dynasty had obtained the dukedom of Bavaria in 1180 thanks to Barbarossa.[40] Within the palace therefore that cult of Bavarian historical memory was again taken up, a theme Ludwig had already expressed in public through the frescoes of the *Hofarkaden*, realized between 1826 and 1829 by a series of student painters (among whom was the young

---

[38] *„Vorwärts, vorwärts sollst du schauen…" Geschichte, Politik und Kunst unter Ludwig I.*, cit., p. 237 and following.

[39] Article from the magazine, *Das Inland* of 1830, cit. in *"Vorwärts, vorwärts sollst du schauen…" Geschichte, Politik und Kunst unter Ludwig I.*, cit., p. 236.

[40] On these frescoes, see *„Vorwärts, vorwärts sollst du schauen…" Geschichte, Politik und Kunst unter Ludwig I.*, cit., p. 159 and following.

Kaulbach) of Cornelius.[41] Beneath the porticoes open to the public to coincide with Oktoberfest the decisive episodes in the dynasty's history were represented, from the aforementioned assignation of the dukedom of Bavaria to Otto of Wittelsbach in 1180 to the Bavarian victory over Napoleon in the Battle of Aris-sur-Aube in 1814.

Ludwig's particular attention to the cult of anti-Napoleonic memory can be understood in the light of previously mentioned events. In all of the German territories the memory of the "wars of liberation" (*Befreiungskriege*) became a constitutive moment of patriotic, dynastic, and then national[42] identity. However, Bavaria had a double motive: it had to recall its *liberation from* Napoleon while simultaneously forgetting its *alliance with* Napoleon. The kingdom of Bavaria "thanks to Napoleon" had a complex regarding its origins and tried to cover up a past by now embarrassing, multiplying in all its forms the memory of the latter period, in other words, the anti-Napoleonic one. In the royal palace an entire room, immediately preceding that of the throne, was decorated with paintings that depicted the defeats of the Grand Armée. Already in 1814 Wilhelm von Kobell had painted, on commission of the then still heir prince Ludwig, the large painting dedicated to the battle of Hanau on October 30, 1814, in which the Bavarians together with the Austrians fought against Napoleon.[43] Ludwig himself wrote a theatrical piece in five acts dedicated to Napleon's defeat entitled "Deutschlands Errettung". Central streets of Munich took the names of battles of the French campaign where Bavarian troops had fought between January and March of 1814: Brienne-le-Chateux, Bar-sur-Aube, Arcis-sur-Aube.

---

[41] The frescoes were to be restored already between 1892 and 1898, but were then gravely damaged during the Second World War and finally restored between 1971-1972 (for the Olympics), see Holger Schulten, *Der "Wittelsbacher-Zyklus" in den Hofarkaden München* (Heidelberg: Heidelberg Universität, 2006), p. 30 and following.

[42] On the iconography of the wars of liberation, see Micheal Thimann, *Bilder aus eiserner Zeit. Napoleon und die Kunst der Befreiunskriege*, in *Napoleon und Europa. Traum und Trauma*, cit., p. 217 and following.

[43] On the painting cycle of the "Hall of Victory" (Siegessaal) and in particular on this painting, see *„Vorwärts, vorwärts sollst du schauen…" Geschichte, Politik und Kunst unter Ludwig I*, cit., p. 59 and following.

Beyond *Arcisstraße* and the *Barerstraße* there is above all *Briennerstraße*, the grand avenue that connects *Königsplatz*, the square of the Glipothek and the Propylaea, with the royal palace.

In some cases the unilateral celebration, that is, the uniquely anti-Napoleonic, requires a certain dialectic capacity and a particular creativity. One example concerns the 30,000 Bavarian soldiers who died in the Russian campaign fighting alongside Napoleon. It is impossible to completely ignore such a tragedy. But when in 1833 the obelisk dedicated precisely to these fallen troops was added to the central round of *Briennerstraße*, the commemorative inscription read: "Auch sie starben für des Vaterlandes Befreiung". The paradox crosses over into indiscretion: the fallen *for* Napoleon are transformed into those fallen in the wars of liberation *against* Napoleon. Another example comes immediately thereafter, literally "right around the corner". The aforementioned Marshal's Hall is found in the square on the corner of *Briennerstraße*, that is, *Odeonsplatz*. The statue of *Generalfeldmarschall* von Wrede celebrates the commander of the Bavarian troops in the French campaign of 1814, but contemporaries well knew that the same Wrede had first fought *with* Napoleon, from Wagram up until the Russian campaign.

Finally, the aspect of political Philhellenism must also be considered, which is not only the other side of Ludwig's aesthetic Philhellenism.[44] In the case of Bavaria, Philhellenism went far beyond that solidarity with the war of independence against the Ottoman empire that ran throughout Europe and which involved many representatives of culture precisely in the years of Ludwig's transition from heir prince to new king.[45] The episode that most affected public opinion was the third and decisive siege of Missolunghi which began in 1825, the same year Ludwig ascended the throne. After a

[44] On the role of Friedrich Thiersch, the *praeceptor Bavariae*, who united the two aspects of Philhellenism in complete accord with Ludwig, see Sandrine Maufroy, *Le philhellénisme franco-allemand, 1815-1848* (Paris: Belin, 2011), p. 191 and following.

[45] For an evaluation of the situation in Bavaria in relation to the most general European tendencies, see Gerhard Grimm, *"We are all Greeks". Griechenbegeisterung in Europa und Bayern*, in *Das neue Hellas. Griechen und Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I.*, edited by Reinhold Baumstark (Munich: Bayerisches Nationalmuseum 1999), p. 21 and following.

year-long siege, the Turks conquered the city, which became a symbol of the tragedy but also the heroism celebrated by Victor Hugo and by Delacroix and connected in an indelible way to the memory of European volunteers, starting with Byron. In Bavaria as well groups of supporters formed[46] and Ludwig supported the Greeks' battles, not only with celebratory poems[47], but also financially.

All of this gains concrete political relevance, or rather, historical dynastic relevance. With the treaty of London in February 1832, the major European powers assigned Otto, Ludwig's recently-turned seventeen year old son, the job of becoming *the first king of modern Greece*.[48] This political aspect in its turn produced ulterior initiatives of Ludwig on an artistic plane. Between 1840 and 1844 the painter Peter von Hess, on Ludwig's instructions, painted a major cycle celebrating the path that had brought Greece to independence.[49] The thirty-nine frescoes (later destroyed by bombings) adorned the northern wing of the royal palace precisely in order to demonstrate and legitimize the dynasty's role in the liberation of Greece.[50] In fact, Hess, who had accompanied the new king on his trip toward Greece, finished the cycle with the representation of Otto's arrival in Nafplio, the first capital of the newly born Hellenic state. The same goal led the Propylaea to be decorated with friezes recalling the Greek war of liberation,[51] which were finished however in 1862, the same year the Wittelsbach's Greek adventure ended with Otto's deposition and return to Bavaria where Ludwig had also had to renounce the throne.

