Classical order is particularly important in European architectural history. It is associated with ancient Greek and Roman culture, Renaissance art and finally with retrospektyvisms of New Ages. Order (Lat. Ordo, fr. Ordre, germ. Order – order) for centuries remained to be the essential system of temples, public or residential buildings and it consisted of three parts: 1) the main – column; 2) covering part above the column – entablature and 3) pedestal below the column.

The column was the most important form of artistic expression and it was the centre of attention for architects, artists and customers. For centuries artists searched for its perfect proportions, calculated structural properties, created a wide range of decor options, but each time they used to discover that it is not possible and even it is not necessary to surpass what once was created by Greeks and developed by Romans. Thus, there was contemplation about the divine nature of a column, its similarity to human beings and its organic origin.

The aim of this article is to review the main theories of orders from ancient times until the XIXth century, emphasizing their aesthetic and spiritual essence and the explanations of sacred column origin. This work is not meant to be a comprehensive review as it was not possible to read all architectural works. In 1832, in Vilnius University, Department of Architecture, a rich library in this field was destroyed during the liquidation of the university; books were stolen and transported to Kiev, Kharkov and elsewhere. Therefore, when collecting data, the majority of publications were read abroad or their translations into Russian, Polish and Czech languages were used.

The oldest known work, containing the outlined rules of architecture is Vitruvius Pollio’s treatise The Ten Books on Architecture, published in the 1st century BC and dedicated to the Emperor Augustus. Vitruvius attempted to summarize the Greek architecture, although he lived two centuries after their classical period (the V-IIIth c. BC). In this treatise order is often associated with gods. In the following line he explains the origin of the ancient Doric order:

When Doras, the son of Helen and nymph Ftija, reigned in Achaia and in the entire Pe-loponnese, in the old city of Argo he made a temple, which accidentally took a Doric shape of order and then he built temples of the same order in other Achaia cities, even though there were no rules of proportions then1.

Vitruvius also indicates other orders that fit to be used for various temples of gods. The temples for Thunderer, Heaven, Sun and Moon should be open as these gods manifest in open, glowing sky. The temples for Minerva, Mars, and Heracles are Doric temples as the bravery of these gods requires buildings without any decorations. The Corinthian order would be most appropriate for the temples of Venus, Flora, Proserpina and nymphs since these dieties...
are so tender that architecture also requires slender forms, colourfully decorated with leaves and twirls. What concerns the temples for Juno, Diana, Father Liberi and similar deities, having applied Ionic order, an intermediate link between strict Doric and soft Corinthian buildings would be filled.

In his treatise Vitruvius presented the following lyrical legend about the form of Corinthian column's capitol:

A young girl, Corinth citizen, having attained the marriageable age, fell unwell and died. Her wet nurse, gathered her small things, which a girl cherished very much, put them into a basket, brought it to the graveyard and put on the grave. A tile had been placed over the basket to protect it from the weather. Accidentally, the basket was put on the root of Acanthus. In spring, the pressed Acanthus' root let the leaves and sprouts out. The sprouts had grown through the basket's edges, reached the heavy tile and curled up in rolled tips. At that time, Callimachus (Kallimachos, - V. L.), who was honoured by the Athenians for his elegant, delicate marble works, was going through that tombstone and noticed a basket and it covering leaves’ tenderness; he was impressed by that spectacle, original form and in accordance with that view he created the columns in Corinth, established their proportions and the rules of Corinthian order.

For several centuries Vitruvius’ treatise has been forgotten. Only in the XVth century it was discovered again and commented by theorists of Renaissance. It also gave birth to new interpretations of order’s origin. After Vitruvius, the first work, examining the issues of order was an architectural treatise by Italian theorist Antonio di Pietro Averlino, who was also called Filarete (1400-1465). Filarete was a representative of the firmly rooted Christianity and he created theories of order’s origin that corresponded to the spirit of that period. Filarete wrote a lot about Biblical character Adam, searching for a relationship between God and a human being. It could be assumed, he claimed, that those who invented orders, should have discovered a high and well-built man, such as Adam was, because if God created his body, then consequently, it was created beautiful and extremely proportious, only later nature divided people into high, short and those of medium height.

