

# Art history in the university: Toelken – Hotho – Kugler

Eric Garberson

E. H. Toelken (1785-1864), Gustav Heinrich Hotho (1802-1873) and Franz Kugler (1808-1858) were three of the earliest art historians to earn doctoral degrees and to hold university positions for teaching the history of art. This essay offers a contextual reading of the extensive but little studied documentation for their university educations, their appointment to teaching positions in Berlin, and their subsequent university careers. It demonstrates how they gained their subject knowledge and the research and professional skills that prepared them to teach and that shaped their own work as scholars. Spanning about three decades, from 1804 to 1833, their training occurred during a period of rapid disciplinary specialization within the university. A close examination of that training, and the teaching careers built on it, thus contributes to the larger ongoing investigation of how existing university structures and procedures accommodated but also informed emerging disciplines in early nineteenth-century Germany.<sup>1</sup>

Although now largely unknown, Toelken occupies a position of considerable historical significance, as the second person appointed to teach art history at the Friedrich-Wilhelms (now Humboldt) University in Berlin, alongside Aloys Hirt (1759-1837), and the first to hold a doctoral degree (Göttingen, 1811). Denied a permanent position in Göttingen in 1814, Toelken moved to Berlin, where he taught at the university and the Akademie der Künste (Academy of the Arts), held museum positions, and participated in the artistic and cultural life of the city. Across all these varied activities ancient art was his primary but by no means sole focus. Although he published with some frequency, at least early in his career, he left no lasting mark as a scholar. In histories of archaeology only Hirt figures prominently, and both he and Toelken have been largely ignored in histories of art history until very recently. Here, too, Toelken merits only a passing mention<sup>2</sup> or is discounted as an archaeologist and museum professional.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> My formulation of these questions was in part inspired by the work of Uwe Meves on the early history of medieval German philology, which also pointed me toward many of the relevant archival sources. See in particular 'Die Institutionalisierung der Germanistik als akademisches Fach an den Universitätsgründungen in Preussen', in *Einsamkeit und Freiheit neu besichtigt: Universitätsreformen und Disziplinenbildung in Preussen als Modell für Wissenschaftspolitik im Europa des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Gert Schubring, ed, Stuttgart, Felix Steiner, 1991, 110-143. Still foundational for art history is Heinrich Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte als Institution*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979.

<sup>2</sup> Horst Bredekamp and Adam S. Labuda, 'Kunstgeschichte, Universität, Museum und die Mitte Berlins 1810-1873', in *In der Mitte Berlins. 200 Jahre Kunstgeschichte an der Humboldt-Universität*, Horst

The principal published source for Toelken's career remains the brief biographical sketch in Adolf Borbein's history of archaeology in Berlin from 1979.<sup>4</sup> Johannes Tütken's exhaustive history of the position of *Privatdozent* (lecturer) at Göttingen from 2004 provides a thoroughly documented account of Toelken's education there.<sup>5</sup> Documents for Toelken's *Habilitation*, or the second examination required for permission to offer courses as *Privatdozent*, and subsequent appointment as professor in Berlin have not been consulted since Max Lenz wrote his monumental history of the Friedrich-Wilhelms University a century ago.<sup>6</sup>

Hotho owes his prominence to his close association with his mentor, Georg Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel (1770-1831). As the editor of Hegel's *Lectures on Aesthetics* and author of publications on Netherlandish painting, he also figures prominently in some histories of art history.<sup>7</sup> Hotho attended the Friedrich-Wilhelms University from 1821 to 1824, earning his doctoral degree in 1826 and passing, with some difficulty, his *Habilitation* in 1827. Appointed for the history of philosophy, he taught courses in aesthetics and poetics and the histories of art and literature. He also worked for many years at the royal museum and was active in the cultural life of Berlin. Elisabeth Ziemer's exhaustive monograph of 1994 remains the principal source for Hotho's life and career.<sup>8</sup> New here is the discussion of the extensive records from his *Habilitation*. The text he submitted, a plan for a new Hegelian art history, provoked a bitter and highly instructive controversy among the members of the faculty.

Little known among English-speaking scholars, except perhaps as mentor to Jacob Burckhardt (1818-1897), Kugler has long been a central figure in German-

---

Bredenkamp and Adam S. Labuda, eds, Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 2010, 25-54; also published in *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden 1810-2010, 4: Genese der Disziplinen. Die Konstitution der Universität*, Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, ed, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2010, 237-263; references here to *In der Mitte Berlins*.

<sup>3</sup> Marc Schalenberg, 'Disziplin und Geselligkeit: Die frühe Kunstgeschichte in Berlin – in und außerhalb der Universität', in Bredenkamp and Labuda, *In der Mitte Berlins*, 17; Gabriele Bickendorf, 'Die Berliner Schule', in *Klassiker der Kunstgeschichte, 1: Von Winckelmann bis Warburg*, Ulrich Pfisterer, ed, Munich: C. H. Beck, 2007, 52.

<sup>4</sup> Adolf Borbein, 'Klassische Archäologie in Berlin vom 18. zum 20. Jahrhundert', in *Berlin und die Antike*, Willmuth Arenhövel and Christa Schreiber, eds, 2 volumes, Berlin: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1979, 2: 105, 115-116.

<sup>5</sup> Johannes Tütken, *Privatdozenten im Schatten der Georgia Augusta. Zur älteren Privatdozentur (1734 bis 1834)*, 2 volumes, Göttingen: Universitätsverlag, 2004, 2: 518-531.

<sup>6</sup> Max Lenz, *Geschichte der Königlich Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*, 4 volumes, Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1910-1918; for Toelken, 1 (1910): 605-606.

<sup>7</sup> Wilhelm Waetzoldt, *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker*, 2 volumes, Leipzig: E. A. Seeman, 1921-1924, 2 (1924): 53-70; Bredenkamp and Labuda, 'Kunstgeschichte', 42-45; Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte als Institution*, 195-198.

<sup>8</sup> Elisabeth Ziemer, *Gustav Heinrich Hotho. 1802-1873. Ein Berliner Kunsthistoriker, Kunstkritiker, Philosoph*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1994.

language histories of art history.<sup>9</sup> He published extensively on medieval art and architecture, wrote many reviews of contemporary art, and worked as a state official to promote contemporary art in Prussia. He also published two foundational survey texts, one on the history of European painting and the other arguably the first global survey of art history.<sup>10</sup> After study at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University, the Ruprecht-Karls University in Heidelberg, and the Berlin architecture academy (Bauakademie), Kugler received his doctoral degree in Berlin in 1831. He passed the *Habilitation* there in 1833, not without his own difficulties, and was appointed to teach courses in the art history of the Middle Ages. He taught at both the university and the Akademie der Künste until 1842 and then at the academy alone until 1848. Scattered across several repositories in Berlin and elsewhere, the documents for Kugler's training and early career have not been studied until very recently.<sup>11</sup> As for Toelken, there has been no systematic, overall appraisal.

Such an appraisal requires reading the primary sources with an understanding of the institutional frameworks within which they functioned. The academic policies and procedures that governed the training, credentialing, and hiring of men like Toelken, Hotho, and Kugler can be established from university statutes and specialized secondary scholarship not usually consulted by art historians. After sketching this background, I present an overview of those trained and appointed in the historical study of art in Berlin between 1810 and 1840, sketching a preliminary picture of how university procedures both promoted and impeded disciplinary specialization. Individual narrative histories follow for Toelken and Kugler, presenting large amounts of new primary source material for each.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Waetzoldt, *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker*, 2 (1924):143-170; Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte als Institution*, 86-88, 174, 207-209; Hubert Locher, *Kunstgeschichte als historische Theorie der Kunst 1750-1950*, Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2001, 244-254; Regina Prange, *Die Geburt der Kunstgeschichte. Philosophische Ästhetik und empirische Wissenschaft*, Cologne: Deubner, 2004, 144-147.

<sup>10</sup> Franz Kugler, *Handbuch der Geschichte der Malerei*, Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1837; *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*, Stuttgart: Ebner und Seubert, 1842. Each appeared in several subsequent editions, with revisions carried out in cooperation with and partly by Burckhardt.

<sup>11</sup> Jörg Trempler, 'Kunst und Wissenschaft. Franz Kuglers Promotion und Habilitation oder die Zeichnung als Prüfungsgegenstand', in Bredekamp and Labuda, *In der Mitte Berlins*, 55-65; Henrich Dilly, 'Kunsthistorische Studien, "weniger mit der Schreibfeder als mit dem Zeichenstift gemacht". Franz Kuglers Zeichenkunst', in *Franz Theodor Kugler. Deutscher Kunsthistoriker und Berliner Dichter*, Michel Espagne, Bénédicte Savoy, and Céline Trautmann-Waller, eds, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2010, 45-68; Johannes Rößler, 'Franz Kugler als Architekturbistoriker', in Espagne, *Kugler*, 123-142. Earlier literature, cited below, drew almost exclusively on the printed sources. A notable exception, although focused on Kugler's later career is Leonore Koschnick, *Franz Kugler (1808-1858) als Kunstkritiker und Kulturpolitiker*, Dissertation, Freie Universität, Berlin, 1985.

<sup>12</sup> I have attempted to draw upon most of the obvious, and some not so obvious, archival sources. I make no claim to absolute completeness, and I have indicated some areas where further discoveries are likely. The extent and complexity of the primary sources proved greater than I anticipated at the start of this project. For Hotho's biography see Ziemer, *Hotho*, 225-363.

By presenting biographical narratives I do not mean to imply that biography, or any aspect of it, is an end in itself. Rather, biography can provide a concrete starting point for further investigation of an individual's published work and its relation to larger institutional and intellectual contexts.<sup>13</sup> The narratives for Toelken and Kugler are focused rather than comprehensive, and they are conceived as case histories, with limited analysis beyond explanation of context. Their function is to organize and present the primary source material, both archival and printed, in an accessible, straightforward manner, thus making it available for use in other studies and by other scholars. Given the extent and complexity of the available documentation, I do not examine here the published scholarship of these men or their considerable accomplishments in criticism, visual art, music, literature, and the theater. Nor do I examine in depth the texts produced for their university examinations, as emphasis falls on the process itself and the reactions of the faculty.

In order not to obscure the narratives, I largely avoid, for the moment, the contentious question of when art history became independent as a discipline, which easily leads to 'tunnel history', or the projection of current disciplinary definitions and boundaries into the past. Indeed, the education and careers of Toelken, Hotho, and Kugler challenge the waning but still all too common conception of art history as an autonomous discipline that studies an autonomous cultural realm.<sup>14</sup> What they show is that, in the first decades of the nineteenth century, scholars operating with a variety of methods and intellectual perspectives pursued the historical study of art across a range of loosely defined and overlapping fields. In the process they helped to define the three terms, 'historical', 'study', and 'art' in ways that laid the foundations for but are not the same as their twenty-first century definitions.

### **The philosophical faculty and the university**

Both Hirt and Toelken were officially appointed to teach in a field (*Fach*) variously named but clearly focused on the historical study of art, and this is the same field in which Kugler earned his degree and was appointed to teach courses. There is no evidence, however, that Kugler ever studied with Hirt or Toelken in Berlin, at least not in any formal capacity.<sup>15</sup> Nor did Toelken ever work with Johann Dominik Fiorillo (1728-1821), the man who had been teaching

<sup>13</sup> For a concise discussion of current uses of biography see Christoph Gradmann, 'Jenseits der biographischen Illusion? Neuere Biographik in Wissenschafts- und Medizingeschichte', *N.T.M.* 17, 2009, 207-218.

<sup>14</sup> The best debunking of this erroneous conception remains Gabriele Bickendorf, *Die Historisierung der italienischen Kunstbetrachtung im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1998, 9-34, especially 22. See also Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte*, 174.

<sup>15</sup> It is commonly stated that Kugler studied with Toelken and earned his degree from him (*bei Toelken*, in the German formulation). Initially interested in Kugler, I came to study Toelken on the basis of this erroneous assumption.

the history of art at Göttingen for decades. Instead, as the sources show, both Toelken and Kugler received instruction primarily from professors whose teaching and research fell within fields now identified as archaeology, history, and classical and German philology. That several of these men were directly concerned with the historical study of art is a fact now largely overlooked. In contrast, Hotho's appointment was for aesthetics and literature, and he also taught the history of art. He took most of his courses with Hegel, although he also had at least one with Toelken. For all three, the sources show the crucial role of informal extracurricular mentorship and the absence of official doctoral advising. All gained much, if not most, of their knowledge of art and its history on their own, through travel, reading, and independent research, and all submitted independently produced work for the doctorate and *Habilitation*.

These basic biographical facts differ significantly from later forms of university training, but they are consistent with the basic shape of German university education at the time. As this is now unfamiliar, especially among English-language scholars, it will be helpful to trace the course of study from matriculation to *Habilitation* in Berlin, with some attention to university administration.

Although the Friedrich-Wilhelms University had been founded in 1810, it retained many older customs and procedures similar to those in Göttingen, where Toelken earned his degree.<sup>16</sup> The following sketches the elements necessary to understand the narrative histories, leaving out much historical and scholarly detail. It draws on university statutes, my own knowledge of primary source documents, and the literature on the history of universities and academic degrees. While institutional structures did not determine everything that happened in the university, they did inform the history of disciplines in significant ways. Without knowing what these structures mandated, it is impossible to judge their role in shaping scholarly practice in a particular field and the work of individual scholars. Their study is not an end in itself, but rather a necessary foundation for broader investigation.

Students matriculated in one of the four faculties that constituted the basic academic structure of the university: theology, law, medicine, philosophy.<sup>17</sup> Within each faculty there were no departments or other administrative divisions

<sup>16</sup> The literature on the history and significance of the new foundation in Berlin is vast and contentious. For a concise and sensible sorting out of the issues see Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, 'Wilhelm von Humboldts (1767-1835) Universitätskonzept und die Reform in Berlin', *Zeitschrift für Germanistik*, N.F. 20, 15-25. See also Tenorth, 'Zur Einleitung', in Tenorth, *Genese der Disziplinen*, 9-43. The first volume of the *Geschichte der Universität unter den Linden*, to be published in 2011, will doubtless provide a wealth of new information. Lenz, *Geschichte*, remains an essential source. William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006, provides a recent, if problematic, general discussion in English.

<sup>17</sup>For the matriculation records in Berlin see Peter Bahl and Wolfgang Ribbe, eds, *Die Matrikel der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin 1810-1850*, 3 volumes, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010, 1: xxii-xxl.

based on disciplinary specialization, aside from the theological and philological seminars established early in the century. These were, however, not open to all, and one could study philology without being a member of the seminar. To administer each faculty a dean was elected each year from among the ordinary (*ordentlich*) professors, or those with regular salaried appointments. Only ordinary professors had a voice in faculty governance, and only they could participate in the granting of doctoral degrees and in the *Habilitation* process. Each faculty also had a number of extraordinary (*außerordentlich*) professors, usually paid but not with a regular salary, plus a larger number of *Privatdozenten*, or unpaid lecturers. A professor was appointed in a primary field but with the right to teach in any field within his faculty. A *Privatdozent* earned the right, through the *Habilitation* process, to teach only in a particular field. At the university level, academic affairs were administered by the rector and senate, both elected from the full professors.<sup>18</sup> Until the very end of the nineteenth century, all faculty and students were male.

The university was, however, not fully autonomous. It was subject to the authority of the king, exercised through the Prussian ministry for spiritual, educational, and medical affairs, known as the *Kultusministerium* (henceforth simply the ministry), as organized in 1817, and prior to that the relevant section of the interior ministry. Through most of the period examined here the *Kultusminister* (henceforth simply the minister), Karl Freiherr vom Stein zum Altenstein (called Altenstein, 1770-1840), played a direct role in oversight of the university, aided by a hierarchy of officials. Many decisions, even at the faculty level, were subject to ministerial approval, and the ministry often sought to direct the course of academic affairs from above.<sup>19</sup> The minister oversaw the appointment of professors by proposing candidates to the king, who alone had the authority to make appointments. The minister might or might not consult the faculty, who in turn could propose candidates to him. The faculties controlled (within the bounds of the statutes) only the appointment of *Privatdozenten* through the *Habilitation* process. Finally, the university had no funds of its own, aside from the fees collected for nearly every bit of official academic and administrative business; these were apportioned among the full professors and university officials according to formulas set forth in the statutes. Consequently requests for funding, including salary matters, went to the ministry, either by direct appeal or through one of the four faculties.

Toelken and Kugler matriculated in the philosophical faculties at their respective universities, and their education and subsequent academic careers

<sup>18</sup> For a concise overview of academic administration in Berlin, see Erich J. C. Hahn, 'The Junior Faculty in "Revolt": Reform Plans for Berlin University in 1848', *American Historical Review* 82 (1977), 876-879.

<sup>19</sup> For the history and functioning of the *Kultusministerium*, see Bärbel Holtz and others, *Das Preußische Kultusministerium als Staatsbehörde und gesellschaftliche Agentur (1817-1818)*, 4 volumes, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009. Relevant specifics will be introduced in the narratives below.

were largely informed by the composition and procedures of those faculties. By the early nineteenth century every philosophical faculty included professors in a wide range of fields across the humanities and natural sciences, including philosophy as such. All members of the faculty were subject to the same set of statutes, but considerable deference was paid to the expertise of individual members in scholarly matters, including curriculum and the granting of degrees. Much specialization and differentiation occurred within this structure, which was fixed in its basic procedures but flexible in the lack of administrative subdivisions (departments, institutes). Although the number of professors slowly increased, most expansion and specialization occurred initially at the level of *Privatdozent*, where appointment was controlled by the faculty and required no funding.<sup>20</sup>

The same combination of fixity and flexibility characterized the curriculum available to students. There was no set number of required courses, nor was there any formal declaration of a 'major' within a faculty. Aside from general mandates concerning comprehensiveness of instruction and progression of courses from general to specific, curricula were not established overall or within fields. The university statutes stipulated monitoring of students through lists and reports from professors to deans, but there were no formal advising procedures. In 1824 the ministry attempted to mandate more regular decanal oversight of individual students, unsuccessfully, judging from Kugler's spotty record.<sup>21</sup> Eligibility for degrees depended not on the number or types of courses taken but on completion of the traditional three years of study (*Triennium*) and the quality of work submitted. However, most students left before three years and without earning a degree, which had little purpose outside the university, as credentialing in most fields occurred through state exams.

Even though transcripts might appear superfluous in this system, records were kept, largely as a means of monitoring and enforcing attendance and payment of course fees. Each student maintained a registration sheet (*Anmeldungsbogen*) that listed his courses and bore the record of fees paid at the bursary (*Quästur*). He presented it to instructors at the start of the semester for admission to class, and at the end of the semester each instructor attested to the student's attendance with his signature. The registration sheet was submitted and kept on file when the student applied for the required leaving certificate (*Abgangszeugnis*). Not all applied even for this, as it required payment (actual or

<sup>20</sup> For the history of the philosophical faculty see the essays in Rainer Christoph Schwinges, *Artisten und Philosophen. Wissenschafts- und Wirkungsgeschichte einer Fakultät vom 13. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert*, Basel: Schwabe & Co., 1999.

<sup>21</sup> *Statuten der Universität Berlin*, Berlin, 1816, II, 3-7, in Lenz, *Geschichte*, 4 (1910): 227-228. Johann Friedrich Wilhelm Koch, ed, *Die Preussischen Universitäten. Eine Sammlung der Verordnungen, welche die Verfassung und Verwaltung dieser Anstalten betreffen*, 2 volumes, Berlin: E. S. Mittler, 1839-40, 2 (1840): 190-192, for the ministerial decree of 14 September 1824, applicable to all Prussian universities; see also 208-265, for the curricula proposed by the ministry for the philosophical faculties in Halle (1831) and Bonn (1837).

promised) of outstanding fees as well a fee of its own.<sup>22</sup> Kugler's registration sheets survive in Berlin, but no such records are available for Göttingen or Heidelberg.

A similar combination of irregular practice and organized record keeping characterized the teaching of courses. Following established German custom, the academic calendar was divided into two semesters: winter, from mid October to late March, and summer, from mid April to late August. Before the start of each semester, a course list was published in both Latin and German (*Vorlesungsverzeichnis*), the Latin list organized by professorial rank, the German by subject. Instructors submitted their courses for the semester to their dean, who forwarded them to the rector for final publication. Among the tables and reports sent by the university to the ministry at the conclusion of each semester was one listing the courses actually taught, the dates on which each course had begun and ended, and the number of students attending.<sup>23</sup> These tables show that many of the courses announced never took place, usually due to lack of student interest or to faculty illness, travel, or other obligations. Many instructors began their lectures late and ended early, and students were notorious for lax attendance. Across the university courses were of two types. Those offered 'publically' (*publice, öffentlich*) were free (*gratis, unentgeltlich*) and usually open to the public without registration, although students had to register and pay an attendance fee (*Auditoriengelder*). Professors were required to offer a specified number of public courses as a condition of their appointment, but did not always do so. Courses offered 'privately' (*privatim, privatissime*) were open to registered students who paid course fees set by the instructors but collected by the bursary on their behalf. Private courses were also offered by the unsalaried *Privatdozenten*. Both faculty and students took the private courses more seriously.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Bahl and Ribbe, *Matrikel*, xxxv-xlv; see also Koch, *Preussische Universitäten*, 2: 266-272, for the ministerial decree of 11 April 1831 concerning registration (*Meldung*) and payment for courses in Berlin.

<sup>23</sup> A comprehensive listing of courses drawing on all three sources has just been published: Wolfgang Virmond, ed, *Die Vorlesungen der Berliner Universität 1810-1834 nach dem deutschen und lateinischen Lektionskatalog sowie den Ministerialakten*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011. On course lists in general see also Clark, *Academic Charisma*, 33-67. The ministerial tables are in the Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (henceforth GStAPK), Berlin, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. XIII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1-12, and continue to winter semester 1843/44. Tables for winter semester 1847/48 onward are in I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. VII, Nr. 18, Bd. 1ff. Starting before publication of Virmond's book, I have consulted these through winter 1873/74. References below are to Virmond for semesters through winter 1833/34 and to the archives thereafter. The Akademie der Künste also submitted tables to the ministry, which I have used to document courses taught there by Toelken and Kugler: GStAPK, I HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1-2 (1825-1862).

<sup>24</sup> Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, xvii-xviii, provides a concise explanation of these terms. For problems with public courses, see the letter from Boeckh to the ministry of 20 May 1817 in Lenz, *Geschichte*, 4 (1910): 338-342. *Auditoriengelder* were imposed by the ministry in January 1826: Koch, *Preussische Universitäten*, 2 (1840): 256.



In Berlin, as for German universities generally, it is difficult to establish with certainty who taught what to whom at any given time. Individual professors could allow unregistered, non-paying auditors in their classes, a practice known as visiting (*hospitieren*).<sup>25</sup> The end-of-semester tables include occasional notations that there were almost as many unregistered as registered students in a class, or that a class was not taught because too many wanted to attend without paying. Conversely, students could enter into truly private, personal instructional arrangements with instructors (and even persons outside the university) that left no trace in the official records. Especially for those pursuing a degree, personal mentoring relationships appear to have been as important as classroom contact. The records of the Berlin bursary, which included enrollment/payment lists for classes and individual student accounts, were destroyed after 1945.<sup>26</sup>

By the time Hotho and Kugler completed their studies in the late 1820s, the process for earning the doctoral degree, or *Promotion*, was spelled out in manuscript versions of the philosophical faculty's statutes.<sup>27</sup> The basis for the process was a memo dated 10 December 1810 and composed, on the faculty's behalf, by the philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) in response to draft regulations proposed by the ministry as a stopgap until university statutes were drawn up. Author of the draft was the theologian and philosopher Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768-1834), who had played a significant role on the commission responsible for establishing the new university. The ministry accepted all but one of faculty's changes, and the university statutes printed in 1816, which provide less detail on the *Promotion*, superseded Fichte's memo only on some points.<sup>28</sup> The statutes of the philosophical faculty printed in 1838 instituted only small changes in the process.<sup>29</sup>

All shared two common concerns: balancing traditional forms with modern necessities and restoring the rigor of the doctoral degree and thus its value as a

<sup>25</sup> Fichte's conflict with his colleagues in 1812/13 over his restriction of *Hospitanten* provides insight into the practice: Lenz, *Geschichte*, 4 (1910): 276-282.

<sup>26</sup> Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, xiii. The records were destroyed due to a supposed lack of space. Professors submitted lists of students to their deans, but only some of these survive.

<sup>27</sup> The manuscript statutes are preserved in Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Universitätsarchiv (henceforth HUBUA), Philosophische Fakultät (henceforth PhilFak) 16. To my knowledge, they have not been examined, and doing so exceeds the present scope. Although considered binding, these statutes were not always followed. At a meeting on 3 June 1828 the faculty agreed, in the interest of promoting scholarly qualifications, to adhere with renewed strictness to the statutes during doctoral exams: memo from dean Toelken to the faculty, HUBUA, PhilFak 195, f. 48.

<sup>28</sup> Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 358-371, remains the principal source for the initial history of the *Promotion* in the philosophical faculty. As Lenz recounts, Schleiermacher's draft was based on the sixth chapter of his *Gelegentliche Gedanken im deutschen Sinn* (1808), reprinted in Wilhelm Weischedel, ed, *Idee und Wirklichkeit einer Universität. Dokumente zur Geschichte der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*, Berlin, Walter De Gruyter, 1960, 170-177. Fichte's memo and subsequent documents are reprinted in Immanuel Hermann Fichte, ed, *Johann Gottlieb Fichte's Leben und literarischen Briefwechsel*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 2 volumes, Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1862, 2: 102-113.

<sup>29</sup> *Statuten der philosophischen Facultät der Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität*, Berlin, 1838; reprinted in Koch, *Preussische Universitäten* 1 (1839): 138-169.

marker of actual scholarly accomplishment and qualification. The process had long since degenerated into empty ceremony and lax practice, with some German universities notorious for granting degrees *in absentia* and more on the basis of fees paid than work submitted.<sup>30</sup> Schleiermacher's draft established the basic process for Berlin: submission of a Latin dissertation in the candidate's field of specialization to be evaluated by the faculty; admission to an oral exam (*Rigorosum*) only upon written approval of the entire faculty; the exam itself, to be conducted in Latin in the same field as the dissertation; and finally a Latin disputation following medieval custom. The master's degree, earned with just a general exam and a disputation, was retained as preliminary to the doctorate and without including the right to offer lectures, as did the doctoral degree.<sup>31</sup> Schleiermacher had earlier argued that the disputation constituted a necessary public demonstration that the candidate had internalized the spirit of scholarship (*Geist der Wissenschaft*) and of his manner of thought and dialectical abilities. His capacity to advance his own field on the basis of sound knowledge would, on the other hand, be demonstrated by the dissertation and the oral exam.<sup>32</sup>

In his response, Fichte, representing the philosophical faculty, requested several changes to Schleiermacher's draft. He rejected the use of Latin in the dissertation and oral exams as a hold-over from an earlier time, when Latin functioned as the language of instruction and promoted communication not yet possible in German. No longer the language of instruction, Latin would hamper the candidate, requiring him to use classical vocabulary for concepts wholly unknown to the ancient Romans. Fichte and his colleagues also rejected retention of the medieval disputation, even in German, fearing that it would degenerate into idle talk and bad behaviour.<sup>33</sup> Similarly, they sought to introduce more specificity into the name of the degree, reserving 'Doctor of Philosophy' only for

<sup>30</sup> For the history of academic degrees, see, most recently, the essays collected in Rainer Christoph Schwinges, ed, *Examen, Titel, Promotion. Akademische und staatliche Qualifikationswesen vom 13. bis zum 21. Jahrhundert*, Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 2007. A concise overview is provided by Werner Alleweis, 'Von der Disputation zur Dissertation', in Rudolf Jung and Paul Kaegbein, eds., *Dissertationen in Wissenschaft und Bibliothek*, Munich: Saur, 1979, 13-28. Also very useful, both for Göttingen specifically and Germany more broadly, is the extensive discussion in Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 1: 49-290.

<sup>31</sup> The master's was initially the degree granted by the philosophical or (liberal) arts faculty, which long provided a general foundation for study in the 'higher' faculties; these alone granted doctoral degrees. With the rise in its importance over the course of the early modern period, the philosophical faculty sought to express its parity with an equivalent degree. In effect the master's became a doctoral degree, and despite measures to retain it, the master's effectively disappeared, even as an intermediate degree. For this long, contentious process see the sources in the previous note; Clark, *Academic Charisma*, 183-238; and the essays in Rainer Christoph Schwinges, ed, *Artisten und Philosophen. Wissenschafts- und Wirkungsgeschichte einer Fakultät vom 13. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert*, Basel, Schwabe, 1999.

<sup>32</sup> Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 359-361; Schleiermacher, *Gelegentliche Gedanken*, 171-172, 175-176. The draft also tightened the rules for honorary degrees and degrees in absentia.

<sup>33</sup> Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 362-365; Fichte, *Leben*, 2: 102-104, and 107-108, for Fichte's separate proposal regarding other means of testing and promoting the use of Latin.

those examined in philosophy proper and adding degrees for individual fields (e.g. Doctor of Philology, Chemistry, and so forth). The ministry rejected the idea of discipline-specific degrees, and the university statutes of 1816 reinstated both the use of Latin and the disputation.<sup>34</sup>

Fichte and the faculty also changed the nature and focus of the oral exams, rejecting any exam, like those appropriate to schools, that depended solely on recall and did not allow the candidate the freedom to make something particular of his knowledge. They instituted the same exam for both the master's and doctoral degrees: On the basis of a text, in Latin or German, the faculty would admit the candidate to an oral exam before the entire faculty, at which all could vote. Here he would be examined first by the professor in whose field his text fell, second by the professor of philosophy on the conceptual clarity and inner coherence of the dissertation, and finally by any other professor who so desired; in addition, his general knowledge in philology, mathematics, and history would be tested by questions from the professors in these fields. In addition, candidates for the doctoral degree had to deliver two lectures, one in German before the assembled faculty, followed by another oral exam, and one in Latin to be delivered publically and without notes. Only the doctoral text was to be printed.<sup>35</sup>

The faculty accepted the establishment of the two degrees and defined the difference between them as, appropriately, one of degree: 'he will be named just a master who can, with facility, renew and re-order what he has learned and who thus promises to be a not unfit link in the chain of mere scholarly transmission; the doctoral degree is given to one who in his engagement with scholarship shows originality and the ability to make new discoveries.'<sup>36</sup> The printed statutes of 1838 changed the wording only slightly and added, 'It is self-evident that in the evaluation the criteria can vary greatly across the different fields and subjects with which the candidate is primarily engaged.'<sup>37</sup> These statutes retained the three levels of questioning required since 1810, but collapsed the additional questions on general knowledge into the third level of open questions from the assembled faculty. Those applying for the master's degree were to be tested for

<sup>34</sup> Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 365-366, 368; Fichte, *Leben*, 2: 106-107, 109. The German and Latin lectures fell away but were retained for the *Habilitation*, on which see below.

<sup>35</sup> Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 366-367; Fichte, *Leben*, 2: 104-105.

<sup>36</sup> Fichte, *Leben*, 105: daß bloß zum Magister derjenige genannt werde, der das Erlernete mit Fertigkeit zu erneuern und anders zu ordnen weiß, und der auf diese Weise ein nicht untaugliches Glied in der Kette der bloßen wissenschaftlichen Ueberlieferung zu werden verspricht, den Grad des Doktors dagegen derjenige erhalte, der in seiner Behandlung der Wissenschaft Originalität und Erfindungsvermögen zeigt.