---

[46] On the Bavarian *Griechenvereine*, see Ludwig Spaenle, *Der Philhellenismus in Bayern 1812-1832* (Munich: Hieronymus, 1990), p. 213 and following.

[47] Marie-Angie Maillet, *„Auf Hellenen! Zu den Waffen alle!". Bemerkungen zur Rezeption der philhellenischen Gedichte Ludwigs I.*, in *Graecomania. Der europäische Philhellenismus*, cit., p. 306 and following.

[48] Katharina Weigand, *Otto auf dem griechischen Thron: eine Fehlspekulation König Ludwigs I.?*, in *Bayern mitten in Europa*, cit., p. 320 and following.

[49] On this cycle of frescoes, see *Graecomania. Der europäische Philhellenismus*, cit., p. 306 and following.

[50] *Das neue Hellas. Griechen und Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I*, cit., p. 306 and following.

[51] Hannelore Pütz, *Die Propyläen in München als Monument des griechischen Befreiungskampfes und der Wittelsbachischen Sekundogenitur in Griechenland*, in *Bayerische Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, edited by Monika Fenn (Munich: Utz, 2011), p. 63 and following.

3. The Parthenon on the Danube

In Walhalla all the motives we earlier defined as Ludwig's "ideal triangle" found their highest expression: classical art, Christianity and the patriotic cult of history. We have just recalled the initial phases of Ludwig's project, from the 1807 idea of honoring great Germans with fifty busts, up to the 1814 competition for the realization of a classical style building designed precisely to house them. At the termination of the works in 1842, the site stood out on account of its dimensions and location. This "temple of glory" dedicated to the greats of history and German culture rises, isolated and surrounded by a thick grove, to a height of almost 100 meters (*Bräuberg bei Donaustauf*) and offers a panoramic view over the Danube and onto the plain in the direction of the old imperial city of Regensburg.

The exterior, with its Doric peristyles and statues, truly follows that of the Parthenon. Incidentally, in 1817 the Parthenon's statues were exhibited in the rooms of the British Museum and their fame quickly surpassed that of the ancient statutes kept in Italy, even up to forming a new canon of classicism,[52] which in turn produced the well-known response within art history.[53] In addition, among the potential purchasers of those statues competing with the London museum was Ludwig himself, who in 1813 had acquired the sculptures of the temple of Aphaea later exhibited in Munich's Glipothek.[54]

The temple's real and proper dimensions within the monumental complex of Walhalla are impressive and surpass those of its Athenian model. It is 66,7 meters long, 31,6 meters wide, 20 meters high, and is finished with fifty-two 9-meter high columns. However, the temple rests upon an equally impressive base of 82,4 meters that finishes at the temple entrance with a stairway of 358 stairs for a total

[52] Vincenzo Farinella - Silvia Panichi, *L'eco dei marmi. Il Partenone a Londra: il nuovo canone della classicità* (Rome: Donzelli, 2003).

[53] Stelios Lydakis, *The Impact of the Parthenon Sculptures on 19th and 20th Century Sculpture and Painting*, in *The Parthenon and Its Impact in Modern Times*, edited by Panayotis Tournikiotis (Athens: Melissa, 1994), p. 230 and following.

[54] Farinella - Panichi, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

of 35 meters. It really is the realization of Ludwig's most ambitious project: the new Acropolis. Yet this temple was dedicated to Germans and to be found at a strongly symbolic point in the Bavarian countryside between Regensburg and the Danube. The temple, foundation, and surrounding landscape form a complex desperately desired by Ludwig and attentively calculated in its effects. It should accordingly be examined in context.

> Man versteht den dorischen Ruhmestempel nicht, wenn man ihn losgelöst von seinem gewaltigen Unterbau einerseits und ohne den landschaftlichen Zusammenhang betrachtet. Die Errichtung des Unterbaus verlangte eine geeignete Bergformation, die Bedeutung der architektonischen Elemente eine entsprechende kulturgeographische Lage.[55]

The importance that Ludwig attributed to this project from the very beginning may also be understood through painting. Immediately after ascending the throne, for his official portrait (*Staatsporträt*) the new king contracted Joseph Stieler. Stieler was the Bavarian court painter still remembered today for his 1820 portrait of Beethoven (while the latter was working on his score of the *Missa Solemnis*) and his 1828 portrait of Goethe (which is the most well-known portrait of the poet along with that of Tischbein from 1787), whom he represented holding a page containing the final lines of a poem of Ludwig's, the one who had in fact commissioned the painting.[56] Stieler finished Ludwig's portrait (now in the Neue Pinakothek) in 1826, that is, in the year immediately following the latter's having ascended the throne.[57]

---

[55] Jörg Traeger, *Der Weg nach Walhalla. Denkmallandschaft und Bildungsreise im 19. Jahrhundert*, cit., p. 44.

[56] For a comparative analysis of the two paintings see Alessandra Comini, *The changing image of Beethoven. A Study in Mythmaking* (Santa Fe: Sunstone Press, 2008), p. 46 and following.

[57] For the biographical and stylistic references that Stieler inserted in the portrait see Johannes Erichsen, *Ludwig und die Stile, in König Ludwig I. von Bayern und Leo von Klenze*, edited by Franziska Dunkel et al. (Munich: Beck, 2006), p. 31 and following.

The painting presents two aspects of particular interest. The more obvious one emerges at first glance as one understands the goal Ludwig had had in mind. The new and youthful king, recently crowned in a kingdom itself only twenty years old, wanted to exhibit all the royal attributes used by the greatest and oldest dynasties. Ludwig is represented in three-quarter view before the throne. His right hand is holding the scepter above the Bavarian Constitution of 1818, suggesting its being overpowered by the crown. In other words, the king "rests" on the fundamental law that guaranteed the rights of the citizens and limited the power of the sovereign while simultaneously exhibiting all of the traditional regalia of sovereignty. His dress completely corresponds to the established image of the sovereign as well, from the long silk mantle with embroidered train to the ermine tippet. In fact, Stieler had already portrayed Ludwig's father, the first king of Bavaria, in an analogous pose. However, the entire composition has even more ancient and glorious models.