Sacred theories of classical order’s origin were developed in the Christian direction by Sebastiano Serlio (1475-1555), the Renaissance theorist of the XVth century. In his books on architecture, he set to “correct” Vitruvius and suggested to use various orders in a different way. We, Christians, have to follow a different order, he wrote, and recommended to apply the Doric order for churches, sanctified for Jesus Christ, St. Peter, St. Paul, St. George and other saints, who were not professional soldiers but had enough strength and power to donate their lives for Christian faith. According to Serlio, the churches of Corinthian order should have been related to St. Virgin Mary, who was and remained virgin even after giving birth and in general for all the saints whose lives were virginity. The churches of Ionic order should have been assigned to all the saints, whose way of life was to be among the soft and tender, in other words, for holy wives, the former honorable mothers. Serlio’s order sacralization was a new way to express the spirituality of a building. It was a transition to the symbolic semantics, which transferred physical appearance into the second place.

Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola (1507-1573) ir Andrea Palladio (1508-1580) were the most famous architects of Italian Renaissance whose theoretical works introduced classical forms into European architecture. Their treatises summarized Vitruvius’ theories, provided order’s canons, methods of their composition and construction rules. Vignola’s and Palladio’s treatises were mostly widespread among the architects of northern European countries (including Lithuania) and they were often quoted in works of local theorists. The books of these two Renaissance giants were designed to be applied in practice as they were perfectly illustrated instructions for professional architects. However, due to such an applicable nature, in Vignola and Palladio’s works less space was left for aesthetic contemplation and issues of order’s origin.
Palladio’s follower Vincenzo Scamozzi (1552-1616) completed theoretical explorations of the XVIth century Renaissance architects when in 1615, in Venice he published a huge treatise *The Idea of a Universal Architecture*. There he developed Filarete’s disclosed idea of the divine order’s origin. Scamozzi in a new way gave a meaning to order’s, i.e. order’s (procedure) Latin lexeme *ordo* as the antipode of chaos:

Order (i.e. order – V.L.) has to be found in all the things, otherwise confusion would prevail and everything would turn into that Chaos, contemplated and sung by sages ans poets; we will indicate that architecture, as the creator of the finest science, must contain order in itself (…). Thus we can claim, that the created things are composed of order (i.e. order – V. L.), created by God; that order, as well as decorations, dominate in all the things and it is also clearly visible in sciences and noble arts (…).

Thus, Scamozzi gave a huge spiritual meaning to a classic form, claiming, that in architecture order is a part of the same universal order created by God. Having highlighted the divine origin of the order, Scamozzi also individually assessed every order type. In particular, he adored the Corinthian order and considered it to be superior to others:

there is no such order among them all, which would be more pleasant and beautiful as the Corinthian one (…). In ancient times this order was used for decoration of temple facades and internal parts so as to show that the noblest and the most superior things are meant for gods (…). We will add that this order expresses the transparency of soul, which is suitable only in the presence of Supreme Being.

Renaissance theorists’ theories of the divine origin formulated a new approach the order as a spiritual phenomenon.

In the XVIIth century works of architectural theory appeared in other countries. In 1550, in Zürich, an architect and wood carver Hans Blum published a book *V. Columnae or description and application of five orders*. Blum suggested an original derivation of a Toscanian column: *some architects claim that it has gain its name from the giant Tuscan which was supposedly a German ancestor, as this column was the thickest and the largest of all*. Blum’s attempt to associate a Toscanian column with the myth of his nation was new and perhaps the only one phenomena of this kind in the XVIth century. However, the author is original not only because of that. He compared the proportions of Toscanian column with a fat peasant and even called it a peasant column. It was an obvious order’s desacralization by drawing attention to people from lower social stratum. However, Blum highlights order’s sacrality elsewhere. He claims:

(…) This art is not invented from scratch, as it occurred thousands of years ago, reigning for Solomon who ordered the building of Jerusalem temple and royal palace of the Corinthian style, as it is said by Joseph.

In the XVIth century the centre of architectural theoretical thought was transferred to France. New talents appeared after Philibert De L’Orme’s (1510-1570) *First Volume on Architecture*, published in 1568. One of the most prominent talents was Roland Fréart de Chambrai (1606-1676) – a representative of a noble family who had the highest impact on the social layers of his country. He became extremely famoust after publishing *Parallels of Antique and Modern Architecture* in 1650. Chambre repeated Blum’s described biblical theory of the Corinthian order:

though I do not dare claim that this profile (the Corinthian order – V. L.) exactly corresponds to the profile of Salamons’temple (…), the more I am convinced that it is as close to that as it can generally be according to the descriptions, provided by the Bible and famous historians and which are testified by Villialpand in his huge treatise. Chambrai continues: If the churches and altars are built for those noble young ladies who, when defending Christianity in their youth age, suffered the cruelty of tyrants but overcame all the
tortures due to their strength, then is it possible to find something more expressive and corresponding to their dedication than this divine order! (...) In short, as it decorated the famous temple in Jerusalem, which never had any compeer, it can be rightly called the blossom of architecture, the order of orders (…)13.

