

Art History in the University II: Ernst Guhl

Eric Garberson

This essay continues the examination, begun in volume five of this journal, of the training, appointment, and teaching careers of nineteenth-century art historians at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University in Berlin.¹ It focuses on Ernst Guhl (1819-1862), the only new instructor with a primary focus on the history of art to join the university between the early 1840s and the later 1860s. Like Toelken and Kugler, Guhl gained his knowledge of art and its history from independent study and travel, undertaken to supplement an education in the established disciplines of the philosophical faculty. His more focused study in Berlin, from 1838 to 1842, allowed him to move easily through the *Promotion* in 1842-43, with a dissertation on the ancient city of Ephesus, and the *Habilitation* in 1847, with an essay on the origins of the Ionic capital. Between these two milestones he spent over a year in Italy, laying the foundation for future research and teaching that extended to encompass both the medieval and modern periods. This expansion, or from another perspective, dilution, of his professional profile became increasingly problematic in each of his four applications for an extraordinary professorship (1851, 1854, twice in 1858). The successive reports by the faculty on Guhl's qualifications and potential appointment demonstrate that while the historical study of art was becoming more sharply defined as a specific discipline, it continued to be assigned a minor role in the intellectual and pedagogical structures of the philosophical faculty.

Today Guhl is known primarily for several reference works widely read in the nineteenth century. The first, *Denkmäler der Kunst*, was a picture atlas published to accompany Kugler's *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*. Guhl joined the project in 1847, two years after its inception, serving as editor and author of brief explanatory text for the plates.² In *Künstler-Briefe* Guhl published a selection of artists' letters from the

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.

¹ 'Art History in the University: Toelken – Hotho – Kugler', *Journal of Art Historiography* 5 (December 2011). In the notes to part one, references to GStAPK I. HA 76a.... should read I. HA 76 Va..., except in notes 23, 284, and 291. Here references to the course tables for the Akademie der Künste should read I. HA Rep. 76 Ve Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1-2.

² *Denkmäler der Kunst zur Übersicht ihres Entwicklungs-Ganges*, 4 volumes, Stuttgart, Ebner & Seubert, 1845-1853. For a partial overview of the complex publication history see Katharina Krause, Klaus Niehr, and Eva-Maria Hannebutt-Benz, eds., *Bilderlust und Lesefrüchte. Das illustrierte Kunstbuch von 1750 bis 1920*, Leipzig, A. E. Seemann, 2005, 110-112, cat. no. 10. Subsequent expanded editions, beginning with the second in 1857-58, list other editors, including Wilhelm Lübke. Guhl's involvement

fifteenth through seventeenth centuries in German translation with introduction and commentary.³ It has been credited with contributing to, even inspiring, the turn to biography by art historians in the later nineteenth century. *Die Frauen in der Kunstgeschichte* provided a survey of women artists from the ancient near east to the present day.⁴ Pirated immediately in New York, it continues to be cited as a groundbreaking contribution in the historiography of women artists.⁵ Shortly before his death Guhl collaborated with the philologist Wilhelm Koner (1817-1887) on *Das Leben der Griechen und Römer*. Addressed to a general audience, it sought to convey the sense and spirit (*Sinn und Geist*) of the Greeks and Romans through an illustrated survey of architecture (written by Guhl) and of the realia of daily life (written by Koner). First published in 1860-61, it went through multiple revised editions and was translated into both French and English.⁶ Guhl also produced many smaller publications, both books and articles, with a pronounced but by no means exclusive emphasis on the history of architecture.

Scholarly literature on Guhl is virtually non-existent. It consists mostly of brief mentions of him as the author of significant reference texts or as a member of the so-called Berlin school of art history.⁷ Although he is acknowledged as author and editor in studies of the picture atlas, his role in the enterprise has not been examined in detail.⁸ Similarly, recent studies of art history in Berlin mention him either only

appears to have ceased upon completion of the first edition, as indicated by documents from 1858 (see below). His subsequent works all went to publishers in Berlin. English translations published in New York in the 1880s were based on Lübke's edition.

³ *Künstler-Briefe. Übersetzt und erläutert von Ernst Guhl*, 2 volumes, Berlin, Trautwein/Guttentag, 1853-1856; revised and expanded by Adolf Rosenberg, 2 volumes, Berlin, Guttentag, 1880.

⁴ *Die Frauen in der Kunstgeschichte*, Berlin, Guttentag, 1858. It is included in the microfilm collection 'History of Women', New Haven, Research Publications, 1975, no. 1772.

⁵ Albert Ten Eyck Gardner, 'A Century of Women Artists', *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, N.S. 7 no. 4 (December 1948), 112, notes that Guhl's book provided most of the material in E. F. Ellet's *Women Artists in All Ages and Countries* (New York, 1859). Linda Nochlin, 'Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists', in *Women Art and Power*, New York, Harper & Row, 1988, 177, note 2, cites a review of Guhl's book in *The Westminster Review* (American Edition), 70, July 1858, 91-104. Carola Muysers, 'Künstlerin/Kunstgeschichte: Zur Konzeption der Künstlerin in der kunsthistorischen Geschlechtsforschung', in *Handbuch Frauen und Geschlechterforschung: Theorie, Methoden, Empirie*, Wiesbaden, Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2010, 760.

⁶ Ernst Guhl and Wilhelm Koner, *Das Leben der Griechen und Römer nach antiken Bildwerken dargestellt*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1860-61, 1862; 2nd edition 1864; 3rd edition 1872; 4th edition 1876; 5th edition 1882; 6th edition 1893. A partial list of translations indicates the work's wide and continuing appeal. French translations: Paris, 1884-85 and 1902. English translations: New York and London, 1875, 1876, 1889, 1902. Facsimile editions appeared in the 1980s and 1990s.

⁷ Following the pattern established by Waetzoldt, *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker*, 2 (1924): 30, 75, 111, 230.

⁸ Locher, *Kunstgeschichte*, 270-277; Hubert Locher, 'The Art Historical Survey: Narratives and Picture Compendia', *Visual Resources*, 17, 2001, 168-172. In his extended discussions of the *Denkmäler* Dan Karlholm barely acknowledges Guhl and focuses on Lübke's expanded second edition: 'Reading the Virtual Museum of General Art History', *Art History* 24 no. 4, September 2001, 555-563; *Art of Illusion: The Representation of Art History in Nineteenth-Century Germany and Beyond*, Berlin, Peter Lang, 2004, 66-68, 97-125.

very briefly or not at all.⁹ Across these sources, accounts of his life and career are brief and fragmentary.¹⁰ The extensive documentation scattered across several repositories in Berlin has not been examined since Lenz wrote his history of the university a century ago.

These documents functioned in the same institutional frameworks described in the previous essay, with only minor changes. These are outlined here in an initial section that also provides an overview of the professors teaching the history of art in the philosophical faculty during Guhl's time at the university. The following case history of Guhl's training and career presents the extensive primary source material in a chronological narrative, making it available for use in other studies and by other scholars. Guhl's publications are considered only as supporting documents in his applications to the university. There is no evidence that he was involved in artistic or literary production.¹¹

The philosophical faculty and the history of art after c. 1840

The structure and administration of the Friedrich-Wilhelms University remained largely unchanged over the period under discussion, from the mid 1830s to about 1860. Statutes for the individual faculties were finally approved and published in 1838; in the case of the philosophical faculty, these replaced the provisional statutes apparently in effect since 1818.¹² As discussed in part one, the printed statutes made only minor changes to the existing *Promotion* and *Habilitation* procedures. The processes for Guhl in 1842 and 1847 differed only slightly from those described for Toelken, Hotho, and Kugler. For instance, the two principal examiners for the *Habilitation* were now a committee (*Commission*) selected at a meeting of the faculty. Each had fourteen days to examine the materials submitted and prepare a written report assessing the candidate's level of distinction in scholarship and spirit (*Gelehrsamkeit, Geist*).¹³

The statutes of 1838 fixed the number of ordinary professorships in the philosophical faculty at seventeen, including one position designated 'archaeology and history of art' (*Archaeologie und Geschichte der Kunst*). These statutes stipulated

⁹ Schalenberg, 'Disziplin und Geselligkeit', 16; Bickendorf, 'Berliner Schule', 57; Sven Ahrens, 'Eduard Gerhards Lehre und der archäologische und kunsthistorische Unterricht an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin', in *Kunst: Kontext: Geschichte. Festgabe für Hubert Faensen zum 75. Geburtstag*, Tatjana Bartsch and Jörg Meiner, eds., Berlin, Lukas, 2003, 253. Guhl is not mentioned by Bredekamp and Labuda, 'Kunstgeschichte'; Prange, *Geburt der Kunstgeschichte*; or Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte als Institution*.

¹⁰ These accounts are mostly based on a single footnote in Lenz, *Geschichte*, 2.2 (1918): 144, note 1; and the very short entry in *ADB* 10 (1879), 99.

¹¹ Guhl was not part of my original research plan, but as I encountered more and more materials for him it became clear that a continuation of the study was warranted. As before, I make no claim to have exhausted all the archival sources or to completeness in assembling Guhl's own bibliography.

¹² Lenz, *Geschichte*, 2.1 (1910): 441-442. In March 1835 the ministry had tasked the faculties with finalizing their statutes, drafts of which had been submitted already in 1818 and 1819.

¹³ *Statuten der Philosophischen Facultät*, III, 53-64; in Koch, *Preussische Universitäten* 1 (1839): 149-152.

further that when a professorship (*Ordinariat*) became vacant the faculty was allowed to suggest three candidates to the ministry to fill the vacancy. The ministry retained the right to increase the number of professorships according to the needs of the faculty and the available funds. Seniority alone did not give a *Privatdozent* a claim to advancement to an extraordinary professorship; rather this depended on the needs of the faculty and the fitness (*Tüchtigkeit*) of the individual. Petitions for advancement were to be submitted directly to the faculty for review and possible forwarding to the ministry, and not until three years after the *Habilitation*.¹⁴

Although the number of ordinary professorships was set at seventeen, it had surpassed this figure well before 1838 and continued to climb. The increase was mostly due to appointments made by the ministry and often without consulting the university. Although never directly challenging the ministry's right to appoint ordinary and extraordinary professors, all four faculties, but especially the philosophical, repeatedly asserted a right to be consulted on new appointments. The faculties were also slow to fill vacancies and generally resisted expansion. An inherent conflict arose between the interests of the ministry, which sought to secure the best men in their fields and to expand the scope and reputation of the university, and those of the faculties, which sought to defend their corporate rights and prevent limited funds from being divided among ever more members. Salaries for most ordinary professors declined over the years as their numbers increased while the university budget did not. Similarly, conflicts arose over how to divide the fees collected from students for every bit of academic business, which also remained the same. The situation of the extraordinary professors was particularly dire, as low salaries sank ever lower and more and more were appointed with no salary at all.¹⁵

As Lenz recounts, these problems began under Altenstein but continued under Friedrich von Eichhorn (1779-1856), who served as minister from 1840 to 1848. A protracted exchange between the university, again led by the philosophical faculty, and the ministry in 1843, shows that the professors' concerns went beyond the self-serving protection of corporate privileges. Some were the same as those expressed by and for Toelken decades earlier: insufficient income made it necessary for professors to have outside employment, which caused them to direct their efforts in too many different directions, to the detriment of their teaching (*zum Nachtheil ihres akademischen Lehramtes*). The problem was particularly acute for extraordinary professors: unable to focus on their scholarship they could not rise to academic greatness. Increasing numbers also had a negative effect on teaching itself. Excessive uniformity might be avoided, but the resulting plethora of viewpoints pulled the students in too many different directions; nibbling at the many different offerings, students did not master a single scholarly thought process (*wissenschaftlicher Gedankengang*). For their part, professors could not forge close and lasting relationships with their students; as demonstrated by Kugler's case history, it was through such relationships that much if not most professional preparation occurred.

¹⁴ *Statuten der Philosophischen Facultät*, III, 42, 52; in Koch, *Preussische Universitäten* 1 (1839): 147, 149.

¹⁵ Lenz, *Geschichte*, 2.1 (1910): 407-418.

While the statutes only gave the faculty the right to suggest candidates for open positions, they did require that the faculty monitor and ensure the completeness of instruction in its fields. Calling upon the latter, and citing past precedents (extending back to 1818), the faculty respectfully but adamantly asked to be consulted on all future appointments.¹⁶ At the same time, Eichhorn tried to impose his own means for addressing the problem by ordering the faculties to maintain greater control over the admission and then the work of the *Privatdozenten* by submitting regular reports, recommending the best for an increase in pay, and counseling the worst to leave. As before, the university's request to limit the number of *Privatdozenten* (*numerus clausus*) was rejected. Again led by the philosophical faculty, the university strenuously objected to such monitoring, which appears not to have become part of its procedures.¹⁷

Beyond the brief discussion in Lenz, there has been no detailed study of the specific measures put in place to control expansion of the faculty by Eichhorn or by his successors, Adalbert von Ladenberg (1798-1855; minister 1848-50), Karl Otto von Raumer (1805-1859; minister 1850-1858) and Moritz August von Bethmann-Hollweg (1795-1877; minister 1858-1862).¹⁸ The documents presented below show that Guhl's career was shaped by such measures. In his evaluation of Guhl's *Habilitation*, Gerhard noted that book reviews were no longer acceptable as writing samples. In denying Guhl's petitions of 1851 and 1854, both dean Weiß and the ministry made oblique references to Guhl's lack of seniority among the *Privatdozenten*, although it remains unclear how exactly that affected his application. In 1854 the ministry, and in 1858 the faculty, found that Guhl could not be appointed because the approved number of professorships for archaeology and art history had been exceeded. Even after Panofka's death, royal approval was required for Guhl's appointment because the previously fixed number of extraordinary professorships in the philosophical faculty had been reached.¹⁹

¹⁶ Lenz, *Geschichte*, 2.2 (1918): 69-72; and 4 (1910): 589-596, for the reports sent to the ministry by the philosophical faculty (5 August 1843) and the senate (16 August 1843). Twenty-one extraordinary professors had submitted a petition to the senate, asking it to address the problem of declining salaries and limited prospects of advancement. See also the account, largely based on Lenz, in Hahn, 'Junior Faculty', 877-882.

¹⁷ Lenz, *Geschichte*, 2.2 (1918): 72-75, describes a conflict arising from the first report then drops the matter.

¹⁸ The reform plans debated during the revolution of 1848 mostly concerned the inclusion of extraordinary professors, *Privatdozenten*, and students in university governance. In any event, these came to naught with the failure of the revolution itself. The account in Hahn, 'Junior Faculty', 884-893, expands on and corrects that in Lenz, *Geschichte*, 2.2 (1918): 258-277.