The forebear of this long series is the famous 1701 portrait of Louis XIV by the court painter Hyacinthe Rigaud, which established the rule for official portraits of French sovereigns (and European courts). In the *Musée National des Chateaux de Versailles et de Trianon* the paintings that proceed the series follow one after the other: Louis XV by the same Rigau; Louis XVI by Joseph-Siffred Duplessis in 1777; Louis XVIII by Jean-Baptiste-Louis Gros in 1817; Charles X by François Gerard in 1825. The famous portraits of the emperor Napoleon are obviously of this type, and there it was Gerard's 1805 portrait (in Fontainebleau) that established the norm, in its time more appreciated than Ingres' too hieratic and widely criticized 1806 portrait which almost turned Napoleon into an image of Christ Pantocrator.[58] Only with Louis Philippe did the royal insignia disappear from the portrait done by the same Gerard in 1834 (it too in Versailles). That portrait maintained the traditional perspective but made the Constitution of 1830 quite visible upon which the open hand of

---

[58] Uwe Fleckner, *Die Wiedergeburt der Antike aus dem Geist des Empire. Napoleon und die Politik der Bilder* in *Napoleon und Europa. Traum und Trauma*, cit., p. 106 and following.

the *roi bourgeois* rested, almost as if it wanted to renew the oath pronounced on August 9 in the Chamber of Deputies.

Stieler's painting therefore, and certainly upon the orders of he who had commissioned it, intentionally recalled this grand iconographic tradition in the natural size, the solemn pose, the signs of power (the so-called *regalia*), and the splendor of the "grand habillement du sacre".[59] The setting also corresponded to Rigaud's fixed model for Louis XV. Ludwig looks toward the spectator and obviously dominates the scene, but a large part of the painting is reserved for the representation of the panorama that peeks through the columns from outside. And it is here one really notes the importance Ludwig gave to his project for the "temple of the nation". In this background there is a singular edifice, a Greek temple on a hill in a Bavarian landscape: Walhalla. At that time, however, it did not yet exist. In fact, Stieler finished his painting four years before construction of Walhalla began. In the painting of the coronation therefore Ludwig immediately and publicly indicated the programmatic choice that would be his government's objective: a *Kunstkönigtum* with the rebirth of the classical ideal in the kingdom of Bavaria at its center. The new king wanted to be represented like the even more powerful great sovereigns of state, but he also wanted to distinguish himself through an ambitious architectural project that certainly no other sovereign would ever have dreamed of inserting into the official coronation portrait.

The architect destined to realize this project was Leo von Klenze, the major representative of classicism together with Karl Friedrich Schinkel.[60] Klenze became Ludwig's most important architect,[61] even

---

[59] For the meaning, also teleological, of these elements beyond coronation (*Krönungsornat*) see Joseph Johannes Schmid, *Sacrum Monarchiae Speculum. Der Sacre Ludwigs XV. 1722: monarchische Tradition, Zeremoniell, Liturgie* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007), p. 412 and following.

[60] On reciprocal relationships, see Adrian von Buttlar, *Schinkel und Klenze*, in *König Ludwig I. von Bayern und Leo von Klenze*, cit., p. 119 and following.

[61] On the relationship between Ludwig and Klenze, see the essays collected in *König Ludwig I. von Bayern und Leo von Klenze*, cit., and in particular, Hubert Glaser, *Der "sinnliche Eklektiker" auf dem Thron und sein "Generalvollmächtiger in Kunstsachen"*, p. 323 and following.

if the king often intentionally had him compete with others, above all Friedrich von Gärtner. Schinkel, who died 23 years before Klenze, was Frederick Wilhelm III's architect and had designed the central face of Berlin (*Berlin Mitte*). For this reason, Klenze met with a lot of resistance in Munich but remained the predominant figure almost until the end of Ludwig's reign. Klenze began working in Bavaria with the Glipothek. In 1834 he followed Otto to Greece and consolidated his position with the new wings of the royal palace. He confirmed his predominance with the Alte Pinakothek, which was appreciated by Tsar Nicholas I during his visit to Munich so that he entrusted Klenze to design the New Hermitage in Saint Petersburg in 1838.

Klenze and Ludwig shared, each in his own field and at his own level, an inheritance that both considered embarrassing. They had both collaborated with Napoleon. Ludwig had had to bow before the reasons of state followed by his father; Klenze had begun his career in February 1808 as the Hofarchitekt in Kassel, that is, dependent on Jerome Bonaparte who had just become king of the newly formed kingdom of Westphalia. For another five years Klenze was considered both a loyal and convinced supporter of the Napoleonic regime. After Napoleon's defeat at Leipzig in October 1813 and the arrival of allied troops, he was forced to flee, as was Jerome, and found refuge in Munich. There he became an ardent German patriot, condemned his Napoleonic experience and already in his first audience with king Ludwig in February 1814 proposed great projects for monuments that would celebrate Napoleon's defeat and the "liberation of Germany".[62]

Klenze though had even more ambitious plans. He worked on developing a project for a "pan-European monument" dedicated to the rebirth of Europe which, thanks to the alliance of the sovereigns of the major powers, had eliminated Napoleon and returned Europe to its Christian roots and dynastic traditions. Architecture anticipated politics: the idea of the Holy Alliance was to be expressed not in

---

[62] Adrian von Buttlar, *"Also doch ein Deutscher?". Klenzes Weg nach München*, in *Leo von Klenze. Architekt zwischen Kunst und Hof. 1784-1864*, cit., p. 72 and following.

a national, but supranational monument. Klenze tried, to no avail, to present this project to European sovereigns during the Congress of Vienna. It was no coincidence that he had drawn up the illustrative text in French, the Congress's official language, entitled *Projét de Monument à la Pacification de l'Europe* and published in Vienna.[63]

In those years architects dedicated many projects, not only in Bavaria and not only in Germany, to the allied victory. There were numerous 'offers' in which the triumphalism of nations that had been humiliated by the long Napoleonic cycle merged with all of its devastations[64] but also responded to a tantalizing 'question' facing the various and powerful commissioners. Klenze also designed a monument dedicated to Waterloo, with Blücher and Wellington riding together and trampling Napoleon's imperial insignia.[65] In Berlin in 1818 the work for Schinkel's *National Denkmal für die Befreiungskriege gegen Napoleon* began, which was inaugurated in 1821 before the presence of Tsar Alexander I. The side inscriptions recalled the final battles, from Leipzig to Waterloo, while at the top there was the "iron cross", the military decoration also designed by Schinkel.