In the evolution of architectural science, Chambrai was also distinguished as one of the first Hellenistic apologists who denied everything that did not meet the ancient Greek forms and aesthetic ideals. Later it became norm for the classicists of the XVIII-XIXth centuries but Chambre passed them all for more than a century. The author reminded Vitruvian’s description of the Doric order, where it was compared with a powerful man, such as Heracles (Herculis) was, who was always depicted as barefoot. Therefore, Chambrai concludes that Greek Doric order has to be without base either, in other words, it must be barefoot. Greek Doric order had no base, it appeared only in Roman times. Thus, this theorist, referring to the image of the ancient god, made an attempt to dismiss that was not Greek.

In the XVIIIth century, the problem of sacral symbolism was not as popular as it was before. Then theorists were debating whether the order came from the similarity to the human body or whether it developed from wooden constructions. Jacques-François Blondel (1705-1774), the adherent of Ant-hropomorphic theory, in his Cours d’architecture reminded that the logic of the divine order’s purpose cannot be ignored:

Take a look at Greek history and you will notice that Doric buildings were almost without exception assigned to Jupiter, Mars, Hercules, Ionic were assigned to Cybele, Juno, Proserpina and Corinthian – to Vesta, Flora, Hebe; if these three orders, together with Toscanian and Compositional, were equally applied for all types of buildings, then, such inconsistency would create greater that it can be imagined architectural monotony and inaccuracies in details14.

Italian scholar and journalist Francesco Algarotti (1712-1764), in his Essays on Fine Arts, related sacral order origin’s explanations with the searches of organic origin. He wrote: (...) The images of various forms’ trees thin as spruce, stumpy as beech and also those of medium thickness, to which people face everyday, could give birth to the idea of different orders... It is easy to imagine how the most enduring and the largest boards were attached to the ends of the thickest tree trunks that were used for abutment. The entablatures, made of several parts were put on the top of those boards, whereas it was different with the trunks of slimmer trees. I would say it is not difficult to understand how appeared the two initial forms, which determined the Doric and Corinthian order and which, when being transmitted from one master to another, finally reached such beauty that one author – a foreigner, even stated that these were given to human by God as objects, the invention of which far exceeded the capabilities of the human mind15. Here, Algarotti had probably in mind a German foreigner Leonhard Christoph Sturm (1669-1719) who wrote that the Doric and Corinthian orders were given to people by God. Sturm is also quoted by another German author - Georg Wolfgang Krafft (1701-1754)16.

At the end of the XVIIIth century, there were such theorists that skeptically evaluated Villalpand’s interpretation of the Corinthian order’s origin. Francesco Milizia (1725-1798) was extremely skeptical. In the book Princippo di architettura civile he wrote:

Father Villapand who generously searched for its (the Corinthian order – V. L.) origins dreamed- and he himself believed in that- as if God ordered Salamon to create this order and Greeks took it over from Jerusalem temple17.

Antoine Quatremere de Quincy (1755-1849) was critical about Vitruvius’s interpretation on the Doric order’s origin. He was convinced that the Doric order could have been created only by imitating the primitive wooden construction18.

Archeologic discoveries of the XVIII-XIXth centuries, achievements in exact sciences and finally educational philosophy encouraged architectural
theorists to be more accurate but everything that
was created from Vitruvius to Classical times was
not forgotten.

Lithuania also was not left behind by the theory of
the divine order’s origin. They came through the
works of other theorists, who have been studied and
assisted in shaping the view of artists.

The oldest architectural works of the XVI-XVIIIth
centuries, written in Polish and spread in Lithuania
were mainly practical manuals of construction and
farming. Rules of order construction have been
learned from Vignola and Palladio. However these
two authors less attention paid to the problems of
order’s origin. Wojcech Bystrzonowski19 referred to
Scamozzi. Martin Knackfuss, the developer of early
Lithuanian classicism, responding to the anony-
mous letter about Vilnius City Hall construction in
1782, wrote:

of those, who I have been reading about,-Ve-
etian architect Andrea Palladio, Vincenzo
Scamozzi (...). I respect the latter for his no-
veldy when defining the Ionic top (...)20.