¹⁹ This may have referred to Friedrich Wilhelm IV's decree of 5 October 1840 that royal permission was required for the appointment of even unsalaried extraordinary professors beyond the previously fixed limit on the number of professors in a given faculty. The decree is cited in the letter of 17 April 1844 from Eichhorn to the king regarding Waagen's appointment: GStAPK I. HA Rep 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. 4, Nr. 47, Bd. 1; reprinted in Friedrich Stock, 'Zwei Gesuche Waagens', *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 53 (1932), 115-116.

The documents consistently list five men as (over)filling the professorships for archaeology and art history: two ordinary professors, Toelken and Gerhard, and three extraordinary, Panofka, Hotho, and Gustav Waagen (1794-1868). All were about a generation older than Guhl (born between 1785 and 1802), all had secured their appointments by 1844, and all also held positions at the museum. A brief overview of how these five gained their appointments and their teaching over the years confirms the impression that emerges from the Guhl documents. In the pair 'archaeology and history of art', the latter, defined primarily, but not exclusively, as the study of post-antique art, was decidedly the junior partner, whose primary function within the philosophical faculty remained limited to general education, not the training of future scholars.

Toelken was appointed ordinary professor for art history and mythology in 1823.²⁰ Available evidence suggests that his art history courses were primarily conceived as surveys providing a general overview. Although he sometimes included museum visits, illustrated his lectures with objects or reproductions, or held discussion meetings (*Hilfsstunden*), Toelken did not offer practica until the 1850s. Similarly, while interpretation (*Erklärung*) of the monuments was often part of his surveys, he did not offer this as a separate course until the 1850s, and then with only limited success. By the 1830s, after his permanent appointment at the museum, if not before, teaching seems to have become less important than his many other activities.

Appointed extraordinary professor for literature and aesthetics by minister Altenstein in 1832, Hotho never advanced to ordinary professorship, and his museum position seems to have become his primary focus.²¹ In his relatively limited teaching, art history was but a minor component. His course on aesthetics, which he offered almost every year, included a brief survey of the history of art. Beyond this, he intermittently offered a few poorly attended courses on painting and painters: German and Netherlandish Painting,²² Flemish painting,²³ Dürer,²⁴ and Rubens.²⁵ As Hotho had noted in his petition to Altenstein, his courses were intended for a general audience, not for the training of future specialists. In the recollection of a former student, the writer Karl Frenzel (1827-1914), Hotho was a minor light of the university, where the study of art (*Kunstwissenschaft*) still found little respect. Frenzel remembered the Flemish painting course, which did not move past awe-struck elucidation of the Ghent altarpiece, as a half-romantic, half-mystical evocation of the medieval world. Although the students had little grasp of the

²⁰ For Toelken's career see the detailed case history and tables in part one.

²¹ For Hotho's training see part one.

²² Summer 1837, 33 students; summer 1838, not taught due to an extended stay in the country; winter 1838/39, 3 registered. As shown by Ziemer, *Hotho*, 264-269, this course was based on a research trip of 1836. The lectures were published as *Geschichte der deutschen und niederländischen Malerei. Eine öffentliche Vorlesung an der Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*, 2 volumes, Berlin, Simion, 1842-43.

²³ Winter 1851/52, 8 students; winter 1854/55, 7.

²⁴ Winter 1852/53, 20 students; winter 1855/56, 9 registered, 20 present; winter 1857/58, 20.

²⁵ Winter 1853/54, Hotho was excused from teaching.

overall goal of the course, it succeeded in inspiring a deep, life-long enthusiasm for the history of painting.²⁶

Like Hotho, Waagen was appointed to an unsalaried extraordinary professorship for modern art history (*moderne Kunstgeschichte*) following a petition submitted directly to the ministry in 1843. Although not trained in Berlin like the others, Waagen followed a similar path in his education. In Wroclaw (Breslau, 1812-1815) and Heidelberg (1818-19) he studied philosophy, philology, history, and natural history. His doctoral exams in Heidelberg covered fossils and minerals, passages from Pausanias, and the place of Phidias's Minerva in the history of ancient art. A dissertation on a passage from Pausanias was promised but never submitted. Like his Berlin colleagues, Waagen gained his knowledge of art primarily from his own study and travel, aided by family and personal connections. These early trips laid the foundation for his many later publications on art collections in Europe. His first major publication, *Ueber Hubert und Johann van Eyck* (Berlin and Wroclaw, 1822), established him as a leading expert on painting, and in summer 1823 he was called to assist in the establishment and organization of the royal museum. This led to his appointment as director of the painting gallery in 1831.²⁷

From both Waagen's petition and Eichhorn's report to the king, it is clear that Waagen's university appointment served Waagen as much, if not more, than it served the university. Both cited Waagen's need for additional income to support his professional and family life and for recognition at home of the scholarly accomplishments that had brought him both honor and acclaim abroad. As director of the painting gallery, Waagen received the lowest salary among the directors at the royal museum (for more work, as he saw it), and he did not have the outside positions that brought them extra income (like Toelken's at the Akademie der Künste). Since there was no open position for art history in the philosophical faculty, the ministry needed the king's permission to appoint Waagen even without a salary. In his report, Eichhorn explained that the position alone brought the recognition that Waagen sought and that lecture fees would provide income.²⁸ Informing Waagen of the appointment on 21 May, Eichhorn explicitly noted that it had been made even though there were already too many professors for art history

²⁶ Karl Frenzel, *Die Berliner Märztage und andere Erinnerungen*, Leipzig, 1912, 41, 50-52; also cited in Ziemer, *Hotho*, 296. Frenzel mentions but does not discuss courses with Guhl (53). Hotho's Flemish lectures were also published: *Die Malerschule Hubert's van Eyck nebst deutschen Vorgängern und Zeitgenossen. Eine öffentliche Vorlesung*, 2 volumes, Berlin, Veit, 1855-58.

²⁷ For Waagen's education see *ADB* 40 (1896), 410, and Irene Geismeyer, 'Gustav Friedrich Waagen – Museumsdirektor in der Preussischen Hauptstadt', *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen* 37 (1995), 8-9; Geismeyer also provides a concise overview of his museum career; for his museum appointment Vogtherr, *Königliches Museum*, 215. The primary study of Waagen's early work remains Gabriele Bickendorf, *Der Beginn der Kunstgeschichtsschreibung unter dem Paradigma 'Geschichte'. Gustav Friedrich Waagens Frühschrift 'Ueber Hubert und Johann van Eyck'*, Worms, Werner, 1985.

²⁸ Along with Eichhorn's letter of 17 April 1844, the undated petition is published in Stock, 'Zwei Gesuche Waagens', 114-115, from the original in the Sammlung Darmstaedter.

(namely Toelken, Hotho, Gerhard, Panofka) and that there was no money in the budget for a salary.²⁹

As self-serving as his petition may have been, Waagen did cite the need for lectures at the university to promote more scholarly understanding of the art collections of the royal museums. He presented himself as qualified to deliver such lectures successfully, citing his work at the museum since 1823, which included leading frequent tours through all its sections, not just his own painting gallery. As a medium (*Vermittler*) between the art treasures and the educated public, he had come to know those treasures well and had gained much practice in presenting them to the most varied audiences. From the study of many art works on his extensive travels, he had gained the general overview that allowed him to survey ancient and medieval art in the great developmental sequence that Winckelmann had begun for the former. His many notes, made before the monuments themselves (and mostly not yet published), would allow him to enliven his surveys with discussion of specific instances. He proposed the following courses:

1. History of art among the oriental peoples, the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans (not archaeology in the narrow sense of the word)
2. History of architecture, sculpture, and painting in the middle ages
3. General encyclopedia of art history
4. On the greatest artists from the time of Raphael
5. Periegesis of Germany, Holland, Belgium, Paris, England, and Italy³⁰

In keeping with his appointment for 'modern art history', Waagen reconfigured this plan somewhat, dropping the course on ancient art and adding one on painting. The 'periegesis', a form of topographical description based on the Greek literary genre exemplified by Pausanias, would have allowed him to draw directly on his publications and travel notes. By the 1840s, however, this form was becoming outdated.

Waagen began in winter 1844 with two courses: one a survey of the history of the visual arts in Europe since the French Revolution, the other a history of painting from the fifth to the eighteenth century.³¹ In summer 1845 he again offered two courses: an encyclopedic survey of the history of the visual arts from their beginnings to the French Revolution and another on the monuments of medieval art, primarily in Italy. With winter 1846/47 he settled into an irregular rotation of the two surveys. He offered the first (beginnings to 1789) as a private course intermittently until summer 1852, rarely attracting enough students. He offered the second (since the French Revolution), usually as a public course, almost every semester until summer 1857, but he usually only taught it in the winter and rarely for more than twenty students. In the summer semester he was almost always absent on a research trip. He offered a private course (*privatissime*) on the great

²⁹ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. 4, Nr. 47, Bd. 1, f. 78 (draft by Schulze).

³⁰ Cited from Stock, 'Zwei Gesuche', 114.

³¹ Waagen's offerings have been reconstructed here from the published lists and the ministerial tables.

Renaissance painters (Leonardo, Raphael, Michelangelo, Correggio, Titian) intermittently from summer 1848 to winter 1851, but it was never taught owing to a complete lack of students or his frequent trips. In winter 1849 he introduced a course in general art history (*allgemeine Kunstgeschichte*), always private and with illustrations and tours in the different sections of the museum. He taught this almost every winter until 1867, usually with fewer than twenty students. Every summer from 1856 to 1867 he offered a general history of painting (always private), also with illustrations and tours of the painting gallery. Given his frequent trips, the course was only taught once, in summer 1858.

Waagen did not achieve the success as a professor that he anticipated. Attracting few students and traveling frequently, he earned little from course fees. In August 1847 he submitted a petition for a salary supplement of 500 *Taler*, and his financial need continued for many years.³² According to the account of his younger contemporary Alfred Woltmann, Waagen's surveys were indeed introductory in nature and directed toward students not embarking on the scholarly study of art and. As Woltmann noted, Waagen's 'principal gift did not actually lie in teaching. He held forth in a plain narrative oriented toward the individual objects, without seeking to give a rigorous introduction to the methods of his scholarship.'³³

The other two extraordinary professors that Eichhorn listed for archaeology and art history, Gerhard and Panofka, had been appointed in 1843 by the ministry without consultation of the faculty. Gerhard advanced to an ordinary professorship the next year, while Panofka never rose above his initial appointment.³⁴ Both had been teaching at the university since the mid-1830s as members of the Akademie der Wissenschaften, to which they had been appointed upon returning from extended sojourns in Italy.³⁵ Both also held appointments at the royal museum, Gerhard as 'archaeologist' (a position focused on research and acquisitions) and Panofka as an assistant. Both came to their study of art through philology, and both undertook most of that study on their own.³⁶

³² Waagen to Prince William of Prussia, 30 August 1847, reprinted in Stock, 'Zwei Gesuche', 117-119, along with the discussion between the ministry and the king and his brother about the matter. Waagen received only 300 *Taler*.

³³ Alfred Woltmann, 'Gustav Friedrich Waagen. Eine biographische Skizze', in Gustav Friedrich Waagen, *Kleine Schriften*, Stuttgart, Ebner & Seubert, 1875, 26: Für den Lehrberuf war er eigentlich nicht vorzugsweise begabt. Er verfuhr schlicht erzählend und orientirte über die einzelnen Gegenstände, ohne daß er sich eine strengere Einführung in die Methode seiner Wissenschaft zum Ziele setzte. For a more positive appraisal see Bredekamp and Labuda, 'Kunstgeschichte', 40-41; they cite lecture notes showing that in winter 1862/63 'general art history' covered Egypt through the Renaissance and combined classroom lectures with visits to the museum.

³⁴ Lenz, *Geschichte*, 2.2 (1918): 140-141.

³⁵ As a member of the academy of sciences Gerhard had the right to lecture without obtaining a *venia legendi*. In Panofka's case this superseded his prior appointment as *Privatdozent* (see part one).

³⁶ For Panofka's training and *Habilitation* see part one. For Gerhard's work at the museum see Vogtherr, *Königliches Museum*, 217, and Ursula Kästner, 'Eduard Gerhard und die Berliner Vasensammlung', in *Dem Archäologen Eduard Gerhard 1795-1867 zum seinem 200. Geburtstag*, Henning Wrede, ed., Berlin, Arenhövel, 1997, 87-100.

After initial, and unsatisfying, study in Wroclaw, Gerhard moved to Berlin in 1814, where he attended the lectures of Boeckh and Wolf. According to the biography by Otto Jahn (1813-1869) Gerhard treasured Wolf's *Encyclopädie der Alterthumswissenschaft* as 'worth more than gold' for introducing the true spirit of scholarship, in general and in the details. Gerhard attended Boeckh's philological seminar and worked with him independently, much as Kugler would later work with von der Hagen. In July 1815 Gerhard received the first doctoral degree granted by the Friedrich-Wilhelms University in an unproblematic but irregular process prior to the adoption of even preliminary statutes.³⁷ During his exams and after, he continued his studies, attending lectures (Wolf and Schleiermacher) and turning his attention primarily to art history through Winckelmann, Fiorillo, and Hirt. He was inspired and guided in this by Toelken, whose lectures on Hesiod he attended (see part one, Table 3). As the first to sign up for Toelken's history of ancient art (although it was not taught due to the war), Gerhard received his mentor's recently completed book on bas-relief as a gift. Toelken continued to have an inspiring effect on Gerhard, as seen in (now lost) correspondence; the friendship did not resume in later years, even though they were colleagues at the museum and university.³⁸ Gerhard then embarked on an extended period of travel, primarily in Italy, where he continued his study of art and where he also established a professional and personal friendship with Panofka. Through many publications and his founding and administration of the Istituto di Corrispondenza Archaeologica in Rome, Gerhard established the reputation that earned him his several positions after returning to Berlin in 1833. Panofka returned in 1836.³⁹

In their teaching, both Gerhard and Panofka appear to have followed a rotation of courses directed toward both general education and the training of future scholars, certainly more so than Toelken, Hotho, or Waagen. From 1835 until 1857 (when vision problems caused him to reduce his activities), Gerhard offered an introduction to archaeology nearly every year. Initially called 'Archaeological encyclopedia' (*Archaeologische Encyclopädie*), after 1838 its title went through several variations on 'archaeology of art', all of which made clear, as in the case of Toelken's course, that the focus was antiquity. His other principal offering was 'Archaeological exercises' (*Archaeologische Übungen*), which he taught nearly every year, sometimes every semester, from summer 1838 to his death in 1866. His other regular offerings included two separate courses on mythology and mythology in art

³⁷ Otto Jahn, *Eduard Gerhard. Ein Lebensabriß*, Berlin, Reimer, 1868, 11-21. Jahn had access to Gerhard's diaries and correspondence. For the various aspects of Gerhard's career see the essays collected in Wrede, *Dem Archäologen*, and Stürmer, 'Eduard Gerhard'.