In the end, Klenze's projects were not realized but that of a "Pan-European monument" is of particular interest to our purposes. Here in fact we find the ideological beginnings and the fundamental architectural elements of that which would become Walhalla. There was already a Greek temple with a large crypt and there was the pyramid-shaped base divided into three sections with stairs that went to the entrance. But above all there was already the function to which everything was subordinated: a "Festival of Peace" (*Friedensfest*) to be solemnly celebrated periodically both within and without the temple.[66] Here Klenze recalled Ernst Moritz Arndt's idea, which we have

---

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[64] Jörg Echternkamp, *Die "Architektur" der Nation im Krieg. Patriotismus, Kultur und die Radikalisierung der Gewalt in der Zeit Karl Friedrich Schinkels*, in *Klassizismus – Gotik. Karl Friedrich Schinkel und die patriotische Baukunst*, edited by A. Dorgerloh et al. (Munich: Dt. Kunstverlag, 2007), p. 43 and following.

[65] Adrian von Buttlar, *"Also noch ein Deutscher?". Klenzes Weg nach München*, in *Leo von Klenze. Architekt zwischen Kunst und Hof 1784-1861*, cit., p. 83.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

already mentioned, on the commemorative celebration of the battle of Leipzig. This theme remained central to Klenze's vision and was both actively supported and reinforced by Ludwig. Walhalla was not only to be a monument "open" to the public which would "conserve" the collection of busts in memory of the past but a "temple" in the most ideal sense, a place where popular rites were periodically to be celebrated. Not a cemetery in the form of a classical temple, but that which we might call "an active sacred complex": a site which had the function of grafting onto German soil popular rites taken from classical tradition and adapted to the requirements of a new patriotism. One could object that the ancient model of the temple was at the service of pre-existing and long-standing rites, while that of Ludwig's Bavarian-German model of a rite that did not exist. On the contrary, however, everything still had to be created: the temple, the rite and Germany itself.

Yet even if there still remained objection to the utopian character of Ludwig's project, it is necessary to reconstruct the constitutive elements of that utopia. In other words, how were these periodical ritual celebrations to develop? And furthermore, what was the link between the architectonic choices and these para-religious "functions"? If the monumental complex of Walhalla had been conceived of and realized to serve this function, in order to understand it a reconstruction of both Ludwig and Klenze's vision for its "future life" after its completion is indispensable.

4. The liturgy: from "waiting room" to "temple of glory"

For us today "Walhalla" is synonymous with "the temple of the busts". For Ludwig and Klenze there was also another architectural element seen, both literally and figuratively, to be the "bearing structure" of the complex. This was the *Halle der Erwartung*, the great hall designed to host the busts of the important figures "waiting" to enter the temple. There was not therefore a closed number to the series of busts in the temple, but rather from the very beginning others had been conceived. This enlargement was supposed to happen in two phases. Before ascending to the highest glory, the new selections had to pass

a "settling" and transitional period in a large atrium with a cupola, precisely the *Halle der Erwartung* on the lower level. For the transfer of the busts to the definitive seat a "national liturgy" was foreseen, a series of popular ceremonies that were to become real national celebrations. The date was to coincide with that of the battle of Leipzig, October 18, thereby uniting the greats of Germany to the commemoration of its liberation. The monumental complex was thus to be experienced through the participation of a culturally united populace precisely by means of its greatness as well as that inherited from the classical world.

In Walhalla Klenze's *poetische Idee* corresponded to the classical coupling of death and transfiguration, connecting the great figures' death to the life of the German peoples united in memory and celebration. Justly the most perceptive analyses of Klenze's work, from Traeger to Buttlar (and most recently Pfäfflin), agree on this aspect.

> Nur die poetische Idee konnte dem Monument einen geschichtlichen und ideellen Sinnhorizont geben, der sich einerseits mit dem Leben und Interesse des Volkes, andererseits mit dem Unendlichen, Kosmischen und Transzendenten verknüpfen ließ […]. Klenzes reine Denkmalbauten waren als „Architektur der Unsterblichkeit" durch die poetische Idee von Tod und Verklärung (Jörg Traeger) bestimmt. Das transzendentale Moment der Geschichte sollte nach Klenzes Konzeption mit dem Volksleben durch einen Festkultus verknüpft werden, der diesen Ascensus vollzog.[67]

This vision regarding Walhalla is ever present in Klenze's and Ludwig's letters. The most thorough presentation is found in Klenze's letter of August 2, 1835.[68] Firstly, he established that the "inauguration of a new bust" must "always [occur] in connection with a German national holiday", October 18. Then the modality of the transition of the new bust was given in further detail, from the "waiting room" toward the glory of the temple:

[67] Adrian von Buttlar, *op. cit.*, p. 439.

[68] On the importance of this point, see Anna-Marie Pfäffling, *Kunstansichten zur Walhalla. Die "Poetische Idee" Leo von Klenzes*, in "Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte" 73 (2010), p. 67.

[…] nur diese Büste würde jedesmal darin aufgestellt, und dann mit einem feierlichen Zuge gleichsam aus diesem Hypogaion in die oberen Räume des Ruhmes und der Unsterblichkeit, die großen und breiten Rampen und Treppen hinan in den Tempel gebracht werden […]. So wie das Parthenon und seine Vorhalle und Unterbau (die Propyléen) erst beim Festzuge der Panathenäen, so würde die Walhalla ihre volle Bedeutung und Schönheit bei diesem pangermanischen Feste entwickeln.[69]

Klenze thus constructed an unrealistic but logical analogy. The temple corresponded to the Parthenon, the "pan-Germanic celebration" was the modern version of the Panathenaea, the transfer of the "waiting" bust the equivalent of the Panathenaic procession. To underline the utopian dream one could say that only the hoplites, canephorae, and oxen ready for the hecatombs were missing. In light of the 20th century and the project itself (recalling that De Coubertin's was no less utopian at the beginning), we could also say that other aspects were missing: the international structure, the competitive dimension, and the mass marketing that established itself with the new century.

However, the really useful observations are two. From the historical point of view, it is necessary to remember that these were the years in which that aspect of the "nationalization of the masses" that George L. Mosse was among the first to define as a "national liturgy"[70] took place. We have already mentioned Arndt and Jahn, the principle inspirations behind the first national German celebration of October 1814. Then there is the celebration of October 1817 at Wartburg castle, organized by nationalist students, who among other things publicly burned theoretical books of the restoration.[71] In times closer to Klenze's project, that is, in May 1832, the celebration of Hambach Castle took place, most importantly in Bavarian territory

---

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[70] George L. Mosse, *op. cit.*, p. 85 and following.

