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Abstract

Pompeii and Herculaneum attracted the attention of many European tourists, scholars, and letterateurs after their discoveries in the 1730s-1740s. Although seen as primary examples of Greco-Roman culture and of the way people lived in an ancient town, the cities did not arouse much attention as far as their architectural vestiges were concerned. In this contribution I try to assess this observation and to explain why the town was not yet seen as a source of inspiration for architects.

‘Pompeïa étoit une médiocre ville de la Campanie; ce n’est qu’un très petit débris de l’antiquité, mais c’en est le débris le plus vrai, le plus curieux, le plus touchant.’

1 Augustin François Creuzé de Lesser, Voyage en Italie et en Sicile, fait en MDCCCI et MDCCCII (Paris 1806), 181. This paper was presented during the round table ‘Origins and the legitimacy of architecture in Europe, 1750-1850’ organized by Professor Maarten Delbeke from (formerly) Leiden and Ghent Universities on May 1-2, 2015. I thank him and his Leiden colleagues for the opportunity to present my thoughts on Pompeii’s ‘quality’ as an example for the late 18th-century architecture. Professor John Clarke (University of Texas at Austin), a great pompeianista, was so kind to critically read my paper and to improve both its contents and English wording.

My research was carried out as part of the “Anchoring Innovation” research agenda launched by OIKOS (National Research School in Classical Studies, The Netherlands). This agenda is being developed with the financial support of Leiden University, Radboud University, the University of Amsterdam and the University of Groningen. The Anchoring Innovation projects investigate the way
Pompeii and Herculaneum were discovered in the second quarter of the eighteenth century and gradually excavated in hard campaigns which have gone on until the modern times. Although the local authorities were eager to keep the information as restricted as possible, in order to monopolize the knowledge gleaned from these spectacular sites, the remains attracted the attention of many European tourists, scholars, and literary authors from the 1750s onwards. The two towns were immediately seen as unique examples of Greco-Roman culture. Here no later intrusions disturbed the perception of ancient culture. Whereas Rome had a great number of public monuments, it was Pompeii – gradually laid bare thanks to open-air excavations – that showed houses in their original environment, in the ancient urban structure of streets and city gates and walls. If Pompeii could give an impression of the way people lived in a Roman town, Herculaneum yielded many artifacts from excavations carried out 20 meters below the surface by means of shafts and tunnels. One could even get the impression that the ancient inhabitants were not far away, since the remains were so well preserved and the buildings contained all the utensils used by them. Nevertheless Pompeii and Herculaneum did not arouse much attention as far as their architectural vestiges themselves were concerned. In this contribution I want to try to assess this observation and try to explain why these ancient Roman towns were not yet seen as a source of inspiration for architects as they would become in the nineteenth century.

The eighteenth century was an era of discovery of ancient Greek and Roman ‘ruins’. The Balkan, Greece and Asia Minor were traveled more intensely than ever before and various explorers produced lavishly illustrated volumes with images of the edifices they saw during their discovery excursions, some of which lasted several years (Schnapp 1996). These data were added to those about well-known and long-studied monuments in the Italian peninsula, mainly Rome, and changed the traditional image, especially by adding Greek original monuments to those of the Roman world. As to Italy itself, it also became subject of novel explorations, especially the part south of Naples, that is the ‘barbary’ of Magna Graecia and Sicily. At Paestum, not far from Salerno, three Greek temples were discovered in 1740, in a countryside long belonging to the state, but apparently strongly neglected by local scholars, not to say by a larger audience (De Jong 2014, 1-3). There were shepherds and farmers in an otherwise unworked and partly marshy region, deemed unhealthy due to malaria. The temples would stimulate many artists and scholars to produce images of all kinds and monographic studies as well as descriptions in travelogues and poems. What is more, they constituted important elements in discussions about origin and development of architecture and the impact they might have on modern
building (De Jong 2014). In various cases, Greek temples in Sicily were involved in the same discourse, but the island was apparently too remote to receive the same influx of travelers as Campania did.