³⁸ Jahn, *Gerhard*, 22; Jahn refers to the *herzliche Theilnahme* in Toelken's letters, and he notes that later Gerhard could not forgive Toelken's neglect of his archaeological studies in favor of other activities.

³⁹ Gerhard's time in Italy is discussed at length by Jahn, *Gerhard*.

(*Kunstmythologie*), as well as irregular but frequent courses on monuments of ancient art, sometimes focused on specific collections at the museum.⁴⁰

Jahn conjectured that it must have been difficult for Gerhard, immersed in his highly specialized research, to assume a perspective suited to inspiring and instructing his unprepared students. In his lectures, Gerhard preferred to read out paragraphs from Karl Otfried Müller's *Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst* (first edition 1830) and simply add further details, a process requiring more knowledge and judgment than the students possessed. Gerhard's exercises (*Übungen*), held in his home, functioned to introduce students to the corpus of monuments and their interpretation. The class would go through a major print work, coming to discussion through description and attempts at elucidation of individual works.⁴¹ This division between lecture and exercises corresponds roughly to the ideal course of archaeological instruction sketched by Gerhard in his several programmatic texts, most explicitly in the latest. Speaking to a general audience at the fiftieth jubilee of the university in 1860, he asserted that, like any historically based study, archaeology required both learning and exercise (*Lehre und Übung*); it must be carried out through both systematic knowledge and critical and hermeneutic practice, methods made available by its intimate connection to philology.⁴² The lectures he outlined for the imparting of systematic knowledge correlate roughly with his own offerings. In exercises (*Übungen*) students came to know the monuments of ancient art through paired methods proven by centuries of use in philology: working from the specific monument, visual or textual, to general conclusions or, vice versa, employing general knowledge in the elucidation of the individual object. Gerhard cautioned, however, that the deceptive ease of archaeological exercises allowed students to fall into dilettantism, one defect of which was the superficial application of knowledge to the object at hand. While the need to read a text carefully was taken as a given, the parallel need for rigor in the examination of art works was too easily forgotten. Such rigor required visual acuity to be learned through careful description of the art work and comparison with the descriptions written by past masters in the field, as well as the study of monuments in museums and reliable reproduction.⁴³ Gerhard's abiding concern with methodological rigor and the relevance of physical monuments (including but not limited to works of art) to philology informed his preference for the 'archaeologist'

⁴⁰ This summary overview of Gerhard's courses has been assembled from the published course lists and the ministerial tables. The most extensive discussion of Gerhard's teaching is Ahrens, 'Gerhards Lehre'.

⁴¹ Jahn, *Gerhard*, 96-97.

⁴² Eduard Gerhard, *Über Archäologische Sammlungen und Studien. Zur Jubelfeier der Universität Berlin*, Berlin, Reimer, 1860, 23.

⁴³ Gerhard, *Über Archäologische Sammlungen*, 27-29. See Detlef Rößler, 'Eduard Gerhards "Monumentale Philologie"', in Wrede, *Dem Archäologen*, 55-61, for a survey of Gerhard's largely consistent views, across several programmatic texts from 1833, on the complex relation between philology and archaeology and archaeology and art history.

Friederichs over the 'art historian' Guhl in 1858, as revealed in the documents presented below.⁴⁴

Panofka's courses were similar, including an 'introduction to archaeology' offered irregularly from winter 1839/40 to summer 1858. From summer 1840 his other principal offering was a course on the interpretation (*Erklärung*) of ancient monuments (with varying titles and frequently a focus on the royal museum) that he usually taught at least once a year until his death. This seems to have replaced his archaeological exercises for philologists, which he only taught from winter 1836 to winter 1844. He also offered courses on mythology in relation to monuments of art as well as others that promised elucidation of ancient texts through art or vice versa.⁴⁵

To those familiar with the teaching of archaeology and art history in Berlin, one name might seem conspicuously absent from this list: Ernst Curtius (1814-1896). After studying with Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker in Bonn and Karl Otfried Müller in Göttingen and attending lectures in Berlin, he had passed the *Habilitation* at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University in June 1843 for Greek philology, archaeology, and ancient geography. He was admitted to the exam despite debate among the faculty as to whether they could approve yet another *Privatdozent* in philology, a discipline already overfilled.⁴⁶ In October 1844 he was appointed extraordinary professor; his close connection with the royal household was instrumental in overriding the cap on new professorships in the philosophical faculty.⁴⁷ Between winter 1843 and winter 1855/56, after which he left Berlin for a position in Göttingen, his courses were focused on ancient Greek literature, history, and geography. In summer 1844 he offered 'History of Greek and Roman art' (summer 1844), which was reduced to 'Introduction to the history of Greek art' (summer 1846, winter 1847) or 'History of the visual arts in Greece' (winter 1850).

Although his initial hope had been to fill a gap in the offerings of the university, Curtius was soon disappointed that the course did not attract many students.⁴⁸ Writing to his parents on 13 July 1843, he recounted how he had found encouragement for his plan to devote himself more fully to ancient art in conversations with minister Eichhorn and Vortragender Rat Johannes Schulze. Both had noted that the university needed new blood in philology and archaeology, that

⁴⁴ As demonstrated by A. A. Donohue, *Greek Sculpture and the Problem of Description*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005, 3-14, this concern was widely shared and remains of central importance not just in the respective fields of philology, archaeology, and art history, but also in the still contested relationships among them. The well documented case of Guhl provides new insight into the history of these relationships.

⁴⁵ This summary overview of Panofka's courses has been assembled from the published course lists and ministerial tables.

⁴⁶ HUBUA, PhilFak 1203, f. 325-332. In his application of 2 April 1843 (f. 325), Curtius sought permission to lecture *de litteris graecis, de historia artium antiquarum, de geographica antiqua*.

⁴⁷ GStAPK I. HA Rep 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 1, f. 118-127.

⁴⁸ Henning Wrede, 'Wissenschaftsgeschichtlicher Kommentar', in *Ernst Curtius' Vorlesung 'Griechische Kunstgeschichte'*. *Nach der Mitschrift Wilhelm Gurlitts im Winter 1864/65*, Sepp-Gustav Gröschel and Henning Wrede, eds., Berlin, De Gruyter, 2010, 88-91, citing Curtius's letters to his parents and brother.

the city's art treasures were not being used to the university's proper benefit, and that they would like to see art history lectures filled again.⁴⁹ Writing again on 19 April 1844 Curtius observed that although there were three instructors in place for *Kunstarchaeologie*, none succeeded in teaching a proper course (*ordentliches Kollegium*). Thus, despite the poor prospects for advancement, a young man might find the opportunity to distinguish himself with a brilliant course that would thus become a mainstay of the university (*Hauptkollegium der Universität*).⁵⁰ The enrollment in summer 1844 was disappointing.⁵¹ Writing in late 1850 to his brother Georg (1820-1885), Ernst noted that he was lecturing in his lodgings for a small but enthusiastic class (5, according to the ministerial tables), and he consoled himself with Trendelenburg's observation that there was simply no interest in Greek art among the students, at least not enough that they would spend their money for it.⁵² Curtius did not offer the course again in Berlin until after he returned in winter 1868.

Aside from Curtius, the only instructor offering courses that might be seen as overlapping with Guhl's offerings on ancient architecture (see [table 2](#)) was Karl Bötticher (1806-1889). After training as an architect, partly as an autodidact and partly at the Bauakademie in Berlin, he obtained teaching positions at the Gewerbeschule, the Akademie der Künste, and finally the Bauakademie. He earned a doctoral degree in Greifswald in 1853, passed the *Habilitation* in Berlin in 1854, and assumed a position at the museum in 1855.⁵³ Until 1862 he offered an irregular rotation of university courses on four topics (with slightly varying titles): 'On the temples of the ancient peoples, considered architectonically and archaeologically'⁵⁴, 'On the private temples, dwellings and graves of the ancients'⁵⁵, 'On the Athenian Acropolis and its monuments'⁵⁶, and 'History of architecture in the ancient world'.⁵⁷ Bötticher also published a number of significant texts on art and architecture, and his *Tektonik der Hellenen* (Potsdam, 1844-52) continued to play a key role in the history and theory of architecture into the twentieth century.⁵⁸ Thus, other than the five men listed in the documents, Guhl had no real internal competition in his

⁴⁹ Friedrich Curtius, ed., *Ernst Curtius. Ein Lebensbild in Briefen*, Berlin, Springer, 1903, 306.

⁵⁰ Curtius, *Lebensbild*, 321.

⁵¹ Observation to his parents, 9 June 1844, in Curtius, *Lebensbild*, 323. Given the gap in the ministerial tables, exact figures are not available for the first three times he taught the course.

⁵² Curtius, *Lebensbild*, 432.

⁵³ *ABD* 47 (1903), 144-153.

⁵⁴ Winter 1854/55, 24 students; summer 1856, 24; winter 1856/57, 48; winter 1857/58, 25; summer 1859, 36; winter 1861/2, away on a trip.

⁵⁵ Summer 1855, 20 students; summer 1857, 25; summer 1858, ill; winter 1859/60, excused to plan for a trip; summer 1861, 6.

⁵⁶ Summer 1855, 36; winter 1860, 4; winter 1862, not taught.

⁵⁷ Winter 1858/59, ill; winter 1860/61, 20.

⁵⁸ On the text see Hartmut Mayer, 'Die Tektonik der Hellenen': Kontext und Wirkung der Architekturtheorie von Karl Bötticher, Stuttgart, Axel Menges, 2004. For its continuing importance see Mitchell Schwartz, 'Ontology and Representation in Karl Bötticher's Theory of Tectonics', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 52:3, 1993, 267-280, and Donohue, *Description*, 70-71.

teaching or in his hopes for a professorship. Kugler had left the university in winter 1842/43 with his move to the ministry. Schöll had gone to Halle in late 1842.

Direct competition came instead from the outside, in the form of Karl Friederichs (1831-1871), who was trained in philology in Göttingen and Erlangen, where he received his doctoral degree in 1853. As so often the case, he had come to the study of art largely on his own, in the Munich collections and later attending Gerhard's courses in Berlin. In 1855 he passed the *Habilitation* in Erlangen for archaeology. In 1858 he accepted a position at the museum in Berlin, replacing Panofka and anticipating an appointment at the university. That fall both he and Guhl applied to replace Panofka, prompting reports from the faculty to the ministry regarding their respective qualifications.⁵⁹

The case history for Guhl, like those for Toelken and Kugler, shows that the relationship between the two elements in the pairing 'archaeology and art history' is extremely complex and still in need of much elucidation, both in this limited context and in the broader history of the two disciplines. There was no fixed or generally agreed upon definition of what the two had in common, of what distinguished one from the other, or of how each related to neighboring fields. A further difficulty arises in the present discussion from the nature of the documents themselves. They served administrative, rather than scholarly purposes, and they were but one element in ongoing exchanges within the faculty and between the faculty and the ministry. As such, they could be very concise, assuming knowledge of past conversations and broader forms of intellectual exchange, such as occurred in publications, societies (*Vereine*), and at scholarly meetings. Additionally, course titles were even more concise and subject to often random variation, and there is but sparse documentation of what exactly was actually taught.

Still, from the training, appointment, and teaching of the five men holding positions in 'archaeology and art history', there emerges very clearly a shared focus on the historical study of art. The core definition of 'art' as architecture, painting, and sculpture seems to have been well established (with disagreements around the edges for things like coins, utilitarian objects, and costume). There was a fairly clear temporal divide between antiquity and subsequent periods. These later periods remained somewhat undifferentiated and were designated by shifting terminology. Modern could refer to everything since antiquity, or it could begin in the fifteenth century. Similarly, the comparative form *neuere Kunst* (newer art) could mean all post-antique art or more recent, 'modern' art. *Kunstgeschichte* (art history) extended across the temporal divide, with differences arising, at least among the faculty, around what constituted proper historical study and whether a discipline was best defined by the study of a single period (archaeology) or by a single object across periods (art history). That the distinction between archaeology and art history was largely one of method is signaled by Waagen's terse remark that his proposed history of ancient art was 'not archaeology in the narrow sense of the word'.

⁵⁹ *ADB* 7 (1878), 391-392. The documents examined below provide further detail on Friederichs's qualifications.

The nature of the distinction emerges more clearly in the disagreement in 1858 (presented in full below) between Gerhard and Toelken regarding the relative qualifications of Guhl and Friederichs as replacements for Panofka. The key issues were Guhl's expansion beyond his philological training to work on post-antique art and the effect of his appointment on the curriculum. Gerhard saw the study of post-antique periods as leading to an over-emphasis on the aesthetic nature of art (which he left undefined) to the detriment of its rigorous philological study. Appointing Guhl would relegate ancient art to general education because he could not replace Panofka's courses with their consistent, reciprocal focus on the visual and textual monuments of antiquity. Friederichs could, given his more solid philological credentials and position at the museum. For Toelken, appointing Friederichs over Guhl would be detrimental to archaeology's role in general education, reinforcing its neglect of the aesthetic value of ancient monuments and its preference for lesser types of objects. Such an appointment would also contribute to a general disdain for antiquity extending now even to artists. The dispute also points to divergent conceptions of how the university functioned as a 'scholarly support' to the museum. Gerhard emphasized the training of young scholars, while Toelken seems to have held the view, also expressed by Waagen, that university teaching served to promote a scholarly understanding of the collections among a wider educated public.

Indeed, Guhl's advancement appears to have been hampered by the belief among his colleagues that the study of art, outside the chronological and methodological boundaries of archaeology as an element of philology (albeit a sometimes contested one), did not warrant an additional appointment in its own right. Writing for the faculty in June 1858, Trendelenburg remarked that while general art history 'could do without' (softened in the draft from 'did not need') specialized scholarly treatment, it nevertheless still served the university in preparing students to appreciate and learn from the many works of art available to them in Berlin. In arguing for Guhl's appointment, the faculty always stressed his qualifications as a scholar of ancient art and his training in philology; they never argued that he represented a separate field that required, and was worthy of, its own professorship. It was left to the ministry to make that argument, and then not until Panofka had died.

It must also be remembered, however, that decisions about appointments were not made on intellectual and pedagogical grounds alone. While the general quality of Guhl's scholarship and teaching was never in doubt, he lacked the reputation and, perhaps more importantly, the personal and professional connections, like those enjoyed by Curtius, that would have superseded the administrative, budgetary, and intellectual impediments to his advancement. Conversely, the faculty stressed Guhl's long service to the university, and all but Gerhard felt that his years of sacrifice as a poorly paid *Privatdozent* outweighed Friederichs's in turning down a well-paid position in Erlangen for uncertain prospects and a lower salary in Berlin.