[71] Peter Brandt, *Das studentische Warburgfest vom 18/19 Oktober 1817*, in *Öffentliche Festkultur. Politische Fest in Deutschland von der Aufklärung bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*, cit., p. 89 and following.

and at the same time as work on Walhalla began. Ludwig and Klenze therefore had Hambach in mind, which had been the first, real manifestation of the masses with almost thirty-thousand participants and was justly considered the most representative initiative of popular tendencies toward national unification. It is however important to mention that the celebrations at Hambach had not been guided from above but were rather critical toward the established powers.[72]

From the architectural point of view, one comes to the conclusion that, in order to understand the *poetische Idee* that inspired Walhalla, it is necessary to consider not only the temple and the busts, but the "waiting room" as well. One would have to enter therefore from the entrance that is found on the lower floor as regards the temple, at the center of the great terrace at the end of the first flight of stairs. That door however is closed. In fact, it has never been open to the public. Ludwig rejected the idea of the "pan-Germanic festival" organized periodically in order to transport the busts from the "waiting room" into the temple. As the busts "in waiting" were living people, he realized that, as in every selective procedure, there would be too many problems. The most sensational example was that of Metternich who Ludwig had wanted to involve but who, instead, criticized the project, insinuating that Ludwig was constructing the "waiting room" more than anything else for himself.[73] The room was not finished and has never in fact hosted a single bust. From Walhalla's beginnings up until today it has been used as a storeroom.

Even without the activities of the *Halle der Erwartung* and the periodic connected festivals, the monumental complex holds meanings that go beyond that of simply a temple. The course must be in fact seen and understood in its entirety: from the base all the way to the friezes that decorate the temple without and within. Klenze deliberately used allusions to different ages and styles, as can be seen in his

---

[72] Cornelia Foerster, *Das Hambacher Fest 1832. Volksfest und Nationalfest einer oppositionellen Massenbewegung*, in *Öffentliche Festkultur. Politische Feste in Deutschland von der Aufklärung bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*, cit., p. 113 and following.

[73] Jörg Traeger, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

illustrated papers of the project. He did so for architectural-functional reasons, but also to give artistic expression to his ethnological theory on the origin of the German peoples, the so-called "Caucasian theory", that has a number of similarities with the theories on the origins of the "Aryans".[74] The first and most sweeping presentation took place in 1821 when Klenze published his essay on the shared origins of the Greek and German peoples.[75] Both had originated in the areas around the highest mountain ranges of Asia and in particular India. From this native home at the foot of the "eternal snows" and "roof of the world", the two peoples began, in the remotest times, a gradual but constant migration that, once across the Caucuses, brought them to Europe. The German peoples turned to the north following the course of the Danube: "Vom Paradies der Menschheit nach Mitteleuropa".

All of Klenze's construction took up widely held theories from those years, from *Über die Sprache und Weisheit der Inder* by Friedrich Schlegel (1809), to *Mythengeschichte der asiatischen Welt* by Görres (1810), a much loved author even by Ludwig.[76] From this ancient, complex history uniting Asia and Europe, diverse ages emerged that are of particular importance also from the point of view of art and that precede the classical period represented at the highest level by Greece. These are the Pelasgian phase, the Egyptian phase, and the Etruscan phase. The least known, but rather mythic, is the Pelasgian civilization. It refers to the Pelasgians, the populations that preceded the Hellenes in the regions of the Aegean. Klenze was not alone in seeing in the "Cyclopean walls" of Mycenae a typically Pelasgian form of architecture.

The segments that compose the monumental complex of Walhalla correspond precisely to Klenze's design. The powerful "Cy-

---

[74] On the racial aspects of Klenze's theories, which take also take up themes from Renan, see Dirk Klose, *Klassizismus als idealistische Weltanschauung. Leo von Klenze als Kunstphilosoph* (Munich: Uni-Dr., 1999), p. 162 and following and p. 221 and following.

[75] Jörg Traeger, *op. cit.*, p. 67 and following.

[76] Anna-Marie Pfäfflin, *Kunstansichten zu Walhalla. Die „Poetische Idee" Leo von Klenzes*, cit., p. 68 and following.

clopic'' base, that obviously 'precedes' the Greek temple, is Pelasgian (*pelasgische Mauerung*). The two lateral stairways of the successive floor rest on the pyramid-like from (*pyramiddaler Vorbau*). Here is the entrance to the "waiting room", conceived on the model of Etruscan hypogea (*etruskische Grabkammer*). At the higher level, one enters the temple where the busts are presented and finds oneself before a sculptural representation of the Caucasian theory. One of the largest friezes in bas-relief of the modern age (85 meters in length and 1 meter in height) runs along the walls and illustrates the great migration of the German people, from Asia to the Rhein, passing by the Danube. The final scene, on Ludwig's express orders, represents the people's conversion to Christianity inspired by the bishop Boniface, also known as "the apostle of Germany". Returning to the exterior, the story continues with two large bas-reliefs (more than 20 meters) that decorate the two gables of the temple. On the anterior gable, the southern side facing the Danube, the reconstitution of the German Confederation after Napoleon's defeat is celebrated. The feminine figure of Germany, with lowered sword in the sign of peace, is at the center welcoming the varied states of the Confederation, from Prussia to Austria and Saxony to Bavaria. The frontal posterior frieze commemorates the Battle of the Teutoburg forest (*Hermannsschlacht*) with Armin's triumph and Varo's suicide.

The path to the temple was therefore, if not properly an initiatory one (Ludwig was not a mason, and as regards Klenze there are only hypotheses),[77] then certainly "a lay pilgrimage" that took up the tripartite form *exitus-ascensus-reditus*. The connection between the natural and rural landscape allowed one to "take leave" of the urban and daily world. The ascent to the temple realized the *ascensus ad superior* which, after having passed through the Egyptian and Etruscan sections, culminated in the Greek temple, the supreme example of the highest aesthetic standard. Through the busts and bas-reliefs, in the end, the visitor's soul would open to the return of the German people's past, both ancient and recent, and could relive the greatest

---

[77] Adrian von Buttlar, *Leo von Klenze. Leben-Werk-Vision*, cit., p. 313 and Jörg Traeger, *op. cit.*, p. 205 and following.

moments of German history after having experienced the apex of classical architecture.