New Discoveries in Southern Italy: Paestum, Herculaneum, and Pompeii

Herculaneum and Pompeii decidedly belonged to this newly-discovered world and became important goals for travelers to the south (Moormann 2015, 95-164). Often in the same travelogues as those which described Paestum, these towns were highlighted as absolute must-be-seens and in both areas authors and artists worked together. As examples I mention Richard Payne Knight and Jakob Philipp Hackert in 1777 (De Jong 2014, 82-88, figs 50-54) and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe who traveled with Christoph Heinrich Kniep in 1787 (De Jong 2014, 48, fig. 25; Moormann 2015, 148-152). Even if texts and images were not always published together, the combination of the two sources as studied by Sigrid de Jong conveys a good idea of the approach the travelers adopted and the experiences they had on seeing these ‘new’ monuments. Whereas De Jong (2014) has made clear that the temples of Paestum – and those found in Sicily – played a great role in the discussion on ancient architecture and its position in modern society, no scholar has studied the possible effects of Pompeian architecture in the architectural discourse in the first decades after their discovery. I argue that this simply did not take place because of the difference in scale of the monuments; here I investigate why this is the case.

Archaeologically, Paestum was new, since it possessed Greek temples, hitherto not seen, from the 6th and 5th centuries BC; Herculaneum and Pompeii were new thanks to their houses full of decorations and objects. Up to now, archaeologists have always pointed out that the sites provide an almost perfect, but surely also biased source of information regarding the urbanism of ancient average towns of Roman Italy in the 1st century AD, but the eighteenth-century excavators and visitors did not see Herculaneum and Pompeii as sources of this sort of information, simply because no one was investigating the modes of ancient daily life within an urban atmosphere. This had partly to do with the agenda of the local authorities, partly with the different scientific agenda of the time, and partly with the ignorance about the excavations due to a lacking documentation of the objects these excavators found. From the outset, the Neapolitan authorities considered the excavations as treasure-troves, where they could acquire many curious objects for a new Wunderkammer, never seen before. Because the objects came from urban contexts the were unparalleled within European collections of antiquities. Vessels, utensils, furniture, carbonized food, and other movable objects like statues were unique testimonies of the (supposedly) rich ancient towns and could shed light on practical matters of Greek and Roman culture – the famous antiquaria – of ancient texts. Still more appealing were fragments of floor mosaics and wall paintings extracted from the
discovered buildings from which the antiquarians hoped to get illumination about ancient visual arts, especially famous works by lost artists like Zeuxis, Parrhasius, and Apelles. This wish could not be fulfilled, as became clear soon, for the mosaics and murals actually constituted the adornment of banal houses and other utility buildings. The discovery of papyri in the Villa of the Papyri in Herculaneum formed a third source of fascination, for all litterati hoped to get unknown masterpieces by the classical authors, a wish that would not be fulfilled.

From the perspective of the Royal court in Naples, it was understandable that the politics of appropriating the archaeological finds as private property led to an absolute interdiction on publications by others than those appointed by them. In the first decades the court did not seem to have planned publications at all, but the increasing demand from outside would create a publishing policy of their own (Moormann 2015, 34-39). This absolute verdict did not prevent people from publishing accounts, but in comparison with the many publications on Paestum dating to the second half of the eighteenth century, the harvest is extremely meagre. We will have to take into account this dearth of serious studies in what follows.

Architecture in Herculaneum

As to architecture, the excavators of Herculaneum who crept through tunnels under the thick layers of volcanic material did not get an idea of the dimensions and aspect of the buildings they explored. From the outset, the visitors were aware of the fact that these lose vestiges belonged to a town, a hitherto unknown Roman town, soon to be recognized as Herculaneum devastated by Vesuvius in AD 79.

The theater – the first monument excavators had hit, probably already in 1709 or 1710 - was immediately recognized as such and drawn by various scholars. So it appeared in the first illustrated publications from the 1750s onwards (Pagano 2000). It would form the only seriously studied Herculanean monument until the twentieth century, when the open air excavations carried out under the guidance of Amedeo Maiuri would stimulate serious research on architectural topics. Gianbattista Piranesi (1783) published a seminal monograph on the theatre which was, according to him (1783, 1), ‘il più cospicuo di quante fabbriche siansi da trenta anni e più in qua scoperte.’ He observed correspondences with Vitruvius’ description of a Roman theatre and dated it to the Augustan period, which might be true. His plates show plans with and without the tunnels made by the excavators and ‘spaccati’ of a reconstructed situation, which he presented for the purpose of theatre makers (fig. 1). This book formed, as far as I know, the only monograph dedicated to architecture of Herculaneum for almost 150 years and did not evoke reactions. It is even not very clear whether stage designers profited from Piranesi’s reconstructions.  