<sup>37</sup> *Statuten der philosophischen Facultät*, V, 97, in Koch, *Preussische Universitäten* 1 (1839): 160: Jedoch versteht sich, daß bei der Beurtheilung hiervon der Massstab nach den verschiedenen Fächern und Gegenständen, womit sich der Bewerber vorzüglich beschäftigt, ein ganz verschiedener sein kann'. Although Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 369, note 1, finds this notion at odds with Fichte's conception of a unified philosophical faculty, it appears to have guided actual practice in the doctoral exams at least by the 1820s.

general knowledge, those applying for the doctorate on their principal field, and those seeking both degrees at once were to be asked both field-specific and general questions.<sup>38</sup> As in 1810, the faculty still assumed that all applicants would first seek the master's degree, but that the doctorate could be granted immediately on the basis of the scholarship submitted and performance on the exams. As it happened, however, all candidates applied directly for the doctorate, and the university only granted one master's degree.<sup>39</sup>

The printed statutes, and probably the manuscript versions as well, made explicit the expectation that the candidates would submit only original work. The statutes stipulated that the dissertation be produced by the candidate himself without outside assistance and that he certify this in writing.<sup>40</sup> Nowhere in any of these sources is there mention of a formal doctoral (or *Habilitation*) adviser to oversee the dissertation or preparation for the exam. Such oversight, at least if officially acknowledged, would have detracted from the originality of the candidate's work; one of the objections raised against Hotho was that he adhered too closely to what he had learned in Hegel's courses.<sup>41</sup>

During the period in question here, the *Promotion* proceeded as follows.<sup>42</sup> The candidate submitted a letter of application, in Latin, to the dean of his faculty, along with supporting material: a short Latin *vita* listing life experience and past studies, university leaving certificate documenting the *Triennium*, secondary school certificate (*Zeugnis der Reife*), and a sample of scholarly knowledge (*Specimen der wissenschaftlichen Kenntnisse*) in the form of an essay

<sup>38</sup>Toelken's memo of June 1828 (HUBUA, PhilFak 195, f. 48) cites the manuscript statutes as including the same three levels of questioning, with the supplemental questions in philosophical, philological, and historical knowledge still mandatory for candidates not working in those fields. At this meeting, the faculty also resolved that no one should monopolize the time allowed for questions. Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 369-371, sees a significant shift in focus from the dissertation to general knowledge in the printed statutes. Based on the documents I have studied, it appears that, in practice, the principal examiners asked questions pertaining to both the dissertation and general knowledge. Questioning by the philosophy professor on clarity and coherence is not recorded and may not have occurred. Likewise, open questions from the assembled faculty are usually not recorded in detail, and they may not have been asked consistently.

<sup>39</sup> Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 368, note 1.

<sup>40</sup> *Statuten der philosophischen Facultät*, V, 103, 115, in Koch, *Preussische Universitäten* 1 (1839): 162, 164. In the documents for exams from the 1820s, deans often mention that candidates have provided this certification.

<sup>41</sup> For the absence of the *Doktorvater* and *Habilitationsvater* in the nineteenth century see Notkar Hammerstein, 'Vom Interesse des Staates. Graduierungen und Berechtigungswesen im 19. Jahrhundert', in Schwinges, *Examen, Titel, Promotionen*, 190; and Martin Schmeiser, *Akademischer Hasard. Das Berufsschicksal des Professors und das Schicksal der deutschen Universität 1870-1920*, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta, 1994, 37, note 14. Both cite discussions at the fifth Hochschullehrertag in Strasbourg in 1913 as to whether work produced in seminars and laboratories could be considered independent (*selbständig*).

<sup>42</sup> This overview is based on the printed statutes and my knowledge of several doctoral exams. Documents for all doctoral (and *Habilitation*) exams between 1810 and 1945 are preserved in HUBUA. There has been no systematic study of how the exams were actually conducted and how the procedures changed between 1810 and 1838.

(*Abhandlung*) in the candidate's main area of study. Once approved, the sample would be published as the candidate's dissertation. Upon receipt of the application, the dean composed a memo (*Circular*) to the entire faculty certifying satisfaction of administrative requirements and designating one, two, or occasionally more, principal examiners based on the subject of the writing sample. The assembled materials were then circulated, beginning with the principal examiners, by the beadle (*Pedell*), who carried them around to the professors.<sup>43</sup> As the memo circulated, the professors added their vote for or against and comments, which could be very brief or quite extensive. If the majority voted in favor of admitting the candidate to the oral exam, the dean set a date and time. At the exam, the principal examiners asked the first questions, followed by their colleagues. Questions concerned both the dissertation and the candidate's general knowledge, in both his designated field and outside it. Sometimes professors asked questions relevant to courses or areas of interest listed in the *vita*. The exam was conducted in Latin or German, as the subject required and the examiners chose. The dean presided and kept the minutes, although individual professors recorded their own questions, the language used, and the quality of the responses received, in their own hand but in the third person. These minutes tend to be less detailed than the comments on the written work.

If the candidate passed the oral exam, he proceeded to the public Latin disputation. In preparation, the dissertation, as approved by the faculty, was printed and distributed to university and ministerial officials. It included the Latin curriculum vitae and Latin theses approved in advance by the dean. At the disputation, the candidate could defend the dissertation, the appended theses, or both, against 'opponents' chosen by him and then against any member of the university who wished to challenge him. No minutes were maintained of the disputation, which was a ceremonial event known for very bad and often pre-scripted Latin. The ritual conferring of the degree (*feierliche Promotion*) occurred immediately after the disputation.

Where Schleiermacher's draft and Fichte's memo stipulated that the right to lecture (*venia legendi, venia docendi*) was earned with the doctoral degree alone, the university statutes of 1816 conferred that right only with a second examination, the *Habilitation*.<sup>44</sup> The university statutes specified only that the

<sup>43</sup> The circulation of memos and materials (*Umlaufverfahren*) is little documented for Berlin, but it seems to have been similar to that elsewhere, including Halle and Göttingen; for the latter see Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 1: 86, n. 230. Faculty were required to live in or near the university quarter, and they often held classes and conducted university business in their homes.

<sup>44</sup> The process now known as the *Habilitation* had become common by the later eighteenth century, but practices varied widely among different universities, extending even to what it was called. Its history is extremely complex and its full relevance to processes of disciplinary specialization little researched, especially for art history. The principal source remains Ernst Schubert, 'Geschichte der *Habilitation*', in Henning Kössler, ed, *250 Jahre Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg*,

candidate already hold the doctoral degree and that each faculty assess his ability (*Fähigkeit*) according to its own procedures before allowing him to deliver a public lecture, without notes, on an approved topic.<sup>45</sup> As with the *Promotion*, the specific procedures in the philosophical faculty were an elaboration on the basic requirements set forth in the memo of 1810 for granting the right to lecture to those holding degrees from other universities, namely submission of a writing sample for evaluation by the faculty, a lecture in German to the faculty followed by an exam in the form of a discussion (*Colloquium*), and a public lecture in Latin.<sup>46</sup> The process set forth in the printed statutes of 1838 is very similar to that for Toelken in 1814, which followed a preliminary draft, and those for Hotho, Kugler, and others.<sup>47</sup>

The candidate submitted a letter of application, in Latin, with supporting material to the dean: standard administrative documents, a curriculum vitae in Latin, and a scholarly essay, printed or in manuscript, in each of the main areas (*Hauptfächer*) in which the candidate sought permission to lecture.<sup>48</sup> The dean circulated the materials along with a memo designating the principal examiners (usually two), based on the subject of the work submitted, and listing the subjects chosen by the candidate for the two required lectures. The professors entered their opinions on the memo as it circulated, beginning with the main examiners; all were to comment on both the sample submitted and the lecture topics. If a majority voted in favor, the dean scheduled the German lecture before the faculty. In the discussion after the lecture, the first questions came from the professor in whose field the lecture fell, who was not necessarily a principal examiner of the writing sample. Others present might ask questions if they wished. As at the doctoral exam, the dean began the minutes, which, again, tended to be quite concise. No minutes were kept of the Latin lectures, although the broadsheet advertisements often survive in the university archives.

In the 1820s the procedures for the *Habilitation* in Berlin were tightened in response to the increasing numbers of *Privatdozenten* and professors across the university.<sup>49</sup> The required interval after the *Promotion* was fixed at two years, but calculated in the same traditional way as the Triennium, i.e. as five years from first matriculation (producing the *Quinquennium* and much confusion in practice). The interval was to have been spent in further scholarly activity, and the

---

Erlangen, Universitäts-Bibliothek, 1993, 115-151. See also Hammerstein, 'Vom Interesse des Staates'.

<sup>45</sup> *Statuten der Universität Berlin*, VIII, 4, in Lenz, *Geschichte*, 4 (1910): 257-258. See Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 358-359, for how the statutes came to include these requirements.

<sup>46</sup> Fichte, *Leben*, 2: 106, 109.

<sup>47</sup> *Statuten der Philosophischen Facultät*, III, 53-64, in Koch, *Preussische Universitäten* 1 (1839): 149-152.

<sup>48</sup> Requirement of a publication identified as the *Habilitationsschrift* was only introduced later.

<sup>49</sup> This is a very reduced account of complex discussions between the ministry, the university, and the individual faculties. The philosophical faculty was also responding to problems that had arisen in the early 1820s with the *Habilitation* of Friedrich Beneke (1798-1854). For a basic account see Lenz, *Geschichte*, 2.1 (1910): 295-300, 410-415.

dissertation was explicitly excluded as an acceptable demonstration of scholarly accomplishment. The ministry denied the philosophical faculty's request to limit the number of *Privatdozenten*, suggesting only that the exam process be made more rigorous.<sup>50</sup>

The practices and statutes of the philosophical faculty thus established a basic structure in which all candidates for the *Promotion*, regardless of field, were examined for subject knowledge, ability and originality. At the second level, the *Habilitation*, candidates were evaluated on the basis of further scholarly accomplishment as a prerequisite for teaching.<sup>51</sup> While this two-stage process encouraged a fundamental emphasis on originality and expertise, the specific criteria of evaluation were left largely to the discretion of professors in the fields most relevant to the work submitted. As now widely recognized, no single conception of research or scholarship held sway at the new university in Berlin, and fields within the faculties had significant latitude to develop their own conception of the proper relationship of research to teaching.<sup>52</sup>

Despite its name, the philosophical faculty was not governed by philosophy as such, whose traditional leading role was increasingly challenged by the rise of philology and related historical fields. There was a clear tension within the faculty between the speculative, a priori system building of the philosophers and the concrete, text- and document-based work of the philologists and historians, which emphasized new discovery and source-based original research. This tension is exemplified by Hegel's exclusion from the Berlin academy of sciences due to his ostensible lack of scholarly rigor and historical method, a move led by Schleiermacher, who promoted an historical perspective.<sup>53</sup> This dichotomy between philosophy and philology is a gross generalization, albeit one sharply and polemically drawn at the time. Then as now, it obscures similarities between the two sides and elides significant differences and divisions within each, especially among the philologists. Despite appearances to the contrary, the opposition was not between ungrounded speculation and pure empiricism, but rather concerned questions of emphasis, degree, and method. Original research and new discovery had a grounding, often implicit and unacknowledged, in

<sup>50</sup> Relevant documents from 1828-29 in Koch, *Preussische Universitäten*, 2 (1840): 8-10, and HUBUA, PhilFak 1374, f. 17-18.

<sup>51</sup> Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 369-371, perhaps informed by his own experience, somewhat overstates the reduction of the *Promotion* to a general exam at the end of course work.

<sup>52</sup> See most recently Tenorth, 'Universitätskonzeption', and Tenorth, 'Zur Einleitung'. The work of R. Stephen Turner remains foundational on these questions: 'The Prussian Universities and the Concept of Research', *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur*, 5, 1980, 68-90; 'Historicism, Kritik, and the Prussian Professoriate, 1790-1840', in Mayotte Bollack and Heinz Wismann, eds., *Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1983, 451-489.

<sup>53</sup> Tenorth, 'Einleitung', 28; Herbert Schnädelbach, 'Philosophie auf dem Weg von der System- zur Forschungswissenschaft', in Tenorth, *Genese*, 163.

overarching conceptions about the object of study and the nature of human culture.

While there was no single governing conception of research, the new university was guided by the belief, articulated at the founding and mandated in the statutes, that research and teaching should have a reciprocal relationship. The specifics of this relationship, however, remained undefined and open to interpretation according to the needs and standards of different fields. In a practical sense, effective teaching depended upon current research, in order to provide all students with up-to-date instruction, and in this Berlin followed other progressive universities of the eighteenth century, notably Göttingen (founded in 1734, inaugurated 1737), in moving from the simple transmission of received knowledge to the production of new knowledge. More generally, exposure to prominent, working scholars was held to be inspiring and educative in and of itself. In both senses, then, research served the double mission of the university: to provide general education (*Bildung*) to the great mass who would go on to serve the state as bureaucrats or teachers (usually without a degree) while also training an elite group who would earn degrees and constitute the next generation of scholars in their fields. The specific relation between general education and specialized, discipline-specific training remains an area in need of further study, in particular for fields, such as art history, that did not establish seminars and institutes until the latter part of the nineteenth century.

### **The history of art in the philosophical faculty**

Case histories, like those of Toelken and Kugler, can help to show how individuals engaged in the historical study of art gained their subject knowledge and scholarly training within universities devoted primarily to general education and lacking formal advising procedures. They can also show how divisions within the philosophical faculty played out in the examination of doctoral students and the appointment of new instructors, and specifically in the evaluation of historical scholarship on art. The following overview uses concise synopses to place the longer case histories within the period from the founding of the Friedrich-Wilhelms University through the 1830s. Kugler's departure in 1842 coincides roughly with the major shift in ministerial priorities that came in 1840 with the death of minister Altenstein and the appointment of his successor, Friedrich Eichhorn (1779-1856), and the ascension of a new king, Friedrich-Wilhelm IV (1795-1861).

When Toelken initiated the *Habilitation* process in October 1814 there were thirteen ordinary professorships in the philosophical faculty. Of the two in philosophy, one had become vacant in January with the death of Fichte; the other was held by Karl Solger (1780-1819), whose publications and teaching extended beyond philosophy proper to aesthetics, literature, and ancient mythology. In addition to seven positions in mathematics and the natural sciences, there were



four in the philological-historical fields: August Boeckh (1785-1867) and August Bekker (1785-1871) for classical philology; Christian Rühls (1781-1820) for history; and Aloys Hirt (1759-1837) for theory and history of the arts of design (*Theorie und Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste*).

Already well established in the artistic life of Berlin, a member of the academy of sciences, and professor at the academy of arts, Hirt had been included in lists of potential faculty for the new university since the beginning, usually within the broad field of *Alterthumswissenschaft*, even though his expertise extended to art of the present time.<sup>54</sup> Like several of his colleagues, Hirt was appointed and awarded a doctoral degree at the same time, on the basis of publications and recognized accomplishment in his field. Contemporary sources indicate that he studied philosophy in Nancy and law in Freiburg, before studying in Vienna (1779-1782), where he neither enrolled nor earned a degree. Working with professors and scholars engaged in the study of antiquity and the arts, he laid the foundation for an extended period of independent study and private teaching in Italy (1782-1796).<sup>55</sup> In Berlin, Hirt's courses ([Table 1](#)) included a general theory of the visual arts (*bildende Künste*)<sup>56</sup> and more specialized courses primarily organized by medium and with a pronounced emphasis on antiquity but extending through the seventeenth century.<sup>57</sup>

According to the curriculum vitae submitted with his application, Toelken's path to an academic career was not all that different from Hirt's, up to the point of earning a degree. His education in Göttingen had been broad, encompassing philosophy, history, literature, and mythology. He presented himself as having worked with the historian Arnold Ludwig Heeren and with Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729-1812), a scholar of antiquity in whose publication and teaching art played a significant role.<sup>58</sup> In addition, he had spent several years in Italy,

<sup>54</sup> The official appointment documents for Hirt have not been published or studied in depth; they are cited in Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 262-263. The title for his appointment is given in Rudolf Köpke, *Die Gründung der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*, Berlin: Gustav Schade, 1860, 81.

<sup>55</sup> Hirt's life and career have been thoroughly researched. For his education and years in Italy see Adelheid Müller, "'Docendo discimus...durch das Lehren lernen wir'. Aloys Hirts Jahre als Cicerone in Rom", in Claudia Sedlarz, ed., *Aloys Hirt. Archäologe, Historiker, Kunstkenner*, Hanover-Laatz: Wehrhahn, 2004, 15-68. Müller was unable to find any record of Hirt at the university in Vienna; by not matriculating students avoided paying the many university fees (44, note 20).

<sup>56</sup> 'Visual arts' is the best approximation for *bildende Künste*, although it wrongly privileges the visual over the more physical sense of 'forming' conveyed by the German *bildend*.

<sup>57</sup> This table has been assembled from the information in Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, and the ministerial tables. It shows that in many semesters Hirt did not actually teach and that he effectively stopped after winter 1832/33. See Wrede, 'Archäologien', 221, for a brief overview of Hirt's courses based on the published lists.

<sup>58</sup> Although largely ignored by historians of art history, Heyne's importance for archaeology and now history has been thoroughly studied. See most recently Marianne Heydenreich, *Christian Gottlob Heyne und die Alte Geschichte*, Munich and Leipzig, K. G. Saur, 2006, and Daniel Graepler and Joachim Migl, eds., *Das Studium des schönen Altertums. Christian Gottlob Heyne und die Entstehung der klassischen Archäologie*, Göttingen: Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, 2007.

primarily engaged in the study of art and antiquity. Back in Göttingen, he earned his doctoral degree with a dissertation on the political philosophy of Plato (424/23-348/47 BCE) and his *venia legendi* with an essay on the statue of Zeus in the temple at Olympia. From 1811 to 1814 he taught courses in the history of art and the history of religion.

Toelken's Berlin *Habilitation* went very smoothly, suggesting that there was nothing unusual about his academic profile or the materials he presented, namely the essay on the Olympian Zeus, a published outline of lectures on ancient mythology, and a manuscript history of religion. Hirt and Solger, the principal examiners appointed by the dean, August Boeckh, barely commented on the written samples, and they raised no objections to his proposed lecture topic, 'on the bas reliefs of the ancients'. Solger did not attend the lecture, at which, according to the minutes, only Hirt asked questions. Similarly, the documents for the long process that led up to Toelken's appointment as ordinary professor for art history and mythology in 1823 show little specific discussion of, and no disagreement about, his scholarship or intellectual allegiances. What they do show, however, is a narrowing of his field of expertise. Initially the faculty put him forth as able to cover courses in the multiple areas of his education, and the ministry cited him as able to teach philosophy courses while they dragged their feet finding a replacement for Fichte (who turned out to be Hegel in 1818). In subsequent discussions about a replacement for Solger, who died in 1819, the faculty saw Toelken picking up Solger's courses in art and aesthetics, thus allowing a new professor to devote himself fully to philosophy proper, which Solger had neglected.<sup>59</sup> Toelken's own activities followed a similar trajectory: his publications, teaching, and positions outside the university focused more and more on art, both ancient and modern. Ultimately he reached the same degree of professional specialization attained earlier, and largely outside the university, by his older colleague Hirt.

Between Toelken's *Habilitation* in 1814 and Kugler's in 1833, there were only two others who sought permission to teach courses primarily devoted to the historical study of art.<sup>60</sup> Both applied in early 1827, and both had earned the doctoral degree in Berlin. Theodor Panofka (1800-1858), a member of Boeckh's philological seminar, encountered no problems as a philologist with a clear emphasis on the art of antiquity. The second, Hotho, easily passed the doctoral exam with a dissertation on Descartes but had to withdraw his first *Habilitation* essay, because its new, Hegelian, approach to the history of art provoked violent outrage and disgust in everyone but Hegel. Offerings listed under the rubric *Kunstgeschichte* in the published course lists increased somewhat in the mid 1830s, but mostly not due to new *Habilitationen*. Panofka returned in 1836 after a

<sup>59</sup> See below for full documentation.

<sup>60</sup> This overview includes only those who listed courses in the published *Vorlesungsverzeichnisse*. A thorough search of the *Habilitation* records in the university archives might find others, but this is unlikely.

long absence, and another student of Boeckh, Eduard Gerhard (1795-1867), began lecturing in his capacity as member of the Akademie der Wissenschaften in 1835.<sup>61</sup> Adolph Schöll (1805-1882) briefly offered courses on Greek art and mythology in art (*Kunstmythologie*) between 1837 and 1841; like Kugler he also taught at the Akademie der Künste, regularly offering the mythology course until his departure for Halle in 1842. Coming from Tübingen and Göttingen, he sailed through the Berlin *Habilitation* in December 1833 with his dissertation on the origin of Greek drama and a translation of Herodotus.<sup>62</sup>

Panofka's case also shows how easily things could go, even when the topic was art. On 23 May 1822, the dean, the historian Friedrich von Raumer (1781-1873), circulated a memo initiating review of Panofka's dissertation on Polycrates, tyrant of Samos (r. c. 535-522 BCE) and Samian art. No examiners were named, but the first to sign off were Boeckh, the historian Friedrich Wilken (1777-1840), Hirt and Hegel (Toelken was not yet an ordinary professor). All simply assented to admission to the oral exam, which took place on 20 June. Questions were posed, on topics in their own fields, by Boeckh, Hegel, the astronomer Christian Ludwig Ideler (1766-1846), and the historian Friedrich Wilken (1777-1840). Only Ideler expressed minor dissatisfaction with the candidate's responses. According to his curriculum vitae, Panofka had been a member of the philological seminar and had studied with Boeckh, the philologist Friedrich August Wolf (1759-1824), von Raumer, Wilken, and Hegel (for logic).<sup>63</sup>

After spending nearly four years in Italy, Panofka initiated the *Habilitation* process on 3 January 1827. As demonstration of his scholarship he submitted a publication, *Vasi di Premio* (Florence, Guglielmo Piatti, 1826), and mentioned other publications from his time in Italy. He proposed to lecture in German on the 'Principal periods of the visual art of the Greeks' (*Über die Hauptperioden der bildenden Kunst der Griechen*) and in Latin on 'What figural monuments contribute to the knowledge of antiquity' (*quid monumenta figurata ad antiquitatis cognitionem conferant*). In his memo to the faculty, the dean, von Raumer again, identified Boeckh, Hirt, and Toelken as principal examiners; that Panofka had not studied with Hirt and Toelken was irrelevant. As the memo circulated, Toelken added

<sup>61</sup> Gerhard earned his doctoral degree in Berlin in 1815. From his return in 1835 he held several positions in the museum. He was appointed ordinary professor in 1844. On Gerhard see most recently Veit Stürmer, 'Eduard Gerhard – Begründer der institutionellen Archäologie in Berlin', in Annette Baertschi and Colin King, *Die modernen Väter der Antike. Die Entwicklung der Altertumswissenschaft an Akademie und Universität im Berlin des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009, 145-163.

<sup>62</sup> *Habilitation* 14 December 1833 to 11 January 1834: HUBUA, Phil Fak 1202, 15-21. See *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (henceforth ADB) 32 (1891), 218-224. A similar case is Joseph Ambrosch (1804-1856), who earned his degree in Berlin in 1829 and sailed through the *Habilitation* in October-November 1833 with his dissertation on Livy and texts on Justinian's letters and vases in Praeneste (HUBUA, PhilFak 1202, 8-15). He began a course on ancient vases in summer 1834 but was called to Breslau in the middle of the semester. Art was not a major component of his subsequent career. See ADB 1 (1875), 391-392.

<sup>63</sup> HUBUA, PhilFac 210, f. 204-206.

the only negative observation among the positive but brief comments, calling Panofka's Italian style the most cumbersome and awkward imaginable. According to the minutes of the German lecture, only Toelken asked questions, about the interpretation of vase painting and 'other matters'. The vote was unanimous in favor of the candidate.<sup>64</sup> For summer 1827 Panofka announced a polemically titled private course, 'Ancient Greek life and customs with assistance of works of art and starting with an introduction to the visual study of antiquity' (*Griechische Alterthümer mit Hülfe der Bildwerke und mit vorangeschichteter Einleitung in das Studium der bildlichen Alterthumswissenschaft*). No one registered, and Panofka left town.<sup>65</sup>

Hotho's *Promotion* is remarkable only for the dissertation topic and the minor disagreement between Boeckh and Hegel at the exam.<sup>66</sup> On 1 August 1826, two years after leaving the university, he applied for the doctoral exam with a dissertation on Cartesian philosophy.<sup>67</sup> According to the vita, Hotho's studies had initially been quite unfocused, leading him to attend the lectures of Wolf, Toelken, Schleiermacher, the physicist Paul Ermann (1764-1851), the jurists Freidrich Karl von Savigny (1779-1861) and Johann Goeschen (1778-1837), the philosopher Leopold von Henning (1791-1866), and, of course, Hegel.<sup>68</sup> In his memo to the faculty, dean Toelken asked Hegel to comment first; as the memo circulated, all simply assented to Hegel's positive evaluation. At the oral exam on 16 August, Boeckh began by asking questions about Latin poetry and ancient philosophy and found that the candidate's answers showed knowledge that was not sufficiently complete or precise (*nicht vollständig und bestimmt genug*). Hegel started his questions with the same topics, to allow the candidate to correct his mistakes, before moving onto Cartesian philosophy; he found that 'the candidate showed both insight into the abstract objects of philosophy and adroitness and dexterity in speculative thought'.<sup>69</sup> After von Raumer asked questions about

<sup>64</sup> HUBUA, PhilFac 1200, f. 152-153, 169. The topic of the German lecture changed, with no reason stated, to the reading of an archaeological essay and the start of another essay on the ancient grave monuments in Paris.

<sup>65</sup> Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, 467, 1827ss242.

<sup>66</sup> HUBUA, PhilFac 211, f. 171-176; Hegel's comments with summary of the proceedings are published in Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Berliner Schriften 1818-1831*, Johannes Hofmeister, ed, Hamburg, Felix Meiner Verlag, 1956, 647-648. See also Ziemer, *Hotho*, 238; she notes, drawing on Hotho's correspondence, that he had little interest in writing a dissertation in the 'empirical' sciences, preferring to work with metaphysical questions. Ziemer's thorough biography shows that Hotho's education in art and literature occurred largely outside the university.

<sup>67</sup> Hotho matriculated on 4 April 1821 in the law faculty and left the university on 22 April 1824: Bahl and Ribbe, *Matrikel*, 176, nr. 224.

<sup>68</sup> Of Toelken's courses during this period only the following were taught and thus available to Hotho: 'Archaeology' (summer 1821 and winter 1822/23), 'History of poetry' (summer 1821), 'Painting of the ancients' (winter 1821/22), , and 'Mythology' (summer 1823), Aesthetics (1823/24). See Table 3.

<sup>69</sup> HUBUA, PhilFac 211, f. 176: der Candidat zeigte ebensowohl gründliche Einsicht in die abstrakten Gegenstände der Philosophie als Gewandtheit und Fertigkeit im spekulativen Denken.

political history during the lifetimes of famous ancient philosophers, the assembled faculty voted unanimously in the candidate's favor.

Because Hotho had first matriculated in 1821, he could initiate the *Habilitation* almost immediately. He did so on 15 January 1827. According to his Latin application, Hotho sought permission to teach in two fields: 'the philosophy of art, mainly Christian, and the history of philosophy' (*philosophia artis praesertim christianae, et historia philosophiae*). As preparation for teaching the philosophy, and history, of Christian art, he cited a trip in spring 1825 to study monuments of architecture, painting, and sculpture in France, Britain, and the Netherlands. As evidence of scholarly accomplishment he submitted a German essay in manuscript (now lost), which he titled 'on the true treatment of art' (*de vera tractatione artis*). He proposed to lecture on topics relevant to both fields: for the faculty in German 'On some differences in medieval Netherlandish and South German painting styles (*Über einige Unterschiede der älteren niederländischen und oberdeutschen Mahlweisen*) and for the public in Latin on differences in the philosophy of Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) and Nicholas Malebranche (1638-1715).<sup>70</sup>

In his memo to the faculty, the dean, von Raumer, designated Hirt, Toelken, and Hegel as the principal examiners for the writing sample, which he called 'an essay on the treatment of art history' (*Abhandlung über die Behandlung der Kunstgeschichte*). As Hotho's essay circulated, it provoked an outraged but ultimately ambiguous response. Hirt got things off to a rousing start by complaining that after spending three hours with Hotho's 'most philosophical essay' (*hochphilosophische Abhandlung*), he had not understood a word. That the dean had sent it to him first could only be a 'cruel irony' (*grausame Ironie*). Toelken found the essay more appropriate to a *Habilitation* in the history of philosophy, but left judgment on that score to Hegel, who, nonetheless should evaluate its insufficient conceptual originality (*Selbständigkeit der Auffassung*). Toelken also stated that Hotho should be set the task of submitting a more developed, concrete essay on the history of art. Most colleagues simply signed on to Toelken's position, without stating whether they wanted to see a new essay or would defer to Hegel. The medieval German philologist Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen (1780-1856) entered a definitive no vote on the basis of the essay and agreed with Toelken that the candidate should submit a new writing sample, especially as there was no other evidence of scholarly achievement since the *Promotion*. To support his position, von der Hagen entered seven pages of biting critique into the record. Hegel voted for the candidate on the basis of the essay, which he praised, and other demonstrations of exceptional philosophical talent and knowledge. The mineralogist Christian Daniel Weiß (1780-1856) concurred with Hegel's vote, but with sharp words about the essay's vicious (*ruchlos*) attack on Solger's positions in aesthetics. The

<sup>70</sup> HUBUA, PhilFac 1200, f. 156-157. For the study trip see Ziemer, *Hotho*, 234. The whole proceeding is summarized, with full quotation of Hegel's comments, in Hegel, *Berliner Schriften*, 648-651; see also Ziemer, *Hotho*, 247-248.

geographer Carl Ritter (1779-1859) signed on to what he called Weiß's 'stern but just opinion (*strengem aber gerechtem Urtheil*) while adamantly rejecting the essay as an empty, unscholarly polemic utterly unsuited for the *Habilitation* in fields once taught by Solger. Unable to find a clear decision, dean von Raumer initiated a reconsideration, stating his agreement with the general criticism of the essay's arrogant tone and its failure as scholarship. Hotho withdrew his application on 10 March and submitted a new one, with a hastily composed essay on the pre-Socratic philosopher Heraclitus (c. 535 – c. 475 BCE), already on 22 June.<sup>71</sup>

The structure and content of Hotho's essay can be reconstructed by combining the outlines given by Toelken and von der Hagen, and this helps to understand the strong reactions. The first part examined the history of the visual arts in order to show how aesthetics slowly emerged to independence out of the earliest art-historical accounts, those of chroniclers and connoisseurs, who nevertheless lacked fixed and correct principles. The second section examined various aesthetic systems in the same way, showing how each corrected the one before it, with particular, extended attention to errors in Solger's thought. The third section, 'reconstruction of art history', continued the second, but without reference to the visual arts, It defined this new art history as tracing the history of art as the development of the concept of art and thus as the self-realization of the leading idea (*Kunstgeschichte als Selbstentwicklung der Hauptidee*).<sup>72</sup>

The critiques of Toelken and von der Hagen and Hegel's defense demonstrate a clear difference of opinion on the speculative versus the historical treatment of the history of art. Toelken adopted a somewhat more restrained tone than most of his colleagues. He noted the extreme incompleteness in Hotho's survey of successive attempts to establish the set principles lacking in the first period of art history, because it began only with Lessing, and he gently ridiculed the idea that only a philosophy of art (*philosophische Kunstlehre*) could provide such principles. He praised Hotho's thoroughness and dialectical adroitness in examining the one-sided views of Kant, Schiller, and Solger, which were (according to Toelken) inconsistent with art itself. He found the third section wholly inadequate:

The setting forth of the proper [treatment], which one expects at this point, is, however, so short and supported with such general statements that one cannot gather the least bit about its content, even less about its value. Nevertheless, it must be admitted here that we are also asked to accept that the task of art history can only be to demonstrate the realization of this system of thought in the development of art, i.e. to construct history according to this

<sup>71</sup> HUBUA, PhilFac 1200, f. 158-163, 179-184.

<sup>72</sup> HUBUA, PhilFac 1200, f. 160 for von der Hagen, f. 158r-v for Toelken. Thus far Hotho scholars have worked only from the brief summary in Hegel, *Berliner Schriften*, 648-651, which reduces von der Hagen's seven pages to just two sentences.

system, whose 'true goal it is to see itself in the mirror of all existence', 'in that nature, spirit, moral life, political history, art, religion, and learning are nothing but the self-application and realization of the same, brought forth by its own inner dialectical nature'. As delightful as it might be to see this actually accomplished, even less satisfying is the mere promise of wanting to accomplish it.