The following case history for Ernst Guhl is offered as a contribution to the ongoing investigation of art history's emergence within the complex, and often contentious, intellectual and academic ferment of early to mid-nineteenth-century Germany. It demonstrates the need to look broadly at the historical study of art in its various manifestations without hoping to find, or justify, current disciplinary definitions. Guhl's experience, as a student and a long-suffering *Privatdozent*, shows that he belongs to the history of both, as do his teachers and colleagues.

Ernst Guhl: a career in Berlin

Ernst Guhl was born in Berlin on 20 July 1819. His father, the bookbinder Adam Wilhelm Guhl, died young, leaving Ernst with a life-long devotion to his mother Carolina (née Leon). He studied at the Französisches Gymnasium (Collège français) for seven years. Notable among the Gymnasium teachers listed in the curriculum vitae attached to his dissertation are the philosopher Karl Ludwig Michelet (1801-1893), a prominent student and follower of Hegel; and the linguist Theodor Heinsius (1770-1849).⁶⁰ Guhl matriculated as a student of philology at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University on 13 October 1838.⁶¹ Documentation of his studies is sparse, as his matriculation was simply dissolved (*gelöscht*) on 1 December 1842, in the midst of his *Promotion* and with no leaving certificate issued.⁶² In his curriculum vitae he claimed to have studied 'for the triennium and a semester' (*per triennium et semestre*), or seven semesters from winter 1838/39 to winter 1841/42. In his application for the *Habilitation* he claimed to have studied for a quadrennium, or four years.⁶³ He last appears in the published list of students for summer 1842.⁶⁴

In the curriculum vitae Guhl described himself as having been 'devoted to philology and chiefly engaged in the specific study of archaeology' (*philologiae deditus et archaeologiam potissimum singulari studio amplexus*), a characterization confirmed by the list of professors whose lectures he attended. For Greek and Latin literature: Boeckh, Lachmann, Karl Gottlob Zumpt (1792-1849), Karl Heyse (1797-1855), Agathon Benary (1807-1860), and Carl Eduard Geppert (1811-1881). For archaeology and mythology: Gerhard, Panofka, and Schöll. For philosophy: Georg Andreas Gabler (1786-1853), Hegel's truest student and successor in Berlin; Steffens; Karl Werder (1806-1893), also a Hegelian; and Trendelenburg, a well known critic of Hegel. For history and geography: Ranke and Ferdinand Heinrich Mueller (1805-

⁶⁰ Ernst Guhl, *Ephesiaca*, Berlin, A. G. Schad, 1843, 33-34. This curriculum vitae is the only source for Guhl's early life.

⁶¹ Bahl and Ribbe, *Martrikel*, 1:790, no. 868.

⁶² Bahl and Ribbe, *Martrikel*, 1:790, no. 868; the staff at the HUBUA confirmed the absence of a leaving certificate.

⁶³ SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1848 (5) Ernst Guhl. As this folder lacks foliation, I cite the documents by date and assign folio numbers for each document longer than a single page. The reference here is to the letter of 16 June 1847, f. 1r. The copy is in HUBUA, PhilFak 1204, f. 215.

⁶⁴ *Amtliches Verzeichniß des Personals und der Studirenden auf der Königl. Friederich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin auf das Sommerhalbjahr von Ostern bis Michaelis 1842*, Berlin, Nauck, 1842, 11.

1886)⁶⁵. Guhl claimed to have also participated in exercises led by Boeckh and Lachmann in the philological seminar, those instituted by Gabler in philosophy, and, of course, the archaeological exercises of Gerhard and Panofka. In a final expression of gratitude to his professors, Guhl singled out Schöll, 'who is attached to me with the highest compassion and friendship' (*qui summa humanitate atque amicitia me amplexus est*).

This relationship dates from at least the beginning of Guhl's study, in winter 1838/39, when he appears in the list of students attending Schöll's course on *Kunstmythologie* at the art academy, with the notation that Guhl might also be a student of the academy.⁶⁶ Guhl is likely to have also attended Schöll's course on Greek art in summer 1841 at the University, the only one besides mythology that he offered during Guhl's student years. The published course lists and ministerial tables also show that archaeological exercises (*Übungen*) were offered by Gerhard in winter 1838/39 and winter 1841/42, and by Panofka, specifically for philologists, in winter 1840/41 and winter 1841/42. Panofka also offered exercises in connection with his introduction to archaeology in winter 1839/40 and summer 1841. Among Gerhard's lectures, Guhl could have attended 'Archaeological Encyclopedia' (*Archaeologische Enzyklopädie*; winter 1838/39, winter 1839/40), 'Science of Monuments' (*Denkmälerkunde*; winter 1838/39) and 'Greek and Roman Mythology' (*Griechische und Römische Mythologie*; summer 1840). Panofka's lectures during these years also included *Mythologie* (winter 1838/39, winter 1839/40 winter 1840/41), and courses on vase painting (summer 1839) or monuments (summer 1840, summer 1841) in the royal museums.

On 11 August 1842 Guhl initiated the *Promotion* process in the philosophical faculty, stating that he had been occupied primarily with archaeology and philology (*archaeologiae potissimum et philologiae operam dedo*). He submitted a slim Latin dissertation titled *Ephesiaca*. Of the four chapters outlined in the introduction, only the first, giving a description of Ephesus, and part of the second, giving a very brief overview of its history only to 546 BCE, were included. To follow later were the rest of chapter two; a third chapter on the cult of Diana (*Artemis*); and a fourth, barely sketched out, on the Temple of Diana. On 12 August the current dean, Ranke, circulated Guhl's materials to the faculty, asking Boeckh and Bekker to comment first. Boeckh found all parts of the dissertation to be diligent and based on appropriate knowledge; although not distinguished (*ausgezeichnet*), it was a significant enough contribution to merit admission to the doctoral exam.⁶⁷ Bekker simply assented, as did the other professors. The faculty gathered for the exam on 27 October. Boeckh began in Latin with many questions on the history of Greek

⁶⁵ Mueller is a minor figure, identified by Lenz, *Geschichte*, 2.1 (1910): 506, as a Hegelian whose main publication was *Die deutsche Stämme und ihre Fürsten*, 5 volumes, 1840-52.

⁶⁶ AdK 0665, f. 25, 12 June 1839. Only university students are listed, as academy students did not present registration slips. Guhl's possible matriculation at the academy has not been independently verified.

⁶⁷ HUBUA, PhilFak 221, f. 1-2.

poetry, in particular on the lyric and the elegy; the candidate's answers were wholly satisfactory. Next Toelken engaged the candidate in a discussion of the development of Greek architecture, specifically on the particular nature of the Doric order and the attempts, seen in the monuments, to give it more decoration and variety, and on the differences between the Doric and Ionic orders. He also asked about the views (*Ansichten*) of Hermogenes, a Hellenistic architect known, via Vitruvius, for advancing a system of architectural proportion. Toelken found that the candidate demonstrated sufficient knowledge in these areas of art history. Gabler posed questions regarding the origins and early phases of philosophy, the divisions of its history, and the development of Greek philosophy down to the Socratic period. Time ran out, but the candidate's responses demonstrated that he was well acquainted with this field and could have handled further questions. Finally, Ranke asked about the time of Charlemagne and Ludwig the Pious, receiving only mediocre answers. As recorded by the dean, now Trendelenburg, the assembled faculty voted unanimously for the candidate's *Promotion*; the majority voted to designate his exam *multa cum laude* and his dissertation *docte et diligenter composita*.⁶⁸ On 14 January 1843 Guhl defended the six theses printed with his dissertation, which advanced statements on specific points of textual emendation, Ephesian history, and the history of Roman law.⁶⁹

During the next four years Guhl undertook the publication and travel needed to prepare for the *Habilitation*. Already in 1843 a much expanded version of his dissertation appeared with a dedication to Boeckh, Gerhard, and Toelken. The second chapter now carried the history of the city through the Byzantine period and added a section on the government of the Ephesian republic. The third chapter (*De Rebus Sacris Ephesiorum*) covered the cults of Diana and other deities as previously outlined, while the fourth expanded to cover Ephesian authors (*Scriptores Ephesii*) and arts (*De Artibus Ephesiorum*). In 1844 and 1845 Guhl published five reviews in the *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*.⁷⁰ Four were of books in the field of architectural history: a general survey by C. A. Rosenthal,⁷¹ a study of the tectonics of Greek architecture by Karl Bötticher,⁷² a polemic on early Christian and medieval

⁶⁸ HUBUA, PhilFak 221, f. 4.

⁶⁹ Guhl, *Ephesiaca*, 34.

⁷⁰ By this time the journal's editorial staff was no longer dominated by followers of Hegel, and it published reviews representing a variety of viewpoints. For a concise history see Sybille Obenaus, 'Berliner Allgemeine Literaturzeitung oder Hegelblatt? Die 'Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik' im Spannungsfeld preußischer Universitäts- und Pressepolitik der Restauration und Vormärz', in Christoph Jamme, *Die 'Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik'. Hegel's Berliner Gegenakademie*, Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt, fromann-holzboog, 1994, 15-56.

⁷¹ *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik* 1844/1, no. 41-46 (March), cols. 321-364; C. A. Rosenthal, *Vollständige Uebersicht der Geschichte der Baukunst, von ihrem Ursprung an bis auf die neueste Zeit*, 3 volumes, Berlin, Reimer, 1841-43. The review bears the heading 'erster Artikel' but a second did not appear.

⁷² *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik* 1844/1, no. 101-104 (June), cols. 801-827; Karl Bötticher, *Tektonik der Hellenen, Erster Band: Einleitung und Dorika*, Potsdam, Ferd. Riegel, 1844.

church architecture by Johannes Kreuser (1795-1870),⁷³ and a documentary study of medieval German building corporations and techniques by the architect, historian, and preservationist Carl Heideloff (1795-1865).⁷⁴ The fifth review examined an art-theoretical tract by the philosopher Friedrich Maercker (1804-1889).⁷⁵ In a critical essay of 1845 Guhl assessed and rejected previous theories, which he categorized as symbolic, structural, and aesthetic, of the origin of the Ionic capital and advanced his own account of the Ionic order's development from the earlier Doric.⁷⁶ Like the earlier *Ephesiaca*, this essay was based almost entirely on textual sources, both ancient and modern, and graphic reproductions.

Guhl's first publication based on direct study of the monuments appears to have been a small article on the parish church and the crypt of the former Cistercian convent in Stadtilm, a small town near Weimar. Having completed the article after an 'unforgettable' visit to the city, Guhl revised it upon seeing a recent installment of Ludwig Puttrich's (1783-1856) corpus of medieval monuments in various Saxon lands.⁷⁷ He noticed that 'many painterly errors' (*manche malerische Unrichtigkeit*) in the accompanying illustration had led Puttrich to false conclusions contradicted by the monument itself. In footnotes to his detailed description Guhl corrected the errors in Puttrich's rendering and discussion; by re-interpreting inscriptions and citing documents he corrected Puttrich's erroneous dating, which he found to be inconsistent with the stylistic features of the church. The methodological approach and authorial tone both bear a striking resemblance to Kugler's publications on medieval architecture, suggesting that a mentor-student relationship was in place soon after Guhl completed his doctoral degree.⁷⁸

In 1846-47 Guhl spent fifteen months in Italy; the trip is mentioned in several documents, but there is no record of exactly where he went or how he met the cost of such a long journey.⁷⁹ By mid-June 1847 he was back in Berlin, where he submitted his application for the *Habilitation*. Since passing his doctoral exams with honor, Guhl wrote, he had continued to pursue the disciplines of his initial studies

⁷³ *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik* 1845/1, no. 5-9 (January), cols. 38-70; Johannes Kreuser, *Kölner Dombriefe oder Beiträge zur altchristlichen Kirchenbaukunst*, Berlin, Duncker und Humblot, 1844.

⁷⁴ *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik* 1845/2, no. 6-9 (July), cols. 41-70; Karl Heidelhoff, *Bauhütte des Mittelalters in Deutschland. Eine kurzgefasste geschichtliche Darstellung mit Urkunden und anderen Beilagen*, Nuremberg, J. A. Stein, 1844.

⁷⁵ *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik* 1845/2, no. 79-80 (October), cols. 631-40; F. A. Maercker, *Was heißt Kunst? Ein artistischer Vortrag*, Berlin, F. Dümmler, 1843.

⁷⁶ *Versuch über das Ionische Kapitäl. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Griechischen Architektur*, Berlin, G. Reimer, 1845, as an offprint from *Journal für die Baukunst* 21, 1845, 186-246.

⁷⁷ 'Die Pfarrkirche und die Krypta zu Stadt-Ilm', *Neue Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiete historisch-antiquarischer Forschungen* 7, No. 4 (1846), 63-77; Ludwig Puttrich, *Denkmale der Baukunst des Mittelalters in Sachsen*, 5 volumes, Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1836-1852, 1/1 (1836-43): *Denkmale der Baukunst des Mittelalters in den Fürstlich Schwarzburg'schen Landen* (1843), 31-34, plate 15 (mis-identified as the convent church).

⁷⁸ Among these is the article Kugler published in the previous issue of the same journal: 'Bemerkungen über die Kirche zu Paulinzelle', *Neue Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiete historisch-antiquarischer Forschungen* 6, No. 1 (1843), 19-25.

⁷⁹ ADB 10 (1879), 99.

(philology, archaeology, and mythology), and now embraced, with a kind of new ardor, disciplines pertaining to the history and theory of art, which he cultivated above all others and which his natural abilities, propensities, and inclinations directed him to follow. To prepare himself to teach in the philosophical faculty, he had not only continued his research but had also undertaken a major trip (without specifying where) to examine the monuments, so that he might better know the disciplines he had been studying and drink more deeply from their sources. Thus prepared, he now submitted his request for permission to teach 'the disciplines pertaining to the history and theory of ancient and modern art and also Greek and Roman mythology'.⁸⁰ To support his application he included his original dissertation and diploma, the expanded *Ephesiaca*, the essay on the Ionic capital, and the four architectural history reviews from the *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*. He also mentioned two items currently in press: a book on modern history painting and an installment of the *Kunstdenkmäler*.⁸¹ For his lectures he proposed to deliver a short history of Gothic architecture in Italy and to investigate representations of the Holy Family in different schools of painting.⁸²

Setting Guhl's materials in circulation, the dean, Lachmann, reminded his colleagues that Toelken and Gerhard had been appointed by the faculty to review the application and were thus to comment first.⁸³ Toelken began his extensive evaluation with the additional material in the *Ephesiaca*. In the historical chapter he faulted Guhl for omissions large (the lucrative trade on which Ephesus built its

⁸⁰ SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1848 (5) Ernst Guhl, 16 June 1847, f. 1r-v: Postquam inde ab anno hujus saeculi XXXVIII in alma literarum universitate Berolinensi per quadriennium philologiae, archaeologiae et mythologiae studiis diligenter incubui, examine philosophica magna cum laude absoluto, summis in philosophia honore side abtinui. Quibus honoribus in me collatis eodem diligentia et ea studia, quorum supra mentionum feci, persecutus sum et novo quodam ardore omnes eas disciplinas amplexus sum, quae ad artium historiam atque theoriam spectant, quasque ut prae caeteris colerem, peculiaris quaedam ingenii mei propensio atque dispositio jamdum me monuerunt.