Ludwig renounced the central part of his vision he had long shared with Klenze, that of the transfer of the busts from the "waiting room" to the temple. It had to be the most solemn of *ascensus*, not only because it was to be inserted into a large, periodic pan-Germanic people's festival, but also because it was considered to be the final meeting point between the German tradition and the Greek in the cult of heroes. For this reason, Klenze used the expression *germanisches Elisium* to define Walhalla from November 1819 onward.[78] Already in August 1807 Ludwig had welcomed historian Johannes von Müller's suggestion of using the ancient Nordic mythological term for his project: *Valhöll*, the site which welcomed heroes fallen in battle.[79] In fact, the busts are joined by Valkyries, in Nordic tradition those who accompanied those fallen heroes to Walhalla, the kingdom of Odin. The "waiting room" was the sepulchral chamber and therefore the kingdom of death. With the ascension into the temple, one passed into the kingdom of immortality and glory surrounded by the sculptures: "das Büstenelysium der Unsterblichen".

The final product was a complex and confused mixture of ancient and modern history, mythology and aesthetics, Etruscan hoplites and Doric columns, pseudo-pyramid and opisthodomos, Caryatid and Valkyrie, Armin and Napoleon. If thereafter we return to the debate about the "temple of the nation" evoked previously, one could add that there was another model acting upon Ludwig's vision. The transfer of the busts in effect echoes the aforementioned *panthéonisation* of the Parisian Panthéon. The objective was the same, but the modifications did not only concern the practice. Ludwig inverted the values in accordance with his aesthetic, religious and patriotic convictions. His "Pantheon" was Greek and not Roman, it did not renounce but rather conserved references to the Christian religion and the choice of the personages to immortalize was tied to the German language and not place of birth (in fact it hosts Swiss as

---

[78] Jörg Traeger, *op. cit.*, p. 59.
[79] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

well as Dutch). Walhalla is certainly a "national monument" but not in a political-territorial nationalistic sense. Nipperdey justly placed it in a category of its own, defining it as the "Denkmal der Bildungs- und Kulturnation".[80]

5. The "Danubian course": Walhalla between history and landscape

From all of these elements it is therefore possible to extract that which we have called Ludwig's "ideal triangle": classical art, Christianity and the patriotic cult of history. And yet, an essential component of Walhalla is still missing: the landscape. We have already mentioned the importance of the choice to place Walhalla in an open space.[81] But one must consider how much perception of that landscape changed after the opening of the railway line, called the *Walhallabahn*, in June 1889. Furthermore, according to Ludwig's vision (and in the reality of the years around the middle of the 19th century), Walhalla had been inserted into a more spacious context which followed the Danube's watercourse. In May 1836 works began on the *Ludwigskanal*, which inauguration was foreseen to coincide with that of Walhalla. Through the 174 kilometers and the 100 locks of the canal (abandoned already after the last post-war), the Danube and the Main were at last connected, from Kelheim to Bamberg. Precisely at the beginning of that route Ludwig connected another monument, one dedicated to victory over Napoleon. This *Befreiungshalle* as well, finished by Klenze in 1863,[82] marks the Danubian watercourse that had a great meaning in Ludwig's vision and that today is found in a completely unrecognizable landscape context.

---

[80] Thomas Nipperdey, *Nationalidee und Nationaldenkmal in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* (1968), now in Thomas Nipperdey, *Gesellschaft, Kultur, Theorie*, cit., p. 148.

[81] On the diffusion of the model of the *Landschaftsdenkmal* and therefore of the *Denkmallandschaft*, see Lutz Tittel, *Monumentaldenkmäler von 1871 bis 1918 in Deutschland. Ein Beitrag zum Thema Denkmal und Landschaft*, in *Kunstverwaltung, Bau- und Denkmal-Politik im Kaiserreich*, edited by E. Mai and S. Wetzold (Berlin: Mann, 1981), p. 215 and following.

[82] On this monument, see Adrian von Buttlar, *Leo von Klenze. Leben-Werk-Vision*, cit., p. 408 and following.

Works on the canal finished in 1846, and Ludwig had a monument built to commemorate them north of Erlangen. The statues that represent the two rivers are holding hands and on the base the inscription celebrates Ludwig's greatness, he who had finally realized Charles the Great's ancient project, the *Fossa Carolina*. Today this monument is in fact "invisible" thanks to having been completely incorporated into the containment wall of the four-lane state road. On the other side the highway that connects Erlangen to Nuremberg follows the course of the Ludwigskanal almost exactly. It is a case of an obvious and taken for granted fact that is true for almost all of the architecture of the past, at any latitude. But a historical reconstruction of the overall project of Ludwig cannot ignore that Walhalla was part of a *Denkmallandschaft* that united art, religion, and history.

> Die Monumentalbauten Ludwigs I. sind zwar zum größten Teil intakt […]. Aber ihr ursprüngliches Umfeld hat sich nicht erhalten. Der ästhetische und geistige Zusammenhang erscheint heute zumeist gestört oder gar zerstört. Die erste kunsthistorische Aufgabe besteht deshalb in einer Wahrnehmung dieser Veränderung und demgemäß in einer Rekonstruktion der *Denkmallandschaft*, in der sich die Bildungsreise des 19. Jahrhunderts vollzogen hat.[83]

Incidentally, even the closest context also changed. In Ludwig's era the connection between Walhalla and the Church of the Savior, the only building anywhere close in the forest nearby, was immediate. Klenze attributed a higher meaning to the proximity because it gave further proof to the connection between art and religion, between the resurrection of the classical world and the Christian tradition. Klenze not only intervened with important modifications to the church, precisely to give a greater harmony to Walhalla, but exalted its importance in the 1839 painting *Die Walhalla im Donautal* (Regensburg, *Stadtmuseum*). Klenze chose a perspective that exalted the church, that placed it in the foreground, so much so that it seems

---

[83] Jörg Traeger, *op. cit*, p. 18. Emphasis added.

to be at the same height as Walhalla, at that point still under construction. In all of the landscape, totally agricultural and wooded, there is only one other, more modest building: a farmhouse. And everything is against the backdrop of the Danube.

The composition appears realistic, but there is also a historical-symbolic meaning. In light of Klenze's writings and correspondence with Ludwig, it is evident that even this painting had the function of illustrating Ludwig's "ideal triangle", connecting in a patriotic way the new Parthenon to the Christian religion and to local history.[84] In its way, the connection between the classical world, the Christian religion, and the Germanic populace in the landscape of the Danube corresponded perfectly to the quoted theory of Klenze on the common origins of the two peoples, Greek and Germanic. The great migration, following the Danube, had brought the German peoples to convert to Christianity, as illustrated in the bas-relief within Walhalla. The pilgrimage that, following the Danube, brought one to Walhalla and then rose toward the new Parthenon, allowed its contemporaries to commemorate these two great inheritances from the past, once again united in a national liturgy.