Toelken then proposed two options. Hotho could develop this system further as it concerned visual art. More appropriate to the concrete nature of art, however, would be for Hotho to demonstrate through a single school, for example Venetian painting, 'how much he is able to provide art history with this methodological construction without coming too close to the truth of actual historical reality'.<sup>73</sup>

Commenting next, Hegel met Toelken's criticisms head on. He acknowledged Toelken's praise, faint as it was, and went so far as to say that Hotho should have left out the last section. Presented naked and undeveloped, it gave rise to incomprehension or misunderstanding, even though, Hegel added, its relation to and progression from the preceding had been so clearly indicated. He could not see how Toelken had come to the misunderstanding that Hotho was presenting a particular philosophical system, and not '*the* system of thought, which immediately prior was called the self-development of the concept out of itself and the method.' For Hegel

even less admissible [was] the demand that an idea which was to be related to the classification of art in general should be tested through the suggested application to a particular aspect, the Venetian school – as inadmissible as if Linnaeus's or Jussieu's, or anyone else's, principle of plant classification were to be proven to

<sup>73</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1200, f. 158v: Die nun zu erwartende Aufstellung des Richtigen ist aber so kurz und bezeugt sich mit so allgemeinen Sätzen, daß sich daraus nicht einmal über den Inhalt, vielweniger über den Werth dieser Lehre das Mindeste abnehmen läßt. Gleichwohl wird uns zugemuthet, nun einzugestehen, daß die Aufgabe der Kunstgeschichte keine andere seyn könne, als die Verwirklichung dieses Gedankensystems in der Entwicklung der Kunst nachzuweisen, d.h. die Geschichte nach diesem System zu construiren, dessen 'wahrhaftes Ziel es sey, im Spiegel alles Seyenden sich selbst zu sehen', 'indem Natur, Geist, sittliches Leben, politische Geschichte, Kunst, Religion und Wissenschaft nichts seyn, als die Selbstapplication und Verwircklichung desselben, hervorgebracht durch dessen eigene innere dialektische Natur.' Je erfreulicher es nun wäre, dies wirklich geleistet zu sehen, um so weniger kann das bloße Versprechen, dies leisten zu wollen, befriedigen. Nach meiner Meinung wäre also dem Herrn Verf[asser] die Aufgabe zu stellen: entweder jenes System in so fern es die Kunst betrifft, näher zu entwickeln, oder (was bei der durchaus concreten Natur der Kunst noch gerade mäßiger seyn wird) an einer einzelnen Kunstschule z. B. der venetianischen Maler, der Facultät ein Specimen vorzulegen, wiefern er der Kunstgeschichte diese methodische Construction zu geben vermag, ohne der Wahrheit des wirklich Geschehenen zu nahe zu treten. The quotes are from Hotho's essay.

be the principle for the derivation of a classification of one family or genus in its species, since particular principles of classification arise in the classification of the particular.<sup>74</sup>

Turning to the content of the essay, Hegel pointed out that, obviously, it could have been approached from many other directions. Hotho could have chosen a more appropriate, descriptive title, something like ‘Speculative critique of modern concepts of art and treatment of art history’ (*spekulative Kritik der neuern Begriffe von Kunst und Behandlung der Kunstgeschichte*), or he could have left out all reference to art history. Responding to Toelken’s other criticisms, Hegel asserted that it was appropriate, and not unoriginal, for Hotho to cite, in a philosophical essay, what he had learned in Hegel’s philosophy lectures. Although granting that the essay was too abstract and abrupt in places, Hegel found the concise presentation of viewpoints sharply drawn, correct, and thorough. The comprehensive treatment of Solger’s ideas showed a particular thoroughness in the precise grasping and speculative treatment of abstruse metaphysics.

Eschewing Toelken’s restraint and ignoring Hegel’s defense, von der Hagen spared neither invective nor substantive critique to support his rejection of the essay as ‘altogether unworthy’: ‘I can recognize [it] as neither historical nor aesthetic, and find it as negligent in tone as it is perverse, frivolous, and arrogant in its overall conception’.<sup>75</sup> The problem was not just that Hotho began with the visual arts in the first section but then ignored them in his over-general and self-important program for the reconstruction of art history. Worse, Hotho’s essay failed as a work of history, both factually and conceptually. Aesthetics did not begin with the modern study of ancient and modern art, but with the ancients themselves, and specifically in connection with rhetoric. The first known general aesthetics, that of Baumgarten, had less to do with the first art history writers than with philosophy as such, and Kant and Richter, etc., had more connection with Baumgarten than with those who observed the arts (*Kunstabetrachter*). Hotho claimed to have provided an historical sequence of aesthetic systems by showing how each corrected the one before it, and thus to have demonstrated the self-realization of aesthetics and art history. Showing the necessity of a sequence may be easy, von der Hagen countered, but in aesthetics the chronological is not the only set of relations, history does not provide the framework. Furthermore,

<sup>74</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1200, f. 159r-v: ...und nicht von *dem* Systeme der Gedanken, was unmittelbar vorher die Selbstentwicklung des Begriffes aus sich und die Methode heißt. Noch unstatthafter finde ich die Zumutung, daß eine Idee, die sich auf die Einteilung der Kunstgeschichte im Ganzen beziehen soll, durch die zu machende Anwendung auf einen speciellen Teil, die Venetianische Kunstschule, zu prüfen sei – so unstatthaft, als wenn das Linnéische oder Jussieusche u.s.f. Prinzip des Pflanzenreichs sich auch das Prinzip der Ableitung der Einteilung einer Familie oder Gattung in ihre Arten erwiesen sollte, da im Speciellen wieder specielle Einteilungsprincipien eintreten.

<sup>75</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1200, f. 163v: Denn die vorliegende kann ich weder für geschichtlich, noch für ästhetisch erkennen, sondern finde sie, wie in der Sprache nachlässig, so in der ganzen Fassung verschroben, eitel und hochmüthig, überhaupt unwürdig.



Hotho had based his chronological overview on a structure borrowed from political history and applied it in an extended analogy that appeared both unseemly and childish, and pursued it to a repugnant and criminal degree.<sup>76</sup> From here von der Hagen went on to demonstrate, at length, specific errors of fact and interpretation in Hotho's survey of aesthetic systems. He devoted several pages to a defense of his friend and colleague Solger, supporting it with long quotations from Solger's own writings. The tone and substance of von der Hagen's critique is encapsulated in this outburst, just one of many throughout: 'One is truly frightened by the depth of nonsense and absurdity in this grandiose specimen of improved art-historical construction'.<sup>77</sup>

Quoting at greater length from the passages cited by Toelken, von der Hagen criticized Hotho's concluding discussion of a 'reconstructed art history' as overly schematic and making excessive, unjustified claims. Hotho posited the history of art as the development of the concept of art, which in turn referred back to the concepts of the state and its history and the concept of the spirit and nature. The necessary system of guiding thoughts that thus resulted provided art history's method and its metaphysical truth, and enabled it to see itself in the mirror of all existence and to understand its own long forgotten history in the now illuminated universe. Such, Hotho claimed, was the true heavenly blessedness of the new art history. In a sarcastic comment on the young man's arrogance, von der Hagen posed the rhetorical question, 'are you not afraid of your own similarity to God'?<sup>78</sup> He concluded by quoting extensively from Solger's

<sup>76</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1200, f. 160: Es ist freilich sehr leicht, die Nothwendigkeit des auf einander folgenden zu zeigen; aber in diesem Gebiete, -- der Kunstphilosophie,-- gilt ein ganz anderer Zusammenhang, als jener chronologische; die Geschichte ist hier keineswegs das Gerüst... Der V[er]f[asser] stützt zwar seine chronologische Darstellung bedeutend durch ein aus der Staatsgeschichte eben dieser Zeiten entnommenes und fortgesetztes Gleichnis, welches aber ebenso unschicklich als kindisch erscheint, und zuletzt wirklich ins Widrige und Frevelhafte hinausgeführt und gesteigert wird. The analogy employed terms, such as 'consul', 'dictator', 'institutional monarchy', 'terror', 'directory', and 'emperor', to characterize successive stages of Hotho's sequential development.

<sup>77</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1200, f. 161: 'Man erschrickt wirklich vor der Tiefe des Unsinns und Aberwitzes in diesem grandiosen Probestück verbesserter kunstgeschichtlicher Construction.' His critique mainly concerned Hotho's misunderstanding of the relationship of Solger to Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853) and Hotho's mishandling of the concept of irony.

<sup>78</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1200, f. 163r: Denn ihm geht hier nun alles in Luft auf, alles ist durchsichtig: die Kunstgeschichte sieht er als Entwicklung des Begriffs der Kunst selbst, der auf die Begriffe vom Staat und seiner Geschichte und dem Begriff des Geistes und der Natur überhaupt zurückweist. Das nothwendige System der darin treibenden Gedanken ist zugleich ihr Methode und die metaphysische Wahrheit selber. 'Natur, Geist, sittliches Leben, politische Geschichte, Kunst, Religion und Wissenschaft, Alles ist nur Selbstapplication und Verwirklichung dieses Gedankensystems, hervorgebracht durch die eigene innere dialektische Natur desselben, dessen (?) wissenschaftliches Leben und wahrhaftes Ziel es ist, im Spiegel alles Seienden nur sich selbst zu sehen, und durch das zum klaren Cristall erhaltene Universum die Züge der eigenen längst vergessenen Handschrift zu lesen. Dieß Geschäft wird ihr (dieser Methode) wahrhaft paradisische Seligkeit.' -- Hiebei möchten wir dem jungen Ver[asser] zurufen: 'dir wird gewiß noch mal bei deiner Gottähnlichkeit bangen!'

warnings not to be misled by the claims of philosophy to explain the world, or the claims of aesthetics to explain art from its inner nature.<sup>79</sup>

Apparently much more traditional, Hotho's second essay, on the philosophy of Heraclitus provoked little reaction, although it still riled some of the philologists. Of the principal examiners, Hegel, Boeckh, and Bekker, only the last raised a concern. While the faculty knew Hotho from the speculative side of things, they had no basis for judging him with respect to his scholarship, for the new essay was too dependent on secondary sources, particularly Schleiermacher. The zoologist Martin Hinrich Lichtenstein (1780-1857) came to Hotho's defense: since the candidate wished to teach philosophy, the essay should be judged for its philosophical content, by men in the field; since the candidate did not claim to be a philologist, he could not be faulted for depending on existing sources. The rest of the faculty voted for admission to the German lecture with only minor commentary. Even von der Hagen voted in favor, more on the basis of the solid doctoral exam than the essay, in which he again found barbaric jargon, dialectical formula, and the self-development of the object (*Selbstentwicklung des Gegenstands*).<sup>80</sup> In the minutes for the German lecture, Toelken, as dean and first examiner, recorded that the candidate's presentation thoroughly demonstrated a wide knowledge of German and Netherlandish painting, even if 'the deduction of these schools was conceived in exaggeratedly sharp oppositions'. Toelken noted, without comment, that Hotho confessed that he had not concerned himself with ancient art and showed little knowledge of Italian art. Hegel engaged the candidate in a discussion of Heraclitus and several topics in philosophy (the opposition of knowledge and faith, direct and indirect knowledge). To his questions on medieval German architecture von der Hagen received satisfactory answers, as did von Raumer to questions on the history of the Netherlands. The assembled professors approved Hotho's *Habilitation* by a unanimous vote.<sup>81</sup> In a memo of 20 July, the faculty informed the ministry that it had granted Hotho permission to give lectures in philosophy.<sup>82</sup> On 27 April 1832 minister Altenstein appointed him extraordinary professor for '*Literatur und Aesthetik*' with a salary of 200 *Taler*, a mere three days after receiving Hotho's direct request for such a position.<sup>83</sup> Unlike Toelken, Hotho never secured appointment as ordinary professor. Like Toelken, he was employed at the museum, beginning in 1830, and his work there has rightly been cited as

<sup>79</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1200, f. 163r-v. The citations are from Solger's *Philosophische Gespräche*, Berlin, 1817, which Hotho had failed to cite.

<sup>80</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1200, f. 179-180. Lichtenstein was married to Hotho's sister.

<sup>81</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1200, f. 182: wiewohl die Deduction dieser Schulen in übertrieben schroffen Gegensätzen gefasst war.

<sup>82</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1200, f. 183 (draft).

<sup>83</sup> Ziemer, *Hotho*, 250, citing GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76Va Sekt. 2. Tit. IV, Nr. 8, Bd. 4, f. 8.

indicating that Hotho, like Hegel before him, did not exclude the historical study of objects from his conception of aesthetics.<sup>84</sup>

Although Hotho is often claimed as a central figure in the history of art history, his appointments at the university were to teach philosophy and the history of literature, and an overview of his courses shows that he rarely taught what would now be considered 'art history'. Like Toelken, Hotho initially taught philosophy proper, offering a version of his 'Philosophical encyclopedia' nearly every year until 1833. After Hegel's death in 1831, Hotho taught his own version of 'Aesthetics', which he offered at least once every year until his death in 1873. While this included an overview of art history, he rarely offered courses specifically on art, and then only after Hirt's death in 1837. A course on post-Kantian aesthetic systems based on the ill-fated first *Habilitation* ceased in 1836. Similarly, his courses in the history of literature came to focus on a general survey, 'Poetics', which like 'Aesthetics' included an historical overview. Hotho had his greatest success between 1828 and 1840 with courses on Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller, either alone or in varying combinations.<sup>85</sup> In his letter to Altenstein of 24 April 1832, Hotho explicitly positioned his courses in aesthetics and the history of literature as serving the general education function of the university: 'through comprehensive surveys, and without neglecting the necessary foundations of these branches of general education, [I] render them interesting and instructive for those who do not make these fields their exclusive study'.<sup>86</sup>

Six years younger, and moving through the university about five years later, Kugler provides a telling contrast to Hotho. The *vita* submitted with his application for the *Promotion* on 15 June 1831 suggests that Kugler's education up to that point had been a bit more focused than Hotho's. He had studied for five semesters in Berlin and Heidelberg, taking a range of courses in classical and German philology, history, and geography, plus two philosophy courses with Hegel (logic and aesthetics). Other than Hegel's 'aesthetics', and possible discussions of art in other courses, his only formal university course in art was one in 'archaeology' in Heidelberg. He had, however, studied the practice and history of architecture at the architecture academy (*Bauakademie*) in Berlin. Further sources show that he gained much knowledge of art and architecture and

<sup>84</sup> Ziemer, *Hotho*, 254; Bernadette Collenberg-Plotnikov, 'Einleitung', in *Heinrich Gustav Hotho. Vorlesung über Ästhetik oder Philosophie des Schönen und der Kunst. Nachgeschrieben von Immanuel Hegel (1833)*, Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: frommann-holzboog, 2004, xl. Positioning Hotho within the history of art history, mainly by drawing on his own statements, she draws too sharp a contrast with the supposed empiricists, like Kugler, who produced only catalogues and handbooks, not real art writing, through concrete object-based work (xlvii-xlviii).

<sup>85</sup> See Virmond for the semesters to winter 1833/4 and the tables cited above for later semesters.

<sup>86</sup> Staatsbibliothek Preußische Kulturbesitz, Berlin (henceforth SBPK), Handschriften Abteilung, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1842 (4) Hotho, Gustav Heinrich, f. 7-8: ohne Vernachlässigung der nöthigen Gründlichkeit diese Zweige der allgemeinen Bildung durch Umfassende Ueberblicke auch solchen interessant u. lehrreich werden zu lassen, welche diese Gebiete nicht zu ihren ausschliesslichen Studium machen.

through independent study and travel and especially from his close mentor-student relationship with von der Hagen. Kugler's dissertation examined a twelfth-century illuminated manuscript, attending to both image and text. Thus, for all his (in)famous indecision and widely dispersed interests, Kugler shows a definite step toward specialization, at least compared to Hotho and Toelken, who wrote traditional philosophical dissertations. Although not distinguishing fully between art and literature, Kugler mostly lacked the traditional grounding in philosophy shared by Toelken, Panofka, and Hotho.

Like Hotho, Kugler failed his first attempt at the *Habilitation*, in 1833, but mainly because he submitted only his dissertation without the required new work. Unlike Hotho he did not, and probably could not, fall back on a traditional topic. Instead he submitted new work in the same field as the dissertation, 'art history of the middle ages', in the form of essays and six portfolios of drawings. This submission provoked sharp disagreement among those in the philological-historical fields and found ambiguous support or simple rejection among the rest. As set forth below, Kugler's detractors were the strict text-based philologists August Bekker and Karl Lachmann (1793-1851), who deemed his work unoriginal, uncritical, and too dependent on secondary sources. In a beautiful bit of historical symmetry, his principal defenders were Hotho's main detractors, Toelken and von der Hagen. Both excused some obvious errors but defended Kugler's scholarship and his use of drawings as tools in research and teaching. While both clearly had independent knowledge of Kugler's work, there is no way to determine the extent or nature of their contact with him at this time.

Although Kugler had applied to teach in a very particular field, 'art history of the middle ages,' he never actually taught precisely in that field, at least not at the university. His first course was 'General history of architecture', taught privately in summer 1833. For winter 1833/34, he announced the architecture survey as a private lecture and, as free and public, 'Beginnings of Christian art' (*Anfänge der christlichen Kunst*). Thirty-eight students were willing to pay for the history of architecture, but no one wanted Christian art, not even for free. That semester he began teaching at the Akademie der Künste, with 'Archaeology of the German Middle Ages' (*Archäologie des deutschen Mittelalters*). Until 1842 he taught at both institutions, often offering the same course simultaneously at both. His most frequent courses in this period were two surveys: the general history of architecture and a history of modern painting using the galleries of the royal museum. From autograph documents pertaining to his academy courses, it is clear that Kugler, like Hotho, saw the survey, or general overview, as the most effective means for communicating 'the necessary foundations' to audiences of non-specialists. The significant differences in how each understood those foundations remain to be fully explored. One thing is, however, immediately clear. Where Hotho's teaching followed the older model exemplified by Toelken's early career, ranging over several fields within the philosophical

faculty, Kugler's teaching, both at the university and the art academy, followed the coming model of the specialist who teaches only in a specific field.

Kugler's teaching, and to a lesser extent his scholarly publications, also shows a shift to a newer model of specialization, one focused on the object of study, in his case art, rather than on the history and culture of a single period. Kugler began his studies as a student of medieval poetry with von der Hagen, who is now known primarily as medieval German philologist. He was, however, concerned with the German Middle Ages as a cultural whole, on the model of *Altertumswissenschaft* (science of antiquity) put forth by Friedrich August Wolf. Like Boeckh, who took a similarly broad approach to antiquity, von der Hagen had studied with Wolf. On this conception, the visual arts constituted one component of the larger culture, and they were thus best studied not in isolation but as part of the whole.<sup>87</sup> In his successive applications for a position in Berlin, from 1810 and again in early 1820s, von der Hagen set forth his vision of a German *Alterthumswissenschaft*. Although some in the ministry raised objections on the grounds that the same material was already covered (by von Raumer and Wilken in history, Toelken in art history, Hirt in the history of architecture), von der Hagen eventually secured an ordinary professorship in Berlin. Still, he never taught the full range of his program, focusing his courses more narrowly on German language and literature.<sup>88</sup> Concurrently, however, he published frequently on the art of antiquity, the middle ages, and his own time.<sup>89</sup> The documentation discussed below demonstrates that that Kugler was likely exposed to the full range of von der Hagen's expertise in the German middle ages, and Kugler later credited his mentor with providing the conceptual foundation for his own historical study of art. Working with von der Hagen also appears to have inspired, or at least expanded, Kugler's interest in making the past relevant to the present through the holistic study of the monuments (whether artistic or literary), a study grounded in but not restricted to (or always primarily concerned with) detailed textual or formal analysis.<sup>90</sup>

As a case history, Kugler's biography shows how training in the historical study of art could occur both outside formal academic instruction and across fields, and with individuals, not now widely recognized as precursors to art

<sup>87</sup> For von der Hagen and Wolf see Meves, 'Institutionalisierung', 111; Uwe Meves, 'Zur Einrichtung der ersten Professur für Deutsche Sprache an der Berliner Universität (1810)', *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 104, 1985, 161-184. In the extensive literature on Wolf and Boeckh see most recently Wilfried Nippel, 'Genese und Ausdifferenzierung der Altertumswissenschaft', in Tenorth, *Genese der Disziplinen*, 199-215.

<sup>88</sup> See Meves, 'Institutionalisierung' and 'Einrichtung'. Von der Hagen was extraordinary professor in Berlin from 1810 to 1811, ordinary professor and librarian in Beslau from 1811 to 1824, and ordinary professor in Berlin from 1824 to 1856.

<sup>89</sup> For a bibliography of von der Hagen's publications see Eckhard Grünewald, *Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen 1780-1856. Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte der Germanistik*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988.

<sup>90</sup> For this aspect of von der Hagen's scholarship see Werner Röcke, "'Erneuerung" des Mittelalters oder Dilettantismus? Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen (1780-1856) und die Anfänge der Berliner Germanistik', *Zeitschrift für Germanistik*, N.F. 20, 2010, 48-63.

history but still deeply engaged in the study of art. It also situates him squarely in one subset of the philological-historical side of the philosophical faculty, in the same broad conception of *Alterthumswissenschaft*, albeit at a partial remove, as Panofka and others trained by Boeckh. Like Toelken's biography, Kugler's indicates the breadth and direction necessary in future investigations of art history's emergence within the complex, and often contentious, intellectual and academic ferment of early nineteenth-century Germany. The following narratives are offered as a contribution to that ongoing project.

### **E. H. Toelken: from Göttingen to Berlin**

E. H. Toelken<sup>91</sup> was born in Bremen on 1 November 1785, the son of a prosperous merchant. The curricula vitae submitted in Göttingen and Berlin provide detailed accounts of his early life.<sup>92</sup> After initial instruction by his father and grandfather, Toelken attended the school of the Rothes Waisenhaus and then the elite Pädagogium in Bremen, as well as the private school of Johann Nicolaus Ludwig Hünerkoch (b. 1764). He supplemented the usual curriculum with French, English, and Italian, reading an immense jumble of books in these languages, including modern poetry. Seized with a sudden desire to learn Greek, he immersed himself in private instruction. Upon leaving the Paedagogium with honors at the age of 16, he elected to remain in Bremen to continue his study of Plato and other ancient philosophers. During this time he also received private instruction from and developed a close relationship with professors at the Bremen gymnasium, the theologian Johann Jacob Stolz (1753-1828) and one Dr. Staefel, the latter primarily for church history.<sup>93</sup>

Toelken matriculated at the Georg-August University in Göttingen on 25 April 1804 as a student of theology.<sup>94</sup> In his first semester (summer 1804) he attended lectures on exegesis given by Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752-1822), a theologian, historian, and scholar of oriental and modern languages and literatures; and lectures on church history by the theologian Gottlieb Jacob Planck (1751-1833). He soon found that such subjects did not suit his natural abilities enough to devote his life to them, and he switched his emphasis to history, philology, and philosophy, probably by simply auditing the lectures of other

<sup>91</sup> Many sources employ the alternate form 'Tölken', but he always signed himself 'Toelken', often using only his initials, as on most of his publications.

<sup>92</sup> Universitätsarchiv Göttingen (henceforth UAG), Kur 96a, f. 35 – 36<sup>a</sup>; HUBUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 72. Additional information in Heinrich Wilhelm Rotermund, *Lexikon aller Gelehrten, die seit der Reformation in Bremen gelebt haben*, 2 volumes, Bremen: Carl Schünemann, 1818, 2: cxxviii-cxxxix. The entry is designated 'Mitgetheilt', indicating that Rotermund obtained his information directly from Toelken.

<sup>93</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, 35v – 36r; Rotermund, *Lexikon*, 2:cxxviii. See Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2:518-519, for a slightly different reading of these sources

<sup>94</sup> Götz von Selle, ed, *Die Matrikel der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen 1734-1837*, 2 volumes, Hildesheim-Leipzig, Lax, 1937, 1: 446, Nr. 118.

professors.<sup>95</sup> After this first decisive semester, he received permission from his since widowed mother to spend the rest of the summer travelling through Germany, Switzerland, and part of Italy, mostly on foot.<sup>96</sup>

In winter 1804/5 Toelken returned to Göttingen and remained there through summer semester 1807. It is possible to reconstruct his course of study, at least in part, from his Göttingen curriculum vitae and other sources, principally the published course lists.<sup>97</sup> The vita notes a full year with the mathematician Bernhard Friedrich Thibaut (1775-1832) and lectures in experimental physics and chemistry as well as those of the historian Arnold Hermann Ludwig Heeren (1760-1842). The course lists show that Heeren maintained a fairly regular cycle of courses, covering ancient and modern history as well as what might now be considered geography or anthropology.<sup>98</sup> By Toelken's own account, the most important professor during his three years in Göttingen was the philosopher and pedagogue Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841), with whom he maintained a close relationship, both in and out of the classroom. Toelken is documented only in Herbart's lectures on metaphysics in summer 1806,<sup>99</sup> but he probably attended all or most of Herbart's other courses: a general introduction to philosophy (which included logic), practical philosophy (combining moral and natural law), and pedagogy with an overview of psychology.

Much of Toelken's education took place outside the classroom, either through independent study or through informal contacts with faculty. In his leisure time he diligently devoted himself to the study of history, philology, and philosophy.<sup>100</sup> He was a member of Herbart's private society, the Pädagogische Gesellschaft, which brought together young men, some of them already *Privatdozenten* and extraordinary professors, concerned with both philology and the teaching of Greek and Latin literature and philosophy. Among the members were important figures in nineteenth-century philology and archaeology: Ernst Karl Friedrich Wunderlich (1783-1816), Georg Ludolf Dissen (1784-1837), and Friedrich Thiersch (1784-1860).<sup>101</sup> Through them Toelken may have had at least informal contact with Heyne, whom he did not list among his professors on his

<sup>95</sup> Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2:519; UAG Kur 96a, f. 36r.

<sup>96</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 36v; HUBUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 72.

<sup>97</sup> *Abgangszeugnisse* were not issued or required at Göttingen (Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 1:81). The course lists for Göttingen were published in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*. For Toelken's courses see: 17 March 1804, 432-440; 15 September 1804, 1472-1480; 30 March 1805, 505-509; 21 September 1805, 1504-1511; 21 March 1806, 465-471; 20 September 1806, 1504-1511; 21 March 1807, 465-470.

<sup>98</sup> During Toelken's time in Göttingen, Heeren announced the following courses, most more than once: *Allgemeine Länder und Völkerkunde* (with the use of maps and the Ethnographic Museum), *Alte oder sogenannte Universal-Geschichte nach seinem Handbuch, Merkwürdige Ereignisse des Mittelalters, Geschichte der europäischen Staaten und ihren Colonien seit dem 16. Jh, Geschichte der vorzüglichen europäischen Staaten seit der Völkerwanderung bis auf unsere Zeiten, Allgemeine Statistik*.

<sup>99</sup> Walter Asmus, *Johann Friedrich Herbart. Eine pädagogische Biographie*, 2 volumes, Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1968, 1:245.

<sup>100</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 36v.

<sup>101</sup> Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2:520; for the Pädagogische Gesellschaft see Asmus, *Herbart*, 1:263-266.

curriculum vitae. Nor did he list Johann Dominik Fiorillo (1748-1821) and his son Wilhelm Johann (1776-1816). While this omission probably indicates that he was not officially enrolled in their courses, it is possible, perhaps even likely, that he attended parts of their courses as an auditor. Heyne's well known course on archaeology was essentially an introductory history of ancient art to prepare young men for travel (*Archäologie, oder Anleitung zur Kenntniss der Kunst und Kunstwerke des Alterthums*), while his lectures on Greek and Latin language and literature were given in conjunction with practica and the philological seminar.<sup>102</sup> Every semester the elder Fiorillo offered a history of painting, sculpture and carved gems using prints from the library for those preparing a trip to Italy, while his son regularly offered a course on the philosophy of art according to Schelling's principles and one on Greek art and literature. As an extraordinary professor, the elder Fiorillo was ineligible to serve on doctoral committees.<sup>103</sup>

In late 1807 Toelken left Göttingen without a degree, embarking on several years of travel, heading first to Berlin, where he spent the winter of 1807/8. He claimed to have heard and come to know in a private or familiar context several famous men, above all Fichte but also Schleiermacher.<sup>104</sup> Although Toelken may have attended lectures delivered prior to the official opening of the University, it is more likely that he entered into a private arrangement of some sort.<sup>105</sup> This is confirmed by a letter in which Herbart noted that Toelken was in Berlin, probably studying with them (*wahrscheinlich bei Fichte und Schleiermacher*). Herbart complained that he had not yet heard from the young man, who had apparently found more than he expected.<sup>106</sup>

Toelken spent the summer of 1808 primarily in Dresden, 'burning with the love of art' (*artium amore incensus*) and apparently studying painting at the Kunstakademie.<sup>107</sup> Here he met up with another student from Göttingen, the Estonian nobleman Otto Magnus von Stackelberg (1787-1837), who was copying

<sup>102</sup> On Heyne's teaching see Hartmut Döhl, 'Chr. G. Heynes Vorlesungen über die Archäologie', in Graepler and Migl, *Studium des schönen Altertums*, 29-44, and for art history in Göttingen, Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte*, 175-182.

<sup>103</sup> He became ordinary professor in 1813. For the elder Fiorillo see Claudia Schrapel, *Johann Dominicus Fiorillo*, Hildesheim, Georg Olms, 2004; for the younger see Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2: 835-848.

<sup>104</sup> HUBUA PhilFak 1198, f. 72: ubi prae aliis Fichtium audiivi & familliaris cognovi; UAG Kur 96a, f. 35v: ubi viros celeberrimos Fichtium Schleiermacherum, alios, cognovi.

<sup>105</sup> Köpke, *Gründung*, 141, lists for 1807/8: Schleiermacher, 'Theologische Encyclopädie'; Fichte, 'Reden an die deutsche Nation'. For private instruction offered by Fichte see Reinhard Lauth, 'Über Fichte's Lehrtätigkeit in Berlin von Mitte 1799 bis Anfang 1805 und seine Zuhörerschaft', *Hegel-Studien* 15, 1980, 9-50. Fichte moved to Erlangen in 1805 but returned to Berlin in August 1807.

<sup>106</sup> 'Vermutlich hat er mehr Gewicht fühlen müssen, als der junge Mann sich vorstellte.' Herbart to Carl von Steiger, 7 December 1807, in Otto Ziller, *Herbart'sche Reliquien*, Leipzig, Verlag für erziehenden Unterricht, 1871, 168; Asmus, *Herbart*, 1:257.

<sup>107</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 36<sup>a</sup>; HUBUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 72; Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2:520.



paintings and drawing ancient sculptures.<sup>108</sup> A biography based on Stackelberg's diaries and correspondence indicates that the two left Dresden for Italy on 29 August 1808, travelling on foot. Their route took them first to Bayreuth, where they paid a call on the writer Jean Paul (1762-1825), then through Regensburg, Landshut, and Freising to Munich. Crossing the Alps at the Brenner, they continued south through Verona, Mantua, and Modena, reaching Florence in mid-September and shortly thereafter Rome, almost six weeks after leaving Dresden.<sup>109</sup> The two friends resided together in Rome until late 1809 or early 1810.

In presenting his academic credentials, Toelken stated that he spent the whole of this time in diligent study of antiquity and the liberal arts, aided by the many things supplied by the city's fine libraries, and that he lived in familiar circumstances with many famous men.<sup>110</sup> This diligent study certainly extended beyond libraries to direct encounters with works of art and architecture, as Toelken also claimed, and much of it occurred in the company of Stackelberg, who continued to draw and paint after ancient and modern masterpieces (above all the works of Raphael) as he had in Dresden. At the Café Greco Stackelberg found entrée into the community of expatriate artists and poets, establishing a particularly close relationship with the Danish sculptor Bertel Thorvaldsen (1770-1844). Toelken's presence in these circles is confirmed by a passing reference in a letter of 7 July 1809 from the Danish painter C. F. Høyer (1775-1855) to Thorvaldsen.<sup>111</sup> During the summer of 1809, Stackelberg and Toelken remained in the city but made many excursions into the surrounding countryside with the Danish philologist Georg Koës (1782-1811) and the Göttingen painters Franz (1786-1831) and Johannes (1789-1860) Riepenhausen.<sup>112</sup> By the end of 1809 Toelken had left Rome and did not accompany Stackelberg when he left for Greece early the next year with Koës, the German architect Carl Haller von Hallerstein (1774-1817), and the Danish archaeologist Peter Oluf Brøndsted (1780-1842). Writing to Stackelberg, Toelken expressed fear for his friend's safety on the

<sup>108</sup> Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2:520-21; Nathalie von Stackelberg, *Otto Magnus von Stackelberg. Schilderung seines Lebens und seiner Reisen in Italien und Griechenland. Nach Tagebüchern und Briefen dargestellt*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1882, 32. Stackelberg's correspondence, which included letters to and from Toelken, is apparently lost.