In hisce igitur disciplinas quam et per quadrennium academicum et per totius temporis inde a promotione mea praeterlapsi spatium adsidae atque diligenter versatus essem, haud illicitum doxi, ut am Amplissimo philosophorum ordine has disciplinas in alma nostra literarum universitate Berolinensi profitendi veniam exposcerem. Neque tamen id ante facere opportunum natus, quam majore quodam itinere suscepto ipsisque artium monumentis visis atque examinatis, disciplinas illas, in quorum studio per tot iam annos occupatus fueram, penitus cognoscere et tamquam ex ipsis fondibus haurire potuerim, nunc, quam ex hoc itinere redux ad patriam et ad pristina desideria reversus sum, in alma literarum universitate Friderica Guilelma docendi facultatem ambire audeo, quam hisce literis rogo.

Ut amplissimus Philosophorum Ordo pro disciplinis, quae ad artium tam antiquarum tam recentiorum historiam atque theoriam pertinent nec non pro Graecorum atque Romanorum mythologia benigno mihi animo concedere velit. Copy in HUBUA, PhilFak 1204, f. 215.

⁸¹ *Die neuere geschichtliche Malerei und die Akademien*, Stuttgart, Ebner & Seubert, 1848. Kugler provided a forward and allowed the inclusion of his previously published lecture, 'Vorlesung über das historische Museum zu Versailles und die Darstellung historischer Ereignisse in der Malerei' (Berlin, 1846).

⁸² *Succincta architecturae gothicae apud Italos historiae expositio; Disquisitio de varia in variis pictorum scholis 'sanctae familiae' representationem*.

⁸³ SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1848 (5) Ernst Guhl, 16 June 1847, f. 1r, notation of 22.6.1847 at the upper left.

power) and small (names of the magistrates), as well as organizational weaknesses. He found the chapter on the cult of Diana the least satisfactory, despite reference to one of his own texts: discussion of the many breasted statue derived only from previous literature, and the priests and virgins devoted to the goddess were mentioned only in passing. He praised Guhl's antipathy toward anything having to do with the mystical or symbolic, since archaeologists tended to make such misuse of them, but this should not have prevented the author from pursuing this recurrent direction in religion, especially here, where the fantastic-mystical was an essential element. The list of epithets for the gods and heroes was, however, comprehensive and well documented. In the fourth chapter Toelken found the discussion of Ephesian letters insufficient, particularly in its neglect of the wider context of Ionian accomplishments in Asia Minor. He also faulted the failure to discuss the Ephesian school of painting, one of the most perfect of all the Greek schools, while noting the care and attention given to architecture, which he attributed to Guhl's plans to devote himself primarily to that field. Toelken found the essay on the Ionic capital to be thorough and to demonstrate a great knowledge of the architectural and art historical literature, although he rejected Guhl's new account of the capital's origins as unsupported by the early examples. Finally, he found all the reviews to have been written with knowledge and trenchancy (*Kenntniß und Schärfe*); those of Kreuser and Heideloff showed that Dr. Guhl had been penetrating (*eindringend*) in his study of medieval architecture.⁸⁴

Gerhard began by agreeing with Toelken's evaluation of the *Ephesiaca* as 'a not exhaustive but praiseworthy work' (*ein nicht erschöpfendes aber lobenswerthes Werk*) and stating that it demonstrated the candidate's competence in ancient history, geography, and mythology. He offered his own view of the essay on the Ionic capital, noting that it had probably been occasioned by Guhl's reading of Bötticher's study of Greek tectonics. Its results would stand or fall, Gerhard wrote, along with the peculiar direction (*mit der eigenthümlichen Richtung*) of this important and currently influential book. The candidate had attached himself to Bötticher's model in an independent and thoughtful manner (*auf selbständige und gedankenreiche Weise*), his reading in other works of architecture was complete and ordered, his presentation (*Darstellung*) mostly clear, and his knowledge of the monuments demonstrated as allowed by the modest scope of the essay. Thus, despite the limited extent of the submission, Gerhard raised no significant doubts about the candidate's qualification to teach the history and theory of ancient architecture (his emphasis), and he anticipated that further research in this field would continue to support the candidate's lectures. Regarding Guhl's qualifications in medieval and modern art history Gerhard expressed more serious, but not fatal, reservations. The faculty had been provided no basis for judgment, since reviews could no longer substitute for scholarly works and the two submitted by Guhl were unacceptable. However, the faculty would be justified in overlooking this significant lack of accomplishments,

⁸⁴ HUBUA, PhilFak 1204, f. 216-217.

since Guhl had just made a not at all short trip to Italy to study monuments of medieval architecture, and, further, because it was in and of itself desirable that modern art research, a field so given over to dilettantism (*ein dem Dilettantismus so preisgegebenes Gebiet, wie das der modernen Kunstforschung*), secure younger scholars pursuing solid scholarly formation (*eine gründliche wissenschaftliche Bildung*). Additionally, the books in press might also contribute to the faculty's evaluation. Under these circumstances Gerhard stressed the necessity of a thorough *Colloquium* (the discussion following the lecture to the faculty) and suggested that Dr. Waagen be brought in, since none among them was primarily concerned with the art of the middle ages. Despite all this, Gerhard voted for admission to the exam.⁸⁵

Aside from one dissenting vote, by the classical philologist Johannes Franz (1804-51), the full faculty assented to admission to the exam. Guhl delivered his German lecture on representations of the holy family before sixteen professors (not including Waagen) on 14 August. Toelken and Gerhard led the discussion, but what they said was not recorded by dean Lachmann, and the vote was unanimous in the candidate's favor. On 27 October Guhl delivered his public Latin lecture 'On the origin and nature of Gothic architecture among the Italians' (*Gothicae apud Italos architecturae origine et indole*).⁸⁶ The next day Lachmann informed the ministry of Guhl's successful *Habilitation* for art history and theory as well as Greek and Roman mythology (*für die Fächer der Kunst-Geschichte und Theorie sowie der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*).⁸⁷ In later documents Guhl stated that he had been a *Privatdozent* at the University 'since Michaelmas 1847', referring to the date of appointment. He began teaching the next semester, summer 1848, with a public course on the history of modern painting and a private course on ancient architecture.⁸⁸ Overviews of Guhl's teaching are provided in [Tables 1 and 2](#).⁸⁹

Just as Kugler had done right after his own *Habilitation* in 1833, Guhl quickly sought out an additional appointment at the Akademie der Künste. On 16 December 1848 he wrote to minister von Ladenberg asking to be considered for the position in art history and classical mythology that had recently become vacant with Kugler's resignation. When Kugler resigned from this position is not documented, but it must have followed quickly on his promotion to Geheimer Regierungs- und

⁸⁵ HUBUA, PhilFak 1204, f. 217r-v. Several words in Gerhard's text are illegible, owing to his tiny and difficult hand, or lost in the gutter of the tightly bound volume. The paraphrase given here captures the sense of his judgments, although his specific reasons for rejecting Guhl's reviews remain indecipherable.

⁸⁶ HUBUA, PhilFak 1204, f. 218-220.

⁸⁷ HUBUA, PhilFak 1204, f. 221 (draft); GStAPK I HA Rep. 76 Va Sekt. 2, Tit. 4, Nr. 51, Bd 1, f. 241.

⁸⁸ Guhl does not appear in the published course lists for winter 1847/48, for which there are no ministerial tables. The lists of courses associated with Guhl's applications for a professorship in 1851 and summer 1858 both begin in 1848 (see below).

⁸⁹ These have been assembled primarily from the tables submitted to the ministry each semester by the university (GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. VII, Nr. 18, Bd. 1-5) and the Akademie der Künste (GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 2). In the latter Guhl's courses are listed simply as *Kunstgeschichte* and *Geschichtskunde*. Supplemental information drawn from the teaching reports to the academy (in AdK 0665), when available, is given in parentheses.

Vortragender Rat on 7 December. Already on 14 December Geppert, extraordinary professor for classical philology at the University since 1846, had sought to take over Kugler's lectures on mythology; as primary qualification he noted that his work on ancient gods and heroes was often used as a text book (*Hilfsbuch*) in such courses.⁹⁰ In contrast, Guhl claimed that his prior scholarly pursuits qualified him to take over both aspects of the now-vacant position. He described the primary focus of his university studies as the history and theory of the fine arts (*Geschichte und Theorie der schönen Künste*), supplemented by a scholarly trip (*wissenschaftliche Reise*) to Italy and subsequent study. He acknowledged that although his *Habilitation* had been for history and theory of art as well as classical mythology, he had only taught courses in the first of these fields.⁹¹

On 19 December Kugler drafted letters, for the minister's signature, to the academy and to each applicant. While there was no ministerial objection to Geppert taking over Kugler's mythology lectures in the coming first (fiscal) quarter from New Year's to Easter (equivalent to the rest of the winter semester), the ultimate decision was left to the academy itself. At the end of this period the minister would be ready to decide about continuing the arrangement on an interim basis, but no final decision could be made regarding Kugler's replacement, since the ongoing reorganization of the arts administration (*Kunst-Angelegenheiten*) might produce changes in this position (on this see below). Geppert was sent a shorter version of the above. Guhl was told that the matter had already been given over to the academy to decide and that he should apply there directly.⁹² On 3 January 1849 the academy agreed to appoint the two instructors for the next quarter. Given his scholarly background Geppert was fully qualified for the mythology lectures, but it remained to be seen if he would succeed in conceiving and presenting the material in a manner suitable for artists. Guhl, who had been suggested by Kugler himself, was 'eminently qualified' (*ganz vorzüglich befähigt*).⁹³ On 22 May the academy requested payment to the two new instructors for the first and second quarters, noting that Geppert had held his lectures in a most satisfactory manner (*in sehr befriedigender Weise*), but not commenting on Guhl, who had presumably performed as expected.⁹⁴ In June 1849 both were confirmed in their interim appointments, with quarterly payments of 50 *Taler* to Geppert and 75 to Guhl.⁹⁵

⁹⁰ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 4, Bd. 10, f. 137. Carl Eduard Geppert, *Götter und Heroen der alten Welt*, Leipzig, Weigel, 1842.

⁹¹ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 4, Bd. 10, f. 135.

⁹² GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 4, Bd. 10, f. 137a, 136. Kugler had intended to place Burckhardt in this position at the academy, but that plan had definitively failed by February 1848. See Koschnick, *Franz Kugler*, 222-224.

⁹³ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 4, Bd. 10, f. 139. Kugler's draft of 19 December to the academy does not mention Guhl, and it is likely that he prepared a separate, probably personal, letter of introduction for Guhl.

⁹⁴ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 4, Bd. 10, f. 159.

⁹⁵ A ministerial decree to this effect of 4 June 1849 is not present in the academy files at the GStAPK. It is, however, cited in subsequent documents: 18 December 1849: GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 4, Bd. 10, f. 249 (academy's report of satisfactory performance and request for payment) and 29

A small glitch in these payments occasioned what may be the only surviving correspondence between Guhl and Kugler. On 11 January 1850 Guhl wrote beseechingly to Kugler at the ministry, seeking his assistance in resolving an embarrassing, and costly, misunderstanding with the cashier's office (General-Kasse). Guhl called upon the older man's many past expressions of friendship and the advice given in other situations. He noted that his academy lectures continued to be well and eagerly attended, as he had frequently reported to Kugler in the past.⁹⁶ With Kugler's prompt intervention the matter was quickly resolved.⁹⁷

The straightforward process of Guhl's interim appointment at the Akademie der Künste somewhat belies the unsettled state of the institution in these years. Plans for a thorough reorganization had been drawn up by Kugler in 1845, but were blocked in June 1846 by the resistance of the director, Schadow.⁹⁸ The need for reform was, however, widely recognized, and at the academy itself contentious, but largely inconclusive, debate began in 1848, prompted by the events of that year and encouraged by the new reform-minded minister, von Ladenberg. While a significant impediment to change was removed with the death of Schadow in January 1850, another appeared with the appointment of a new minister, the conservative Otto von Raumer.⁹⁹ Between these two events, on 11 May 1850, the academic senate asked Guhl to prepare a report on expanding the scholarly (*wissenschaftlich*) courses for artists; he presented this to a plenary meeting of the academicians on 20 May. On 28 November Guhl sent a finished draft of his report, dated 19 October, to the ministry.¹⁰⁰ The polite but dismissive response of 27 December apparently prompted Guhl to seek official support, and two days later the academy submitted a formal request to add a new course covering world history and the history of costume, pointing out that Guhl had written his report at the academy's behest and that he was qualified to teach the new course. In his response of 13 June 1851, the

May 1853: GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 1, f. 183 (Kugler's notation on Guhl's request discussed below).

⁹⁶ The cashiers accused Guhl of re-dating a receipt in an attempt to receive double payment. GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 4, Bd. 10, f. 261: Da ich nun augenblicklich nicht weiß, wie ich mich in diesem Falle zu verhalten habe, werden Sie es nach der mir so oft erwiesenen Freundlichkeit entschuldigen, wenn ich mir auch in dieser geschäftlichen Angelegenheit Ihren güthigen Rath erbitte, dessen ich mich in anderer Beziehung schon so oft zu erfreuen hatte. Indem ich mir schließlich erlaube, dieser Bitte noch die Bemerkung hinzuzufügen, daß die Vorlesungen noch immer so zahlreich und mit demselben Eifer von Seiten der Akademiker besucht werden, von dem ich Ihnen schon öfter Mittheilung machen durfte, verbleibe ich mit gewohnter Hochachtung....

⁹⁷ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 4, Bd. 10, f. 262.

⁹⁸ Koschnick, *Franz Kugler*, 204-231.

⁹⁹ Koschnick, *Franz Kugler*, 225-232, gives a concise overview of this period, without noting the small changes considered but only partially implemented after the death of Schadow.