Department of architecture in Vilnius University
has accumulated a set of theoretical works among
which there were Vitruvius’ The Ten Books on Archi-
tecture (published 1800-1801), treatises21 of Blondel,
Scamozzi and other authors. Representatives
of Lithuanian classical school were well aquainted
with rules of the Classical order and mythological
and anthropomorphic theories were helpful when
shaping their artistic worldview.

Anthropomorphic theories, looking for similarities
to a human being, were directly related to the sacral
ones. Ancient Greek and Roman gods were human;
biblical character Adam, created by God, had to be
divine proportions. It was a long time since Vitru-
vius associated the order with proportions of a man,
a woman or a girl. Laurynas Gucevicius, the devel-
oper of Lithuanian mature classicism, was educated
by anthropomorphic theories. His student Michal
Szulc, having become a professor of Vilnius Univer-
sity, also focused on the relationship between human

and order proportions. His lectural notes contained

a numeration of human body proportions accord-
ing to Vitruvius and Albrecht Dürer22.

The developer of Late Classicism, a professor of
Vilnius University and an architect Podczaszyński,
following the French rationalist Jean Nicolas Louis
Durand (1760-1834), distanced himself from
anthropomorphic theories. In his treatise Architect-
ural Basics for Academic Youth, he wrote: (...) It
would be better to adopt those rules that derive their
(orders’ – V.L.) shape from their purpose than to rely
on the imitated similarity between the Toscanian cor-
nice and human face seen from the profile23. How-
ever, even though Podczaszyński was utilitarian,
in his work he preferred and most probably he was
the only one who often used the most fragile, poetic
and non practical in our conditions the Corinthian
order (Ziliciai manor, Vilnius Evangelical Lutheran
Church, Vilnius University Aula).

Podczaszyński’s student Hipolit Rumbovicz in his
treatise On the Orders as Such also criticizes the ant-
thropomorphic theory: How it is possible that, for ins-
tance, the human shape all parts of which are created
for their own purpose can be an example for the sup-
port made of inanimate matter24? Meanwhile anot-
her Podczaszyński’s student Jan Sobolewski in his
treatise On the Beauty of Buildings, written almost
at the same time, claimed that the most beautiful
architectural forms are those that imitate nature if
this imitation is wisely thought-over:

Thus, the purpose of human creation, regard-
less its focus, approaches to the purpose of
the natural creation, because people follow
nature and it is what brings nature and people
together. This following has to be intelligent as
only perfect things can be followed by (...)25.

Works of Vilnius University architectural theorists
clearly reveal how sacral theories of order, having
gone through anthropomorphic stage, achieved the
searches of organic origin. Architectural theorists’

attempts to provide order with a spirit did not disap-
pean without a trace.
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Santrauka

Straipsnyje siekiama apžvelgti pagrindines orderių teorijas nuo Antikos laikų iki XIX a., giliai į ją dvasię esmę, sakralizuotus klasikinio orderio kilmės aiškinimus.


XVI a. architektūros teorijos darbų pasirodė ir kitose šalyse. 1550 m. Viurche išėjo architekto ir medžio rašytojo Hanso Blumo knyga *V Columnae, arba penkių orderių aprašymas ir pritaikymas*. Toskaninės kolonos proporcijas jis lygino su storu valstiečiu ir netgi vadino ją valstietišką. Tai buvo akivaizdus orderio desakralizavimas, atkreipęs dėmesį į žemesnį socialinį sluoksnį.

XVII a. architektūrinės teorinės minties centras persikėlė į Prancūziją. Po Philibert'o De L'Orme (1510?-1570) dar 1568 m. sukurtą Pirmojo tomo apie architektūrą iškilo naujų talentų. Vienas ryškiausių buvo Roland'as Frėart'as de Chambrai (1606–1676), pasižymėjęs kaip vienas pirmųjų helenizmo apologetų, neigusį visą, kas neatitiko antikinės Graikijos formų ir estetinių idealų.

XVIII a. orderių sakrališkos simbolikos problema jau nebuvo tokia populiarė ir anksčiau. Teoretikai labiau diskutavo, ar orderis kilęs iš panašumo į žmogaus kūną, ar iš sirutuliojo iš medinių konstrukcijų.