<sup>109</sup> Stackelberg, *Schilderung*, 33-43. Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2:521, n.1336, has them pass through Weimar, but Stackelberg most likely stopped there en route from Göttingen, to deliver a book from the historian Sartorius to Goethe, before arriving in Dresden. He cites Else von Monroy, *Goethes Briefwechsel mit Georg und Caroline Sartorius*, Weimar: Hermann Böhlau's Nachfolger, 1931, 57-58. Neither Stackelberg nor Toelken is mentioned in the extensive documentation of Goethe's daily life.

<sup>110</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 36<sup>ar</sup>, HUBUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 72.

<sup>111</sup> Thorvaldsen Letter Archives: <http://brevarkivet.thorvaldsensmuseum.dk/letters/m21809,nr.14>.

<sup>112</sup> Stackelberg, *Schilderung*, 44-60, focuses on Stackelberg's activities but clearly implies that the two remained together until Toelken left the city, specifically including him in the summer excursions. For the Café Greco as a gathering place for German artists see *Künstlerleben in Rom. Bertel Thorvaldsen (1770-1844). Der dänische Bildhauer und seine deutsche Freunde*, exh. cat., Nuremberg: Germanisches Nationalmuseum, and Schleswig, Schloß Gottorf, 1991-1992, 420-422.

dangerous journey and deep regret that they could not carry out their shared dream of experiencing Greece together.<sup>113</sup>

Toelken attempted to return to Germany in the winter of 1809/10, but his trip was interrupted in Switzerland and he returned to Italy. He then spent the summer of 1810 in the Alps, making his way back to Germany through France. He arrived in Bremen in late 1810 after an absence of nearly seven years.<sup>114</sup> Instead of assuming a position as pastor of St. Martin, Toelken served on diplomatic missions, one to Paris the other to Hamburg, representing the city in Napoleonic reorganization of northwestern Germany.<sup>115</sup>

On 23 June 1811 Toelken re-matriculated in Göttingen, now as a student of history and philosophy.<sup>116</sup> The Göttingen vita explains that he had elected to follow an academic career and that, of all the disciplines he had sampled, it was archaeology that would constitute his life's work. Aided by the judgment of famous men and invited by the goodwill of his friends, he had but one wish for his life, to complete his studies and join the faculty in Göttingen.<sup>117</sup> Having already completed the *Triennium*, Toelken submitted his application for the *Promotion* in October 1811, probably just by talking to the Dean, the philosopher Gottlob Ernst Schulze (1761-1833). On 11 October Schulze sent a memo to his colleagues, granting administrative approval and proposing a date and time. Since Toelken wished to be examined in ancient and modern history, the Dean asked his colleagues Heyne and Heeren to supervise the oral examination and stated his own intention to ask questions from the history of philosophy. In his response, Heyne remarked that the candidate's studies seemed rather desultory (*etwas disultorisch*), or lacking in focus, but this would be a problem only if evident in the exam.<sup>118</sup> The examination committee, convened in the house of the dean, probably consisted of Schulze, Heyne, Heeren, Eichhorn, the historian Georg Friedrich Sartorius (1765-1868), the philologist Christoph Wilhelm Mitscherlich (1760-1854), and the mathematician Johann Tobias Mayer (1761-1833). At Göttingen no minutes were kept of doctoral exams, but Toelken evidently satisfied his examiners. On 9 November he submitted a formal examination request, either to make up for the missing paperwork or to move on to the next step of the process, the public disputation. Here he described his preparation more specifically, placing it in the humanities, ancient history, modern and ancient philosophy, and philology.<sup>119</sup>

<sup>113</sup> Quoted in Stackelberg, *Schilderung*, 59-60.

<sup>114</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 36<sup>r</sup>; HUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 72; Rotermund, *Lexikon*, 2:cxxviii.

<sup>115</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 36<sup>r</sup>; Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2:522.

<sup>116</sup> Selle, *Matrikel*, 510, Nr. S.

<sup>117</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 36<sup>v</sup>: E disciplinis autem quas delibavi, archaeologiam potissimum cui vitam impenderem, selegi. Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2:522.

<sup>118</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 33; Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2: 523. See Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 1:78-98, for this process, its frequent irregularities, and the tendency to conduct business orally.

<sup>119</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 34: studia humanitatis, historia antiqua, philosophia tam antiqua tam recentior, & philologia.

Toelken's public disputation occurred on 9 November and seems to have been on both a part of his dissertation and published theses. In an undated note, he requested permission to submit and be examined on only the first part of the dissertation, a comparison of Plato's political thought in the *Republic* and the *Laws*. This work was apparently never published, not an unusual occurrence in Göttingen.<sup>120</sup> The ten published theses cover a range of subjects that fit within the broad parameters of the training Toelken describes.<sup>121</sup> While they do not all correspond to his formal instruction, they clearly depend upon the totality of his education and point toward his early career as a scholar and teacher. There is a definite emphasis on the history of religion and mythology, with several theses on the relation between mythology and ancient art and literature, the origins of Greek religion, and the writings of the church fathers. The Romans predictably appear as owing their greatness to military prowess and the learned imitation of the Greeks in poetry. Two theses are explicitly concerned with common views about subjects in the visual arts, that sacred idols are misshapen stones and that the painted vases said to be Etruscan are undoubtedly of Greek origin.

Following local custom, the philosophical faculty allowed Toelken to begin lecturing immediately upon completing his doctoral degree, skipping over the subsequent steps required to earn the *venia legendi*.<sup>122</sup> He offered one course in winter 1811/12 (see [Table 2](#)).<sup>123</sup> At this time, the ministry in Kassel (to which Göttingen was subject in the Napoleonic reorganization of northern Germany) instructed the university to tighten its procedures.<sup>124</sup> Toelken was allowed to announce three courses for summer 1812 on the condition that he submit another essay and pass a second exam before Easter.<sup>125</sup> The exam took place on 19 March 1812, focused on the first part of a scholarly essay, *Observations on the Olympian Zeus of Phidias (De Phidiae Jove Observationes)*. The text was dedicated to Heyne, who received payment as the chief examiner and published a generally favorable

<sup>120</sup> 'Comparatio politiarum Platonis in libris de republica et de legibus delineatarum'. Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2: 522, n. 1341, reported that it is not present in either the Göttingen library or archives.

<sup>121</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 37.

<sup>122</sup> Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 1:139, notes that in Göttingen the titles *Magister* and *Doktor* were used interchangeably for those earning the highest degree in the philosophical faculty. In the Göttingen sources Toelken is sometimes listed as *magister*, but in Berlin he presented himself as Dr. Toelken and is always recorded as such.

<sup>123</sup> This was a last minute addition not in the published course lists. It is documented as taught (gehalten) on the questionnaire Toelken submitted as requested by the new regional administration in Kassel on 19 May 1812: UAG, Sek 315, f. 156.

<sup>124</sup> See Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 1:6-15, 49-111, 143-176, and 232-245, for the exceedingly complex history of the *Habilitation* in Göttingen.

<sup>125</sup> UAG, Kur 96a, f. 3-5; Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2:523. As noted above, the Napoleonic administration in Kassel required the university to follow proper procedures in the appointment of lecturers.

review.<sup>126</sup> Toelken examined two primary issues in the scholarship: the size of the opening in the roof of the temple and the proportions of the statue relative to the interior space and as manipulated to accommodate viewing from below. Heyne anticipated completion of the study, but Toelken published nothing further.

From winter 1811/12 to summer 1814, Toelken taught or at least announced several courses that drew on his wide preparation (Table 2).<sup>127</sup> These included two courses in philosophy proper as well as a private course on Italian poets, probably with an emphasis on Dante's *Divine Comedy*.<sup>128</sup> Every semester thereafter he announced his availability for private lessons in the Italian language. In winter 1813/14, he offered an introductory course, 'On the academic study of antiquity', apparently similar to one taught by the recently deceased Heyne. The rest of Toelken's teaching focused on his dual interest in the histories of religion and art; initially combined, these topics soon moved into two separate but related courses. Toelken's first course, in winter 1811/12, examined 'the incremental formation of divine ideals in Greek art'. In Summer 1812 the focus shifted to art: 'Archaeology of the art of the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans (architecture, painting, sculpture, gems, and coins), combined with mythology and symbolism'. For winter 1812/13, Toelken shifted the focus to mythology, announcing a course that would follow a plan printed at Dietrich's and using prints from the university library.<sup>129</sup> For unknown reasons, he narrowed the focus to Hesiod as a guide to lectures on mythology in summer 1814.

In the published plan Toelken indicated quite explicitly how he intended to teach the course. First, he acknowledged the great variety of approaches to the topic and defined his own: knowledge of ancient mythology serves a higher purpose than simply deciphering the works of the ancient poets, for mythology contains nothing less than the religious history of the ancient Greeks, the most cultivated and highly religious people history has ever known. Knowledge of mythology thus serves not just their history, but that of humanity in general and holds traces of its earliest phases. Its decline shows how a religion is slowly undermined until it becomes an object of scorn and ridicule. Toelken thus conceived the course as an historical survey of the religious history of antiquity, primarily the Greeks, beginning with the most ancient traces of religious culture

<sup>126</sup> Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 1:125, cites Kur 96a, f. 69, for the payment of 23 March 1812. The review appeared in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 4 April 1812, 548-550. I have not consulted the original text in Göttingen.

<sup>127</sup> This table is based on the course lists published in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 21 March 1812, 465-472; 19 September 1812, 1509-1512; 27 March 1813, 498-504; 18 September 1813, 1497-1504; 9 April 1814, 582-584.

<sup>128</sup> The Berlin vita mentions Dante's *Divine Comedy* among courses taught, but there is no other record of a course specifically on it: HUBUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 72.

<sup>129</sup> *Ankündigung und Plan wissenschaftlicher Vorträge über die Mythologie besonders der Griechen*, Göttingen: Heinrich Dietrich, 1812. Situating this brief but suggestive text (a mere 16 pages) in the large and complex history of treatments of mythology is beyond the present scope. Heyne had been an active participant in this field.

among them and following its course through full development and adaptation by the Romans to its decline and final fall in the fight with Christianity. This was to be preceded by a general introduction on religion as such and its forms, mythology as an object of scholarly lectures, and various approaches and past literature. The introduction would also include a discussion of polytheism in general, its causes, practices, symbolism, relation to morality, principles of its historical development, and, finally a comparison of religions in antiquity. Throughout, Toelken planned to present, for each divinity, the principal poetic descriptions and reproductions of the most remarkable (*merkwürdigsten*) art works.

In this plan Toelken also stated his intention to offer, as a continuation, 'a similar course on the visual arts among the ancients' in the following summer.<sup>130</sup> Although he never published a plan for this course, it probably followed much the same format: an historical survey preceded by a general introduction establishing fundamental principles and giving a survey of scholarly methods. The course appeared in the published lists, under the rubric 'fine arts' (*Schöne Künste*), from summer 1813 to summer 1814 with slight changes in title.

On 3 April 1814 Toelken applied to the ministry in Hannover for a position as extraordinary professor in Göttingen, with a salary if possible, so that he would not be forced to squander his time with private instruction and language lessons. Now presenting himself as having studied philology, history and politics with both Heeren and Heyne, he situated his own teaching in several branches of *Alterthumskunde*, specifically the history of art, religion, and education, as well as Italian and Greek literature. Noting that the field of archaeology (*das Fach der Archäologie*) remained vacant since Heyne's death in 1812, he argued that extended stays in Rome, Florence, Dresden, Vienna, and Berlin enabled him to speak about art and beauty not simply from books but from his own observation.<sup>131</sup> As a further qualification, he noted his close relationship with the young philology professors Wunderlich and Dissen. To stress his preference for an academic career in Göttingen, he listed several positions in Bremen, political and academic, that he had turned down, as well as Herbart's mention of a possible position at a Prussian university. On 7 April 1814 Toelken's request was denied by the ministry, citing lack of funds and advising him not to decline other offers for an uncertain future in Göttingen.<sup>132</sup>

Toelken followed this advice in part, leaving Göttingen, but heading to an equally uncertain future in Berlin. He is first documented there in October 1814,

<sup>130</sup> Toelken, *Ankündigung*, 16: Auch benutze ich diese Gelegenheit, anzuzeigen, daß an diesen Kursus über Mythologie künftigen Sommer ein ähnlicher über die Geschichte der Kunst bei den Alten sich anschließen wird, über dessen Plan und Zweck ich zu seiner Zeit gleichfalls Rechenschaft geben werde.

<sup>131</sup> UAG, Kur 6083, f. 4-5: macht es mir möglich, über Kunst und Schönheit nicht bloss aus Büchern, sondern aus eigener Anschauung zu reden. A stay in Vienna is not otherwise documented; it probably occurred on the return trip from Italy.

<sup>132</sup> UAG, Kur 6083, f. 2.

when he applied to teach at the University as a *Privatdozent*. Securing that position was an easy first step, followed by a period of almost ten years during which he survived by piecing together poorly paid jobs as a private instructor, teaching at the University as well as two gymnasia (the Friedrichswerdersche and the Cöllnische), and temporary appointments in the royal art collections. The long process by which he moved from unpaid *Privatdozent* to salaried ordinary professor provides insight into how his colleagues evaluated his credentials and saw his expertise fitting into the philosophical faculty in its first years.

In his application letter, dated 14 October 1814, Toelken presented himself as having studied history and languages at Göttingen, Berlin, and Rome, and having taught the history of art and religion at Göttingen for two years. Supporting documents consisted of his curriculum vitae, his doctoral diploma, and three writing samples: his essay on the Olympian Zeus, the plan for his mythology course, and several chapters of a manuscript history of religion.<sup>133</sup> On 18 October the dean, the philologist August Boeckh, prepared a memo to his colleagues, reminding them that, according to the temporary statutes, they were to decide if the samples of scholarly work demonstrated sufficient knowledge and ability (*Kenntnisse und Fähigkeiten*) to justify admitting the candidate to the next step, the German lecture to the faculty. Although Boeckh himself raised no objection, he observed that the printed texts had been composed some years previously and that the knowledge of the author ought now to be further advanced. Boeckh saw no need for a meeting, and, if the majority of the faculty agreed, he would immediately invite Dr. Toelken to give his lecture on Saturday (the 22<sup>nd</sup>) at six o'clock, on the topic proposed in his application, the bas reliefs of the ancients. Boeckh asked for written opinions to be given on the memo as it circulated, beginning with Hirt and Solger. Solger responded first, raising no objections. Hirt and the rest of the faculty simply agreed, asking only for a change in time.<sup>134</sup> The minutes of the faculty meeting on 24 October indicate that Toelken read several chapters from his '*Abhandlung über das Basrelief*' and that Hirt discussed it with him afterwards (Solger was not present).<sup>135</sup> On 5 November Toelken delivered his public lecture in Latin 'On painting of the ancients' (*De Pictura Veterum*).<sup>136</sup> In winter 1814/15, Toelken gave one public lecture course, 'On the Origin, Development, and Decline of Religions', as well as private lessons in Greek and modern languages.<sup>137</sup>

<sup>133</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 71-72. Only the vita is preserved in the University archives, as the *Specimina* were always returned to the candidate. The history of religion was never published.

<sup>134</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 70r.

<sup>135</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 70v.

<sup>136</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 73 (announcement of the lecture)

<sup>137</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. XIII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1, f. 93: Über den Ursprung, die Fortbildung und den Verfall der Religionen, running from 12 November to 4 March. The number of students is not recorded, nor is there more specific information on his language courses. Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, 96, 1814ws121.

On 24 April 1815 Boeckh sent a memo, co-signed by his colleagues, to the ministry asking that Toelken be granted a one-time remuneration pending a more suitable appointment. Unable to earn a living at the university from lecture fees and private lessons, due to the unsettled times, he was constrained to teach in the lower classes at the Friedrichswerdersche Gymnasium, an occupation unsuited to one so preeminently qualified for an academic career. Over the past half-year, the philosophical faculty had come to know Toelken as ‘a man of exceptional knowledge and talents and the most ardent zeal for scholarship’, making him a promising young scholar whom they wished to retain.<sup>138</sup> On 11 May Toelken was awarded a remuneration of 150 *Taler*, with the requirement that he teach a public course in the current summer semester. In his letter of thanks to Boeckh on 22 May, Toelken indicated that he was teaching a public course, ‘Mythology following Hesiod’s *Theogony*’ (*Mythologie nach Anleitung des Hesiod*), with eight students.<sup>139</sup> The courses he had announced, in his first appearance in the published class lists, were not actually taught: ‘Archaeology of the Arts of Design, using prints from the Royal Library and other collections’, ‘History of modern German philosophy,’ ‘Shakespeare’s historical plays,’ and language instruction in ancient languages and English and Italian.<sup>140</sup> (See [Table 3](#))

On 12 October 1815 Toelken submitted a request to the philosophical faculty, asking that they petition the ministry for his appointment as extraordinary professor. He wished to be more effective and respected as a teacher and to have a more secure basis for his future career. If no fixed salary could be awarded, he sought at least a one-time remuneration, like the one he had previously received.<sup>141</sup> This request prompted the current dean, the zoologist Lichtenstein, to seek comments from his colleagues, beginning with Boeckh, Hirt, and Solger. Boeckh found Toelken, as a person and a scholar, deserving of such an appointment, noting, as earlier, his exceptional knowledge, lively spirit, and industriousness. He also pointed out that Toelken was of great use to the University for his lectures in branches of philosophy, art history, and ancient and modern languages, and that the ministry should be made aware of the need to retain such promising individuals at a time when there were so few young men and even fewer old ones fit for the advancement of learning. Both Hirt and Solger agreed with Boeckh on all counts. Solger added that the faculty’s report to the ministry should stress how Toelken’s gifts as a teacher contributed to the liveliness of the university, especially given the current deficiency of the

<sup>138</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1454, f. 12 (draft): ein Mann von ausgezeichneten Kenntnissen und Talenten und äußerst regen Eifer für die Wissenschaft. GStAPK 1. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 3, f. 49-50.

<sup>139</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1454, f. 13, 14. The mythology course continued in winter 1815 as ‘Theogony des Hesiod’, the title it bore in subsequent semesters (Tables 3 and 4).

<sup>140</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. XIII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1, f.116v. The Hesiod course is listed here as having begun at the end of April with 9 students. Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, 103, 1815ss67; 105, 1815ss97; 106, 1815ss104; 107, 1815ss120, 1815ss123.

<sup>141</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1454, f. 15.

instructional staff. The rest of the faculty simply assented.<sup>142</sup> Boeckh's report to the ministry, signed and submitted by Lichtenstein, recast in more formal language what he and Solger had written in the internal memo, and it was particularly eloquent on the need for the Prussian state to hire and retain young professors in the current renewal of higher learning. The memo described Toelken's expertise even more expansively, encompassing philosophy, history, art, *Alterthumskunde*, and modern foreign literature.<sup>143</sup> On 26 October the ministry responded, acknowledging the faculty's arguments and granting Toelken a remuneration of 200 *Taler* but withholding a decision on his appointment.<sup>144</sup>

Toelken renewed his request to the faculty on 19 March 1816. This prompted yet another memo from Lichtenstein to his colleagues, asking them to return to their decision of 5 November supporting Toelken's request. While most simply signed on to Boeckh's vote in favor, the mathematician Johann Georg Tralles (1763-1822) also noted that he could give no valid account of Toelken, because he did not know the young man well enough. Solger added two further justifications to cite to the ministry. First, that Toelken would be of great use given the increasingly likely creation of more extensive art collections in Berlin, for he could be employed in their care (*Aufsicht*) or in their use for the university. Second, that for a scholar such as Toelken, it was essential to be able to live in the capital with a salary sufficient to avoid dividing his time with other jobs. It was only here, and not in a provincial city, that he could find the necessary literary and antiquarian resources (*literarische und antiquarische Hilfsmittel*), so that having to leave the city would be a true misfortune for his already well advanced scholarly projects.<sup>145</sup> Solger's arguments found their way, nearly verbatim, into the report submitted by Lichtenstein to the ministry on 27 March 1816,<sup>146</sup> which led to Toelken's appointment as extraordinary professor on 4 April. In lieu of a salary, he received a regular remuneration of 200 *Taler*.<sup>147</sup> As Solger had anticipated, Toelken was soon employed on two projects in the royal art collections, starting in the summer of 1816. One was an audit (*Revision*) of the gems in the antiquities collection, which demonstrated that the Stosch collection (catalogued by Winckelmann and acquired for Berlin in 1764) had been returned intact from its transport to the provinces just before the Napoleonic occupation.<sup>148</sup> The other was a preliminary index of ancient art in the royal residences in

<sup>142</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1454, f. 17

<sup>143</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1454, f. 18 (draft); GStAPK, I. HA 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 3, f. 122.

<sup>144</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak, 1454, f. 16; GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 3, f. 124.

<sup>145</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak, 1454, f. 25. The decision of 5 November is not independently documented.

<sup>146</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak, 1454, f. 27-28 (draft); GStAPK, I HA 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 3, f. 228.

<sup>147</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak, 1454, f. 29; GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 3, f. 230 (draft).

<sup>148</sup> Gerald Heres, 'Die Anfänge der Berliner Antiken-Sammlung. Zur Geschichte des Antikenkabinetts 1640-1830', *Forschungen und Berichte. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin* 18, 1977, 116-117. ADB 38 (1894): 415, notes a commission to audit the works returned from Paris after 1815, but this is not otherwise documented and may refer to the audit of the gems.



preparation for their transfer to an independent museum, a task that engaged him until at least 1818.<sup>149</sup>

The new appointments did little to ease Toelken's financial situation, and for the next several years he appealed repeatedly to the philosophical faculty and the ministry for help. Sometimes he simply asked to have scheduled payments released, as in November 1817.<sup>150</sup> Usually, though, it was to ask for additional funds. On 14 February 1818 he asked the faculty to petition the ministry on his behalf. Although recognizing his teaching and his work in the antiquities collections, the ministry declined to oblige, stating its intention to give Toelken a position commensurate with his knowledge upon completion of the Royal Museum.<sup>151</sup> Toelken twice appealed directly to Minister Altenstein, on 23 October 1818 and again on 20 July 1819, both times receiving a special, one-time payment.<sup>152</sup> The reasons stated by Toelken and the faculty were always the same: his regular income was insufficient and private lessons and basic gymnasium classes took time away from his scholarly work.

On 4 November 1819, Toelken submitted yet another request to the philosophical faculty, this time asking to be appointed ordinary professor to replace Solger, who had died on 25 October. Toelken expressed his embarrassment at seeking personal advantage from the death of a dear friend, but he found consolation in the prospect of continuing the work of the deceased. He also voiced the hope that his research and teaching, concerned with art theory (*allgemeine Kunstlehre*) and the history of human culture (*Geschichte der menschlichen Bildung*), especially of art, would be seen as complementing the work of the senior faculty. This scholarly profile represents a significant narrowing of focus in comparison to his earlier applications in Göttingen and Berlin, clearly tailored to make him appear an appropriate replacement for Solger.<sup>153</sup> Consideration of Toelken's request by the faculty shows their estimation of how his expertise complemented existing fields, although not as fully as it might, because the discussion was derailed by some timeless academic in-fighting.

Boeckh, now dean again, circulated Toelken's request, asking for comments ahead of a faculty meeting on 19 November, which, however, was postponed to allow consideration of two other individuals, the poet Ludwig Tieck, suggested by the historian Friedrich von Raumer (1781-1873), and a current Privatdozent,

<sup>149</sup> Rotermund, *Lexikon*, 2:cxxix; Christoph Martin Vogtherr, *Das Königliche Museum zu Berlin. Planungen und Konzeption des ersten Berliner Kunstmuseum. (Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen 39/Beiheft [1997])*, 215-216.

<sup>150</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 4, f. 223-224.

<sup>151</sup> HUBUA PhilFak 1454, f. 52-55; GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 5, f. 44-45.

<sup>152</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 5, f. 215 and Bd. 6, f. 29.

<sup>153</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1454, f. 92-93

one Dr. Heinrich Ritter (1791-1869).<sup>154</sup> A decision was reached at a meeting on 23 December, attended only by Boeckh, von Raumer, the mathematician Tralles and the mineralogist Weiß. Tieck could not be considered, given his poor health and because his interest in the position was not known. Toelken's request would provide the occasion to find him a position in another way, since the principal concern of the faculty had to be filling Solger's position with an 'actual philosopher' (*mit einem Philosophen vom Fache*). Until the ministry could be informed and proposals made, Ritter was to be considered for an appointment as extraordinary professor to offer courses on a temporary basis.<sup>155</sup> Boeckh presented the faculty's decision to the ministry in a memo of 30 December. He argued that the field of speculative philosophy must be filled by at least two professors, as in most universities. Experience showed that the study of philosophy freezes (*erkalte*) with incomplete staffing, for as good as Solger was, he did not fully complement either Fichte or Hegel. Boeckh stated the faculty's preference for actual speculative philosophy in the narrow sense (*die eigentliche spekulative Philosophie im engeren Sinn*) in filling this vacancy, with less attention to Solger's other areas (*Kunstlehre, Mythologie und Philologie*), which Professor Toelken was suited to take over. Boeckh recommended Toelken to the benevolence of the ministry and suggested that there might be another way to secure his position at the university, without, however directly suggesting appointment as ordinary professor.<sup>156</sup> This view of Toelken as primarily suited to cover areas outside philosophy proper contrasts somewhat with the ministry's assertion in March 1817 that Toelken was ready (*erbötig*) to offer lectures in philosophy and thus, aided by two *Privatdozenten*, could temporarily fill the gap left by Fichte's death.<sup>157</sup> The contrast represents a clear shift toward specialization. Some allowance must be made, however, for administrative expediency, especially given that Toelken never actually taught a course in philosophy proper other than aesthetics (see Table 3).

On 3 January 1820 Boeckh circulated a memo asking his colleagues to voice their opinions on Toelken, apparently in conjunction with a report about him to be sent to the ministry.<sup>158</sup> The discussion was sent in another direction, however, by Hegel's strenuous objections. He had missed the meeting on 23 December because he was indisposed, and, from the memo convening that meeting, he concluded that only the request of Professor Toelken and the suggestion of Tieck had been considered. He thus believed that a decision had been made about

<sup>154</sup> Notation by Boeckh at the top of Toelken's request, including a reference to the faculty's decision to postpone made during an *Habilitation* exam on 13 November 1819 (HUBUA, PhilFak 1198, f. 192). For earlier attempts to bring Tieck to Berlin see Meves, 'Institutionalisierung', 121-123.

<sup>155</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1454, f. 99.

<sup>156</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 6, f. 136.

<sup>157</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 4, f. 143, response of 27 March 1817 to the philosophical faculty's request to move quickly in replacing Fichte. Noted by Tütken, *Privatdozenten*, 2:528, and Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 586.

<sup>158</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1454, f. 103; the report is mentioned here but not preserved.

filling a vacancy in his field, speculative philosophy, without consulting him.<sup>159</sup> Hegel's colleagues emphatically pointed out that his refusal to sign the memo concerning Toelken was based on a misunderstanding: Hegel had been invited to the meeting on 23 December, consideration of Ritter was announced in the convening memo but postponed because the meeting was too poorly attended, and the decision on Toelken was only about finding a way to support this deserving young scholar. Boeckh added that on the day of the meeting he, too, had been indisposed, with a cold that had kept him up the night before, but that he had attended the meeting anyway, because it was his duty.

The report in question is not preserved, but it appears to have been a request for a fixed salary, as indicated by subsequent documents. In a letter to the ministry of 24 January 1820 Toelken expressed his thanks for the fixed salary assigned him on 13 January. He found this evidence of ministerial goodwill particularly flattering, because he assumed that it had occurred prior to the faculty's request.<sup>160</sup> An internal memo of 1 February 1820 from Altenstein to Johann Christoph Friedrich Schultz (1781-1834), a *Staatsrat* in the ministry, notes that this request had been granted by giving Toelken a fixed salary of 600 *Taler* and that a further increase would come upon his appointment to the art collections.<sup>161</sup> Apparently this appointment was further delayed, as Toelken wrote to Altenstein on 3 August 1820 with the same complaints as before: his salary was insufficient, his lecture fees too little, his other occupations too distracting for the money they brought. His life was a constant struggle and all for nothing, with no money to pay for books, postage and all the things required by his position and social standing. This pathetic plea prompted both the *Vortragender Rat* Johann Daniel Uhden (1763-1835) and minister Altenstein to ask Schultz for proposals to help this 'deserving man' (*verdienter Mann*).<sup>162</sup> On 10 November 1820 Toelken was commissioned to write a catalog for the collection of paintings then being acquired from the collector Edward Solly; the catalog was never completed.<sup>163</sup> It is unclear what financial support this brought, as Toelken was still complaining to the ministry about his insufficient income, now in person, as indicated by a memo of 20 January 1821 from Schultz to Altenstein. Referring back to Altenstein's request of the previous August, Schultz pointed out that because the minister's plans for Toelken were dependent upon plans for the royal museum, no specific proposal could be made at this time. Meanwhile,

<sup>159</sup> See Lenz, *Geschichte*, 1 (1910): 607, for Hegel's repeated attempts to stymie the advancement of Ritter, who had studied with Schleiermacher and took a more historical approach to philosophy.

<sup>160</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 6 f. 151.

<sup>161</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 6 f. 138; Altenstein also delayed a decision on Ritter pending a report on his skills as a lecturer and Hegel's opinion.

<sup>162</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 7 f. 34: Mein Leben ist eine beständige Aufforderung und geht doch verloren. Uhden's notations were added to this document, Altenstein's in a note of 7 August (f. 34<sup>a</sup>).

<sup>163</sup> Vogtherr, *Königliches Museum*, 90, n. 597, citing an undated report by Waagen on the Solly collection.

however, Toelken had received several art-related commissions; in order to have time for them and in anticipation of a future position at the Museum, he had ceased teaching Italian at the Cöllnisches Gymnasium, thus losing a regular income of 200 *Taler*. Prompted by Toelken's verbal report of financial need, Schultz asked Altenstein to approve a payment of 200 *Taler* to compensate Toelken for his museum work, retroactive to the previous fall, with another to follow in the coming summer if not yet appointed *Custodus* in accordance with Altenstein's plan. The payment was approved by Uhden on 29 January.<sup>164</sup> Toelken received another extraordinary payment in April 1822.<sup>165</sup>

Due to a gap in the documents, it cannot be determined what prompted Toelken's elevation to ordinary professor in 1823, but the process was under way by September, when Altenstein received confirmation of Toelken's clean police record.<sup>166</sup> Toelken himself may have been unaware that the process had begun when he submitted yet another request to Altenstein for an increase in his regular salary and a supplement. The reasons were the same as always, compounded by the loss of income from teaching Italian at the Cöllnisches Gymnasium. He had given this up in 1820 at the specific request of the ministry, as incompatible with a promised position that never materialized, despite subsequent hints that it would. Encouraged by such hints, he had also turned down repeated offers from outside Prussia. On 11 November Altenstein wrote to the king seeking approval to appoint Toelken as ordinary professor in the discipline of art history and mythology with a salary increase of 200 *Taler*. In the draft, a change was made to the job title: *das Fach der Kunst- und Religionsgeschichte und Mythologie*. Altenstein stressed Toelken's exceptional scholarly zeal (*Eifer für die Wissenschaft*) and his service to the University through well attended lectures on art history and mythology. Toelken was officially appointed on 15 November, with a salary increase of 200 *Taler* and the requirement that he offer one free course in his field every semester.<sup>167</sup>

Toelken's official appointment at the Museum came only much later, on 4 August 1830, when it finally opened that year.<sup>168</sup> He continued to hold concurrent appointments at the university and museum until his death in 1863. For many years he was secretary of the Akademie der Künste, where he also taught for several semesters. At the university Toelken was frequently elected dean, and, judging from a small sampling of *Promotion* and *Habilitation* records, it was a position he took seriously. Among Toelken's relatively few publications the one recognized as most important is his *Habilitation* essay, which was published as

<sup>164</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 7 f. 79-80.

<sup>165</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 8, f. 111.

<sup>166</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 9, f. 130; Bd. 10, f. 22.

<sup>167</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 10, f. 25, 26, 28.

<sup>168</sup> Vogtherr, *Königliches Museum*, 216, n. 1707.