¹⁰⁰ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 2, f. 98, 99-106. The full text was published the following year as 'Der wissenschaftliche Unterricht auf Kunstakademien', *Deutsches Kunstblatt* 2, No. 20-21 (17-24 May 1851), 153-154; 161-163. References here are to the latter.

minister denied the request, citing lack of funds to pay Guhl for the additional work.¹⁰¹

As Guhl noted at the beginning of his report, he had previously submitted two others regarding academy reforms, but neither specifically examined 'scholarly instruction' (*wissenschaftlicher Unterricht*) for artists. Neither is mentioned in any of the documents pertaining to his appointment, probably given their much more general scope. The first, submitted on 15 December 1848, considered the internal organization of the academy as a society of artists as well as its authority and public activities.¹⁰² The second, submitted on 29 March 1849, proposed a reform of the academy's overall curriculum in an attempt to make it more effective in serving the institution's public function.¹⁰³ Expanding on general points made in the second report and in the book on modern history painting,¹⁰⁴ the report of 1850 advocated retaining the established courses in mythology and art history but supplementing them with a new, multi-semester course. This would combine what Guhl called, without further definition, cultural history with the history and study of costume, defined as encompassing not just clothing but the entirety of the human environment in which historical events occurred. Guhl stressed that the course must be not be so scholarly or specialized as to distract the young artists or to tax their limited preparation and concentration. Instead, it was to provide a chronological sequence of individual periods of history as defined by significant historical events and their respective causes and effects. For each period, the instructor would also sketch the most vivid picture possible of the various elements at work in its religious, moral, political, and intellectual life. He would also give an introduction to relevant reference works. In this way, the course would provide a general framework for the artist's preparatory engagement with the specific subjects he chose or was commissioned to depict. Only with this foundation of knowledge, skills, and resources was it possible, Guhl argued, to create history paintings with the historical accuracy and inherent truth needed to make them visually and conceptually compelling.¹⁰⁵

Allowing one hour per day in a six-day week yielded six hours for scholarly instruction, which Guhl divided equally among three courses: mythology, art history, and cultural and costume history. Leaving aside mythology (which had an established curriculum), he proposed a four-semester sequence coordinating the latter two, but departing from strict chronology in order to place the more important material in the longer, better attended winter semester. In the first

¹⁰¹ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, Bd. 2, f. 107-109. The request to Guhl and his presentation to the plenary meeting are documented only in the letter of 29 December 1850.

¹⁰² Published as 'Ideen zur Reorganisation der Akademien mit besonderer Beziehung auf die Akademie der Künste in Berlin', *Kunstblatt* 30, no. 20-21 (31 May – 7 June 1849), 78-86. I was unable to locate the manuscript at the GStAPK.

¹⁰³ This summary is based on that in Guhl, 'Wissenschaftlicher Unterricht', 163. The text was not published, nor could the manuscript be located.

¹⁰⁴ Guhl, *Neuere geschichtliche Malerei*, 192-211.

¹⁰⁵ Guhl, 'Wissenschaftlicher Unterricht', 153-154, 161-162.

summer semester the courses would run parallel, covering antiquity from Egypt through Rome. In the following winter semester they would diverge: art history covered modern art from its beginning in the fifteenth century to its flowering in the sixteenth, while history presented the high middle ages (twelfth to fifteenth centuries), given their importance for the history of costume and as an introduction to the concurrent course on modern art. In the following summer semester the history course could thus provide a full treatment of Christian symbolism and iconography, coordinated with the concurrent course on Early Christian and Medieval art. In the final semester the courses would run almost parallel, covering art from the sixteenth century to the present and history from the fifteenth through the eighteenth century.¹⁰⁶

Guhl's plan is similar to but not identical with relevant passages in Kugler's proposal for the reorganization of the academy. Both advocated the addition of historical instruction to supplement mythology and art history, and both stressed the need to make it accessible and useful to artists. Kugler was, however, much less specific on all counts, simply specifying that 'scholarly instruction' provide 'an overview of the development of all peoples, with attention to ancient mythology, the history of art, costume, and literature.' Distributing these into individual courses was left to the discretion of a single instructor. Where Guhl simply omitted any discussion of aesthetics, Kugler expressly rejected such a course as undesirable, even dangerous, given the risk of directing students, who lacked the necessary general education, away from actual production into one-sided theorizing.¹⁰⁷ While Guhl made no mention of literature, the elements he included in his loosely defined 'cultural history' bear a striking resemblance to the contextual factors Kugler had included in the 'archaeology of the different times' presented in his proposal of 1833 for 'scholarly lectures for artists' at the academy.¹⁰⁸ Although it is more than likely that Kugler and Guhl had discussed these matters, they clearly diverged on the finer points.¹⁰⁹

His hopes of extra income at the academy dashed and his appointment still temporary, Guhl next attempted to secure an extraordinary professorship at the University. On 18 December 1851 he asked that the philosophical faculty forward his request to the ministry along with an evaluation (*Gutachten*) of his qualifications. He reminded the faculty of his *Habilitation* in 1847 for history and theory of art, archaeology, and mythology and that his lectures to date had fallen primarily in the historical part of art study (*Kunstwissenschaft*), namely general art history and the specialized field of architectural history. He acknowledged that the low enrollments in his courses would hardly seem to support a solid application, and that, because

¹⁰⁶ Guhl, 'Wissenschaftlicher Unterricht', 162-163.

¹⁰⁷ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Tit. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 259: eine Uebersicht des historischen Entwicklungsganges der Völker, wobei auf die antike Mythologie, auf die Geschichte der Kunst, des Kostüms, und der Literatur besondere Rücksicht genommen wird.

¹⁰⁸ See part one.

¹⁰⁹ Koschnick, *Franz Kugler*, 229, focusing on other aspects, stressed the similarities of the two proposals, concluding that Guhl was a student and protégé (*Schützling*) of Kugler.

courses in the study of art lay outside the realm of all formal disciplines, he had hardly hoped, in his first years at the university, to attract enough students to actually teach such courses. Still, even if his courses were not successful in terms of enrollment, he regarded them as reflecting well on him personally.¹¹⁰ He then listed each course, its type, and how often he had taught it, since summer 1848 (see [Table 1](#)). Private courses: history of pre-classical architecture, general art history, history of classical architecture, history of Christian art since Constantine. Public or free courses: disputations in theory and history of visual art, history of modern German painting, history of art since the beginning of the nineteenth century with emphasis on painting. To demonstrate the full range of courses prepared, he also listed those offered but not taught: history of Italian painting from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, encyclopedia of art studies, history of Gothic architecture in Italy. He had not taught these three owing partly to insufficient enrollment and partly to participation inappropriate to the subjects (*theils wegen ungenügender Zuhörerzahl, jedoch theils wegen einer dieser Gegenstände überhaupt nicht gerechten Theilnahme von Seiten der Studierenden*); although the exact nature of the students' disruptive behaviour remains unknown, it strongly suggests a lack of interest in the material. Guhl also included 15 examples of his publications in the fields of his teaching, only some of which he identified. The first nine comprised essays and reviews in scholarly journals, including the two reports on the reorganization of the Akademie der Künste. In addition to the four reviews submitted previously and the article on Stadtilm, these could also have included four articles and a review published in the *Kunstblatt* and the *Deutsches Kunstblatt*.¹¹¹ The last six were independently published works, including *Ephesiaca*, the essay on the Ionic capital, and the first two volumes of the *Denkmäler der Kunst*.

The dean, Weiß, responded ten days later, returning the writing samples and denying Guhl's request. The faculty gladly recognized his past and likely future accomplishments in the study of art and its history, as demonstrated by the

¹¹⁰ SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1848 (5) Ernst Guhl, 18.12.1851, f. 1; copy in HUBUA, PhilFak 1432, f. 273. Guhl packed all these ideas into a single sentence that is difficult to quote from selectively: Allerdings fühlte ich nur zu wohl, daß die Frequenz der von mir gehaltenen Vorlesungen mich kaum zu einer soliden Bitte zu begünstigen scheint; indessen ist erweislich, daß die Theilnahme für die Kunstwissenschaftlichen, die ausser dem Bereich aller Fachstudien liegen, in Vergleich zu den letzteren durchweg eine so Beschränkte ist, daß, während ich für die ersten Jahre nach meiner Habilitation kaum Hoffnung hegen wagte Vorlesungen in jenen Wissenschaften überhaupt zu Stande zu bringen, wie der wenn auch der Frequenz nach nicht bedeutende Erfolg persönlich immerhin als ein nicht ungünstiger erscheinen dürfte.

¹¹¹ Guhl published three short notices on the *Denkmäler der Kunst*: *Kunstblatt* 28, no. 60 (9 December 1847), 237-238 (a lecture delivered at the Wissenschaftliche Kunstverein), *Kunstblatt* 29, no. 54 (2 November 1848), 213-215, and *Deutsches Kunstblatt* 1, no. 15 (15 April 1850), 115-117. He also published 'Ueber die Lehre vom Kostüm mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des italienischen Mittelalters' *Kunstblatt* 29, no. 25 (23 May 1848), 97-100; a review of Ferdinand Piper, *Mythologie und Symbolik der christlichen Kunst* (Weimar, 1847), *Kunstblatt* 29, no. 31 (24 July 1848), 121-124; 'Ueber den Begriff des Dramatischen in der bildenden Kunst, mit besonderer Beziehung auf die geschichtliche Malerei', *Deutsches Kunstblatt* 2, no. 2 (13 January 1851), 9-19.

estimable works submitted. They particularly appreciated the effort he had expended in preparing his lectures for the university, and they wished to see them continue with the same zeal, ever-increasing success, and ongoing benefit to the students. Nevertheless, the faculty could not forward his request, given the number of *Privatdozenten* at the University.¹¹²

By early 1853 Guhl saw at least the prospect of a permanent appointment at the Akademie der Künste, although it took nearly a year for this to be realized. On 29 May he sent a letter to minister von Raumer requesting that his interim appointment be converted, as had recently been done for other instructors. He reminded the minister of the approbation received from the academy administration since January 1849.¹¹³ Guhl's petition prompted the ministry to ask whether Geppert, the mythology instructor, and Emil Heinrich Du Bois-Reymond (1818-1896), instructor of anatomy, should also be appointed permanently. The academy responded in the affirmative on 22 June, and Kugler drafted a memo approving the appointments with fixed salaries of 300 *Taler* for Guhl and 200 for the others. This action, however, appears to have been cancelled for unknown reasons.¹¹⁴ In August a competitor in the field of costume history appeared when the painter Hermann Weiß (1822-1892) submitted the first volume of his costume history to the king.¹¹⁵ On 5 December Kugler submitted a very positive report on the book and suggested that the painter be appointed to teach the history of costume on a trial basis. Although the king issued an order to this effect on 10 December, the actual appointment was somewhat delayed.¹¹⁶ On 11 December the academy renewed its request for the permanent appointment of Guhl as instructor for art history and the history of costume. The petition noted the success of his lectures, that he had distinguished himself as a scholar with the recent publication of the *Künstler-Briefe*, and that, as requested by the academic senate, he had prepared himself to lecture on the history of costume. On 27 December Kugler drafted an internal memo again approving the permanent salaried appointments of Guhl, Geppert, and Du Bois-Reymond, plus the provisional, non-salaried appointment of Weiß for the history of costume, given his previously acknowledged work in that field. The appointments, effective 1 April, were finalized on 9 March 1854.¹¹⁷

¹¹² SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1848 (5) Ernst Guhl, 18.12.1851, f. 3, draft on the last page of Guhl's letter; copy in HUBUA, PhilFak 1432, f. 273.

¹¹³ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 1, f. 183.

¹¹⁴ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 1, f. 184 (Kugler's draft of 16 June), 201 (the academy's response with Kugler's draft at the side, struck through once).

¹¹⁵ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 1, f. 213. Hermann Weiß, *Geschichte des Kostüms. Die Tracht, die baulichen Einrichtungen und das Geräth der vornehmsten Völker des östlichen Erdtheils*, Berlin, Dümmler, 1853.

¹¹⁶ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 1, f. 214-215, 227.

¹¹⁷ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 1, f. 231-237. Following a positive report from the academy on Weiß's teaching (26 January 1855), his appointment was made permanent with a salary of 300 *Taler* in April 1855: GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 22, f. 45-49, 58-60.

Meanwhile, Guhl was preparing another petition for an extraordinary professorship, this time sending it to the minister directly. In his letter of 17 February 1854, Guhl wrote that he had long wished to submit such a request but had found it appropriate to wait for completion of a major art historical work (*Vollendung eines größeren kunstgeschichtlichen Werkes*) in progress since his *Habilitation* (i.e. *Denkmäler der Kunst*). He also noted another recent publication, the first volume of the *Künstler-Briefe*. In presenting his teaching Guhl again attempted to put a positive spin on a less than ideal record. In the disciplines of his *Habilitation* he had so far only taught in art history (*Kunstgeschichte*), offering courses in its various branches without interruption (see [Table 1](#)). Among his public courses he chose to list those on general art history, classical architecture, and Christian art since Constantine; among his private courses he listed the disputation on history and theory of the visual arts (*Konversatorium oder Disputatorium über verschiedene Gegenstände der Geschichte und Theorie der bildenden Künste*) and a two-semester course on modern art (*neuere Kunst*). Due to lack of interest, he had still not been able to teach the history of painting from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century or the encyclopedia of art studies (*Enzyklopädie der Kunstwissenschaften*). Still, he found reason to be satisfied with the success of the courses listed, given the recognition received from the philosophical faculty and considering the limited interest in these disciplines, which lay outside all professional studies (*mit Rücksicht auf das verhältnißmäßig geringe Interesse für diese, allen Berufsstudien fern liegenden Disciplinen*).¹¹⁸

Unsigned notations on the first page of Guhl's letter state that among the 37 *Privatdozenten* at the university, fourteen were older; this is followed by a simple list of names: Toelken, Gerhard, Panofka, Waagen, Hotho, all ordinary or extraordinary professors. The implication is that Guhl lacked the seniority that would justify his request (as the philosophical faculty had previously determined), and that five men already held professorships in his fields. These facts probably constitute the 'objections and impediments' (*Bedenken und Hindernisse*) to Guhl's advancement cited in an internal note from Schulze to Kugler of 25 March, which also stated that the minister was prepared to solidify Guhl's appointment at the Akademie der Künste by giving him the title of professor (*Prädicat eines Professors*). This was indeed the case, and Kugler quickly drafted the necessary documents.¹¹⁹

Over the next five years Guhl made four study trips: to Paris and London in 1854, to Paris in 1855, to Spain in 1856, and to Greece in 1858. The documents for all four, but especially those for the Spain trip, reveal Guhl's reasons for travelling, how he financed his travel, and something of how he worked. On 21 June 1854 Guhl wrote to request advance payment of his salary at the Akademie der Künste to finance a trip to Paris and possibly London. To fill a long-felt gap in his knowledge,

¹¹⁸ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 1, f. 241-242.