2 De Jong (2014, 138-139, figs 85-87) has some remarks on stage design in which the influences of Paestum worked out clearly. Pacini’s L’ultimo giorno di Pompei from 1825 would get stage
The underground excavators reconstructed Herculaneum’s street plan showing a system of orthogonally planned house blocks, but although this was a new insight concerning city planning, it did not become a topic in the larger debate on urbanistics, probably because the reconstructed plan by La Vega was not published until 1797.

Architecture in Pompeii

Pompeii offered better chances to study urbanism and architecture: here the explorers excavated by daylight from 1748 onwards, clearing away the relatively light strata of ashes and lapilli and opening the monuments from above (Parslow 1995; Moormann 2015, 25-30). For this reason they could recognize the plans of the buildings and we have various examples of well-documented, but, as in Herculaneum, unpublished accounts, accompanied by plans and other drawings. Until 1755 unearthed buildings were backfilled after the pillage. After that, the explored houses were left open rather than being re-covered with the volcanic debris taken out from one place and brought to another. Soon a paved street lined by houses was recognized – the norther part of the so-called Via Consularis – that ended at a city gate (fig. 2-3).

What visitors saw in this section was a couple of tombs like the round bench, called Schola of Mamia, outside the Herculaneum Gate, and, from the 1770s onwards, the impressive remains of a three-story villa, called the Villa of Diomedes. The schola served as a seat for tourists, e.g. countess Amalia from Weimar, who was portrayed there by the afore-mentioned Tischbein. Inside the three-arched Herculanean gate one had access to a couple of houses and saw facades of other houses that were not yet excavated. Apparently, the excavators cleaned a stretch of the street in order to create an attractive street view, although they did not find many precious objects there and, as we know from other cases, they used to stop working in a certain place if it did not yield sufficient rewarding finds.

A second part was excavated at the southern side of the town. This is the area of the large and small theatres, next to which there are various sanctuaries. The oldest temple is the ‘Doric temple’ that was badly preserved and dates back to the 6th century BC (fig. 4; see De Waele 2001 on this temple). It is situated on a triangular arrangements by Antonio Niccolini immediately inspired by Pompeii (Moormann 2015, 362-364), but here the subject of the opera was decisive.

As an example, I give the large property (called Praedia) of Julia Felix, not far from the amphitheatre, where excavations were carried out in 1755 and the rooms were backfilled. It was, now definitively, excavated under Maiuri in 1952. See Parslow 1995 and Oliveto 2013.

Johann Heinrich Wilhelm Tischbein, Anna Amalia, Herzogin von Weimar in Pompeji, oil on canvas, 1789, Weimar, Museum. Goethe penned down on this ‘Bank am Tor’ some of his reflections, while he was in Pompeii (Goethe 1988, 204): ‘Das Grab einer Priesterin als Bank im Halbzirkel mit steinerner Lehne […]. Ein herrlicher Platz, des schönen Gedenkens wert.’ Note from March 13, 1787.
space, in those days interpreted as the *forum nundinimum* or town market, but also called Foro Triangolare thanks to its shape. At the other side of the theaters was a large *quadriporticus*, the alleged Caserma dei Gladiatori, in which many skeletal remains and a gladiatorial armory were found. The most curious object was the Temple of Isis, with its colourful decorations, one of the few buildings to receive a shelter from the elements—although that would be removed soon—while the paintings were cut out and brought to the museum in Portici. A painting by Jakob Philipp Hackert (fig. 5) shows this part of the excavations as the result of some forty years of excavations.\(^5\)

The amphitheater was apparently recognizable in the landscape, but being remote and invisible as far as its features were concerned will not have been visited by many people. The archaeologist Johann Joachim Winckelmann expressively makes mention of it in his two treatises dedicated to Herculaneum and Pompeii. He observed ‘eine ovale Vertiefung’ (Winckelmann 1764, 3 = 1997b, 9), but had previously noted an elevation in the landscape, probably seen from another point of view (Winckelmann 1762b, 11-12 = 1997a, 73-74). These observations are not contradictory: the layer of ashes and *lapilli* had bedded down and left an oval cavity in the surface of the place called Civita (i.e. Civitas, town), while the perimeter walls stood erect and were not entirely covered or at least not totally crumbled down and formed, therefore, higher landmarks in this plain landscape.