*On Basrelief and the difference between compositions in sculpture and painting.*<sup>169</sup> After this, he published primarily reviews, museum catalogues, and essays directed at a more popular audience, like the journal he edited in 1828 and 1829, the *Berliner Kunstblatt*. His essay of 1822 on the differing relation of ancient and modern painting to poetry, a critical addendum to Lessing's *Laocoon*, was delivered as a lecture to the Humanitäts-Gesellschaft. Like his addresses at the celebrations for Raphael and Durer in 1820 and 1828, this shows his ongoing professional and scholarly engagement with post-antique art, which, however, seems not to have extended into his teaching.<sup>170</sup>

Toelken announced courses in the published lists from summer 1815 to summer 1863 ([Tables 3, 4, and 5](#)). These tables and the following overview have been assembled from the published lists and the tables submitted to the ministry.<sup>171</sup> Toelken's actual teaching was somewhat sporadic from the start. Sometimes his classes failed to attract enough students, or enough willing to pay the fee. In some semesters he did not teach because of his own work at the royal museum, or because the necessary collections were unavailable. He stopped teaching altogether after winter 1857/58 due to chronic illness. Between 1815 and about 1820 he focused more and more on courses concerned specifically with art as he established a somewhat regular rotation, which he then maintained until the early 1850s. Toelken's enrollments were almost always low, except in some of his public courses. Only occasionally did he garner 30 or more and only once did he break 100, for lectures on Horace's *ars poetica* in summer 1828. With one not very useful exception, no student notes have survived for Toelken's classes, making it difficult to reconstruct his pedagogy.<sup>172</sup>

As in Göttingen, Toelken initially offered a wide range of courses that drew on his broad training. (Table 3) Although both his colleagues and the ministry cited his ability to teach philosophy proper, the philosophy courses he announced just after his *Habilitation* were never actually taught. He offered a general history of poetry three times and taught it twice, but he never attracted

<sup>169</sup> E. H. Toelken, *Über das Basrelief und den Unterschied der plastischen und malerischen Composition*, Berlin, Realschulbuchhandlung, 1815. Wrede, 'Archäologien', 223.

<sup>170</sup> E. H. Toelken, *Ueber das verschiedene Verhältnis der antiken und modernen Malerei zur Poesie, ein Nachtrag zu Lessings Laokoon*, Berlin: Nicolaische Buchhandlung, 1822; *Rede der Gedächtnisfeier Rafaels*, Berlin: Nicolaische Buchhandlung, 1820; 'Gedächtnisrede bei der Säcularfeier Albrecht Dürers', *Berliner Kunstblatt*, 1828 (April), 116-130.

<sup>171</sup> See Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, for the semesters to winter 1833/4 and the tables cited above for later semesters. As Virmond observed (xvi), the enrollment numbers in the ministerial tables cannot be taken as exact figures. Some were just approximations, while others were based on class rosters. Nevertheless, they do show general trends over several semesters and differences between instructors. Given the gap in the tables, references to courses from summer 1844 to summer 1847 are based solely on the published lists. Wrede, 'Archäologien', 222-223, and Borbein, 'Klassische Archäologie', 115-116, give brief overviews of Toelken's teaching based only on the published lists.

<sup>172</sup> Georg Waitz, clean copy of notes from 'Einleitung in die Numismatik', summer 1836: SBPK, Ms. quart. germ. 1076,7, nr. 3.

any students for more specialized courses on poetry, aside from the one on Horace. Similarly, he offered ancient history three times and taught it only once, and he could not attract students for the general history of religion. How many private lessons Toelken gave in ancient and modern languages cannot be determined from the ministry tables, and he last offered such lessons in winter 1818/19.

By about 1820 Toelken's teaching had shifted away from the broad scope of his education and toward his increasing professional focus on the history of art. Over the next 30 years he offered two principal private courses ([Tables 3 and 4](#)). In most winter semesters it was 'General art theory or aesthetics' (*Allgemeine Kunstlehre oder Aesthetik*). Toelken may have scheduled this course in the winter to attract art students, when the shorter days left them more time for academic classes. He offered the same course, or a version of it, at the Akademie der Künste every winter from 1832/33 to 1837/38 (plus summer 1834), first under the title 'Theory of the fine arts' (*Theorie der schönen Künste*) then as 'Aesthetics' (from winter 1835/36).<sup>173</sup> In most summers Toelken offered his other main university course, 'Archaeology of the arts of design' (*Archäologie der zeichnenden Künste*), probably a version of the course offered in Göttingen. As indicated by variants of the title, this survey covered architecture, sculpture, and painting in ancient Egypt, the Near East, Greece, and Rome. Until the 1850s he usually offered one or two courses (public and private) alongside these, drawing from an irregular rotation of courses devoted to a specific period, medium, or collection in Berlin.

[Table 5](#) shows that Toelken offered his 'Aesthetics' for the first time in summer 1818 and again in winter 1820. From then on he offered it nearly every winter semester until 1855; the last time he actually taught it was winter 1848/49, after which he either had too few students or was excused from teaching. Over this long span other professors, including Schleiermacher, Hegel, and Hotho, offered courses called 'Aesthetics,' often in the same semester as Toelken but never at the same time of day. Of the four semesters that Hegel delivered his lectures on aesthetics, two (winter 1820/21 and winter 1828/29) overlapped with Toelken's and both times Hegel had far more students.<sup>174</sup>

Although the title of Toelken's course was sometimes shortened to just 'Aesthetics,' it often retained the subtitle 'general art theory' (*allgemeine Kunstlehre*) in contrast to Hegel's subtitle 'philosophy of art' (*Philosophie der Kunst*) or Hotho's 'philosophy of the beautiful and art' (*Philosophie des Schönen und der Kunst*). This suggests a different, perhaps more practical emphasis, one that may

<sup>173</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1, f. 79 (for his appointment), f. 98, 104-5, 109v, 113v, 122a, 149v, 151v. On 24 March 1838 he wrote to Altenstein complaining that the course had been listed for the upcoming summer semester without his permission and against the statutes and standard practice, which placed scholarly lectures in the winter, when the shorter days gave art students less time for practical studies.

<sup>174</sup> The other professors listed in the table are Hermann von Keyserlingk (1793-1858), Theodor Mundt (1808-1861) and Adolf Helfferich (1813-1894).

become more clear with a better understanding of Toelken's published works. It is likely, but not certain, that his course, like Hegel's and Hotho's, covered both the visual arts and literature. Like all the aesthetics courses it was initially placed under the rubric 'philosophy' in the German course lists until winter 1832/33, when it moved to 'art history and art theory' (*Kunstgeschichte und Kunstlehre*).

From the multiple variants of the course titles and limited supporting documentation some conclusions may be drawn about Toelken's teaching in his more specialized courses on the history of art. (Table 4) Most of these usually appeared under the changing rubrics for art history and archaeology, although some, particularly the courses on mythology, moved back and forth between art/archaeology and philology. Usually the course titles simply indicate what the course was about (*über. . .*), but occasionally they give some indication of how they covered their subject. Take, for instance, the course on ancient painting and sculpture. In summer 1822 it bore the title 'History, principles, and preserved monuments of ancient visual art'. In summer 1829 this became 'History and principles of ancient sculpture and painting along with interpretation of the preserved monuments'. Taken together, the two course titles indicate the key elements that probably characterized most of Toelken's courses: an organizing structure of historical development and underlying principles, presumably of the medium, supported by the interpretation of specific monuments, either in the royal collections or through graphic reproduction. This closely resembles the structure announced in the published plan of 1812 for lectures on mythology in Göttingen. These three key elements, history, principles, and interpretation of monuments, also appear in the titles for his courses on ancient architecture. Interpretation of monuments also appears in some of the titles for the general archaeology survey, and in one instance (summer 1825) this was to occur in supplemental class meetings (*Hilfsstunden*).

Toelken's continuing use of local art collections in his teaching is indicated by scattered references in the various course titles and confirmed by supporting documentation. Some courses were dedicated to individual sections of the royal and other collections, such as the successive courses on plaster casts at Monbijou, the academy, and the royal museum, and the many courses on gems and coins. For those on the gems, Toelken probably used his own catalog.<sup>175</sup> He also drew on the royal collections to support or supplement medium surveys, like the course offered in summer 1817: 'On the sculptural monuments of classical antiquity, with particular attention to those in the royal collections in marble, bronze, carved gems, etc.' Toelken drew on the royal collections even for courses not directly focused on art, as in the course on 'ancient history' in winter 1819, which was illustrated (*erläutert*) with coins and other works. The general archaeology survey also used the royal collections, as indicated by the detailed

<sup>175</sup> E. H. Toelken, *Erklärendes Verzeichnis der vertieft geschnittenen Steine in der Königlich Preussischen Gemmensammlung*, Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1835. The catalog appears in the course title only in winter 1858.

titles it bore in summer 1815 and summer 1816. In the summers of 1832, 1833, 1835, and 1836 it was cancelled, because work at the museum and academy made the relevant collections inaccessible.<sup>176</sup> The supplemental meetings noted in 1825 may have taken place in the collections.

Evidence suggests that for his course on the history of post-antique painting, Toelken drew on both paintings and reproductive prints from the royal collections. The course title for summer 1817 noted an emphasis on the royal painting collections, 'in particular relation to the royal painting collections'. In his letter of 24 January 1820 thanking the minister for his salary, Toelken reported that he had been asked by many art lovers, most of them students, to teach the history of painting in the coming summer semester. He requested permission to use the royal print collection, noting that in Göttingen a large collection of this sort was maintained for teaching. Unfamiliar with the organization, extent, and storage of the Berlin collection, and unsure that a suitable room was available, he suggested that for each class session he would need to show only a few, pre-selected prints, and that a small room with closable cases would suffice. The request was approved, and Toelken taught the course in summer 1820 for 10 students.<sup>177</sup> He most likely used the prints to complete the developmental history of modern painting by showing works not available in Berlin.

In the mid 1850s Toelken revised his course offerings, probably in a largely unsuccessful attempt to make himself more relevant. In summer 1854 and summer 1855 he attempted to compete with Gerhard and Panofka by offering a private 'archaeological practicum', but no one registered. He had limited success with a course (sometimes public, sometimes private) on the authenticity of ancient monuments (*Prinzipien der archaologischen Kritik über die Echtheit der Kunstdenkmäler*), sometimes combined with and sometimes alongside their interpretation (*Erklärung*).

In the end, it seems, Toelken had arrived in the right place at the right time in 1814 but then kept up with the changing times only partially. The academic and professional profile obtained in Göttingen and on his travels allowed him to pass the *Habilitation* with ease and to earn the support of his colleagues at a time when the university was expanding. His long struggle for a regular salaried appointment ended before that expansion became problematic in the later 1820s. Although still based in the old model of the professor who taught across fields, Toelken's preparation, in and out of the university, was sufficiently focused, as he said, on *archaeologia* to allow him to adapt quite quickly to increasing specialization in the university and the museum. He soon shed the distraction of language instruction and stopped teaching, or pretending to teach, in philosophy proper, and focused his academic and professional life on the historical study of art, and, to some extent, on the art of his own time. An able administrator, he ran

<sup>176</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. XIII, Nr. 1, Bd. 7, f. 286v-287r; Bd. 8, f. 108v-109r; Bd. 9, f. 110v-111r, f. 278v-279r.

<sup>177</sup> GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 5, Bd. 6 f. 151, 152.



a department at the museum, served for many years as secretary of the art academy, and was often elected dean by his colleagues. In another sense, however, Toelken's formation, combined with his own abilities and inclinations, seems not to have prepared him to excel in the scholarly life he had worked so hard to attain. Already in 1814 Boeckh had noted that Toelken's scholarship was falling behind, echoing doubts expressed by Herbart and Heyne, and anticipating his own cutting comment a decade later. On 6 January 1824 Boeckh wrote to his former student and close colleague Karl Otfried Müller, who had secured Heyne's position in Göttingen, about the prospect of a position for Müller in Berlin. The main problem was, as always a lack of funds, and not so much competition from others already in place. In philology Wolf was increasingly out of the picture, and, Boeckh added, 'in art history and mythology, Toelken is still around, but as far as I know, he's not doing much.'<sup>178</sup> Still, Toelken deserves the attention of historians, for his rather average career shows much about academic life in his time. Likewise, his publications, although they may not have made a lasting mark, will provide insight into the state of scholarship in his day and into how much the historical study of art, whatever label it bore, owes to the older, more established study of antiquity.

### **Franz Kugler: Berlin – Heidelberg – Berlin**

Franz Theodor Kugler was born in January 1808 in Szczecin (then Stettin) in the Prussian province of Pomerania, the son of a prominent merchant and city official.<sup>179</sup> By his own account, his interest in the arts began early, with instruction in music, self-study in drawing and painting, and an introduction to poetry through the theater. His interest in poetry continued at the gymnasium, encouraged by his teacher Ludwig Giesebrecht (1792-1873), who directed him to the study of 'worthy models' and was probably the first to introduce him to the poetry of the Middle Ages.<sup>180</sup> Giesebrecht, who taught German language and literature, history and religion, enjoyed some fame as a poet but was best known as an historian with a particular focus on the medieval history of Pomerania and

<sup>178</sup> Boeck to Müller, 6 January 1824 in *Briefwechsel zwischen August Boeckh und Karl Otfried Müller*, Leipzig, 1883, 132: In der Kunstgeschichte und Mythologie ist freilich Toelken noch da; aber er macht, so weit ich weiß, keine großen Geschäfte. . . . Elipsis in the published text. In the extensive correspondence between Boeckh and Müller Toelken does not otherwise appear, while Hirt retained their respect as a scholar and a person even as his work became more and more outdated.

<sup>179</sup> The exact date of Kugler's birth is uncertain. The principal source for Kugler's life has been the curriculum vitae submitted to the Akademie der Künste in 1849: Archiv der Akademie der Künste (henceforth AdK) Nr. 121, f. 3-6. Also often cited is Friedrich Eggers, 'Franz Theodor Kugler', in *Franz Kugler's Handbuch der Geschichte der Malerei seit Constantin dem Grossen*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, 3 volumes, Hugo von Blomberg, ed, Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1867, 1:4-34. Also important, but little cited, is the curriculum vitae appended to Kugler's dissertation, *De Werinhero, saeculi XII monacho tegernseensi, et de picturibus minutis, quibus carmen suum theoticum de vita Mariae ornavit*, Berlin: August Petsch, 1831, 59-60.

<sup>180</sup> AdK, Nr. 121, f. 3-4; Eggers, 'Kugler', 4-5.

northern Germany. He was active in the local historical society (Gesellschaft für pommersche Geschichte und Altertumskunde, founded 1824).<sup>181</sup> The remark by Friedrich Eggers (1819-1872), Kugler's friend and first biographer, that Giesebrecht exercised a significant influence on Kugler's whole intellectual formation, deserves more attention than it has received thus far in the scholarship.<sup>182</sup>

On 22 April 1826 Kugler matriculated in the philosophical faculty at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University in Berlin.<sup>183</sup> The *Anmeldungsbogen* filed with the leaving certificate prepared for him on 18 April 1827 lists the lectures that he attended during his first two semesters.<sup>184</sup> (Table 6) In summer 1826 he heard Boeckh on the history of Greek literature, von Raumer on medieval history, and von der Hagen on the Niebelungen Lied and the history of German grammar. In winter 1826/27 he attended three classes with Boeckh, meter, Tacitus, and Pindar; von Raumer's history of the reformation; and two classes with von der Hagen, history of medieval and modern literature and Nordic and German mythology.<sup>185</sup> In addition to his studies, Kugler became an active member of the Singakademie, then under the direction of Carl Friedrich Zelter (1758-1832), well known for his interest in the history of music and a close friend of Goethe. He also became acquainted with the prominent musicologist Adolph Bernhard Marx (1795-1866).

Of all these men, von der Hagen played the most significant role in Kugler's early intellectual formation. Kugler's interest in medieval poetry had drawn him to Berlin, and this interest formed the basis of a close relationship with von der Hagen. The young student was granted free access to the professor's rich private library and assisted with his anthology of medieval lyric poetry, *Minnesinger. Deutsche Liederdichter des zwölften, dreizehnten und vierzehnten Jahrhunderts* (4 volumes, Leipzig, Barth, 1838). Promoting a view of Kugler as intuitive and empirical, Eggers asserted that this interaction served not the critical-philological side of German philology but rather the acquisition of broad general knowledge and an innate tendency to the artistic and poetic.<sup>186</sup> While not wholly inaccurate, this statement obscures the practical and scholarly assistance that Kugler provided von der Hagen at a crucial moment in the production of the *Minnesinger*, a monumental project begun in 1810.

<sup>181</sup> ADB 9 (1879), 159-161; Franz Kern, *Ludwig Giesebrecht als Dichter, Gelehrter, Schulmann*, Szczecin: Theodor von der Nahmer, 1875.

<sup>182</sup> Eggers, 'Kugler', 5: Giesebrecht 'hat überhaupt auf seine geistige Bildung einen wesentlichen Einfluß ausgeübt'.

<sup>183</sup> Bahl and Ribbe, *Martrikel*, 1:324, no. 531.

<sup>184</sup> HUBUA, Rektor und Senat, Abgangszeugnisse, 20.3.1827.

<sup>185</sup> During these two semesters Hirt and Toelken taught the following art history courses that he could have audited, although this is unlikely. Hirt: 'Modern Art' (winter 1826/27). Toelken: 'Archaeology' (summer 1826), 'Aesthetics', 'Introduction to carved gems', and 'Mythology' (winter 1826/27). See Tables 1 and 3.

<sup>186</sup> Eggers, 'Kugler', 5. Kugler, AdK, Nr. 121, f. 4v, recalled much the same about his study of medieval poetry, 'das ich freilich mehr in materieller als formeller Beziehung betrieb'.

Writing to Goethe on 17 May 1827, von der Hagen credited Kugler with helping him quickly complete work on the Jenaer *Liederhandschrift* (Jena, Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Ms. El. f. 101); Goethe had arranged the loan of the manuscript, which was finally on its way back to Jena after inordinate delay. Kugler, the young friend who had just paid a call in Weimar (see below for the visit), had compared and transcribed all the texts, including all the musical notation.<sup>187</sup> In addition, Kugler sought expert advice from Andreas Kretschmer (1775-1839), a Prussian statesman from Szczecin known for his work on medieval art, literature, and in particular music. On 27 March 1827 he wrote to Kretschmer with technical and historical questions about the melodies and musical notations in the Jena codex, which Kugler described, with evident pride, as particularly beautiful and historically important. Kugler reminded Kretschmer that his main area of study was medieval German literature and explained that he had undertaken the large task of transcription and copying to increase his knowledge of medieval music and to support his own composition of songs. Kretschmer sent a detailed and very learned response on 1 April, which Kugler immediately published in Marx's music journal, along with modern settings of two songs for voice and pianoforte.<sup>188</sup> Kugler again mentioned his work on the Jena codex in a letter of 30 March 1827 to Giesebrecht in Szczecin, returning one manuscript and asking Giesebrecht to watch for others of the same sort. Kugler also took this opportunity to communicate a passage relevant to current debates in Pomeranian history that he had discovered in a manuscript owned by von der Hagen. In closing he offered his assistance to his former teacher, whose great influence on his education he recalled with much fondness.<sup>189</sup>

Similarly, von der Hagen may have initiated, and certainly shaped, Kugler's study of the history of architecture. Eggers dated Kugler's first engagement with medieval buildings to a trip, on foot, through Germany in the fall of 1826, exactly between the two semesters he spent working with von der Hagen. Introducing his early writings on architecture in his collected essays, the *Kleine Schriften*, Kugler wrote that von der Hagen had promoted his interest not just in manuscripts but also in medieval architecture, and that his esteemed teacher had given him a conceptual foundation for the study of both.<sup>190</sup> The conflict over

<sup>187</sup> Published in Max Hecker, 'Aus der Frühzeit der Germanistik. Die Briefe Johann Gustav Büschings und Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagens an Goethe', *Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft* 15, 1929, 174-179. For production of the anthology see Grünewald, *von der Hagen*, 185-199; 197 for 1826-27. For Kugler's work see Minnesinger, 4: 765-774 (facsimilies from various mss), 775-844 (Singweisen der Jenaer Handschrift), 845-852 (Singweisen from von der Hagen's own Nithart ms.).

<sup>188</sup> Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (henceforth BStB), Cgm 7046, f. 467-68. *Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 4, 17-18 (4 April & 2 May 1827), 129-31, 137-140, and appendix.

<sup>189</sup> BStB, Cgm 7046, f. 468v. Facsimile of Giesebrecht's manuscript in *Minnesinger* 4:769.

<sup>190</sup> Eggers, 'Kugler', 6; Franz Kugler, *Kleine Schriften zur Kunstgeschichte*, 3 volumes, Stuttgart, Ebner & Seubert, 1853-54, 1 (1853): 101. Rößler, 'Architekturhistoriker', 124-125, is the first to incorporate this reference to von der Hagen into a discussion of Kugler's conception of architectural history.

Hotho's first *Habilitation* essay fell exactly in this period, and it is more than likely that von der Hagen shared his strong views with his young protégé.

In April 1827 Kugler left Berlin to spend a semester in Heidelberg. His trips to and from Heidelberg and his time there are well documented in a long letter, written in installments over the course of several months, to Johann Gustav Droysen (1808-1884), his childhood friend from Szczecin and fellow student in Berlin.<sup>191</sup> The memoirs of Karl Rosenkranz (1805-1879), whom Kugler met in Heidelberg and with whom he maintained a close friendship until his death, also provide insight into this crucial period.<sup>192</sup> While Kugler's initial purpose may have been primarily to continue his study of medieval history and culture, his academic interests were shifting and expanding, even as he explored and rejected other possible directions for his life.

Kugler left Berlin on 21 or 22 April, traveling via Wittenberg to Leipzig, where he spent a day waiting for the next post. After walking around the city in the rain, he wrote some distiches, like Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) in damp Venice but not in the style of Goethe. In preparation for the next day's visit in Weimar, he finished reading Goethe's play *Toquarto Tasso* (1780/1790), begun in the coach the previous day, and started *Werther* (1774/1787). Arriving in Weimar after traveling overnight (24 April), he ate breakfast and proceeded to Goethe's house, bearing a letter of introduction from Zelter. The visit apparently lasted little more than the 15 minutes Zelter asked his old friend to spend with the young man. Far from disappointed by the brevity of the visit or the banality of their conversation, Kugler was glad simply to have met the man whose writings were a powerful presence in his life at the time.<sup>193</sup> Again waiting for the post, Kugler spent the next day in Weimar and started the last two parts of Goethe's *Dichtung und Wahrheit* (1811-1833). Looking back on this day (writing on 6 May), he saw it as a gift from heaven to be reading this book just as he was about to begin a new life; although unable to predict its lasting effect, he noted an immediate gain in peace and self-confidence (*Ruhe und Selbstvertrauen*). Along with Heinse's *Ardinghello* it provided the impetus for the new direction of his activities: 'I want to read the works of the masters, come to know history,

<sup>191</sup> 4 – 23 May 1827, Goethe Museum, Düsseldorf; 29 May – 4 August 1827, GStAPK, VI. HA NI Johann Gustav Droysen, Nr. 46, Franz Kugler, f. 2-3v; 12 – 19 September, BStB, Ana 549 Nachlass Kugler, Nr. 265, f. 65-67. The last is a partial draft in pencil without salutation or closing. The text does not address Droysen directly, as do the others, and while identical in format, it is more telegraphic, as befitting a draft or perhaps a diary. Droysen's side of the correspondence is lost: Gustav Droysen, *Johann Gustav Droysen. Erster Teil. Bis zum Beginn der Frankfurter Tätigkeit*, Leipzig and Berlin, B.G. Teubner, 1910, 51.

<sup>192</sup> Karl Rosenkranz, *Von Magdeburg bis Königsberg*, Leipzig, Erich Koschny, 1878.

<sup>193</sup> Goethe Museum, f. 1-2, 2v. The passage describing the Goethe visit is printed, along with commentary and an excerpt from Zelter's letter of introduction (15 April 1827), in *Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. Die letzten Jahre. Briefe, Tagebücher und Gespräche von 1823 bis zu Goethes Tod*, Horst Fleig, ed, Frankfurt am Main, 1993 (Bibliothek der deutschen Klassiker, 89), 469-471, 1041-1042. Kugler wrote briefly of his visit to von der Hagen on 25 April: *Goethes Gespräche*, 4 volumes, Wolfgang Herwig, ed, Zurich: Artemis, 1965; 3.2:111.

literature, and art history, in order to know what has been and where we stand; that is not at all insignificant.' That evening he went to the theater, where he hoped to meet August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767-1845), who was in town to see Goethe.<sup>194</sup>

During the next day's coach ride toward Frankfurt (26 April), he joined a conversation between two men about Goethe's misidentification of Gothic architecture as German, helping out when one could not recall the relevant passages in Goethe's works. The three then fell into a heated discussion about the relative merits of Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805) and Goethe. Kugler challenged the view that Schiller was the 'deeper' (*tiefer*) of the two, arguing that Schiller was 'higher' (*höher*) but certainly not deeper. Although granting that Schiller might now be more widely read, he proclaimed that this was likely to change, as most young people now declared themselves for Goethe. The rest of the ride passed in silence as Kugler finished reading both *Werther* and *Hermann und Dorothea* (1798) despite the extreme discomfort of the coach. After another full day's travel, Kugler arrived in Frankfurt (28 April). Upon rising the next morning, he decided to walk the rest of the way to Heidelberg, a distance of about 85 kilometers. After filling his backpack and his coat, he sewed the rest of his possessions into his nightshirt and sent it on by post. Passing through Darmstadt, he soon came to the start of the Bergstrasse, a scenic road running between the Rhein and the Odenwald, a range of low mountains known for its associations with the *Nibelungenlied*. Passing by a famous mountain (the Melibokus), he arrived that evening in Auerbach, where he dined with a mineralogist who instructed him on the geology and sights of the Odenwald. The next day he continued on foot, spending 'longer than necessary' at the castle ruins in Auerbach, visiting an old quarry, and climbing another hill. Feeling lonely and tired from walking, he rented a wagon for the evening's ride to Weinheim. The next day (30 April) he made the four-hour trek to Heidelberg, where he arrived around noon.<sup>195</sup> That same day he matriculated in the philosophical faculty at the University.<sup>196</sup>

Kugler did not begin attending lectures until Monday, 7 May. He apparently spent the first week taking daily walks, to the famous, partly ruined castle above the town and in the surrounding hills. As later, these excursions served the study and appreciation of architectural monuments and ruins as well as the enjoyment and sketching of the landscape. He had also spent some time getting settled in his room, which he described to Droysen in a long passage on Sunday, 6 May, when rain prevented a planned trip to the baroque palace and gardens in Schwetzingen (10 kilometers to the west). His trunk had not yet arrived,

<sup>194</sup> Goethe Museum, 2v-3: Ich will die Werken der Meister lesen, ich will die Geschichte kennen lernen, Litteratur und Kunstgeschichte, um zu wissen, was gewesen ist und wo wir stehen; das ist gar nicht unbedeutend.

<sup>195</sup> Goethe Museum, f. 3-4.

<sup>196</sup> Gustav Toepke, ed, *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg*, 7 volumes, Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1884-1916, 5 (1904): 341, Nr. 71.

indicating that these items had been carried in his backpack. On a small chair lay an open score for *Iphigenia* by Christoph Willibald Gluck (1714-1787), which Kugler claimed to play and sing almost completely at least once a day, alongside a pair of oratorios by Gluck and Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827). On the other chair lay three quarto volumes of the *Sammlung deutscher Gedichte aus dem XII., XIII. und XIV. Jahrhundert* (2 volumes, Berlin, 1784-85), compiled by Christoph Heinrich Müller (or Myller, 1740-1807), whom Kugler identified as the first after Johann Jacob Bodmer (1698-1783) to be concerned with the study of medieval German literature. Besides commenting on individual poems and Müller's prefaces, Kugler noted that the third volume was but a fragment, over which Müller had died (Kugler thus possessed a partial printing). Next to the Müller, editions of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius. On the table an almost unneeded Greek dictionary. On the writing desk a vase with lilies of the valley and night violets alongside Goethe's *Faust* (1808), *Werther*, *Tasso*, and *Hermann und Dorothea* as well as the *Iliad* and an edition of Sophocles. Also on the writing desk was Heinse's *Ardinghello*, which Kugler again cited as the impetus for the new direction in his life. Praising it as rational and considered (*verständlich und überlegt*), he gave a quick if scattered summary of its contents, noting Heinse's assertion of the Greek as the sole inner essence (*Griechheit, und nichts anders, als inneres Wesen*) in the art of the Renaissance. The vignette of the Medici Venus on the title page caused him to reflect that he had never before seen a naked female figure in the flesh, albeit plenty in stone; he had, however, recently seen a fine male nude on a visit to the Russian baths with his friend Albrecht Bethe, whom he praised for his beautiful proportions, frame, skin, and flesh. He also noted that Heinse had written a novel about music and observed that all these 'Greek folks' (*Griechenleute*) paid too much attention to the visual arts (*plastische Seite der Kunst*) leaving 'our' music almost unconsidered, as for example 'father Goethe' and A.W. Schlegel.<sup>197</sup>

From the start Kugler seems to have mostly avoided the more raucous elements of student life. Already on 4 May he reported to Droysen that he was not going to the tavern (*Kneipe*) and not consorting with old acquaintances, whom he considered 'geniuses of the bottle' (*Kneipgenies*).<sup>198</sup> Continuing his interest in historically informed musical performance, he soon joined the Singverein led by Anton Friedrich Justus Thibaut (1772-1840), a law professor and music historian who promoted a return to older forms of church music and folk song.<sup>199</sup> Kugler also took fencing lessons, planned to take swimming lessons, and also riding lessons, if his father would send more money (travel had cost much more than anticipated). He appreciated the discipline of the fencing lessons, and he felt they had made him aware

<sup>197</sup> Goethe Museum, f. 2-2v.

<sup>198</sup> Goethe Museum, f. 1.

<sup>199</sup> Goethe Museum, f. 4v, 5. ADB 37 (1893), 737-744.

that, given his natural indolence (*Trägheit*) and lack of focus, he needed to follow specific instruction if he hoped to learn anything.<sup>200</sup> Nevertheless, Kugler seems to have been quite diligent in applying lessons learned from von der Hagen, as he was soon ‘really at home’ (*förmlich einheimisch*) in the library, where he was copying the twelfth-century *Rolandslied* of the Pfaffen Conrad (Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. Pal. germ 112), including all the images, which he identified as Byzantine in style. Rosenkranz remembered with great fondness how they shared the results of their work in the library and that Kugler was also working on the *Wälsche Gast* of Thomas of Zerclaere (Cod. Pal. germ. 389).<sup>201</sup>

At the same time, however, Kugler’s choice of courses in Heidelberg reflects the shift to a broader interest in ‘history, literature, and art history’. (Table 6) With the classical philologist Friedrich Creuzer (1771-1858), he took ‘Archaeology, or history and theory of the visual arts of the ancient peoples, in particular the Greeks, with the presentation of antiquities, casts, and prints’. With the historian Franz Josef Mone (1796-1871) he had ‘History of national culture and literature in the Middle Ages’. At first he attended only one course with the historian Friedrich Christoph Schlosser (1776-1861), ‘Universal history of the modern period’, but enjoyed it so much he soon attended Schlosser’s other two classes, ‘Greek and Roman history from the battle at Charonea to the fall of the empire’ and ‘German history’. He made no mention of courses in the history of architecture, perspective drawing, and architectural rendering taught by one Professor Leger, or of the courses in figure and landscape drawing offered by Professor Roux.<sup>202</sup>

Kugler painted concise but evocative portraits of his professors and described his interaction with them outside class. At the start of the semester he found Creuzer to be old and verbose (*weitschweiflich*), but possessing a well-ordered store of facts. He hoped to hear something new from Mone, who was primarily concerned with the proper ground of the national (*eigentlicher Grund des Nationalen*) and chided Christianity for destroying or falsifying the national. Rosenkranz, who met Kugler in this small class of only 6 or 7 students, recalled that Mone offered a summary overview of medieval literature with a pronounced emphasis on folk poetry at the expense of high culture forms and

<sup>200</sup> Goethe Museum, f. 5.

<sup>201</sup> Goethe Museum, f. 5v; Rosenkranz, *Von Magdeburg bis Königsberg*, 320.