¹¹⁹ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 1, f. 245, 246. Resulting from a separate proceeding, Du Bois-Reymond also received the title 'professor' at this time.

he planned to study the art collections in both cities.¹²⁰ Early the next year Guhl sent the minister the off-print of a lecture on the art collections in the Crystal Palace at Sydenham, showing that he had indeed gone to London. In an expression of authorial modesty he characterized the text as arising from a passing opportunity and making no greater claim than to increase public knowledge of an important current artistic undertaking.¹²¹ For his trip to Paris, from 6 September to 15 October 1855, Guhl simply requested and received permission to travel. His stated purpose was to see an exhibition of modern art (*Ausstellung moderner Kunstwerke*).¹²² By this he most likely meant the exhibition associated with the Exposition universelle (15 May to 31 October), although he probably also visited the Pavillon du réalisme set up by Gustave Courbet (1819-1877).

For the longer trip to Spain Guhl provided a more detailed justification and requested both financial support and partial leave from teaching. Writing to minister von Raumer on 21 April 1856 he stated his abiding conviction that 'success in the teaching of art history and art studies is only and above all possible if direct observation of the monuments is combined with written scholarship.' He had always done everything in his power to undertake such observation and had made great sacrifices, since he possessed no private means whatsoever, to finance trips to Italy and England and on many repeated occasions to Belgium and France. On these trips he had come to know the most art historically significant buildings and the most prominent art collections. This same conviction now motivated his decision to travel to Spain, a country still little researched, in order to study more closely medieval church architecture and the painters of the seventeenth century.¹²³ He requested a subvention of 300 Taler, noting that he had not previously received any of the funds which the ministry frequently provided for scholarly travel. Finally, he sought permission to end his summer semester lectures early, allowing him to be

¹²⁰ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 1, f. 269, 270 (notifications of approval). The request was to receive payment for two quarters at the start of the next.

¹²¹ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 2, f. 65 (21 May 1855). Acknowledgement to Guhl (f. 66, 30 May 1855) identifies the submission: *Der Krystallpalast zu Sydenham und dessen Kunstsammlungen in geschichtlicher Uebersicht, ein Vortrag gehalten am 24. März 1855 im wissenschaftlichen Verein zu Berlin*, Berlin, Guttentag, 1855.

¹²² GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 8, Bd. 1, nf: 27 July, 1 September (copy), 6 September 1855; SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1848 (5) Ernst Guhl, 1 September 1855.

¹²³ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 2, f. 114: Da ich stets der Ueberzeugung gewesen bin, daß der Lehrberuf in der Kunstgeschichte und in den Kunstwissenschaften überhaupt nur dann mit Erfolg erfüllt werden kann, wenn zu den literarischen Studien die lebendige Anschauung der Kunstwerke selbst hinzutritt, so habe ich mich bewußt mir diese Anschauung, so viel es in meinen Kräften stand, zu verschaffen versucht und zu diesem Zwecke mit großen Opfern, da ich durchaus kein Vermögen habe, mehrere Reisen nach Italien, wo ich ein ganzes Jahr meine Studien obgelegen, nach England, und zu wiederholten Malen nach Belgien und Frankreich unternommen, um die für die Kunstgeschichte wichtigsten Bauten, so wie die hervorragendsten Kunstsammlungen kennen zu lernen. Dieselbe Ueberzeugung ist es, die mich jetzt zu dem Entschlusse geführt hat, eine Studienreise nach dem in kunstgeschichtlicher Beziehung noch wenig erforschten Spanien zu unternehmen, um dort namentlich die mittelalterliche Kirchenarchitektur und die Maler des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts genauer studieren zu können.

away from 20 July to 1 November. Reviewing the request on 29 April, Schulze reiterated Guhl's financial need and lack of prior support, and he emphasized Guhl's pronounced success at the university, adding that Guhl's lectures were, relatively speaking, among the best attended. Given the recognition that his teaching garnered at the university, it was only fitting that 100 Taler come from university funds, with another 100 each from the Akademie der Künste and the ministry's research funds.¹²⁴ Kugler's draft of the minister's letter to the king included all of the above, plus mention of Guhl's publications, teaching at the academy, and the final remark that, given the still preliminary state of research on the monuments and art treasures of Spain, this trip would prove fruitful for art historical studies in general. Guhl's request received final approval in a royal decree of 21 May.¹²⁵

On 27 July Guhl wrote to inform the ministry that he was still in Berlin, having delayed his departure due to the current unrest in Spain.¹²⁶ On 27 September he wrote from Madrid to request an extension of his leave to the end of December, given both the delayed departure and the great difficulty of travel in Spain (*die große Unvollkommenheit der Reisegelegenheiten in Spanien*), whereby one was often constrained to stay longer in a city than necessary for one's studies. Additionally, the number of objects to be studied was so great that he could not possibly finish his research without staying longer. Adding to the financial burden of the extended trip was the need to give up entirely his lectures at the university during the winter semester 1856/57 (and thus his salary); at the Akademie der Künste he proposed increasing the number of lecture hours in the new year. Guhl then provided a partial account of work completed thus far. He had begun with art collections previously unknown to him in the most important cities of Holland, southwestern France and northern Spain. He was now engaged in extended study of collections in Madrid, including the Prado, which he called probably the most important in all Europe for its richness in the most perfect pictures of all schools of painting. In his study of medieval church architecture he had spent most of his time on drawing ground plans, so often neglected but so important for the scholarly treatment of art history. Thus far he had sketched plans for more than twenty previously unknown but art historically important churches in southwestern France and northern Spain, along with architectural details and small views of historically significant monuments for which no or only insufficient reproductions existed.¹²⁷ Guhl's

¹²⁴ Notation on the first page of Guhl's letter.

¹²⁵ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 2, f. 116, 117.

¹²⁶ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 2, f. 132. He also sent the second volume of the *Künstler-Briefe*.

¹²⁷ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 2, f. 135-136: Ich habe zunächst die mir noch unbekanntesten Sammlungen in den bedeutendsten Städten Hollands, die in dem südwestlichen Frankreich und endlich im nördlichen Spanien untersucht und bin gegenwärtig mit dem Studium der Sammlungen Madrids anhaltend beschäftigt, unter denen das Museo del Prado – in Bezug auf dem Reichtum der vollendetsten Bilder aller Schulen –vielleicht als die bedeutendste in ganz Europa bezeichnet werden darf. Was ferner meine Beschäftigung mit der mittelalterlichen Baukunst anbelangt,

request was approved on 15 October.¹²⁸ He did not teach at all at the university in that winter semester, but was apparently back in time to finish the semester at the Akademie der Künste (see [Table 1](#)). The trip produced a lecture at the Wissenschaftlicher Kunstverein in 1857 and at least one significant publication, a two-part article on architectural monuments in Burgos and Toledo.¹²⁹

For the trip to Greece Guhl sought permission at the last minute, suggesting that the opportunity had arisen unexpectedly. On 7 April 1858 he requested leave from teaching for the summer semester, which was soon to begin. He had long intended to go to Greece to complete his study of the artistic monuments, because he viewed the observation of monuments, and knowledge of the lands where they arose, as a necessary precondition of all art historical research. He made this request knowing that the minister had previously shown approval of this view in granting leave for trips to England, France, and Spain. Guhl also asked that the request be expedited, as he would thus be granted the favor of traveling in the company of professor Friedrich von Raumer, who had advanced his departure to early May. Passport arrangements would need to be completed by then.¹³⁰ With the academy's support the request was quickly approved.¹³¹

Guhl left for Greece while his third petition for an extraordinary professorship, submitted to minister von Raumer on 21 March, was under consideration by the philosophical faculty. In June the faculty advised the minister that they could not support the request at present, but they left the matter open to future discussion. The death of Panofka on 20 June seems to have re-opened the matter, but no immediate action was taken. Guhl received no response, and in late September he

so sind es namentlich die bisher am meisten vernachlässigten und für die wissenschaftliche Behandlung der Kunstgeschichte gerade so wichtigen Grundrisse der Kirchen, die mein besonderes Studium in Anspruch nahmen und habe ich schon die Grundrisse von mehr als zwanzig kunstgeschichtlich wichtigen und bisher noch nicht gezeichneten Kirchen im südwestlichen Frankreich und im nördlichen Spanien entworfen, wozu außer einer Anzahl architektonischer Details noch ebensoviel kleineren Ansichten solcher Monumente kommen, die für die Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Baugeschichte von Wichtigkeit sind und von denen man bisher entweder gar keine oder nur ungenügende Abbildungen bekannt gemacht hat.

¹²⁸ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 2, f. 137.

¹²⁹ The lecture is recorded in *Deutsches Kunstblatt* 8, no. 17 (23 April 1857), 150, as among those held at the Kunstverein in April. 'Architektonische Studien in Spanien I. Burgos', *Zeitschrift für Bauwesen* 8 (1858), 63-84, 233-256; 'Architektonische Studien in Spanien II. Toledo', *Zeitschrift für Bauwesen* 9 (1859), 337-354, 495-522.

¹³⁰ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 8, Bd. 1, nf: Es war schon seit längerer Zeit meine Absicht eine wissenschaftliche Reise nach Griechenland zu unternehmen, um dadurch meine Studien über die künstlerischen Monumente der verschiedenen Länder vervollständigen zu können, indem ich die Anschauung der Denkmäler, sowie die Kenntniß der Länder, in denen dieselben entstanden sind für eine nothwendige Bedingung aller kunstgeschichtlichen Forschung betrachte. Ew. Excellenz haben mir durch die Gewährung des Urlaubs zu einer in der letzten Jahren unternommenen Studienreisen nach England, Frankreich und Spanien Ihre gütige Billigung dieser Ansicht ausgesprochen und so erlaube ich mir auch jetzt Ew. Excellenz gehorsamst zu bitten: für das bevorstehende Sommersemester mir einen Urlaub zu einer wissenschaftlichen Reise nach Griechenland hochgeneigtest gewähren zu wollen.

¹³¹ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 8, Bd. 1, nf (15 and 23 April 1858).

submitted a fourth petition, this time to the philosophical faculty, asking to be considered for Panofka's position. In October, Karl Friederichs, Gerhard's assistant at the museum, also applied, via the ministry, to replace Panofka, prompting much debate among the professors. This series of documents, which extends from March 1858 to March 1859, shows both how Guhl positioned and repositioned himself to justify his appointment and how the faculty and ministry saw him fitting, or not, into the pedagogical and intellectual organization of the university.

Guhl began his petition of 21 March by presenting his article on the monuments of Burgos as the first result of his trip to Spain in 1856, so benevolently supported by the minister. The ground plans of the cathedral and other churches, drawn by him, were the first complete plans to have been made of these monuments. Also resulting from the trip would be a series of monographs on other major cities, including Valladolid, Madrid, Toledo, Granada, Seville, and Barcelona; these would add to the still neglected art history of Spain and its many monuments. Working up to his real purpose, Guhl then recapped his more than ten years of teaching at the university, noting the disciplines of his *Habilitation* in 1847 and that he had taught the various fields of art historical studies (*die verschiedenen Fächer der kunstgeschichtlichen Studien*). Simply referring to the detailed accounting in the petition of 1854, Guhl again stated, with the obligatory circumspection, that he would characterize his teaching as successful, given the encouraging approbation of the faculty expressed already in 1851 and the steady increase in enrollment that continued through the current semester. With slightly less modesty he then presented the success of his publications. In these he had strived, with exacting effort and not without great sacrifice, to expand the disciplines (*Wissenschaften*) he taught at the university. He had received praise from the philosophical faculty and uniformly positive reception from other scholars. Individual works, some of them quite extensive, had received particularly high recognition. His *Denkmäler der Kunst*, now issued in a second edition in violation of his rights as author, had been purchased by the minister for several public collections.¹³² The *Künstler-Briefe* had been honored by the King in 1856 with a gold medal. Taking his salaried appointment as professor as a sign of the minister's satisfaction with his accomplishments at the Akademie der Künste, he now allowed himself to hope for similar approval of his efforts at the university and thus an appointment as extraordinary professor.

On 14 April, the ministry forwarded Guhl's petition to the philosophical faculty, requesting a report on the petitioner's admissibility (*Zulässigkeit*) for advancement and on whether there was a need to increase the number of extraordinary professors.¹³³ As convened by the dean, Friedrich von Raumer, a

¹³² GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 51, Bd. 4, f. 21-22: jetzt (wenn auch mit Umgehung meiner Autorenrechte durch fremde Hand) schon in zweiter Auflage. The change in editor appears to have been quite rancorous. In the dedication to *Frauen in der Kunstgeschichte*, Guhl wrote that an earlier project (clearly the *Denkmäler*) had brought him only ingratitude and violation of his rights (*Undank und Rechtsbruch*). To maintain his interest in scholarship he had begun work on *Frauen*, which was then interrupted by his trip to Paris in 1855.

¹³³ HUBUA, PhilFak 1433, f. 199; GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 51, Bd. 4, f. 11 (draft).

committee consisting of Boeckh, Toelken, Trendelenburg, and Gerhard met on 20 May. The minutes show that they weighed several competing considerations. On the one hand, the field of art history (*das Fach der Kunstgeschichte*) was already covered by the ordinary professors Toelken and Gerhard and the extraordinary professors Waagen and Hotho. On the other hand, the committee called special attention to Guhl's scholarly activities, the number of students in his art history classes (which they had before them in a separate report), and his talent for academic lectures. It was also remarked that a stronger representation (*Vertretung*) of the history of ancient art was not undesirable. Although Guhl had begun from the study of ancient art, he was now more concerned with modern and medieval art, and specifically architecture. In view of these considerations, the committee agreed that the report to the ministry should emphasize Guhl's appropriately distinguished scholarly activities and his service to the university but also state that the faculty could not support his advancement at this time. Because the dean declared himself lacking the specialized knowledge needed to evaluate the applicant, Trendelenburg undertook to write the report for approval by the full faculty.¹³⁴

The final report of 4 June 1858 presented the same conclusions with supporting material. Guhl had educated himself comprehensively for art history in its full extent, beginning with solid philological and archaeological research, as beautifully demonstrated by his learned work *Ephesiaca*. Subsequently he had been primarily concerned with the history of architecture, and his latest article on the cathedrals of Burgos showed him to be undertaking exact and successful investigations. He had seen works of art and monuments of architecture on site throughout Europe, having travelled to England, Spain, and Greece; supported by his gift for drawing, he had made these travels fruitful in the most diverse ways. His *Denkmäler der Kunst* showed him to be active in the kinds of work that supported and enlivened lectures in art history. His volumes of artists' letters, arising from research for his lectures on modern art, characterized the art and artists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in a lively manner. The accompanying commentaries connected the individual and personal lives revealed in the translated letters with a wider history and sought to show the tendencies of art reflected in the culture of its time. Accordingly Guhl had assumed a worthy role in the universal conception of art history, and the faculty felt itself obligated to recommend these studies, which required much material support, to the minister in order to nurture a young man who was distinguishing himself.¹³⁵

¹³⁴ HUBUA, PhilFak 1433, f. 200, 201, 202 (list of Guhl's classes from summer 1848 to winter 1857/58 with attendance figures). Panofka was omitted most likely because he was teaching very little by this point. Dean von Raumer's declaration seems odd, given his publications on medieval and modern history, his interest in the arts, and his invitation for Guhl to travel to Greece with him. He may have sought to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest. Trendelenburg had a background in philology and ancient philosophy, but why he wrote the report and not Toelken or Gerhard is unclear.