As a result, visitors saw nothing but small pockets of ancient architecture surrounded by the unearthed vineyards and farmsteads on top of the fertile volcanic layer, where modern people earned their money with agricultural and vinicultural activities. The plans by Latapie and Piranesi (figs 6-7) show the holes dug within fields and trees. Visitors, therefore, had to start in one of the excavation pits and climb down; they would then up again, stumble through the vineyards, and go down for a second time. Apart from the trip from Naples to Pompeii in a carriage, that is one of the reasons that a visit took an entire day rather than a couple of hours. This situation was far from satisfactory and caused a certain disillusion in the eyes of many travelers, so that we can understand Goethe’s remark quoted in the title of this contribution that hits expresses the *communis opinio*: ‘rather model and doll house than building’ (Goethe 1988, 198; cf. Moormann 2015, 149). ‘Modell’ implies scale models like those made by architects and Goethe might have thought of the cork models made of ancient buildings in Rome, Pompeii, and Paestum (Helmberger/Kockel 1993; De Jong 2015, 250-253). As we know, however, Goethe was more satisfied after a second visit, albeit rather in terms of the finds rather than

---

5 Jakob Philipp Hackert, Die Grabungen in Pompeji, oil on canvas, 1799, Attingham Park, The Berwick Collection, here fig. 5)
the architecture. Nevertheless, he made a sketch of Vesuvius in full action with a grand temple in front of it.

In his *Sendschreiben von den Herculanschen Entdeckungen* from 1762, Winckelmann gives the best resume up to that time of the state of knowledge about Herculaneum, Pompeii and Stabiae. As to our theme he briefly mentions the theater in Herculaneum, villas in Herculaneum and Stabiae and a small temple in Pompeii, probably a small aedicula in a garden of a house not far from the Herculanean Gate. While he criticises the working methods of the excavators, he does not reject the principles these people had adopted. Winckelmann is the first to see the importance of the open-air excavations for the knowledge of house architecture (Winckelmann 1764, 27 = 1997b, 23):

‘Nicht weniger Aufmerksamkeit verdienen zweytens die zu Pompeji ausgegrabenen Wohnungen in der Stadt selbst, von welchen da sie völlig vor Augen, eine genaue Anzeige kann gegeben werden, aus welcher die Form alter Wohnungen deutlich begriffen wird.’

Within the houses, he recognizes the central hall, the atrium with the impluvium in the center; these are features he may have known from Vitruvius’ description of houses of the Roman elite. He observes that the plans of the houses were not necessarily symmetrical, a remark that contradicts the general opinion that ancient art was based on symmetry, both in the depiction of humans and the plans of buildings. He does not address the topic of architecture and urbanism.

In the *Nachrichten*, he discusses some buildings more in detail. In respect to the theater of Herculaneum, he describes the differences between the Greek model (never seen by him) and the Roman successor. Then he passes to the city gate of Pompeii nowadays known as the Herculaneum Gate. Winckelmann expands his sober description of the remains to an analysis of city gates as known from other places and textual sources. One may say that he comments upon the remains in a philological and antiquarian manner, singling out the particularities to be known about city gates, but not on this particular gate. I may be slighting him by saying this, because Winckelmann could barely have had knowledge about the urban situation because of the tiny patches excavated (cf. figs 6-7). In a way, he is a pioneer in that he begins with the town’s circuit and with the observation made in the field about the presence of the amphitheater (see above). He continues by describing the street and

---

6 De Jong (2014, 124-125) makes clear how Goethe reacted in two manners upon seeing Paestum. Apparently, he immediately noted fresh impressions and could alter his opinion thanks to later experiences without any problem.

7 Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Vesuvausbruch, water color, 1787, Weimar, Kunstsammlungen.

8 I leave out some earlier descriptions, mainly concentrated on Herculaneum, for which I refer to my discussion in Moormann 2015, 39-43.
its paving of volcanic basalt. As to houses, Winckelmann (1764, 22-26; 1997b, 20-23) describes two ‘Lusthäuser’, viz. the Villa of the Papyri in Herculaneum and the Villa of Cicero in Pompeii, the latter visible outside the Herculanean Gate. He observes similarities with the houses especially in the field of a technical feature, that is the water conduits, and we might think of water pipes and the like.