<sup>202</sup> The short titles given by Kugler, Goethe Museum, f. 4v, correspond to the full titles cited here and drawn from *Anzeige der Vorlesungen, welche im Sommerhalbjahr 1827 auf der Grossherzoglich-Badischen Rupprecht-Carolinischen Universität zu Heidelberg gehalten werden sollen*, Heidelberg: Universitätsbuchhandlung C. F. Winter, 1827, 11-12, 17-18.

precedents in Latin history and poetry.<sup>203</sup> Kugler appreciated Schlosser as a clear-sighted mind able to present a manifold whole with its inner connections (although not its causes) and to sketch the character of a time with a few quick strokes. He especially prized Schlosser's presentation of history from the perspective of the present, finding it 'thus more practical history' (*also mehr praktische Geschichte*) and precisely what he sought from all his professors, for Schlosser took significant account of art, learning, and literature.<sup>204</sup>

In his interactions with professors outside the classroom, Kugler sought to develop personal relationships and to draw on their expertise and scholarly contacts in his areas of interest. To break the ice with Schlosser he invented the pretext of asking advice about an event in the pre-Roman history of Italy that he hoped to transform into a tragedy. On the morning of 19 May, a Saturday, he visited Schlosser at home and was invited back for tea on Wednesday. He then paid a call on Creuzer, not because he enjoyed the man's lectures, but because Creuzer knew so much and had many antiquarian and art objects, as well as a good library, where Kugler had previously seen the important publication on Cologne Cathedral by Sulpiz Boisserré (1783-1854). On this occasion he asked for information about Speyer Cathedral. Creuzer referred him to Mone's description and history of Speyer and provided an introduction to a former student, the classical philologist Joseph Anselm Feuerbach (1791-1851), then teaching at the Gymnasium in Speyer. That afternoon Kugler consulted Mone's book in the library (it was open Saturdays from 2 to 4). The next day, Sunday, he made the five-hour journey to Speyer on foot. Arriving in the morning, he visited the Cathedral, noting the style and materials of its various parts. After eating at an inn he sought out Professor Feuerbach, who showed him around the city (including the cathedral and the ruins of the *Reichskammergericht*), and took him to see a colleague who owned a large collection of prints and paintings. Kugler commented that the portrait of Goethe by the painter Wilhelm von Kügelgen (1802-1867) was the best he had ever seen. At lunch the three had a lively discussion, mostly about music. Kugler took his leave at 4 o'clock with a promise to return soon and walked happily back to Heidelberg.<sup>205</sup>

The excursion to Speyer was just one of many that Kugler made from Heidelberg. At first these were weekend trips, when, as he told Droysen on 23 May, he had no lectures to attend. Rosenkranz recalled that Kugler would disappear every Friday afternoon, his portfolio under his arm, to sketch in the surrounding area until Sunday evening, but that eventually Kugler was attending only Mone's lectures.<sup>206</sup> Already on 30 May Kugler had abandoned his

<sup>203</sup> Rosenkranz, *Von Magdeburg bis Königsberg*, 316.

<sup>204</sup> Goethe Museum, f. 4v.

<sup>205</sup> Goethe Museum, f. 5r-5v, 6. Franz Josef Mone, *Geschichte und Beschreibung von Speyer*, Speyer: Osswald, 1817. Sulpiz Boisserré, *Geschichte und Beschreibung des Doms zu Köln*, Stuttgart: Boisserré and Cotta, 1821-23.

<sup>206</sup> Goethe Museum, f. 6v; Rosenkranz, *Von Magdeburg bis Königsberg*, 320, 334.



plan to study history, previously communicated to Droysen in such detail, in favor of the free life of an artist (*ein freies Künstlerleben*), specifically that of a landscape painter. After not writing since early June, Kugler wrote on 3 July of his loneliness in Heidelberg, having found only one friend, Jordan (who cannot be further identified), with whom he expected to spend time and travel but who did not understand him. On 4 August he wrote to Droysen, from an unnamed place, for the first time since 19 July, to say that he had found peace in his decision to become an actor and that he planned to inform his parents in a strongly worded letter, thus hoping to end a long, indirect, and unproductive correspondence about his future. Much of Kugler's time in June and July seems to have been spent travelling, often with the unsuitable Jordan, judging from the list of places visited. He was in the present city or town for the second time, and he had been twice to Speyer and Karlsruhe, as well as places in the Bavarian province along the Rhine, Darmstadt, more towns in the Odenwald, Worms, Mainz, Wiesbaden (where Jordan went broke gambling), and Frankfurt by way of the Taunus. Heidelberg appears to have remained Kugler's home base, as this letter was postmarked there on 5 August 1827.<sup>207</sup>

Kugler finally left Heidelberg on 12 September, settling his accounts and gathering his documents. Rosenkranz and another friend accompanied him to the outskirts of town, whence he continued through Neckargemünd and southward up the Neckar, observing the landscape and its architectural monuments. On 14 September, he stopped in Wimpfen (now Bad Wimpfen, 10 kilometers northwest of Heilbronn), where he took detailed notes and made drawings and quick plans by eye of the Stadtkirche and the Kreuzkirche. Turning north, he walked up to Mockmühl on the river Jagst. The next day he proceeded up the Jagst to the castle of Berlichingen, home of the sixteenth-century knight Götz von Berlichingen (the basis for Goethe's play from 1773); during his midday pause he refined his plan of Wimpfen. On the 16<sup>th</sup> he continued along the Jagst to Krauthheim before turning east toward Niederstetten and nearly reaching the river Tauber. On the 17<sup>th</sup> he walked an hour to his first stop in Bavaria, Rothenburg ob der Tauber. After walking around the town, he found a ride to Ansbach, where he paid a call on Professor Feuerbach's mother and visited the city's churches and the palace and orangerie. The next morning he walked on to Heilsbronn, viewing the ruins of the medieval monastery and its church before continuing to Nuremberg. Arriving late in the day, he took a short nap before attending a concert in the great hall of the Rathaus and closely noting its architecture and decoration. He spent the whole of the next day walking around the city, making notes on buildings and drawing the plan of the *Sebalduskirche*, which he measured with his feet.<sup>208</sup>

<sup>207</sup> GStAPK, VI. HA NI Johan Gustav Droysen, Nr. 46, Franz Kugler, f. 2v.

<sup>208</sup> BStB, Ana 549, Nachlass Kugler, Nr. 265, f. 65-67. Apparently Kugler did not complete this draft, as it ends, mid-page, with the account of Nuremberg.

By 12 October Kugler was back in Szczecin. Writing to Droysen (also at home in Pomerania), he described the relative calm he had achieved upon his return. His adamant letter about a life in the theater had been met with an equally adamant, negative response, but he had now repaired relations with his father simply by disappearing into the celebrations for his sister's wedding. Kugler planned to return to Berlin on the 15<sup>th</sup>, and, if Droysen was still interested in their old plan, he would look for quarters for them to share. Kugler also planned, for the time being, to apply himself seriously and diligently to the study of aesthetics under Droysen's supervision, as he was not at all suited to grammar (by which he apparently meant philology). He gave no reason for abandoning plans for life on the stage, simply noting that during his last days in Heidelberg and on a tour (*Rundreise*) he had been much engaged with Gothic architecture, traveling (presumably on his return to Szczecin) via Nuremberg, Bamberg, Weimar and Magdeburg.<sup>209</sup> According to the biography of Droysen written by his son, Kugler's dear friend had tired of the passionate professions of friendship and helpless indecisiveness in the letters from Heidelberg. The two did not share quarters in Berlin, and their close friendship became more distant, although it survived until Kugler's death.<sup>210</sup>

While it would be easy to discount Kugler's semester in Heidelberg as a period of youthful frivolity, as the younger Droysen did, Kugler's letters show that he gained important perspective from the experience: he arrived as serious student of the middle ages, neglected his studies to explore other pursuits, but then ultimately came back to a somewhat revised conception of his academic interests, moving from a philological to an 'aesthetic' emphasis. Kugler himself had a considered appreciation of his time in Heidelberg. On 4 August he responded to a letter in which Droysen, writing of his own plans, observed that he, too, would like the opportunity to see Berlin from the outside. Kugler found this a good idea and remarked that such had been the main benefit (*Hauptnutzen*) of his own stay in Heidelberg. He implied that he had learned something from the frequent local joking about Hegelianism, just as he had become acquainted with distant echoes of the earlier conflict among the Romantics, which had pitted Brentano and Creuzer against Voß. Still, Heidelberg was mostly an inexpensive place to gain perspective (if one neither drank nor travelled), since the faculty offered little for either of them: Mone, a strange but occasionally peculiar man, was about to leave for Holland, Creuzer was 'a philistine of a philologist in class'

<sup>209</sup> GStAPK, VI. HA NI Johan Gustav Droysen, Nr. 46 Franz Kugler, f. 4v: Vorläufig werde ich mich mit Ernst (und unter deiner Aufsicht) mit Fleiß auf das Studium der Aesthetik legen; zur Grammatik passe ich einmal nicht. Rosenkranz, *Von Magdeburg bis Königsberg*, 320, recalled that Kugler changed his mind about the theatre after appearing anonymously, and unsuccessfully, on stage in Mannheim.

<sup>210</sup> Droysen, *Droysen*, 52-53, quoting selectively from the one letter now in Berlin.

(auf dem Catheder, ein philoströser Philolog), and his initial enthusiasm for Schlosser had waned.<sup>211</sup>

Upon his return to Berlin in the fall of 1827, Kugler began studies in the practice of architecture at the Bauakademie, attended the university for two semesters, and expanded his artistic and literary associations. In the spring of 1829 he passed the surveyor's exam (*Feldmesserprüfung*) and returned to Szczecin to take up the practice of architecture. As he later recalled, he had allowed external forces (probably his parents) to push him into this profession, and, despite everything, he had not really become an architect (*ein Architekt war ich bei alledem nicht geworden*). By fall 1829 he was back in Berlin, again attending lectures at the Bauakademie and associating with musicians, poets, and especially painters.<sup>212</sup> As Eggers recounted, Kugler established friendships with, among many others, the composer Felix Mendelssohn (1809-1847, a close friend of Droysen), the poets Adelbert von Chamisso (1781-1838) and Heinrich Heine (1797-1856), the architect Heinrich Strack (1805-1880), and the painter-poet Robert Reinick (1805-1852).<sup>213</sup> During this period Kugler's education continued both within and outside formal academic instruction. The available evidence suggests that he gained less from his few courses at the university than he did from attending the Bauakademie, especially the second time, when he was probably not officially a student.

In addition, Kugler may have attended, and was certainly well aware of, the famous 'Cosmos' lectures delivered by Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859) at the Singakademie between 6 December 1827 and 27 March 1828. Humboldt's immense fame and the great interest in his public course on 'Physical geography' (*Physikalische Geographie*) at the university (beginning on 3 November) had led to popular demand for presentation of the material in a larger and even more public venue. The Singakademie lectures were a major event, with extensive reviews in the Berlin newspapers, and notes also circulated among the interested public. Among Humboldt's several reasons for lecturing in Berlin was a desire to present an approach grounded in the observational practices of the natural sciences as an alternative to the speculative philosophy exemplified by Hegel.<sup>214</sup> The lectures presented a comprehensive, unified picture of the physical world, from the heavens to the earth's core and everything in between, including aspects of

<sup>211</sup> GStAPK, VI. HA NI Johan Gustav Droysen, Nr. 46 Franz Kugler, f. 3: man schimpft hier sehr über den Hegelianismus (sonst habe ich hier auch noch aus einzelnen Nachklängen die schöne Zeit des Streites der Romantiker, unter Creuzer und Brentano, gegen Voß kennengelernt).

<sup>212</sup> AdK, f. 4v-5, Kugler, *De Werinhero*, 59. Droysen, *Droysen*, 53, wrote that Kugler's father had set his head straight upon his return from Heidelberg, but without citing a source.

<sup>213</sup> Eggers, 'Kugler', 8. Eggers's account of Kugler's studies in this period is imprecise and sometimes inaccurate.

<sup>214</sup> Jürgen Hamel and Klaus-Harro Tiemann, 'Vorwort', in *Alexander von Humboldt. Über das Universum. Die Kosmosvorträge 1827/28 in der Berliner Singakademie*, Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag, 1993, 11-36. As a member of the Akademie der Wissenschaften, Humboldt had the right to lecture at the university.

human culture. In the words of his sister-in-law, Caroline von Humboldt (1766-1829), Alexander knew ‘how to trace the outlines of a colossal object with truly grand simplicity and thus to present an image to the inner sense.’<sup>215</sup> The Berlin lectures eventually provided the basis for Humboldt’s most popular and successful work, *Cosmos: Sketch of a physical description of the world*.<sup>216</sup>

At the university Kugler registered for only a few, somewhat random classes. (Table 6) His *Anmeldungsbogen* lists the following for summer 1828: Hegel for logic, Gottfried Bernhardt (1800-1875) for Greek syntax, Carl Ritter (1779-1859) for the ethnography of Asia, and Eduard Gans (1798-1839) for modern history with emphasis on public law. For winter 1828/29 it lists Hegel for ‘Aesthetics’, Carl Ritter for ‘Universal geography’ and ‘Geography of ancient Italy’, with incomplete entries (lacking the professors’ names and signatures) for contemporary (*neueste*) history and Prussian history.<sup>217</sup> In summer 1828 Droysen was in all four of Kugler’s classes; judging from the tenor of their correspondence, the choices are most likely to have been Droysen’s. The next semester Droysen and Kugler were both in Hegel’s ‘Aesthetics’.<sup>218</sup>

Although his professors all attested to his regular attendance, Kugler probably did not attend for the full two full semesters. He did not officially matriculate until 17 June 1828,<sup>219</sup> several weeks after lectures had begun (in his courses on 5 and 6 May), although he probably attended before matriculating. It also appears that he stopped going to class before the end of next the semester. Once back in Szczecin (May 1829), he sought reassurance about not finishing Hegel’s course on aesthetics in a (now lost) letter to his friend Heinrich Herzfeld.<sup>220</sup> Responding from Berlin on 19 and 20 May Herzfeld wrote, ‘Now

<sup>215</sup> Quoted in Hamen and Tiemann, ‘Vorwort’, 20: Die Umrisse eines kolossalen Gegenstandes weiß er mit wahrhaft großartiger Einfachheit zu umschreiben und gerade dadurch ein Bild dem inneren Sinn zu geben.

<sup>216</sup> Alexander von Humboldt, *Kosmos: Entwurf einer physischen Weltbeschreibung*, 5 volumes, Stuttgart: Cotta, 1845-1862.

<sup>217</sup> HUBUA, Rektor und Senat, Abgangszeugnisse, 3.12.1830. In summer 1828 Gans did not attest to Kugler’s attendance, even though fees had been paid. In winter 1828/29 modern history was offered again by Gans and also by von Keyserlingk, although the latter course was cancelled due to lack of students. Prussian history was offered by von Henning and Stuhr. Kugler paid the fees but may or may not have attended some of the lectures. Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, 529, 1828ws236-239. During these two semesters Hirt did not teach the courses he announced; Toelken taught only ‘Horace’s *ars poetica*’, ‘Aesthetics’, and ‘Greek and Roman architecture’. (Tables 1 and 3)

<sup>218</sup> The list of courses from Droysen’s *Abgangszeugnis* of 15 May 1829 is published in Hildegard Astholz, *Das Problem ‘Geschichte’ untersucht bei Johann Gustav Droysen*, Berlin: Emil Eberling, 1933; reprint Vaduz, Kraus, 1965, 209-210. Droysen’s lecture notes from his several courses with Hegel are all lost: Horst Walter Blanke, *Historik. Supplement: Droysen Bibliographie*, Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: frommann-holzboog, 2008, x.

<sup>219</sup> Bahl and Ribbe, *Matrikel*, 1: 398, Nr. 735.

<sup>220</sup> Hegel ended his lectures on 2 April and attested to Kugler’s attendance on 13 April. As the course had 86 students and probably several auditors, Hegel might not have noticed Kugler’s absence. Little is known about Herzfeld, except that he was born in Guhrau in Silesia and matriculated in Berlin on 17 November 1827; his matriculation was dissolved (*gelöscht*) in

about the philos. course you should have finished, don't let your few blond hairs go grey.' The world was a big book that not all could read for themselves, but Kugler, Herzfeld asserted, was ahead of others in this regard and should focus on art, not philosophy, for the present: '...you have enough for the first years. A person like you comes to abstract philosophy on his own when the time is right'.<sup>221</sup>

Herzfeld's response suggests that Kugler's concern was not simply for what he had missed, but also, or more pressingly, for what he had rejected or not understood. Whatever the case, he had probably sought out Hegel's courses. He clearly chose Hegel's logic over three other available options, albeit none taught by an ordinary professor, and Hegel's aesthetics over Toelken's, although here there may have been a time conflict with one of the history courses he had at least planned to take.<sup>222</sup> That Kugler took courses with Hegel is not at all surprising, despite his later, and much cited, claims to have rejected philosophy altogether. Two of his closest friends, Rosenkranz and Droysen, had an intense interest in Hegel. Droysen had taken many courses with Hegel, and he was in Hegel's aesthetics course at the same time as Kugler. That Kugler found it difficult to make sense of his experience is also not surprising, given Hegel's contested position at the time. Kugler may even have been torn between the views of his two friends: Rosenkranz, the loyal but not doctrinaire Hegelian, and Droysen, who subsequently denounced Hegel's aesthetics as a false doctrine (*Irrelehre*), a priori speculation that ignored the material nature of art.<sup>223</sup>

By that summer, Kugler was already back to thinking about the independent study of architecture. On 8 July 1829 Herzfeld wrote to say that it would be really nice (*recht hübsch*) if Kugler could take the architectural study trip (*architektonische Entdeckungsreise*) he was planning, but only with his father's approval, since it would not be worth the disruption to familial harmony.

---

December 1830 (Bahl and Ribbe, *Matrikel*, 1:381, Nr. 258). Subsequent letters to Kugler indicate that Herzfeld was a student of philology with an interest in art and architecture; the two had previously planned a trip to Potsdam to consult with the architect Peter von Lenné (1789-1866) about careers in landscape architecture. In 1833 Herzfeld was in Paris giving lessons in German and ancient languages, learning English and French, and working on an edition of ancient authors for a French patron. 25 May – 29 June 1829 and 6 March 1833: BStB, Cgm 7045, f. 413-414, f. 421-422.

<sup>221</sup> BStB, Cgm 7046, f. 412: Was aber den philos. Cursus betrifft, den du hättest durchmachen sollen, laß dein Paar blonde Haare nicht grau werden...so hast du für die ersten Jahre genug. Zur abstrakten philosophie kommt ein Mensch wie du schon selbst, wenn es Zeit ist. Toward the end of the winter semester Droysen and Kugler apparently had a falling out over something Kugler had said; in this same letter Herzfeld assured Kugler that it was all a misunderstanding. The letter was first cited by Koschnick, *Kugler*, 39, who reads it as indicating Kugler's rejection of philosophy.

<sup>222</sup> In summer 1828 Logic was also offered by Heinrich Ritter (1791-1869), Friedrich Beneke (1798-1854) and von Keyserlingk; none conflicted with Kugler's other courses for the semester. In winter 1828/29 Toelken's aesthetics (4 days a week from 4 to 5) conflicted with Stuhr's Prussian history (5 days a week from 4 to 5). Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, 503, 1828ss169-172; 509, 1828ss250 and 257; 524, 1828ws164; 529, 1828ws238.

<sup>223</sup> Droysen to Ludwig Moser, November 1831, in *Johann Gustav Droysen. Briefwechsel*, 2 volumes, Rudolf Hübner, ed, Berlin, 1929; reprint Osnabrück: Biblio-Verlag, 1965, 1:45-46.

Herzfeld also hoped Kugler could join him on an extended trip to Italy and Spain that the architect Wilhelm Stier (1799-1856) was planning to make in the future.<sup>224</sup> A student of Schinkel better known for brilliant designs than executed buildings, Stier had been appointed to teach at the Bauakademie in 1828, following extended travels in France and Italy. He quickly became known for his engaging lectures on the history of architecture, in which he attempted to make historical buildings comprehensible to a modern audience.<sup>225</sup>

The trip never happened, but upon returning to Berlin that fall, Kugler heard Stier lecture 'on the study of architectural monuments' 'during the next semester' (probably winter 1829/30 but possibly summer 1830).<sup>226</sup> According to the course lists for the Bauakademie published in the *Allgemeine Preussische Staats-Zeitung*, Stier announced a course with the corresponding German title, '*Studien über die Monumente der Baukunst*', in both winter 1829/30 and summer 1830.<sup>227</sup> The course had not been offered previously, and it may have been the reason, or one reason, for Kugler's return to Berlin at this time. He considered Stier's monuments course particularly important, for he made a clean copy of his lecture notes, something he appears not to have done for any other instructor. The notes are partially preserved in the Kunstbibliothek, Berlin, in at least four sections: introduction to the study of architecture, the Egyptian style, ancient Indian architecture, and Greek architecture.<sup>228</sup> Stier's course was an historical survey that began with an introduction to the fundamental principles of architecture as the necessary basis for the historical study of successive styles, which he also referred to as 'building systems' (*Bausysteme*).

In addition to a solid grounding in the history of architecture, Kugler had probably also refined and expanded his practical skills as a draughtsman during his previous semesters at the Bauakademie (probably winter 1827/28, summer 1828, and winter 1828/29). There is no documentation of his enrollment or attendance, but the published lists include courses in mathematics (arithmetic, algebra, geometry, trigonometry) and various types of drawing (free hand and architectural ornamentation, site plans, architectural drawing). It is likely that he had Stier's course on sketching buildings with exercises in perspective, offered in

<sup>224</sup> BStB, Cgm 7046, f. 418.

<sup>225</sup> ADB 36 (1894), 207-208; Wilhelm Lübke, *Lebenserinnerungen*, Berlin: Fontane, 1891, 216.

<sup>226</sup> Kugler, *De Werinhero*, 59: Autumno autem ejusdem anni Berolinum reversus per proximum semestre in academia, ad architecturam discendam instituta, STIERIUM audivi de studio monumentorum architecturae.

<sup>227</sup> Summer semester lists appeared in March, winter semester lists in September. For Kugler's semesters see: 1827, Nr. 209 (7 September); 1828, Nr. 64 (14 March), Nr. 242 (10 September); 1829, Nr. 79 (20 March), Nr. 250 (9 September); 1830, Nr. 77 (18 March), Nr. 245 (4 September).

<sup>228</sup> Kunstbibliothek der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin (henceforth KuBi), Kugler Nachlass, M1, M11, M12, and K-6. While only K6 bears the heading 'nach Stier', the four sections are consistent in paper, hand, format, and content. Also possibly related are M-4 (Corinthian columns), M-5 (Ionic columns) and M-6 (architectural details), and M-7 (Greek temples). See Rößler, 'Architekturhistoriker,' 125-126, for a brief consideration of these notes and their significance for Kugler.

summer 1828 and winter 1828/29. He may also have attended the course in architectural theory (*Allgemeine Baulehre*) with Martin Friedrich Rabe (1765-1856); since it continued to be offered regularly after Stier began his monuments course, Rabe's was probably less historical.

Kugler's classroom education apparently ended with the conclusion of Stier's course in 1830. The period leading up to his *Promotion* in July 1831 was, as he later recalled, a disordered mix of scholarly and the most varied artistic activities. Since Heidelberg, he had fallen, without any particular purpose, into the study of art history, and now, without realizing it, he found there a more solid purchase for his inner self (*einen festeren Halt für mein Inneres gefunden*), because here art and scholarship (*Kunst und Wissenschaft*) seemed to go hand in hand.<sup>229</sup> In the *Kleine Schriften*, Kugler recalled that upon his return from Heidelberg he continued his study of manuscripts in the royal library and private collections and made frequent excursions to churches in and around Berlin. Although his studies had become more serious since Heidelberg, he did not at first have a clear purpose in mind for them. Eventually, as he noted and archival sources confirm, these studies provided the basis for a larger project, the publication of medieval monuments, as well as for the dissertation that earned him a doctoral degree.<sup>230</sup> The stages of this project also show Kugler attempting to find ways to support himself as a scholar, first through private patronage and then through state support from the *Kultusministerium*.

Initially Kugler submitted an ambitious plan for two multi-volume series to an unnamed private individual. The first series would consist of annotated illustrations of monuments of medieval art in nearly all forms and media, excluding architecture but not architectural ornament and encompassing all of Europe but with a focus on Germany. The second series would provide expanded textual description with a selection of images from the first.<sup>231</sup> Kugler sought a yearly salary of 1000 *Taler* for two years to support the travel required for the documentation (*Aufnahme*) of the relevant monuments in Germany and abroad, with an exact itinerary to be formulated after consulting men of proven expertise. His notes and drawings would become the property of the patron, with reproduction of the drawings for publication to be determined later. Describing his qualifications, Kugler listed all the principal elements from his education: earlier philosophical [i.e. in the philosophical faculty] (namely medieval German) studies, many years of drawing, and more recent architectural

<sup>229</sup> AdK, Nr. 121, f. 5.

<sup>230</sup> Kugler, *Kleine Schriften*, 1 (1853): 8-9, 101, 119.

<sup>231</sup> Staatliche Museen zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Zentralarchiv (henceforth SMPKZA), Autographensammlung, Nachlass Kugler, Mappe 0802, f. 3-4: Plan zu einer Herausgabe der Monumente der bildenden Kunst im Mittelalter. The document is undated and lacks a cover letter. It was first discussed by Trempler, 'Promotion,' 57-58, who quotes large sections, albeit with errors and elipses that obscure its import.

studies.<sup>232</sup> Although the sequence of the first series (the illustrations) was yet to be determined, Kugler was very clear on its conception and purpose. It would take account of the art of the entire Middle Ages, but focusing on the periods in which the German style developed and came to full realization (*die Entwicklungs- und Auswicklungsperioden des deutschen Styles*), and it would largely exclude monuments already published. Furthermore, it would serve both an art historical (*kunstgeschichtlich*) and an artistic (*künstlerisch*) purpose. For the first, it would provide a more or less complete overview (*mehr oder minder vollständige Uebersicht*) of the development and progress (*Entwicklung und Fortbildung*) of medieval art by selecting only those examples that expressed the character of a type (*Art*), or permissible on other, antiquarian grounds, i.e. because they depicted costumes, manners, and customs (*Costüme, Sitten, Gebräuche*). This art-historical overview would in turn preserve and present the most beautiful monuments of the period and offer a collection of motifs most useful for current artistic purposes.<sup>233</sup> Finally, he listed work already completed: reproductions of drawings after the *Rolandslied* in Heidelberg (Cod. Pal. germ. 112), drawings after the *Eneid* or *Eneasroman* of Heinrich von Veldeke in the royal library (SBPK, Cod. germ. fol. 282), and a late twelfth-century Psalter. He also mentioned as available in Berlin the illustrated *Marienlied* (formerly SBPK, Cod. oct. 109) by Wernher von Tegernsee.<sup>234</sup>

While this plan bears no date, the signature (Franz Kugler, Architekt) and internal evidence (recent architectural study, i.e. with Stier, and the work in hand) securely places it no earlier than spring or summer 1830, a dating confirmed by its subsequent iteration that year. In the fall Kugler submitted an as yet unlocated proposal to Minister Altenstein. This was an apparently somewhat reduced plan for the publication of medieval monuments in Prussia, accompanied by a request for funds to finance a trip in the eastern provinces (as opposed to the western provinces along the Rhine). To support his request, Kugler also submitted a publication, *Denkmäler der bildenden Künste des Mittelalters in den Preussischen Staaten*.<sup>235</sup> In the one-page preface, Kugler

<sup>232</sup> SMPKZA, Mapped 0802, f. 3v-4r: Zu der Ausführung dieses Unternehmens (d.h. zu den Reisen und zu der Aufnahme der betreffenden Gegenstände) erbiere ich mich, zudem ich mich durch frühere philosophische (namentl. altdeutsche Studien, durch vieljähriges geübtes Zeichnen und durch neuere architektonische Studien demselben befähigt glaube. Doch kann dies nur unter der Bedingung geschehen, daß mir ein Jahrgehalt von 1000 Talern auf 2 Jahren bewilligt wird; wofür die zu dem ersten Werk anzufertigten Zeichnungen und die genannten Reisebemerkungen dem Herrn K [?] als sein Eigenthum zu übergeben sein würden. Die Vervielfältigung der Zeichnungen würde anderweitig zu bestimmen sein.

<sup>233</sup> SMPKZA, Mapped 0802, f. 3r-3v.

<sup>234</sup> SMPKZA, Mapped 0802, f. 4. The Psalter was presumably the one owned by Minutoli included below. The *Marienlied* manuscript was destroyed in the second world war: Carl Wesle, *Priester Wernher. Maria. Bruchstücke und Umarbeitungen*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer, 1969, xx.

<sup>235</sup> Berlin, G. Reimer, 1830. The submission is mentioned in the ministerial notations on Kugler's letter to Altenstein of 4 March 1831 discussed below. See Trempler, 'Kunst und Wissenschaft', 59, for the same dating.



presented this collection of eight prints as the demonstration (*Probe*) of a project dedicated to the art of the Prussian fatherland, and specifically to increasing awareness of the lesser known medieval monuments in its eastern provinces. The focus of the proposed publication would fall on architectural ornament and independent works of painting and sculpture, rather than architecture itself. Continuing the two-fold scholarly and artistic purpose of the initial plan, Kugler asserted that this project would offer a collection of motifs useful for current artistic needs and the preliminary studies for a future art history of the Middle Ages in northern Germany. The plates reproduced ornamental elements from churches and manuscripts located in or around Berlin: the church of the Franciscan monastery (Graues Kloster) in Berlin (capitals, choir stalls, individual motifs from decoration painted on wood), the church in Bernau (capitals, painted decoration, sculpture of the Coronation of the Virgin on the altar), the church in Schmargendorf (painted decoration), and the twelfth-century psalter (initials) and fifteenth-century breviary (page borders) owned by Freiherr Alexander von Minutoli (1806-1887).

Apparently having received no response, Kugler wrote again to Minister Altenstein on 4 March 1831 with a rather pathetic plea for a position, perhaps in a library or a section of the royal museum, appropriate to 'my certainly not one-sided endeavors (*meinen gewiss nicht einseitigen Bestrebungen*). His studies completed, his funds exhausted, and after endless efforts, he found himself at a loss regarding his future path and only too aware that his accomplishments lagged behind his ambitions. In an oblique reference to his earlier petition, he positioned the *Denkmäler der bildenden Künste des Mittelalters* as the fruit of his earlier study and travel, all at his own expense, and noted its positive reception by scholars, connoisseurs (*Kunstkenner*) and even the Akademie der Künste. He sought a position in order to support his undertakings (*Unternehmungen*), which had cost him much and brought no financial gain. The next day *Vortragender Rat* Uhden gave instructions for the official response: Kugler himself was to be informed that while no position was open at the royal library or museum, the ministry would consider his earlier request to fund a research trip in the eastern provinces, but only after receiving a report from the director of the art academy, Johann Gottfried Schadow (1764-1850), with whom he should arrange an appointment. Schadow was to be informed of Kugler's plan and reminded of his publication. Although convinced of Kugler's technical skill, the ministry wanted to know if he had the scholarly knowledge (*wissenschaftliche Kenntnisse*) required to select the monuments. Schadow was thus to talk with Kugler about his plan and send a report to the ministry as to whether the young man possessed the ability to execute it successfully.<sup>236</sup>

<sup>236</sup> SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 9. Uhden's instructions are written in barely legible scrawl on the letter itself.

Although further documentation is lacking at present,<sup>237</sup> the outcome can be partially reconstructed. Uhden referred to Kugler as ‘candidate in philosophy’ (*Candidat der Philosophie*), which may suggest that the initial petition of fall 1830 made some reference to plans for a doctoral degree, or that the ministry required it as a precondition for financial support. A passing comment during Kugler’s *Habilitation* proceedings in 1833 supports the connection between the research trip and his desire for and receipt of the degree (see below). In the memo initiating Kugler’s *Promotion*, Toelken merely noted that the candidate had received a commission from the ministry to document medieval monuments. Support for the project soon ceased and the publication was never completed.<sup>238</sup>

When Kugler made the decision to pursue the doctoral degree cannot be determined precisely. On 27 November 1830 he applied for an *Abgangszeugnis*. In early March 1831 he was working on what would be his dissertation, the Nagler manuscript of Wernher’s life of the virgin, but not as a dissertation. Writing to the German philologist Hans Ferdinand Massmann (1797-1874) in Munich, he claimed to be preparing an article (*einen Aufsatz*) in which he planned to discuss images from the Wernher manuscript in Berlin in connection with those from the *Rolandslied* in Heidelberg, the *Eneidt* in the royal library and others of the same period. He posed specific questions concerning the correctness of earlier references to the Wernher manuscript and the relationship of images in Berlin to those in manuscripts in Munich.<sup>239</sup> Although Kugler never wrote such an article, his work on Wernher was expanded, very quickly, as his dissertation. An essay on the *Eneidt* appeared independently in 1834, while notes on the *Rolandslied* lay unpublished until their inclusion in the *Kleine Schriften*.<sup>240</sup> Similarly, most of his early notes on medieval churches were only published in the *Kleine Schriften*, although he published an article on the Berlin Klosterkirche in 1831.<sup>241</sup>

On 15 June 1831 Kugler filed his application for the *Promotion*. In his memo to the faculty, dean Toelken noted that in addition to the usual supporting documents, Kugler had submitted a scholarly essay (*Abhandlung*) on Wernher, a monk of the twelfth century, which included drawings after miniatures in the manuscript in Nagler’s collection, and the recently published *Denkmäler der*

<sup>237</sup> The original document in the Staatbibliothek was removed from the GStAPK around 1900 and bears no notation of its place in the current archival organization. Determining this may allow location of related documents, including Kugler’s original proposal and subsequent correspondence.