Finally, there is the connection to the closest city of Regensburg. In the *Sammlung Architektonischer Entwürfe für die Ausführung bestimmt* published in 1842, Klenze recalled not only his site inspection of 1826 and Ludwig's ultimate decision, but also the Minister of the Interior Eduard von Schenk's talk on the occasion of the beginning of works on October 18, 1830. Beyond being a politician, Schenk was also a poet (with modest results in both fields) and describing the landscape filled his talk with terminology as sublime as it was predictable, from "mächtiger Donaustrom der uns die Grüße eines verbrüderten Nachbarlandes bringt" to the "gesegnete Ebene Bayerns".[85] But there is al-

---

[84] Adrian von Buttlar, "*Germanische Tektonik?" Leo von Klenzes patriotische Interpretation des Klassizismus*, in *Klassizismust-Gotik. Karl Friedrich Schinkel und die patriotische Baukunst*, cit., p. 279 and following.

[85] The part of Klenze's text which quotes Schenk's speech is reproduced in the anthology *Kunsttheorie und Kunstgeschichte in Deutschland. Band II: Architektur. Texte und Dokumente*, edited by Harold Hammer-Schenk (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1985), p. 34 and following.

so a phrase that with exactitude and completeness connects Ludwig's "ideal triangle", precisely thanks to the reference to the landscape:

> […] und aus dem nahen Regensburg, dem ersten Sitz der Bayerfür-sten, wo Otto von Wittelsbach belehnt worden, erhebt sich wie ein Fels der herrliche Dom. So umgeben uns rings Bilder teutschen Für-stenthums, teutscher Kraft, Gottesfurcht und Kunst.[86]

Walhalla is almost ten kilometers from Regensburg and it is in honor of the city that Schenk united art, religion and patriotic history, just as Ludwig wanted. The ancient free and imperial city is the Bavarian city most tied to the story of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. From 1633 onward it had been the only seat of the permanent Diet (*Immerwährender Reichstag*), the highest representative institution of the empire, until its dissolution in 1806. Ludwig wanted the new national monument to be seen in connection to this ancient, glorious historical memory, emphasizing the link between Bavarian history and imperial history.[87]

It was a legitimate intent, seeing that Ludovico the Bavarian was a Wittelsbach, becoming emperor in 1328. But Regensburg evoked even remoter memories than these. It was precisely in the imperial city that the dynastic adventure of the first duke of Bavaria began in 1180, as had been recalled by Minister Schenk. And the ceremony for the beginning of works on Walhalla began on October 17, 1830, precisely in the *Rathaussaal*, the room that for centuries had welcomed the meetings of the Reichstag. Ludwig began works defining the new monument as a "reparation" for how much Regensburg had lost with the end of the Empire.[88]

Nevertheless, there was a major gap in Ludwig's carefully culti-vated historical memory as regarded ages closer to his own. This

---

[86] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[87] On the relationship between Walhalla and Regensburg, see Bernd Roeck*, Der Reichstag,* in *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte. Band I*, edited by E. François and H. Schulze (Mu-nich 2003 [2001]), p. 142 and following.

[88] Jörg Traeger, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

gap however was by no means accidental and, in this case as well, had everything to do with Napoleon. We have seen the embarrassing situations that Ludwig had to confront in relation to the monuments dedicated to the "liberation of Germany" from Napoleonic dominion. Selective amnesia, an ever-detectable phenomenon in politics, affected all of the states that had previously fought alongside Napoleon and then against him. Regensburg was a particularly embarrassing case. Ludwig praised the ancient glories of the imperial city, but it is important to remember that Bavarian troops had participated on Napoleon's side in the battles of the "Regensburg campaign" in the spring of 1809, concluding with the surrender of the city defended by more than four-thousand Austrians. It was precisely the series of battles around Regensburg that marked the defeat of the Austrians and opened the road to final victory at Wagram on the fifth and sixth of July 1809. The same Ludwig had participated in the battles of Abensberg on April 20 and Eggmühl on April 22, which concluded the following day with the conquering and sacking of Regensburg.

A major painting by Jean-Baptiste Debret (*Musée National des Chateaux de Versailles et de Trianon*) represents Bavarian troops and those from Württemberg singing hymns to Napoleon after the victory of Abensberg, for which the French emperor coined the name *Bravoure-Bavière*.[89] In Johann Lorenz Rugendas the Young's cycle illustrating the Napoleonic wars, an episode recalls the battle of Eggmühl and one sees Ludwig observing from on high the charge of the light Bavarian cavalry (*Ingolstadt, Bayerisches Armeemuseum*).[90] Regensburg is therefore an ancient imperial city, but under the king-

[89] John H. Gill, *Eagles to Glory. Napoleon and his German Allies in the 1809 Campaign* (Barnsley: Frontline, 2011), p. 64 and following.

[90] On the paintings dedicated to the conquest of Regensburg (and in particular in Albrecht Adam's painting of 1840, that is testimony to the battle and represents Napoleon while he observes the burning city), see Jörg Traeger, *Die Spur Napoleons in der Kunst. Bilder aus Bayern, in Kulturelles Gedächtnis und interkulturelle Rezeption im europäischen Kontext*, edited by Eva Dewes (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2008), p. 507 and following. Traeger defines the paintings on the battles around Regensburg as "*Desastres de la guerra in Niederbayern*".

dom of Bavaria only from May 1810 onward, after having been conquered by Napoleon with the participation of the Bavarians and Ludwig himself.[91]

All of this passed, as one might imagine, in silence. Ludwig was welcomed triumphantly in Regensburg for the beginning of construction on Walhalla by over thirty-thousand people. There was plenty of controversy but for other reasons. A passionate debate erupted between *Gräcisten* and *Altdeutsche*. When confronted with the project of Klenze that Ludwig had given him, Cornelius, the Nazarenes' most influential representative, in 1820 asked:

> […] so fällt uns bei dem Entwurf gleich die Frage ein, warum soll das größte deutsche und nur deutsche Ehrendenkmal so absolut griechisch seyn? Geben wir uns nicht eine Demanti indem wir unsere Nationalität durch ein großes Bauwerk verherrlichen wollen und zugleich den großen herrlich ächt original deutschen Baustyl ignorieren?[92]

With authentic "German style" Cornelius obviously meant the Gothic. Even Schinkel had presented a project in rigorous neo-Gothic style in 1814. The criticism continued even after the works had finished. In 1842 the sculptor Ernst Bandel, future constructor of the largest monument to Armin (*Hermannsdenkmal*), laid out the harshest analysis:

> Auf griechischen Konsolen stehen di Büsten großer deutscher Männer in einem Griechentempel, der den ehrwürdigen deutschen Namen Walhalla trägt; zwischen griechischen aber in der Tat eleganten französischen Victorien; hoch über einer unserer schönsten Städte

---

[91] Hans-Jürgen Becker, *Die Übergabe Regensburgs an Bayern, in Regensburg wird bayerisch. Ein Lesebuch*, edited by Hans-Jürgen Becker and Konrad M. Färber (Regensburg: Pustet, 2009), p. 23 and following.