A hot topic in Winckelmann’s days was the existence – or not – of glass window panes. Considering that the windows at the street levels were very small and could contain iron grills, people believed that glass was not used and that this material only served for vessels. Winckelmann advocates its existence (Winckelmann 2001b, 43), and relies on remains of glass, while he says that ancient authors do not describe them. He also advocates this opinion in his notes for a possible second edition of the Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Antiken: in this booklet no word was spent on Pompeii at all (Winckelmann 1762a, 2001a).

Despite the interesting details observed and the interest of these remains for the knowledge of Roman architecture, these buildings could not be seen as grand architecture. Moreover, Winckelmann could not yet describe and comment upon the Doric temple found in 1767, which might have been a good link for him with the Paestum temples (for the earliest explorations, see De Waele 2001, 13-26). The main problem of his two pamphlets for the reader not at home in the excavations is the absence of illustrations which surely would had helped the readers to obtain a good impression of their importance.

It is not until Sir William Hamilton’s paper from 1777 that we get more or less faithful reproductions of what was visible in the town of Pompeii. Hamilton was British ambassador in Naples and apart from his work – which for the greater part consisted of hunting with the King of Naples and receiving the grand tourists – he studied volcanic phenomena and the ongoing excavations. His 1777 account of the archaeological situation in Pompeii was the result of a presentation in the Society of Antiquaries in London in 1775 and came out in the still existing periodical Archaeologia. The text is very brief and mainly consists of commentaries to a set of plates (figs 2-4) probably made after drawings by his private artist Pietro Fabris, especially known for the beautiful illustrations in a lavish book Hamilton had published in 1776, Campi Phlegraei. In modern terms, we would describe the 1777 contribution as a print of the images shown during the presentation. These engravings are matter-of-fact like and do not include romantic notions (see Osanna et al. 2015, 61).

Hamilton’s way of presenting the remains did not arrive in the academy until the early nineteenth century, when scholars like François Mazois began to publish extensive monographs similar to those printed in the 18th century about Paestum and other important sites (see De Waele 2001, 22-26; Osanna et al. 2015, 118-120, 171; Moormann 2015, 49, 55, and see index p. 479).
In contrast, there came dramatic views like those by Gianbattista Piranesi, reworked by his son, and the draughtsmen of Saint-Non for his *Voyage Pittoresque*. On a watercolour by Desprez, we see the Herculanean Gate and get the idea that this gate is huge, but surrounded by or rather barely emerging from the huge amounts of volcanic material. Large trees grow on top of the mountains and people are humble (cf. Osanna 2015, 67). Piranesi gives us the idea of a town hidden under the earth thanks to the infinite powers of God. We know that in many of his fascinating works man is a micro-organism. But was this true for Pompeii?

When the Doric Temple was discovered, it soon became the proof that Pompeii was a Greek town. Its remains, however, were scarce, and we must assume that it was demolished in Roman times, probably during the reign of Augustus. One could not see much more than the stereobate and stylobate as well as the circumference of the cella and some column drums (fig. 4). A capital was the main proof that the order was Doric and, hence, the temple was a sister of those in Paestum. Despite these scanty remains Saint-Non recognized the intercolumniations, so that the plan could be reconstructed (De Waele 2001, 14-22). As mentioned above, another temple discovered was that of Isis, the Egyptian goddess, which contained a mass of Egyptian an egyptianizing objects and decorations. Architecturally, it was too small to arouse interest, but its discovery caused an increased fascination for the still almost completely unknown Egyptian world. We have to wait until the early nineteenth century for larger temples, those on the Forum, which inspired architects to create visualizations, especially those by the French envoys of the Prix de Rome (see *Pompéi. Travaux* 1981).

The general opinion about the houses in Pompeii was, like Goethe’s dollhouses, that they were small and insignificant, although it was admitted that they provided a lot of information about ancient daily life (examples in Moormann 2015, 43, 121-123). I think that this attitude is due to the fact that, indeed, the first houses excavated along the Via consularis were rather small (e.g. Houses of the Surgeon and of the Vestals), while other were only partly explored. The villas mentioned were seen as good specimens of grandeur, especially that of Diomedes with its three levels. Another point is that the verdicts were penned down by members of the northern European elite who, themselves, lived in large and expensive residences. It may be illustrative that Edward Bulwer-Lytton chose two relatively large and richly decorated houses – that of Sallustius and of the Tragic Poet – as the residences of his protagonists. The latter was characterized as the London flat of a bachelor gentleman. The discovery in 1834 of Pompeii’s largest house, the 3000 sqm House of the Faun allowed him to introduce this mansion as the residence of Pompeii’s wealthiest people in later novels.