<sup>238</sup> See below. Kugler to Schadow, 27 October 1831: AdK, Nr. 2, f. 105.

<sup>239</sup> BStB, Cgm 7046, f. 617, Kugler’s undated draft, and f. 615-616, Maßmann’s response of 18 March 1831. I leave further evaluation of this exchange to scholars of medieval manuscripts. The sources cited are Sebastian Günther, *Geschichte der litterarischen Anstalten von Baiern*, Munich, Lindauer, 1810; and Bernhard Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, Augsburg, 1721-23.

<sup>240</sup> *Kleine Schriften* 1 (1853): 1-8; *Die Bilderhandschrift der Eneidt in der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, Berlin, Brüscke, 1834; reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, 1 (1853): 38-52.

<sup>241</sup> *Kleine Schriften* 1 (1853): 101-119, notes on churches in Tempelhof and Bernau and republication of the article on the Berlin Klosterkirche from *Allgemeines Archiv für die Geschichtskunde des Preussischen Staates* 4.3 (1831), 257-272.

*bildenden Künste des Mittelalters*. Toelken stated that both were Kugler's own work and gave his own opinion on the dissertation. Entirely art-historical in content, it could carry a more general title than the one chosen (On Werinhero, twelfth-century monk from Tegernsee, and on the miniatures that adorn his religious song on the life of the Virgin), because the introduction constituted not just the largest but also the most important part of it. The Latin needed some correction (*Nachhülfe*). As a final factor in the candidate's favor, Toelken briefly mentioned the ministry's support for Kugler's project to document medieval monuments in Prussia before their disappearance.<sup>242</sup>

To comment first Toelken selected Friedrich Wilken, an oriental historian and director of the university library who had experience with medieval manuscripts, and, not surprisingly, von der Hagen. Both voted in favor of admission to the oral exam and offered brief but substantive comments on Kugler's submissions. Although Wilken found the language and presentation (*Darstellung*) of the dissertation awkward and clumsy (*ungelenk und unbeholfen*), he felt it demonstrated diligent study and first-rate knowledge (*fleissige Studien und treffliche Kenntnisse*). In contrast to Toelken, von der Hagen found the general art-historical introduction and history of Tegernsee a bit too long, but he conceded that in the former the candidate was working from observation of originals or reproductions. In the latter the candidate succeeded well in bringing out the art historical (*das Kunstgeschichtliche*) and offered mostly pertinent artistic judgments (*Kunsturtheile*). The actual discussion of Wernher was too short, but it synthesized material from the sources sensibly and prudently. He praised the technical competency of Kugler's drawings and of the prints in the *Kunstdenkmäler*. The mineralogist Weiß raised no objection, although he noted that the academic *Triennium* was not fully documented. Hirt agreed somewhat grudgingly, stating only that he did not want to vote against the majority. The rest of the faculty (including Hegel and Boeckh) simply assented.

Von der Hagen's summary of the dissertation is generally accurate, and when Kugler published it in his *Kleine Schriften*, he omitted the first section as outdated (*antiquirt*).<sup>243</sup> Here he had indeed based his discussion on both observation of original works he had seen (in Berlin and Heidelberg) and accounts of other works in various secondary sources. The first few paragraphs depended heavily on the history of Early Christian and medieval art in the *Italienische Forschungen* by Carl Friedrich von Rumohr (1785-1843) but then moved on to offer an independent assessment of medieval art in Germany.<sup>244</sup> Evaluating von der Hagen's assertion that Kugler synthesized material from his

<sup>242</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 212, f. 157-159.

<sup>243</sup> Kugler, *Kleine Schriften*, 1 (1853): 12-37.

<sup>244</sup> As noted in the useful summary of the first section (not otherwise translated from the Latin) in the favorable review by Carl Grüneisen (1802-1878) in *Kunst-Blatt*, 1831, Nr. 95, 377-380, and Nr. 96, 378-380.

sources sensibly and prudently is a larger project in itself, as is an investigation of how much Kugler's work owes to that of his teacher.

Kugler's oral exams took place on 11 July at 5:30 in the afternoon. Toelken opened with questions on the art history of (ancient) Greece, the time of Justinian, and the sixteenth century, followed by questions on the painting of the ancients and technology (*Technik*, presumably in architecture). While the candidate's evident shyness (*Befangenheit*) kept him from always providing the right answer immediately, he showed familiarity with the material, especially architecture. Lachmann presented Kugler with the end of the poem treated in the dissertation, only to find that the young man had little understanding of a passage he himself had selected. The candidate also showed almost no knowledge of old and middle high German grammar. In response to extensive questioning about medieval literature and art von der Hagen received on the whole very satisfying answers. No questions were recorded for the others present (again including Boeckh and Hegel). The faculty agreed that the candidate was working with distinction in a special field (*in einem speciellen Fach*), promised to accomplish still more, and thus should be advanced to the disputation and *Promotion*.<sup>245</sup>

While the minutes suggest a weak but more than passable performance, at least one member of the faculty found it wholly unacceptable. Writing to a friend the next day, Droysen reported that Lachmann told him that Kugler had passed with a 'poor dissertation and an unworthy exam' (*eine schlechte Dissertation und ein unwürdiges Examen*) and that Lachmann was angry about not failing him. For his part, Droysen found this typical of Kugler, who had luck, but dishonorable luck, and he dismissed his childhood friend as entirely without honor or drive.<sup>246</sup>

Kugler's public disputation took place on 30 July. It is impossible to know what happened at this ceremonial event, but his Latin was likely not up to the challenge. Whether he defended them or not, the theses published with his dissertation take up some fundamental art-historical issues that remained current well into the twentieth century:

- 1) The external form of a building should indicate its structure.
- 2) Not without exception should one concede to Vitruvius (VII, 5,1) that by painting an image is made of what is or may be.
- 3) Albrecht Dürer began the destruction of proper German art.
- 4) Songs can be composed with more than one mode of music.
- 5) The highest principle of art is religion.<sup>247</sup>

<sup>245</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 212, f. 163-164. Trempler, 'Promotion', 60-61, does not mention von der Hagen's positive comments in the first memo and concludes that the examiners were troubled by Kugler's dependence on drawings and descriptions. Considering Lachmann's comments to Droysen, the exam itself seems to have been relatively gentle.

<sup>246</sup> Droysen to Wilhelm Arendt (1808-1865), Berlin, 31 July 1831: Hübner, *Droysen Briefwechsel*, 1: 41.

<sup>247</sup> Kugler, *De Werinhero*, 60: I. Externa forma aedificii indicare debet rationem structuræ. II. Picturam imaginem fieri ejus, quod est seu potest esse, Vitruvio (de arch. libr. 7 c. 5) non sine exceptionibus concedendum est. III. Albertus Durerus artem Germanis [sic] propriam evertere

Form and function in architecture, the nature of representation, Dürer as nationalist hero or cultural traitor, the relation of art and religion, these are also topics that also recur in Kugler's own writings.

After receiving his degree, Kugler sought ways to support himself and to further his development as a scholar, possibly with an eye to the *Habilitation*. On 27 October 1831 he wrote to Schadow at the Akademie der Künste, mentioning that his monuments project would not be finished as support was ending. In his present circumstances he felt it necessary to produce further evidence of his studies and abilities, suggesting that he was already thinking about a *Habilitation* in art history. In addition to his work on medieval manuscripts, which required no travel, Kugler had conceived a new project, a study of Arabian (read Islamic) architecture, also using resources available in Berlin. This important aspect of medieval art was as yet little studied, in that not enough had been brought together (*noch nicht Genügendes zusammengestellt*). His contribution would be the lacking synthetic overview, 'a historical development and account of the system of Arabian architecture (*eine geschichtliche Entwicklung und eine Darstellung des Systems der arabischen Baukunst*). Kugler did not yet know if this would result in a publication or notes for lectures (*Collegienhefte*). This letter also included discussion of a possible position at the Akademie der Künste, and Kugler stressed his past experience in the practice of drawing, which he called the best teaching tool (*das beste Bildungsmittel*).<sup>248</sup>

Although documentation is sparse, it appears that various factors delayed Kugler's securing such a position. In a meeting with Johannes Schulze on 5 March 1832 Kugler learned that Minister Altenstein had approved 'a position'; although the King still had some objections to its establishment, Kugler soon expected to receive a letter from the minister appointing him with compensation. Apparently Kugler never received such a letter, and he was not appointed to teach at the Akademie der Künste until July 1833, after his *Habilitation*.<sup>249</sup> Between 16 July and 6 October 1832 he undertook a major research trip in central and southern Germany to continue his study of medieval manuscripts and architecture. As he reported in his applications for the *Habilitation*, this trip had been funded by the ministry. When found, the relevant documents may well

---

incipit. IV. Carmina non una cum modis musicis componi possunt. V. Summum principium artis est religio.

<sup>248</sup> AdK, Nr. 2, f. 105; cited by Kilian Heck, 'Die Bezüglichkeit der Kunst zum Leben. Franz Kugler und das erste akademische Lehrprogramm der Kunstgeschichte', *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 32, 2005, 8. In a letter of 26 October 1831 to Altenstein Kugler asked permission to borrow prints from the royal library for his Islamic architecture project, offering the same justification of its importance and noting that Schadow had allowed him to borrow materials from the academy library: SMPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 10-11.

<sup>249</sup> Kugler to his future wife Clara Hitzig, 5 March 1832, BStB, Ana 549, Nr. 12, f. 22; Bärbel Holtz, 'Franz Kugler's Amtspraxis', in *Espagne, Kugler*, 18-19, plausibly interprets this as a reference to a position at the Akademie der Künste. Documentation for Kugler's appointment there does not begin until April 1833 (see below).

show that the trip was offered as consolation for the delayed teaching appointment.<sup>250</sup> The trip itself is described in a series of letters to his future wife, Clara Hitzig,<sup>251</sup> and its research provided the basis for many essays in the art journal that Kugler began editing that year, *Museum, Blätter für bildende Kunst*.

Kugler's plan was evidently to re-establish himself in Berlin, where Herzfeld had found quarters for him by early October 1832.<sup>252</sup> On 9 November Kugler wrote to the architect Karl Friedrich Schinkel (1781-1841) to say he had just received the unexpected, but very welcome commission from the publisher Georg Gropius to edit the journal *Museum*. Because Gropius wanted the journal to commence with the new year, Kugler had had to stop working on scholarly lectures (*wissenschaftliche Vorlesungen*) for the Akademie der Künste; a few weeks prior he had sent a plan for these lectures to Schinkel, seeking the architect's advice on their execution.<sup>253</sup>

On 29 December 1832 Kugler submitted his application to the philosophical faculty for the *Habilitation* in art history of the middle ages (*das Fach der Kunstgeschichte des Mittelalters*). After strenuous debate, the faculty rejected this as insufficient. Kugler's second application, submitted in February 1833 with more supporting material, provoked further debate but was ultimately successful.

In his first application Kugler stated that since his *Promotion* he had been engaged in further art-historical studies, including a trip through Germany financed by the ministry to study the art history of the middle ages. For his lecture to the faculty he proposed the topic 'developmental stages of German art in the middle ages' (*Entwicklungs-Perioden der deutschen Kunst im Mittelalter*). If this topic were approved, he would present a portfolio of drawings after medieval monuments made on his latest trip, as verification (*Bestätigung*) of assertions made in his lecture. The portfolio would also serve to demonstrate the type and mode (*Art und Weise*) of his subsequent art historical studies. For his public lecture, he proposed to speak on 'the decline of architecture among the ancients (*Verfall der Baukunst bei den Alten*).' In closing he noted that family circumstances made it desirable to begin his lectures with the upcoming summer semester.<sup>254</sup>

<sup>250</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1201, f. 210, 248. These documents probably exist in the GStAPK, most likely in the same place as those for the previous trip.

<sup>251</sup> BStB, Ana 549, Nr. 265, Briefe einer Deutschlandsreise 1832. His passport, f. 2, provides the dates given here. Kugler wrote almost every day, filling almost 60 sheets with his neat but tiny hand. Analysis of these letters is a large project of its own beyond the present scope.

<sup>252</sup> Herzfeld in Berlin to Kugler in Szczecin, 5 October 1832: BStB, Cgm 7046, f. 419.

<sup>253</sup> SMPKZA, Nachlass Schinkel 6.33, Kugler, Franz, unfoliated. The plan itself is not preserved, but it is probably identical with or an earlier version of the one submitted to the Akademie der Künste on 26 June 1833 (see below). Kugler also asked permission to publish a description and perhaps some drawings after Schinkel's designs for frescos in the Museum; Schinkel approved only the description.

<sup>254</sup> SMPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 16-18, here f. 16. The copy in HUBUA PhilFak 1201, f. 210, lacks the second page. Kugler's *Habilitation* is discussed briefly by

Dean Boeckh opened his memo to the faculty by noting that Kugler's application was but one of many in a flood of applicants for the *Habilitation* still causing concern among the faculty and from which the current statutes offered no relief.<sup>255</sup> Still, he saw no impediment to Kugler's admission to the exam process, especially since his field (*Kunstgeschichte des Mittelalters*) did not significantly overlap with those of current faculty. Boeckh again listed the supporting materials submitted: dissertation, diploma, two recommendations from Altenstein (of 5 March and 17 December) and a certificate for deferral of military service. Handling administrative details, he stated that it could be overlooked that the application was not written in Latin and that since Kugler had first matriculated in 1826 his *Quinquennium* was confirmed. Selecting the principal examiners, he asked Hirt and Toelken to comment first.<sup>256</sup>

Toelken began by observing that Kugler had the same right to be examined as any other candidate, over whom he had the advantage, however, that he was applying to work in a particular field (*ein eigentliches Fach*). Toelken had prior knowledge of the drawings and travel notes which Kugler proposed to make the subject of his lecture. These had not been submitted to the faculty, and Toelken informed his colleagues that he knew these to be very interesting (*sehr interessant*). He also asserted that Kugler's efforts thus far gave cause to hope that he would deliver praiseworthy accomplishments in the future. Toelken voted without reservation for the candidate. Simply citing his colleague's opinion, Hirt happily voted in favor as well.<sup>257</sup>

Lachmann came next, and this time he did not refrain from expressing his negative opinion. Whatever the faculty might decide about the growing mass of *Privatdozenten*, in Kugler's case he could see no grounds for admission to the *Habilitation*. Moving against the previous opinions, Lachmann observed that colleague Hirt did not offer his own view but merely repeated that of Toelken, which mentioned only what Kugler hoped to study and that something praiseworthy could be expected of him. Of Kugler's efforts, the faculty had nothing to judge but the dissertation, which had been jumbled together from a few books with no originality. Besides this, Lachmann had seen some poor schoolboy verses, so numerous that some were bound to be good, and he knew that Kugler could copy songs, manuscripts, and architectural details. Lachmann remained unconvinced, however, that Kugler was capable of giving superior lectures on the art history of the middle ages. He reminded the faculty that the candidate's exams had been either very weak or completely failing in all subjects, and that he had been passed only upon dean Toelken's assurance that the degree

---

Trempler, 'Promotion', 61-64, based on an incomplete reading of only the documents in the Universitätsarchiv.

<sup>255</sup> See above for the ongoing concern with the flood of *Privatdozenten*.

<sup>256</sup> 29 December 1832, SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 16v. The recommendations would have been returned to the candidate and are not part of the file.

<sup>257</sup> 8 January 1833, SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 16v-17r.

was only needed for a scholarly trip and that there were no plans for the *Habilitation*. Lachmann evidently found Kugler an embarrassment to the university, since his bad dissertation had been praised in the entertainment press (*Unterhaltungsblättern*). Lachmann took particular offense at one report that Kugler had finally returned life and sense to the tired custom of the *Promotion*. Leading up to his unconditional vote against the candidate, Lachmann concluded that where a trip had made the *Promotion* desirable, a family situation now made the *Habilitation* desirable; he feared that this situation would soon make an extraordinary and then an ordinary professorship even more desirable, so that eventually they would have among them a colleague for the copying of prints after works of the middle ages.<sup>258</sup>

The next to give his opinion, von der Hagen supported his yes vote with a direct response to Lachmann's objections. He set aside Kugler's poems, among which he felt there really were some good ones, as well as the reports in the press, which he attributed to the candidate's mischievous friends. He stated his confidence in Kugler's accomplishments leading up to the *Promotion* and in his serious and fruitful studies of the art history of the middle ages, especially of architecture. Here the candidate's recognized ability for the true rendering (*treue Nachbildung*) of monuments was particularly effective (*vorzüglich zu Statten kommt*). Kugler's potential to be a good teacher would be demonstrated with time and experience. Finally, the ministry's plans for him remained to be seen.<sup>259</sup>

Among the remaining colleagues, the astronomer Jabbo Oltmanns (1783-1833), the linguist Franz Bopp (1791-1867), and the chemist Sigismund Hermbstaedt (1760-1833) found von der Hagen's defense convincing. In the other camp, the mathematician Enno Dirksen (1792-1850) could see no reason to admit someone who had notoriously passed his doctoral exam in the most mediocre manner and had since produced little of importance. Striking a compromise of sorts, the philosopher Henrik Steffens (1773-1845) agreed that although Kugler had not yet accomplished anything in the public sphere (*noch nichts öffentliches geleistet hat*), he had much potential, of which the ministry was already convinced. Not wanting the faculty to miss an opportunity, Steffens suggested that Kugler be advised to resubmit his application at a later date and to use the intervening time to produce the necessary work.<sup>260</sup> At a meeting on 29 January the faculty approved Steffens's proposal by a vote of 6 in favor, 4 against. On 30 January Boeckh informed Kugler that the *Specimen* submitted was insufficient and suggested that he resubmit his application with further evidence of scholarly achievement.<sup>261</sup>

On 16 February 1833 Kugler submitted a new application with extensive supporting material, only some of which he already had in hand. He included a

<sup>258</sup> 12 January 1833, SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 17r-17v.

<sup>259</sup> Undated, SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 17v.

<sup>260</sup> Undated, SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 17v.

<sup>261</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 24/1, f. 25v; PhilFak 1201, f. 231.



new scholarly essay (*wissenschaftliche Abhandlung*), in manuscript, 'On the Roman-Christian building styles' (*über die römisch-christlichen Bausysteme*), which he identified as the first section of a handbook of medieval architecture (*erste Periode eines Handbuches der Geschichte der Baukunst im Mittelalter*) currently in progress.<sup>262</sup> As further proof of the type and manner of his study (*Proben der Art und Weise meines Studiums*) he submitted three sets of 'studies' (*Studien*) drawn from his ongoing projects: Moorish (*maurische*) architecture, 'building style and development of form among the Egyptians and Hindus' (*Bausystem und Formbildung bei den Aegyptern und Hindus*) and various studies relative to the development of the visual arts and oldest architecture in Germany (*Studien in Bezug auf die Entwicklung der bildenden Künste und der ältesten Architektur in Deutschland*). The last had been made on a trip commissioned by the ministry and which continued his earlier such studies (i.e. those from before his *Promotion*). Accounts of this trip were published in the journal *Museum*, of which he was the editor; the first 6 numbers were included. Acknowledging that these studies were mostly unpolished (*wenig cultivirt*), he took the liberty of including letters of reference from two experts with whom he had long been acquainted and who could attest to his capacity to lecture on the art history of the middle ages. He had received one from Schadow (now lost), regarding similar private lectures (*ähnliche Privatvorlesungen*). Another from Schinkel, dated 14 February 1833, refers only to Kugler's plan (*Absicht*) to deliver lectures on the architecture of the middle ages, a part of art history that had not yet been fully treated in Berlin (*bei uns*). Given Kugler's knowledge and studies in this field, which he had come to know, Schinkel believed that only good things (*nur Erspriefliches*) were to be expected of him.<sup>263</sup>

In his memo of the next day, Boeckh refrained from listing the many *Specimina*, but reminded his colleagues to return them all to the beadle as they circulated. This time he selected six principal examiners, asking Hirt, Toelken, von der Hagen, Lachmann, von Raumer and Wilken to comment first. He also requested comments on the topics Kugler proposed for his lectures, which remained the same.<sup>264</sup>

Perhaps wanting to ensure that his colleagues understood what they were looking at, Toelken listed, in detail, the contents of what Kugler had simply called 'studies'. These were in fact six portfolios of drawings. The first three contained, respectively, tracings after the *Description de l'Égypte*, after Langles'

<sup>262</sup> Two drafts of the essay 'On Roman-Christian building styles' are preserved in the KuBi, Nachlass Kugler, M-9; the first is dated 16 January 1833. Two further sheets in a group simply labelled 'Kunst des Mittelalters' (M-2, f. 8-9) appear to be the introduction to the planned Handbook. An essay of the same title appeared in *Museum* for 1833, reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, 1 (1853): 181-203; its relationship to the drafts remains to be worked out.

<sup>263</sup> HUA, PhilFac 1201, f. 248r-v; in the margin Kugler acknowledged the return of the letters on 2 April 1833. Kugler submitted Schinkel's letter to the Akademie der Künste on 2 May 1833: GStAPK, I. HA, Rep 76 Ve, Sekt 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 125.

<sup>264</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1201, f. 245.

*Description de l'Hindoustan*, and Murphy's and Delabord's works on Moorish and Spanish architecture. He further noted the purposeful arrangement of the last: a) examples of pre-Moorish architecture in Spain, b and c) Moorish monuments in two periods, d) influence of Moorish architecture and ornament on later Christian buildings. The fourth portfolio contained tracings of miniatures, thoughtfully executed and faithfully rendered. The fifth and sixth portfolios contained free drawings after medieval German artworks and decoration, also faithfully rendered and tastefully conceived, plus a sheet etched by the candidate himself.<sup>265</sup> Turning to the scholarly manuscript, Toelken found that it left much to be desired, in that its contents were thin and neither sufficiently nor appropriately worked out. The brief observations about the spatial forms of Roman churches were clearly just collated excerpts that did not even fit into the stated temporal parameters (fourth to ninth century), not to mention several factual errors about specific churches that Toelken carefully listed. In contrast, he found the comprehensive descriptions (*Schilderungen*) to be often very successful, citing in particular those of San Clemente, Santa Maria della Rotonda in Rome, San Vitale in Ravenna, and especially Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Overlooking the many deficiencies and on the basis of the drawings submitted (and Kugler's own, which he knew independently) he voted in favor of the candidate. Both Hirt and von der Hagen agreed, with von der Hagen adding that this confirmed his vote from the previous proceeding.<sup>266</sup>

Lachmann again found that he could not vote for Kugler's *Habilitation*, because he still did not see anything original (*etwas Eigenthümliches*) in the candidate's scholarly production, originality that should be required even in a special field. He discounted the descriptions praised by Toelken as both borrowed and of churches the candidate had not himself seen. He also found them to be lacking in both critical evaluation (*Kritik*) of the sources and the expression of art-historical views (*kunstgeschichtliche Ansichten*). The faculty had been right to request more samples of scholarly work, because, again, colleague Toelken had not drawn any justification from the publications submitted. Given the weakness of Kugler's scholarly accomplishments, his admitted artistic ability (*zugegebene Kunstfertigkeit*) gave him no claim to a place among the *Privatdozenten* of the university.<sup>267</sup>

Following the order specified by dean Boeckh, von Raumer was the next to comment, merely observing that since Kugler was not inferior to others previously admitted to the *Habilitation*, the faculty must admit him as well. The physicist Ideler agreed, as did the political economist Johann Gottfried Hoffmann (1765-1847), who found that Kugler's lectures would be useful to a large audience. The historian Wilken also voted in favor, as he did not wish to disagree

<sup>265</sup> These drawings have yet to be identified among the many preserved in the KuBi.

<sup>266</sup> HUABU, PhilFak 1201, f. 245r-v. Toelken appears to have spent some time with Kugler's materials: he received them on 22 February but dated his comments 26 February.

<sup>267</sup> 9 March 1833 HUBUA, PhilFak 1201, f. 245v-246r.

with his colleagues in the field (*Collegen vom Fache*, probably Toelken, Hirt, and von der Hagen). Bekker wished Kugler success at the art academy, but, like Lachmann, he could not find Kugler suited to a career as a university instructor. The geographer Carl Ritter, who had been so critical of Hotho, commented last, giving extensive justification for changing his previous no vote. He was now convinced, by the original works and by the elevated artistic interest that guided his studies and drawings, that Kugler's scholarly lectures on medieval architecture and ornament could be very fruitful. Here learning alone was insufficient, for only a developed, innate artistic sensibility (*entwickelter Kunstsinn und Leichtfertigkeit dazu*), supported by an independent artistic practice, technique, and the expression they demonstrate (*eigens entwickelte Kunstübung, Technik und dadurch bewiesene Aussprache*), could awaken the same in others and direct it to lively intuition and insight (*zur lebendigen Anschauung und Einsicht*). Arguing obliquely against Lachmann and Bekker, Ritter asserted that art did not impede scholarship but rather promoted it.<sup>268</sup>

Dean Boeckh himself voted in favor. Counting up the votes, he found two against (Lachmann and Bekker), several ambiguous votes or abstentions (Lichtenstein, Steffens, Hermbstaedt, Weiß, Ermann, Dirksen, Oltmanns, and the chemist Eilhard Mitscherlich [1794-1863]) and just a bare majority for, or 11 of 21 faculty members (Toelken, Hirt, von der Hagen, von Raumer, Ideler, Hoffmann, Wilken, the botanist Karl Kunth [1788-1850], Bopp, Carl Ritter, Boeckh).<sup>269</sup> That same day, Boeckh circulated a memo scheduling Kugler's German lecture to the faculty for 30 March at six o'clock. Perhaps expecting trouble, he reminded his colleagues that 11 of them needed to be present to make a quorum. The topic for this lecture and for the public lecture in Latin (to be scheduled later) had received no objections from the faculty, and Professor Toelken had approved both. In the margin, Boeckh recorded that Kugler's essay had been sent back to Toelken for further review as requested. The six folios of drawings and the six numbers of *Museum* were later returned to Kugler.<sup>270</sup>

On 30 March Kugler delivered his lecture to the faculty on the approved topic, 'On the developmental stages of German art in the middle ages'. Boeckh's brief minutes record that after Kugler spoke, Toelken engaged him in a discussion of the essay on building systems; at first Toelken focused on the various forms of the Doric column, prompted by Dr. Kugler's statement about the Doric columns in S. Pietro in Vincoli, 'and then many other things' (*so wie denn über viele anderen Gegenstände*).<sup>271</sup> Next von der Hagen talked with Dr.

<sup>268</sup> 10 to 20 March, some undated, HUBUA, PhilFak 1201, f. 246r-v.

<sup>269</sup> 22 March 1833, HUBUA, PhilFak 1201, f. 246v. The ambiguity does not appear on the document, suggesting discussion among the faculty.

<sup>270</sup> HUA, PhilFak 1201, f. 250. In his request to Boeckh of 8 March 1833 (f. 249) Toelken expressed confidence that Kugler would be successful this time.

<sup>271</sup> HUA, PhilFak 1201, f. 250v. Four further sheets (KuBiNachlass Kugler M-2, f. 1-4) may be a draft for this lecture. The remaining sheets (f. 5-7) are for another lecture on a different topic. An article

Kugler, at first about the reasons for the transformation of basilicas into churches and then about still more (unspecified) topics. The proceedings concluded with a unanimous, favorable vote of the 11 professors present (Weiß, Steffens, Kunth, von der Hagen, Lichtenstein, Toelken, Ideler, Hermbstaedt, Carl Ritter, Bopp, and Boeckh). On 17 April Kugler delivered his public Latin lecture on the decline of architecture among the ancients (*Architecturae apud veteres decremento*).<sup>272</sup>

These documents show that members of the faculty judged the application according to the candidate's demonstration of scholarly accomplishment since completing the dissertation and his qualification to deliver lectures. The majority rejected Kugler's first application primarily on the grounds that he had failed on both counts by submitting his dissertation rather than new work, although many were swayed by a low opinion of the dissertation and his doctoral exam. Those who expressed support for this first application, Toelken and von der Hagen, did so on the basis of work they knew independently, although they also had a higher opinion of the dissertation and doctoral exam than the rest of their colleagues. The strongest opinions on Kugler's second application break down into three fairly clear camps: those who rejected it outright (Lachmann and Bekker), those who saw both good scholarship and potential for teaching (Toelken and von der Hagen), and those who emphasized potential for teaching (Hoffmann and Ritter). Lachmann identified the principal problem as an overall lack of originality and rigor. Although he implicitly accepted Toelken's assessment of the weak points in the manuscript essay, Lachmann specifically rejected what Toelken identified as Kugler's strengths, the effective descriptions and the drawings. It is important to note, however, that Lachmann objected not to descriptions and drawings as such, but rather to the lack of originality and judgment in those submitted: Kugler had not seen the buildings in question, the descriptions were borrowed and uncritical, and the drawings were just copies. In arguing that admitted artistic ability did not compensate for weak scholarship Lachmann seems not to have understood the scholarly and pedagogical functions of the descriptions and drawings. That Toelken recognized both these functions is evident in his extended comments. The careful enumeration of the six individual portfolios strongly suggests that he understood the drawings, whether copies or not, to serve both scholarship (as a means of acquiring and organizing information) and pedagogy (through the effective presentation of that information). Description served the same purposes, and its effective employment made up for the other problems in the manuscript essay.<sup>273</sup> For von der Hagen, the additional material, much of which he had probably seen independently, simply confirmed his earlier assertion that Kugler's capacity for

---

with a similar title, 'Andeutungen über den Entwicklungsgang der deutschen Kunst im Mittelalter', appeared in *Museum*, 1834, Nr. 4, 25-31; Nr. 5, 33-36.

<sup>272</sup> HUBUA, PhilFak 1201, f. 250v; f. 254 is the broadsheet invitation to the lecture.

<sup>273</sup> For Kugler's use of drawings in his later career see Dilly, 'Kunsthistorische Studien', 61-66, and Rößler, 'Architekturhistoriker', 129-136.

the true rendering of buildings supported his scholarship on the middle ages. Where Hoffmann simply noted the potentially wide appeal of Kugler's lectures, Ritter placed that potential squarely in the candidate's artistic abilities as a necessary adjunct to scholarship for teaching in his field.

The documents thus do not support the recent assertion that Kugler encountered problems in both his *Promotion* and *Habilitation* because his work included descriptions and drawings.<sup>274</sup> In the end it was only Lachmann, seconded by Bekker, who objected to the drawings and descriptions, and, as always, it is important to consider the source. Lachmann had an established reputation for being a strict and uncompromising examiner with little patience for weak scholarship or unsupported assertions (particularly those of dilettantes and Hegelians). He was aggressive in defending the value and honor of the doctoral degree and in promoting philology as a rigorous scientific discipline, drawing a sharp distinction between academic and popular scholarship.<sup>275</sup> Equally well known were his disputes with von der Hagen, whose editions he denounced as unscholarly. At the same time Lachmann enjoyed a reputation as tough but fair, and so it was probably not so much transference of personal animus as serious scholarly disagreement that motivated his harsh judgment of Kugler's work. Judging from the generally unenthusiastic reception of Kugler's submissions for the *Habilitation*, it appears that most did not understand what he was trying to do; the exact nature of all the objections is unclear, and further investigation of Kugler's early writings may help to sort out what remains implicit in the documents. Whatever the dynamic within the faculty, in this instance they followed the usual practice of deferring to the judgment of 'men in the field', in this case Toelken and von der Hagen. Given the weight accorded the drawings by them (and Ritter), it could even be argued that Kugler passed *because* of his drawings.