[92] Cit. in Leopold David Ettlinger, *Denkmal und Romantik. Bemerkungen zu Leo von Klenzes Walhalla* (1965), now in *Politische Architektur in Europa vom Mittelalter bis heute. Repräsentation und Gemeinschaft*, edited by Martin Warnke (Cologne: DuMont, 1984), p. 230.

ragt stolz die fremde Siegerin […] Sollte unser deutsches Volk wirklich so wenig künstlerischen Sinn haben, daß es keinen eigenen Baustil mehr gebären kann?[93]

One must consider that Bandel had left Munich for Berlin in 1834, precisely as he was no longer supported by Ludwig. Cornelius did the same and for the same reasons. But the criticisms were diffuse and persistent, so much so that Klenze was forced to justify his position. On the one hand, he commented upon the scant amount of light in a neo-Gothic style building; and, even more so, in a building of such dimensions it naturally would not be the best solution when hoping to exhibit busts of 61 to 70 centimeters to the public. On the other hand, he asserted, on principle, the validity of the classical Greek style for all ages and all latitudes:

Wir haben oben zu zeigen gesucht, dass der strenge architektonische Stil der Griechen, insofern er allein nur auf Gesetzen der Statik, Oekonomie und Zweckmässigkeit beruht, welche für alle Zeiten und Orte gleich sind, auch für alle Zeiten und Orte Genüge leisten und zur Richtschnur dienen müsse; und wir glauben ebenso, dass an dieser Allgemeinheit seiner Zweckmässigkeit kein Unterschied des Klimas oder des Baumaterials etwas Wesentliches zu vermindern im Stande ist.[94]

In the last case Klenze turned, as we have already seen, to the "Caucasian theory", asserting the affinity between the Greek and German cultures.

Other arguments regarded the choice of the busts. In 1842, the temple initially hosted ninety-six busts, ordered according to date of death, which was equivalent to the date of "entrance" into the temple of glory. Ludwig's choices, as opposed to that of the French Panthéon, were not dependent on nationality. They ranged from

---

[93] *Ibid.*, p. 229.
[94] Cit. in Anne-Marie Pfäfflin, *Kunstansichten zur Walhalla. Die „Poetische Idee" Leo von Klenzes*, cit., p. 74.

Frederick Barbarossa to Charles V, from Dürer to Kant, from Leibniz to Goethe, but also from Jan van Eyck to Erasmus and from Rubens to Albrecht von Haller.[95] Higher up, right beneath the ceiling, there were sixty-four plaques that commemorated personalities of whom no portraits remained, from Armin to Charles Martel and from Alaric to Theodoric the Great. The most conspicuous absence, which from the beginning had caused the greatest public debates, was Luther's.[96] The reformer entered the Catholic Ludwig's temple only in 1848, the same year Ludwig was forced to abdicate, having been overwhelmed by popular uprisings that in that fateful year coursed throughout all of Bavaria. However, Ludwig's fall was also tied to scandals connected to the name of Lola Montez, the twenty-five year old ballerina to whom the sixty-year-old Ludwig had transferred enormous sums of money, palaces, and noble titles, provoking the revolt of the population.[97]

Ever since, the number of busts has increased as the government of Bavaria to this day is still following Ludwig's project. On the recommendation of associations or of individuals and the non-binding advice of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences, the government may decide, in general every five or six years, to add new busts of personages of the German language who have been deceased for at least twenty years. In this way, after Ludwig, the busts have increased in number to one-hundred-and-thirty. From Bismarck (added in 1908), to Bruckner (the only choice of Hitler's in 1937), to Einstein (the first Jewish member, 1990), to Sophie Scholl (2003), the heroic student of the University of Munich guillotined February 22, 1943 for anti-Nazi activity.

The most recent arrival, in July 2010, was Heinrich Heine. The poet – as well as being refused professorship at Munich thanks to

---

[95] For the most accurate analysis of the busts, which reconstructs all of the selective procedures, Ludwig's advisors and the scupltors, see Simone Steger, *Die Bildnisbüsten der Walhalla bei Donaustauf. Von der Konzeption durch Ludwig I. von Bayern zur Ausführung (1807-1842)* (Munich: LMU, 2011), and in particular the general catalogue, p. 242 and following.

[96] *Ibid.*, p. 189.

[97] Heinz Gollwitzer, *Ludwig I. von Bayern. Königtum im Vormärz*, cit., p. 706 and following.

Ludwig – had had to wait one hundred-fifty-four-years, but there are good reasons to believe that in reality he never would have wanted to enter in the first place. In Heine's opinion, Ludwig was a *Kunsteunuch* and Walhalla simply *a marmorne Schädelstätte*.

But was Ludwig ever admitted to "his" Walhalla to be among "his" busts? Yes, but he also had to wait more than the statutory twenty years. He died in 1868, but entered the "temple of glory" only in 1890. Ludwig is buried in Munich in the Basilica of Saint Boniface, which he had had constructed in 1850 and had vested to the Benedictines, his preferred religious order. Queen Teresa, his faithful and patient wife and mother of their nine children, rests next to him. His lover Lola Montez (in reality Elizabeth Rosanna Gilbert) has her place of honor in the paintings Ludwig dedicated to feminine beauty (*Schönheitsgallerie*), today in the Nymphenburg Castle. For these paintings (only thirty-six in number), the selection was more rigorous than for the busts, and Lola was the only one, among the king's many mistresses, to have received the honor of having her portrait done by Stieler, the same official painter of the coronation portrait.

Ludwig had to wait to enter Walhalla and not in the "waiting room" as he no doubt would have wanted. In exchange, however, he entered his "temple of the nation" in grand style: a full figure statue upon the throne, placed between the two columns of the opisthodomos. The pose is classical as is the clothing, but his arm rests upon the Bavarian lion, uniting for one final time the classical inheritance and the kingdom of Bavaria.

In memory of this, Ludwig's ideal vision so steadfastly followed, we find it just to continue to refer to Walhalla today as the "Parthenon on the Danube" and not to yield to the temptation to use that other, irreverent designation, "the storeroom of the busts" (*Büstenmagazin*).