---

The aforementioned monograph by Sigrid de Jong (2014) on the discourse surrounding the temples in Paestum in architectural publications of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries stimulates me to compare reminiscences about the two sites by travelers who visited both Paestum and Pompeii. De Jong makes clear that the visitors in the more or less hundred years between discovery and the 1840s compiled their descriptions starting from the notion of Burke’s sublime or, if they had not read him, copying others who did so (De Jong 2014, chapter 1). This approach we do not encounter in the evaluations of Pompeii, which tend to concentrate on decoration, objects (which were not yet found in Paestum!), victims, and the disaster of AD 79. As far as I know, no author used words like sublime in his or her description of Pompeian architecture.

As we have seen, Goethe (De Jong 2014, 48; Moormann 2015, 149-150) was first disappointed and later more or less enthusiastic about both sites, but did not compare their architecture with each other. Charles Mercier Dupaty (De Jong 2014, 39; Moormann 2015, 37) did not recognize anything of grandeur in Pompeian architecture, whereas Lady Blessington (De Jong 2014, 55; Moormann 2015, 125) probably was not very impressed by the Doric architecture of Pompeii either, although she noted some antique elements in the ‘Temple of Venus’ (which is that of Apollo). The Doric portico, however, was marred by the addition of stucco (Blessington 1839, 277):

‘For example, in the Temple of Venus, several Grecian entablatures, in tolerable taste, have been barbarously plastered over and painted, transforming them from a pure Grecian to a bad Roman style.’

Probably Paestum was (too) rough and Pompeii (too) refined in her eyes.

As far as I know, Thomas Leverton Donaldson (1827, I, 41-42) is among the few early scholars to compare the Doric Temple of Pompeii with those of Paestum. He was with the painter Joseph Mallord William Turner in both Paestum and Pompeii (De Jong 2014, 55).

A second approach that De Jong analyzes is the picturesque (De Jong 2014, chapter 2), which implies an approach to the monuments from afar, so that sight, mind, and emotion might gradually acclimate to them. In that sense, Pompeii was not a picturesque site, as it sat in a recession within the landscape surrounded by heaps of debris. Although the area was wonderful and praised like the Bay of Naples in general, it did not give the opportunity to get acquainted with the monuments during the trip towards the site. As of a sudden, one stood at the rim of a deep trench in which the ruins were lying. The unique view by Jakob Philipp Hackert of 1797 (fig. 5) probably tries to satisfy the demands of the picturesque to a certain degree: distance, ruinous state of the monuments, imperfection, and good light. At the same
time, this view of Pompeii fails to transmit the grandeur the views of Greek temples of Paestum and Sicily had provoked during Hackert’s travel of 1777 (De Jong 2014, 85, figs 50-54). Even if these temple views show the monuments at a distance similar to the vedute of Pompeii, they try to ‘diminish’ the size of the temples or to suggest a farther distance despite their much bigger sizes than those of any building in Pompeii.

Despite the great discoveries made in the early nineteenth century such as the forum and its temples and public buildings, the debate concerning architecture and urbanism developed only slowly. Pompeii was and would remain a city of small houses, which were considered to be a major source for many purposes. On the one hand, therefore, it be these houses which inspired architects in the nineteenth century to create new, neoclassical houses like the Pompeianum in Aschaffenburg (Von Roda 1988), the pavilion in Crystal Palace (1851; Nichols 2015) and the Maison pompéienne in Paris (1856; Bellot 1998). On the other hand, interior decorations were shaped after Pompeian examples as early as the 1750s, when the illustrations of the Antichità d’Ercolano circulated in learned and artistic circles in northern Europe. The draughtsman in the Villa of Diomnedes (fig. 8) probably was impressed by what he saw as grand villa architecture, the columns being double as high as they were in reality. We might think of the recreation of the interior of a Pompeian house in ‘Villa Hamilton’ in the park of Wörlitz (1788-1794; I. Pfeifer in Vulkan 2005, 109-120) and Goethe’s Römisches Haus in the landscape park of Weimar, designed for his Maecenas and employer Karl August, with an exterior rather reflecting an ancient temple (1791-1798; Beyer 2001).
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