Almost immediately Kugler began seeking another teaching position at the art academy to supplement his unsalaried position as *Privatdozent*. On 28 April he sent Altenstein a brief letter, simply informing the minister of his just completed *Habilitation*. On 2 May he wrote again, asking permission to give simultaneously at the academy the private course announced for the upcoming summer semester at the university. Having been informed (by the bursary) that the course, 'History of architecture' (*Geschichte der Baukunst*), would be filled mostly with artists, he realized that it might be more suited to the art academy. He also suggested that a position might arise for him in the ongoing re-organization there and that he would need only a small income since he made his living from his own activities. Director Schadow, with whom he had already consulted, was in agreement with this plan. To demonstrate his qualifications, he

<sup>274</sup> Trempler, 'Promotion', 61-64.

<sup>275</sup> Turner, 'Prussian Professoriate', 465. Martin Hertz, *Karl Lachmann. Eine Biographie*, Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1851, 74-75, 203-204.

included the reference Schinkel had written for the *Habilitation*.<sup>276</sup> The summer semester 1833 officially began on 29 April, a mere 12 days after Kugler's *Habilitation*, so it is not surprising that his university course is not recorded in either the published *Vorlesungsverzeichnis* or the tables submitted to the ministry.

On 13 June Schadow responded to Altenstein's request for an evaluation of Kugler's proposal. In its meeting, the academy senate had found that Kugler's course might indeed fill a gap arising from curricular reorganization at the Bauakademie. Schadow had visited Kugler's class at the university, which was indeed filled with architecture students, six in all. That day Kugler had lectured on the oldest forms of city walls and gates, supported by illustrations from Hirt's *Baukunst der Alten*. On the blackboard Kugler 'drew, with facility, the various types of joints and means of constructing stone walls and gate frames. Here he succeeds at something often lacking in the erudite and which seems to me necessary for the arts of design'.<sup>277</sup>

Kugler wrote to Altenstein again on 26 June. He had heard of Schadow's favourable report and apparently that the re-opening of the Bauakademie posed a problem for offering a course on the 'aesthetic study of architecture' (*aesthetische Baukunde*). He therefore declared himself ready to offer any other aesthetic course, of the sort demonstrated by the plan which he submitted for the minister's consideration.<sup>278</sup> He had been working on this for some time, and it is probably the same one submitted to Schinkel in October 1832. This plan, discussed below, found a positive reception, and on 10 July 1833 Kugler was appointed instructor (*Lehrer*) at the Akademie der Künste and given permission to hold scholarly lectures for artists according to the plan submitted on 26 June titled 'Archaeology of the different periods'. There was no money in the academy's budget for a salary, but the ministry would consider offering remuneration until funds were available.<sup>279</sup>

<sup>276</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 124-125. Most of the relevant documents are also cited by Heck, 'Bezüglichkeit', 8-9.

<sup>277</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 126, 143-144: an der schwarzen Tafel zeichnete er, mit Leichtigkeit, die verschiedenen Fugen Arten, Aufrichtung der Steine, und Thoreinfassungen. Hier kommt ihm etwas zu statten, was oftmals die eruditen Leuten ermangelt und bei den zeichnenden Künsten mir nothwendig scheint. Schadow also noted the remarkable breadth of Kugler's innate abilities, listing portrait drawing, etching, poetry, composition, and singing.

<sup>278</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 139-140. Kugler also responded to Schadow's suggestion that, as editor, he could help supplement the publications of the academy by including more line drawings in *Museum*. Kugler pointed out that he was not the owner of the journal but would do what he could, for which financial support would be helpful. There appears to have been a conflict between the two academies about scheduling and overlap of subject matter going back at least to 1830; see the correspondence between Toelken and Altenstein of September 1830 in GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1, f. 54-57.

<sup>279</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 145 (drafts for Kugler and academy); GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 8, Bd. 6, f. 193 (copy of letter sent to Kugler).

In winter 1833/34 Kugler repeated his ‘General history of architecture’ at the university as a private lecture, with an enrollment of 38. His free public lecture, ‘Beginnings of Christian art’ (*Anfänge der christlichen Kunst*) was not taught due to lack of students.<sup>280</sup> At the art academy he taught a more focused version of the plan submitted to Altenstein, ‘Archaeology of the German Middle Ages’ (*Archäologie des deutschen Mittelalters*), with an enrollment of 30.<sup>281</sup> On 2 April 1834 Kugler sent Altenstein a report of his activities in the just concluded winter semester, including detailed accounts of his two courses. At the academy, he had largely followed his initial plan, but with a narrower focus on the German Middle Ages. For the university course on architecture, he had secured permission to use the quarters of the local architects’ association and prints from its rich library. Kugler also informed Altenstein of his plan to lecture at both the university and the academy on the ‘History of modern painting with particular attention to the painting gallery of the royal museum’ (*Geschichte der neueren Malerei mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Gemälde-Galerie des Königl. Museums*). He hoped thereby to concentrate his efforts on a single task, allowing him to perfect the course and also to meet a much-voiced need concerning the painting gallery.<sup>282</sup> The report was acknowledged by the ministry on 29 May 1834, and Kugler received a payment of 100 *Taler* for teaching at the art academy.<sup>283</sup>

During the next year (summer 1834 and winter 1834/35) Kugler taught at both institutions, as indicated on [Table 7](#).<sup>284</sup> On 24 March 1835, he was appointed professor at the Akademie der Künste,<sup>285</sup> and in mid-April he left for several

<sup>280</sup> Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, 761, 1833ws279, 280.

<sup>281</sup> GStAPK, I HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1, f. 104v-105r; on the course list for the coming semester submitted on 1 September 1833 (f. 95), Kugler’s course was initially listed as ‘Archäologie der verschiedenen Zeiten’.

<sup>282</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 177. He also informed the minister of his ongoing scholarship. Work in the history of architecture was to be found in the historical essays, translations, and criticism, published in *Museum*, and in the text to *Architektonische Denkmäler der Altmark Brandenburg in Malerischen Ansichten aufgenommen* (Berlin: L. Sachse, 1833). Results of his earlier study trip in Germany (1832) were also published in *Museum*, as the series ‘Studies in German libraries’.

<sup>283</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 178.

<sup>284</sup> This table has been assembled from the information in Virmond, *Vorlesungen*, and from the tables submitted to the ministry by the university (as cited above) and by the Akademie der Künste (GStAPK, I HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1). The academy tables at the GStAPK are more complete than the documents in the academy archives cited by Heck, ‘Bezüglichkeit’, 12, which I have not consulted myself. The academy documents lack several semesters and do not reflect changes in course title recorded on the final semester reports to the ministry, although they fill in some semesters missing at the GStAPK. Heck mentioned but did not reproduce the lists of students in the academy archives; these might help clarify the question of overlapping enrollments between university and academy.

<sup>285</sup> Heck, ‘Bezüglichkeit’, 12, gives this date for the royal order confirming the appointment. The relevant volume for the appointment of instructors at the Akademie der Künste is lost at the GStAPK: I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 6: 1835-37.

weeks in Italy, returning to Berlin by mid-August.<sup>286</sup> He had secured funds for this trip from Altenstein the previous October.<sup>287</sup> Upon his return to Berlin, Kugler resumed teaching at both the university and the academy. In September 1842 he was appointed, with a yearly salary of 200 *Taler*, to teach the academy courses on Greek and Roman mythology previously taught by Adolph Schöll, who had just left to assume an extraordinary professorship in Halle.<sup>288</sup> Probably prompted by the additional income and responsibilities, Kugler ceased teaching at the university with the winter semester 1842/43. On 4 January 1843 he informed the dean of the philosophical faculty, the philosopher Friedrich Trendelenburg (1802-1872), of his decision, noting that interested students could still attend his lectures at the art academy.<sup>289</sup> In October 1843 Kugler was appointed assistant for art matters (*Hilfsarbeiter in Kunstangelegenheiten*) at the Kultusministerium. His courses at the art academy continued until winter 1848/49, ceasing with his promotion at the ministry (*Geheimer Regierungs- und Vortragender Rat*) in December 1848.<sup>290</sup>

Tables 7 and 8 provide a full overview of Kugler's fifteen-year teaching career (summer 1833 to summer 1848).<sup>291</sup> Until winter 1842/3 he usually announced at least one course each at the university and the academy. He often taught the same topic at both institutions, but it is impossible to know how much he altered his lectures for the two different audiences, or how many of the students in his university courses continued to be drawn from the art and architecture academies and vice versa. In the plan submitted to Altenstein in June 1833 he stressed the difference between lectures for university students and those for art students, yet in his letter of April 1834 he noted that teaching the same course at both institutions would allow him to perfect it. Kugler's enrollments at the academy were relatively stable, rarely dipping below ten, while those at the university were erratic, with some courses cancelled due to a complete lack of interest. When offering the same course at both institutions, he, unlike most of his colleagues, allowed the university course to run with just one student. It is likely, but not documented, that he simply combined the two classes, thus earning the minimal university fee with no extra work. With the exception of the 'origins of Christian art' in winter 1833/34 and some iterations of modern

<sup>286</sup> Kugler's letters to his wife Clara, which begin on 21 April (Nuremberg) and end on 12 August (Vienna), constitute yet another project in their own right: BStB, Ana 549, Nachlass Kugler, Nr. 30-41.

<sup>287</sup> Kugler to Altenstein, 16 October 1834, SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 12. As for the earlier trip through Germany, further documentation may yet be found in the GStAPK.

<sup>288</sup> GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 8, f. 95.

<sup>289</sup> SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 18.

<sup>290</sup> For the appointments and a detailed accounting of Kugler's work at the ministry, see Holtz, 'Amtspraxis', and Bärbel Holtz, 'Das Kultusministerium und die Kunstpolitik 1808/17 bis 1933', in Holtz and others, *Kultusministerium*, 2.1: 451-470.

<sup>291</sup> Table 8 was assembled from GStAPK, I HA Rep. 76a, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1 and 2.



painting, his university courses were always private. Although he had a somewhat consistent set of courses that he repeated, he did not begin to develop a regular rotation until teaching exclusively at the academy. Aside from a few special topics, all of Kugler's courses were surveys, defined by either medium (architecture, painting) or period (ancient, medieval, modern). Aside from 'Origins of Christian art', he never offered a course specifically on the middle ages at the university, even though that had been the field of his *Habilitation*.

As shown in [Table 8](#), Kugler soon developed a regular rotation of courses at the academy after he left the university. With three 'period surveys' he provided full coverage of the history of art from ancient through medieval to modern.<sup>292</sup> The medieval component was probably a variation on his earlier 'archaeology of the middle ages.' Similarly, the ancient component probably drew on a course offered in summer 1836 at both the academy and the university, 'History of art (architecture, sculpture, painting) among the ancients'. The modern component of the rotation, 'History of modern art', most likely also drew on the *Handbook*, as well as earlier courses (History of modern painting, History of architecture). The final, and most constant, element of this rotation was the course taken over from Schöll, 'Mythology of the Greeks and Romans'.

Four documents from the mid-1830s give significant insight into how Kugler organized his courses, and by extension how he conceived the history of art as a pedagogical and scholarly pursuit. Key elements in this conception can be clearly, if still tentatively, linked to specific aspects of his education in Berlin and Heidelberg.

The 'Plan for scholarly lectures for artists' submitted to Altenstein in June 1833 begins by explaining how the course had been made easy and efficient for artists, who of necessity spent the majority of their time learning technique.<sup>293</sup> Lacking sufficient scholarly preparation, they were unable to conduct art-historical study on their own or to benefit from courses at the university, which served other purposes. The principal purpose of this course was to direct artists in their choice of subject matter, through the full understanding of those subjects, and to reveal to them the motivations that drove the examples they studied (i.e. earlier works of art). 'In a word, these lectures would consist of an "archaeology of the different times"'.<sup>294</sup> That archaeology would be conveyed through what

<sup>292</sup> This rotation appears to become more regular in 1845, just as Kugler was preparing his report to the ministry on the reorganization of the academy (on which see Koschnick, *Kugler*, 204-221).

<sup>293</sup> Heck, 'Bezüglichkeit', erroneously calls this 'the first academic lesson plan for art history (*das erste akademische Lehrprogramm der Kunstgeschichte*). Earlier examples include Christian Gottlob Heyne, *Einleitung in das Studium der Antike, oder Grundriß einer Anführung zur Kenntnis der alten Kunstwerke*, Göttingen: Dietrich, 1772; Johann Dominik Fiorillo, *Ueber die Grotteske: Einladungsblätter zur Vorlesung über die Geschichte und Theorie der bildenden Künste*, Göttingen: Rosenbusch, 1791; reprinted in Johann Dominik Fiorillo, *Sämtliche Schriften*, 12 volumes, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1997-1998, 12 (1998). Toelken's *Ankündigung und Plan* of 1812 is art-historical at least in part.

<sup>294</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 140-142. It is fully transcribed (with only minor errors) in Heck, 'Bezüglichkeit', 10. Here f. 141: Diese Vorlesungen würden

Kugler called an account or presentation of the material (*Darstellung*), since this was not the place for a philosophical consideration (*philosophisches Raisonement*).<sup>295</sup> In some instances he used the term overview (*Übersicht*) as a near synonym.

The course would be divided into four main thematic sections and each further subdivided in two main periods, the ancient world and the middle ages (including the beginning of the modern period). First, an overview of political history, leaving aside details that confuse the layman but including specific sources. This overview would show the development of the period's main interests, its rise and fall, and place emphasis on the monuments, poetic and artistic, and the figures that constitute historical epochs. Second, an account of the religious situations of individual times and peoples. Third, an account of social conditions (*des geselligen Zustands*), including the constitution of the state, religion, warfare, public and private life, customs and morals, and costume. Fourth, and most important, an account of intellectual and aesthetic development (*Bildungszustand*), or a history of art and literature. Such a history would show, on the one hand, how art works of a given period arise wholly from the spirit of their time, from specific needs and conditions, in order to guide students toward a recognition of the essence and character of the present. On the other hand, it would focus more on the actual sources of the artist's material, individual monuments of poetry.

In addition, Kugler recommended a separate class on the Bible as the main source for art of the present, since artists had no time to study the Bible itself. This would be both archaeological and aesthetic, but it would emphasize the latter. It would offer an account of inner organic coherence and progress, specific examination of formal issues, a comparison of different renderings of one and the same subject, a determination of what in the Bible can be represented, the relationship of Christianity to art, and, as a conclusion, an account of early Christian art.<sup>296</sup>

---

insbesondere den Zweck haben, den Künstler eines Theils in der Wahl seiner Stoffe zu leiten und ihn anderen Theils den gewünschten Stoff in allen seinen Theilen kennend zu lehren, zugleich aber auch, in Bezug auf seine Vorbilder (Kunstwerke früherer Zeiten), die Motive aufzudecken, welche diesen zu Grunde liegen. Sie würden, mit einem Wort, in einer 'Archäologie der verschiedenen Zeiten' bestehen.

<sup>295</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 141v: N[ota] B[ene]: Es ist überall mit Absicht das Wort Darstellung gesetzt worden, da ein philosophisches Raisonement hier nicht an seinem Ort scheint.

<sup>296</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 142r: Eine Darstellung des inneren organischen Zusammenhangs und Fortganges, ein näheres Eingehen auf die eigentlich plastischen Punkte, eine Vergleichung verschiedener Auffassungen ein und desselben Gegenstandes, eine Bestimmung des Darstellbaren in der Bibel überhaupt, des Verhältnisses des Christentums zur Kunst, und endlich, hiezu sich anschließend, eine Darstellung der älteren christlichen Kunstbestrebungen.

Writing to Altenstein on 2 April 1834, Kugler reported on his two courses in the just concluded winter semester. The academy course had largely followed the plan of 1833, but with a narrower focus on the German Middle Ages:

In this lecture I attempted, following a brief historical introduction, to give a general picture of medieval conditions, with respect to state, church, war, customs, and so forth, in order to develop, on this basis, the particularity of the art of the middle ages, and at the conclusion, to introduce my audience to the rich treasures of the poetry of this time both in a general overview and through individual examples. In general my efforts were directed toward inspiring and providing my audience with the means for their own research; on those points where my presentation was more concerned with artistic practice, I tried to demonstrate the specific as clearly and precisely as possible.<sup>297</sup>

In the architecture survey, taught at the architects' association, he had shown prints from the association's library and attempted to elucidate the most important elements by drawing, presumably on the blackboard (as Schadow had observed earlier). The course had been difficult to construct, but he was pleased with the results:

I was called upon, within the bounds of my abilities, to bring together past research on this topic and my own in a comprehensive account, still a difficult task because there is as yet no even partially comprehensive handbook. I was gratified to find in the participation of my audience, which remained undiminished to the end of my course, proof of the relevance of my efforts and of their appropriate execution.<sup>298</sup>

<sup>297</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 177: In dieser Vorlesung habe ich versucht, nach einer kurzen geschichtlichen Einleitung ein allgemeines Bild der mittelalterlichen Verhältnisse, in Bezug auf Staat, Kirche, Krieg, Sitte u.s.w. zu geben, um auf solchem Grunde sodann die Eigentümlichkeiten der Kunst des Mittelalters zu entwickeln und am Schluß meinen Zuhörern in einer allgemeinen Uebersicht und durch einzelne Beispiele die reichen Schätze der Poesie jener Zeit zu eröffnen. Ich habe mich bestrebt, im Allgemeinen mehr anzuregen und die Mittel zu eigener Forschung den Zuhörern in die Hände zu geben, an denjenigen Punkten aber, wo mein Vortrag mehr die künstlerische Praxis bewährte, möglichst scharf und bestimmt das Einzelne darzulegen.

<sup>298</sup> GStAPK, I. HA, Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 5, f. 177: Indem ich berufen war, die Resultate früherer und eigener Forschung über diesen Gegenstand, soviel in meinen Kräften lag, in einer Gesamt-Darstellung zu vereinigen,-- eine Bemühung, die noch durch kein vorhandenes, nur einigermaßen vollständiges Handbuch erleichtert wird, -- so hatte ich die Freude, in der Theilnahme von Seiten meiner Zuhörer, welche sich bis an dem Schluß der Vorlesung unverringert gleich blieb, einen Beweis von dem Zeitgemäßen meiner Bemühungen, wenn auch wieder von derer angemessener Ausführung zu finden.

Kugler's report does not show much about how the classes differed between academy and university, beyond a greater emphasis on technical questions and practical application at the former. However, in both courses Kugler strove to present a general overview and to make the course content relevant to his audience.

From the variants of the titles alone, it is clear that Kugler's course on painting was particularly concerned with the examination of objects within an overall framework. Either the royal painting gallery supported a general historical survey or reference to the larger art-historical context supported an examination of the paintings in the gallery. The two are in effect the same thing stated differently.<sup>299</sup> Just how Kugler combined the presentation of an overall historical framework with discussion of individual paintings is explained in a request that he submitted to Schadow on 19 December 1835.<sup>300</sup> That semester he was teaching 'History of modern painting' at both the academy and the university. Visits to the painting galleries of the royal museum were an important component of the class, as Kugler explained:

I have attempted to take particular account of the painting gallery of the royal museum, and to give my students an understanding, primarily in art-historical terms, of the works displayed. I have found it appropriate to visit the gallery with my students and to discuss the paintings' particular characteristics directly in their presence. The large number of students I have, especially in this current semester [25 at the academy], creates many distractions for the public assembled in the gallery. Conversely, the coming and going of the public disrupts my lectures.

Kugler thought the problem could be solved by closing the gallery to the public during a time set aside for his class to visit.<sup>301</sup> He asked Schadow to forward his

<sup>299</sup> As evident from Table 7, the change of course title occurred in winter 1837/38.

<sup>300</sup> SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 15. The official response to Kugler's request is probably preserved in the GStAPK. As in the instances above, finding it will require reconstructing the original place of this document there.

<sup>301</sup> SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 15: Bei den Lehrvorträgen, welche ich an der Königl. Akademie der Künste 'über die Geschichte der neueren Malerei' halte, habe ich besonders Rücksicht auf die Gemäldegalerie der hiesigen Königl. Museum genommen und meinen Zuhörern das Verständnis der dort ausgestellten Werke, vornehmlich in kunsthistorischen Hinsicht, darzulegen versucht. Ich habe es dabei für zweckmässig befunden, mit meinen Zuhörern selbst die Gallerie zu besuchen und in unmittelbaren Gegenwart der Gemälde das Nöthige über die besonderen Eigenthümlichkeiten derselben zu besprechen. Da jedoch die grosse Anzahl der Zuhörer, deren ich mich bei diesen Vorträgen und namentlich in gegenwärtigen Semester, zu erfreuen habe, bei solchen Besuchen mannigfache Störungen für das in der Gallerie versammelte Publikum hervorbringt und da umgekehrt das Ab- und Zugehen des Publikums störend auf meine dortigen Vorträge einwirkt, so ist es mein sehr grosser Wunsch, dass mir von

request to the appropriate authorities for consideration, ideally for the current semester. Kugler went on to explain how he would rearrange his lectures to accommodate such special viewing hours, were his request to be granted:

...in the future I will separate the explanation of the paintings in the painting gallery completely from the actual lectures on art history and establish a special lecture for students of the academy to take place once per week at the gallery before the relevant works. I find this [the separation] appropriate, because if I include the gallery visit within the general art-historical lectures, that visit cannot occur regularly, at a set time, because the examples offered by the gallery are stronger for some periods and completely lacking for others. Thus in the general lectures I am constrained to assume a different organization and developmental path for art, given that the organization of the gallery hang is in many respects determined by the works available. Finally, it is desirable, in the observation of the paintings, to recapitulate their historical relationships, which necessarily interrupts the time available for the overall lecture.<sup>302</sup>

The response to Kugler's request is not known, but it clearly shows that he had two complementary, if sometimes incompatible, concerns: demonstration of an overall developmental trajectory and engagement with the objects.

For Kugler a comprehensive, synthetic knowledge of the history of art was not merely something he taught to artists at the academy and budding bureaucrats at the university. Rather it was the very basis of his own practice as scholar and a teacher, and it was also a critical point where teaching and research

---

Seiten des Königl. Museums besondere Stunden angewiesen werden möchten, in welchen die Gallerie für das grössere Publikum geschlossen ist und der Besuch derselben mit meinen Zuhörern keine weitere Ungelegenheit nach sich ziehen kann.

<sup>302</sup> SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 15r-v: ... so würde ich in Zukunft die Erklärung der Gemälde des Königl. Museums ganz von den eigentlichen Lehrvorträgen über Kunstgeschichte trennen und einen eigenen Vortrag über die Gemälde-Gallerie des Königl. Museums, der einmal wöchentlich vor den zu besprechenden Werken selbst Statt finden würde, für die Zöglinge der Königl. Akademie der Künste einrichten. Ich halte dies insofern für zweckmässig, als der Besuch der Gemälde-Gallerie, wenn ich ihn mit den allgemeinen kunstgeschichtlichen Vorträgen veranstalte, in solchem Falle nicht regelmässig, nicht auf bestimmte Stunden, festzusetzen ist, da die Beispiele, welche die Gallerie bietet, für manche Perioden reicher, für andere wieder vollständig ausfallen. Sodann bin ich, in Bezug auf jene allgemeinen Vorträge, genöthigt, eine andere Eintheilung und Folge des Entwicklungsganges der Kunst anzunehmen, während solche bei der Aufstellung der Gallerie mannigfach eigentlich durch den vorhandenen Vorath bedingt wurde. Endlich auch ist es wünschenswerth, bei Betrachtung der Gemälde die geschichtlichen Verhältnisse in einer gewissen Ausdehnung zu rekapitulieren, was dem Gesamt-Vortrage zugemessener Zeit nothwendig Abbruch thun würde.

both came together and diverged. Whereas in teaching the framework, presented as a whole (*Darstellung, Übersicht*), served to elucidate the objects, in research the study of objects supported creation of the framework, which Kugler seems to have understood as a central task in his work as an art historian. In his report to Altenstein, he noted that he had provided the necessary general account (*Gesamt-Darstellung*) of the history of architecture by synthesizing his own research and that of others, given the lack of a suitable handbook. Similarly, his project on Islamic architecture, although of necessity based on secondary sources, sought to provide, for the first time, 'an historical development and account of [its] system'.

As Kugler explained to Altenstein in his funding request of 6 October 1834, his art-historical studies to date had made him familiar with the general developmental course of art (*allgemeiner Entwicklungsgang der Kunst*). This was proving insufficient, however, and he was ever more aware of the need for the further personal observation (*eigene Anschauung*) possible only through a long trip. The knowledge gained on his previous trip through Germany, so generously financed by the minister, was invaluable but too limited to the particular (i.e. German art) and in need of completion.

I still lack an independent opinion of the most important historically documented works of Christian art (as preserved primarily in Italy and the Netherlands); in addition, the discipline of art history overall stands at so low a level that most of the various developmental stages, especially of Christian art, still require many special investigations which can be carried out only before the monuments. For the history of the earliest art in Germany I believe I have assembled much that is not without significance, but the excellent results of these studies are still dependent on many hypotheses, such that they require a great expansion and comparison with the achievements of neighboring countries, principally Italy and the Netherlands, and investigations into the influence emanating from Italy and the Netherlands.<sup>303</sup>

<sup>303</sup> SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 12: Noch fehlt mir ein selbständiges Urtheil über die wichtigsten und geschichtlich dokumentierten Werke christlicher Kunst (wie solche vornehmlich in Italien und den Niederlanden enthalten sind); noch steht überhaupt die Wissenschaft der Kunstgeschichte auf einer so niedrigen Stufe, daß fast überall, besonders für die christliche Zeit, die verschiedenen Entwicklungsepochen mannigfacher spezieller Untersuchungen bedürfen, die aber nur an Ort und Stelle vorzunehmen sind. Für die Geschichte der frühesten Kunstübung in Deutschland glaube ich bereits nicht Unbedeutendes gesammelt zu haben; doch sind auch die aus diesen Studien hervorgehenden Resultate noch zu vielen Hypothesen unterworfen, als daß nicht für sie selbst eine grössere Ausbreitung und Vergleichung mit den Leistungen der Nachbarländer, vornehmlich Italiens, und Untersuchungen des Einflusses, der von Italien und den Niederlanden ausgegangen ist, nothwendig wären.

He argued further that he could not complete other projects before he gained ‘a free overview, founded as far as possible on my own judgment, of art as a whole’. These projects were a ‘general art history’ (*allgemeine Kunstgeschichte*), for which he had gathered much material, and a nearly complete description of the art treasures of Berlin and Potsdam (already partially published in *Museum*). Finally and most particularly, this free overview was of utmost importance for his teaching at the art academy and the university.<sup>304</sup>

Within these four documents are elements that point back to Kugler’s training in Berlin and Heidelberg. Drawing these connections can help to situate him, at least preliminarily, within the complex, contentious intellectual climate of the 1820s and 1830s. In the plan of 1833, he drew a distinction between the ‘archaeological’ and the ‘aesthetic’, not as opposites, but rather as different emphases within his presentation (*Darstellung*) of the material. Emphasizing the aesthetic, the Bible course for artists focused on matters internal to art (its definition, formal issues, what can be represented and how), approached historical questions from the art side of the equation (its relationship to Christianity), and concluded with an historical survey as a demonstration of the preceding. In contrast, Kugler’s ‘archaeology of the different times’ sounds remarkably like the capacious conception of *Alterthumswissenschaft* pursued by Wolf and Boeckh and adapted by von der Hagen: accounts of politics, religion, social life and customs lead up to and support a history of art and literature. The separation proposed here recalls that in Toelken’s course rotation, with ‘Aesthetics’ (*Kunstlehre*) offered in the winter and ‘Archaeology of the arts of design’ in the summer. These were and remain loaded terms, and their valence in the 1830s remains to be established. Similarly, the idea that works of art ‘arise wholly from the spirit of their time’ may sound Hegelian, but as the Burckhardt biographer, Werner Kaegi, warned many years ago, ‘everything that now sounds like Hegel does not come from Hegel.’<sup>305</sup>

Another key term in Kugler’s plan is *Darstellung*, which is translated here as ‘account’ in order to stress that it is an interpretation, a form of analysis conducted through the arrangement of the material presented. Writing to Altenstein in April 1834, Kugler stated that he had succeeded in giving his students a ‘general picture of medieval conditions’ that included the elements listed in his plan. This recalls what he had found lacking in Creuzer’s diffuse but fact-filled lectures and prized in Schlosser, namely the ability to present a manifold whole with its inner connections and to sketch the character of a time

<sup>304</sup> SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1840 (4) Kugler, Franz Theodor, f. 12: bevor mir nicht ein freier, möglichst auf eigenem Urtheil begründeter Ueberblick der Kunstverhältnisse zu Theil geworden ist. Endlich und ganz insbesondere ist ein solcher für meine öffentlichen Vorlesungen . . . im höchsten Grade wünschenswerth.

<sup>305</sup> Werner Kaegi, ‘Jacob Burckhardt zwischen Naturwissenschaft und Philosophie. Fragment aus einer Entstehungsgeschichte der “Weltgeschichtlichen Betrachtungen”’, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 224, 1977, 16: Nicht alles stammt von Hegel, was dem heutigen Leser hegelianisch scheint.

with a few quick strokes. Through Schlosser in Heidelberg, and possibly von Raumer and Carl Ritter in Berlin, a connection can probably be drawn between Kugler's use of the term *Darstellung* and its importance in the historiography of history stretching back to the eighteenth century.<sup>306</sup> Likewise, Kugler's opposition of 'account' to 'philosophical consideration' (*philosophisches Raisonnement*) cannot be taken at face value but needs to be placed within the polemics of the time, just like his many, oft-quoted, rejections of philosophy and claims to approach objects naively.

Schlosser's manifold whole with its inner connections bears a striking resemblance to the fundamental lesson Kugler recalled learning from von der Hagen for his earliest study of both medieval manuscripts and architectural monuments:

'Just as he had promoted my interest in those [previously discussed] medieval illuminations, so, too, did my esteemed teacher give me for these observations [of buildings] that instruction, which, by pointing out differences in style and historical progression, allowed the recognition of a regular development, an organization dependent on internal grounds, within a disorderly profusion'.<sup>307</sup>

Kugler thus learned to recognize what Hotho had missed in his ill-fated *Habilitation* essay, namely that a simple chronological ordering is not enough, and that other, more significant organizing principles may not be immediately evident but recognizing them is fundamental to historical scholarship.

Just how Kugler went about recognizing and presenting significant internal principles in the art he studied is necessarily a large project in its own right, one made all the more difficult by his general avoidance of 'philosophical considerations' in his publications. Such a project is also complicated by historical distance, which obscures polemics and assumptions that Kugler and his readers took for granted. Twenty-first century readers would be well advised to read Kugler like Kugler the student of von der Hagen, looking for internal connections within an apparently disordered profusion. While most scholars now reject the notion of a regular development and the coherence of totalizing views, understanding individuals like Kugler, along with Toelken and Hotho,

<sup>306</sup> See Wolfgang Hardtwig, 'Die Verwissenschaftlichung der Geschichtsschreibung und die Ästhetisierung der Darstellung', in *Formen der Geschichtsschreibung*, Reinhardt Koselleck, Heinrich Lutz, and Jörn Rüsen, eds, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1982, 147-191.

<sup>307</sup> Kugler, *Kleine Schriften*, 1 (1853): 101: Mein hoch verehrter Lehrer – wie er mein Interesse an jenen Handschriftbildern des Mittelalters freundlich förderte – hatte mir auch für diese Anschauungen diejenige Belehrung gegeben, die auf die Styl-Unterschiede und deren geschichtliche Folge hindeutend, in der bunten Fülle eine gesetzliche Entwicklung, eine auf innere Gründen beruhende Gliederung erkennen liess.



Eric Garberson    Art history in the university: Toelken – Hotho – Kugler

helps to trace the emergence of art history as a discipline within the historical study of art dispersed across multiple fields in the early nineteenth century.

**Eric Garberson** is Associate Professor of Art History and Director of the interdisciplinary doctoral program in Media Art & Text at Virginia Commonwealth University. Past publications include 'German Baroque Architecture and National Identity', in *Barock als Aufgabe*, Andreas Kreul, ed, Wolfenbüttel, 2005; and 'Libraries, Memory, and the Space of Knowledge', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 18, 2006. This article is part of a larger historiographic project focused on the historical study of art in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Germany.

Eric Garberson  
Department of Art History  
Director, Doctoral Program in Media Art & Text  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
Box 843046  
Richmond, Virginia 23284-3046  
USA

eggarberson@vcu.edu

Research for this article was funded with the generous support of the Department of Art History and the VCUarts Dean's office at Virginia Commonwealth University. I would also like to extend my thanks to the staff at the many archives and libraries cited in the notes; their ready assistance and expertise have been essential to the completion of this project.