¹³⁵ HUBUA, PhilFak 1433, f. 203 (draft); GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 51, Bd. 4, f. 19: Dr. Guhl hat sich für die Kunstgeschichte in ihrem ganzen Umfang auf eine umfassende Weise

Turning to Guhl's teaching, the report noted that his effectiveness did not lag behind his knowledge and talent. Attendance in his courses had been steadily rising since 1848, as demonstrated by recent figures for his public course on modern art and his private course on general art history. Previously he had given specialized courses on the history of painting and the history of architecture. The initial draft shows a small but telling change in the way Trendelenburg described the value of Guhl's courses:

Even if general art history ~~needs no~~ can do without specialized scholarly discussion, such lectures nevertheless have value for the university. They provide students with the view points from which to observe the many local art works, and they teach students to use the unique opportunity, offered by their time in Berlin, for educative visual observations.¹³⁶

The undersigned faculty valued the applicant's contributions to the highest extent and found him worthy of advancement beyond all doubt.

However, in considering the needs of the university, the faculty could not support the request, given that there were already five professors for ancient and modern art history. They left open the possibility that in the future the need might arise to supplement the instructional staff for ancient art history, given the recent departure of professor Curtius. Still, it was incumbent upon the faculty to keep the

ausgebildet. Seine Studien gehen von gründlichen philologischen und archaeologischen Forschungen aus, wie davon seine gelehrte Abhandlung Ephesiaca /1843/ ein schönes Zeugniß giebt. Von da ab hat er sich vorzugsweise mit der Geschichte der Architektur befasst und sein neuester Aufsatz über die Cathedrale von Burgos zeigt ihn nach dieser Richtung hin in genauen und erfolgreichen Untersuchungen. In den verschiedensten Ländern Europa's hat er vor Ort und Stelle Anschauungen von Kunstwerken und Baudenkmalern erworben. Seine Reisen erstrecken sich von Italien bis England, von Spanien bis Griechenland und unterstützt von der Gabe zu zeichnen hat er sie sich nach den verschiedensten Seiten fruchtbar gemacht. Seine 'Denkmäler der Kunst' zeigen ihn für Darstellungen thätig, welche den Vortrag der Kunstgeschichte unterstützen und beleben. Seine Künstlerbriefe /2ter Bd. 1856/, aus Forschungen für seine Vorlesungen über neuere Kunstgeschichte hervorgegangen, geben eine lebendige Charakteristik der Kunst und der Künstler des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts und die begleitenden Erläuterungen knüpfen das individuelle und persönliche Leben, das sich in den übersetzten Briefen der Künstler kund giebt, an die große Geschichte an und suchen die Richtungen der Kunst an der Cultur ihrer Zeit wiederzuspiegeln. Hiernach nimmt Dr. Guhl in der universellen Auffassung der Kunstgeschichte eine anzuerkennende Stelle ein, und die Facultät hält sich für verpflichtet, diese wissenschaftlichen Bestrebungen, welche der materiellen Beförderung vielfach bedürfen, Ew. Excellenz angelegentlich zu empfehlen, da es darauf ankommt, eine jüngere Kraft, die sich hervorthut, zu pflegen.

¹³⁶ HUBUA, PhilFak 1433, f. 204: Wenn auch die allgemeine Kunstgeschichte ~~keine~~ specielle(r) wissenschaftliche(r) Erörterungen ~~zulassen~~ entbehren wird, so haben doch solche Vorträge für die Universität Werth, damit die Studierenden die Gesichtspunkte gewinnen, unter welchen sie die hiesigen mannigfaltigen Kunstwerke betrachten können, und die eigenthümliche Gelegenheit zu bildenden Anschauungen, welche ihnen ihr Aufenthalt in Berlin bietet, zu nutzen lernen. Cf. GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 51, Bd. 4, f. 20.

matter open, so that they might provide advice on which proposed appointment would best meet their needs.¹³⁷

Unaware of the faculty's report, Guhl wrote to the minister from Koblenz on 7 August to make the case for himself as successor to Panofka, of whose death he had learned upon his return from Greece. Guhl claimed to have found the loss particularly and personally painful. He had revered the deceased as his teacher, among others, in several archaeological disciplines, the very disciplines in which he had done his *Habilitation* ten years earlier. In fact, the gap opened by this unfortunate loss corresponded to his previous teaching; in addition to courses in general and post-antique art history he had treated many branches of ancient art in special lectures (*in speciellen Vorträgen*).¹³⁸

Having received no response, Guhl wrote to the philosophical faculty on 30 September to emend and renew his earlier application in view of Panofka's death. He began with the by-now usual acknowledgement that his courses had not been exclusively dedicated to ancient art but had included medieval and modern as well. Given that he sought to replace a colleague whose exclusive focus had been ancient art, he now needed to explain this apparent retreat from archaeological studies. To this end he offered two slightly contradictory observations. First, his *Habilitation* in 1847 proceeded from strictly philological and archaeological studies in precisely the fields taught by Professor Panofka. Guhl had not made use of his right to offer courses in archaeology and mythology simply because there was already an unusually large number of professors in those fields, and because he found it unseemly to compete with older men whom he honored as his teachers and friends. Second, he pointed out that the teaching of general art history did not necessarily constitute a retreat from the study and teaching of ancient art. He had taught the history of ancient architecture many times and not without good enrollments. His discussion courses (*Konversatorien*) were specifically oriented toward ancient art, and these, too, were relatively well attended. In this context he found it appropriate to admit (*bekennen*) that his general art history courses were primarily concerned with the art of antiquity. Consequently, he regularly offered public courses on the art of the post-antique periods (*die neuern Zeiten*), with even higher enrollments. He also reported that he was currently working on a project exclusively concerned with ancient art (*Das Leben der Griechen und Römer*). Even though he could not yet present a writing sample, except perhaps in manuscript, he believed he had sufficiently demonstrated his continuing engagement with ancient art. In conclusion, he left it to the ministry and the faculty to decide if his activities qualified him to hold a professorship for both ancient and modern art, but he also added a reminder that the latter had provided positive judgment of his work already in 1851.¹³⁹

Guhl's situation was further complicated when, on 14 October, Friederichs submitted his own application for Panofka's position directly to the minister.

¹³⁷ HUBUA, PhilFak 1433, f. 204 (draft); GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 51, Bd. 4, f. 20.

¹³⁸ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 51, Bd. 4, f. 37.

¹³⁹ HUBUA, PhilFak 1433, f. 206-207.

Simply, and somewhat arrogantly, alluding to his qualifications (described below in the reports of the faculty), Friederichs focused on his reasons for wanting the job. He had turned down the offer of an extraordinary professorship in Erlangen (with the generous salary of 700 Taler) to take the assistant's position at the Berlin Antiquarium offered (with a salary of only 500 Taler) by the museum director, Olfers, because he expected to be considered for the university position left vacant by Panofka's death. He was confident in this expectation given the offer from Erlangen, the clear need in Berlin for new blood (*Zuwachs frischer Lehrkräfte*), and the expressions of support he had received from members of the philosophical faculty whom he had approached, namely Boeckh, Gerhard, Haupt, Toelken, and Trendelenburg. Finally, although he needed additional income (he was without means and 500 Taler was insufficient for life in Berlin), he was less interested in a raise (*Zuschuß*) than in not having to start all over again (i.e. as a *Privatdozent*).¹⁴⁰

On 9 November the ministry forwarded Friederichs's petition to the philosophical faculty with the request that they report on two questions, without considering Guhl and Bötticher. Was there a need to increase the number of instructors for art history and archaeology? Did his scholarly accomplishments and past success in teaching justify the appointment of Friederichs as extraordinary professor?¹⁴¹

On 1 December the dean, Gustav von Magnus (1802-1870), a chemist and physicist, convened the previously constituted committee (Boeckh, Toelken, Trendelenburg, and Gerhard) to consider the ministry's request and the two applications by Friederichs and Guhl. Magnus's minutes record the discussions that, as before, provided the basis for the faculty's report, to which separate, competing opinions, by Gerhard and Toelken, were appended. At the meeting, Gerhard stated his view that new staff were needed for instruction in ancient art and its monuments and that Friederichs was particularly suited given his known success at Erlangen and his book on Praxiteles. Although Boeckh agreed on the need for another professor in these fields, he felt that Guhl was suited for the position, given his accomplishments, and that Guhl's long service to the university deserved to be recognized. After much discussion, the committee agreed unanimously that Friederichs could not be appointed unless Guhl was also appointed, either at the same time or sooner. The committee hesitated to recommend the appointment of two professors at once, and so the decision was made to recommend that the faculty inform the ministry as follows. While they recognized Friederichs's reputation as a teacher and his sacrifice in moving to Berlin, Guhl had a more solid claim, given both his accomplishments in the field of art history and his long service to the university. Guhl may not have lectured on archaeology and mythology, but only

¹⁴⁰ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 197; 203, 219 (supporting documents from Erlangen).

¹⁴¹ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 158 (draft); HUBUA, PhilFak 1458, f. 114. The faculty either ignored or misread the instruction to leave aside Guhl and Bötticher.

because, as he had himself stated, older professors were already teaching these subjects. His philological and archaeological studies qualified him to teach in these fields, and much good was expected of his current work on Greek and Roman antiquities. Finally, it would be unfair to deny Guhl's solid claim simply because of what he had been teaching. Thus, Guhl was to be recommended for advancement to an extraordinary professorship. Although the same could not be offered to Friederichs, it was desirable that he teach courses in classical archaeology at the university; in recognition of his hopes of a professorship, he was to be absolved, as far as possible, of the *Habilitation* requirements if he wished to seek appointment as *Privatdozent*.¹⁴²

On 15 December the committee convened again to review the draft of the report composed by dean Magnus and Boeckh, which was approved with minor changes. The dean then informed the committee that he had just received a memo in which Gerhard expanded upon his reasons for supporting Friederichs and urgently recommended that the faculty put forth Friederichs rather than Guhl. The committee could not agree to this, and so they suggested that Gerhard revise his memo as a separate opinion (*Separatvotum*) to be appended to the report for submission to the full faculty and then to the ministry. This provoked Toelken's response, which was appended as a second separate opinion.¹⁴³

The report composed by Magnus and Boeckh presented the committee's decision with further supporting material. It acknowledged that after Panofka's death there remained four professors for the theory, history, and archaeology of art, namely Toelken, Gerhard, Hotho, and Waagen. Only the first two covered the history of ancient art, the study of monuments, the explication of art works, and, related to these, mythology; even they recognized the need for younger instructors to teach alongside them. Particularly needed was an introduction to the study of monuments and explication of art works for students of classical antiquity, something Panofka had offered, albeit with diminished capacity at the end. For Gerhard, Friederichs was very suited to this, in view of his scholarly accomplishments, in particular the text on Praxiteles, and what was known of his success as a teacher in Erlangen. There was no doubt that, if appointed, Friederichs would do the job well, and, furthermore, his sacrifice in coming to Berlin must be acknowledged.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴² HUBUA, PhilFak 1458, f. 115-116v. Karl Friederichs, *Praxiteles und die Niobegruppe, nebst einer Erklärung einiger Vasenbilder*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1855.

¹⁴³ HUBUA, PhilFak 1458, f. 117. In his cover letter (14 December, f. 120) Gerhard claimed that his memo was not a separate opinion, just an explanation for why he could not fully support the committee's report.

¹⁴⁴ The report is cited here from the final draft submitted to the ministry, as the draft in HUBUA, PhilFak 1458, f. 123-125 (microfiche), is often illegible due to the tight binding of this volume and its poor condition. GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 188v-189v: Was die allgemeine Frage betrifft, ob die Zahl der Lehrer für Kunstgeschichte und Archäologie bei der hiesigen Universität noch zu vermehren sei, ist gar nicht zu leugnen, daß nach dem durch den Tod erfolgten Abgang des Prof. Dr. Panofka, für Theorie, Geschichte und Archäologie der Kunst in den Personen der

However, the faculty saw a significant impediment to Friederichs's appointment, in that they could not prefer this newcomer over Guhl, a worthy young man of outstanding talent and expertise who was suited for the position given his many years of service as a *Privatdozent*. With a salary of only 300 Taler from the Akademie der Künste, his financial situation was even more precarious. Drawing on Guhl's letter of 30 September, the report presented his accomplishments so as to emphasize his qualifications to teach ancient art. Since 1848 he had offered courses on the history and theory of ancient architecture and general art history. In the latter he primarily treated the history of ancient art, supplemented with explication of ancient masterpieces in many sections of the royal museum. His disputations focused primarily on works drawn from the history of ancient art. In the current semester he was offering a course on the monuments of Athens, which he had recently studied in situ. The faculty had every reason to be satisfied with his teaching. Beginning from a solid philological education, evidenced by his *Ephesiaca*, Guhl had slowly moved in his teaching and publications toward post-antique art, the field of his later, universally recognized accomplishments. He made this move away from the disciplines of his *Habilitation* to avoid unseemly competition with his respected elders. By no means should this be taken to indicate a neglect of these fields, and primary consideration should be given to the full spectrum of his activities, which fell squarely in the fields for which he was being considered.¹⁴⁵

Recommending both Friederichs and Guhl would go against the principles (*Grundsätze*) frequently discussed and recognized by both the faculty and the ministry. Thus, if an extraordinary professorship were to be established to replace Panofka, the faculty could only recommend Guhl. They acknowledged that he might not provide exactly the courses that Panofka had, and that the explication of monuments might not always be a significant aspect of his teaching. Still, he had been, and would continue to be, successful in teaching ancient architecture. It was

Herren Toelken, Gerhard, Hotho und Waagen noch vier Lehrer vorhanden sind. Indessen kommen für die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums, die Denkmälerkunde, Erklärung der Kunstwerke und die damit in Verbindung stehende Mythologie nur die beiden erstgenannten in Betracht und diese machen selbst geltend, daß es noch jüngere Kräfte neben ihnen bedürfe. Namentlich scheint es ein Bedürfniß, daß für die Denkmälerkunde und Kunsterklärung, welcher der Professor Panofka, obgleich in der letzteren Zeit nur mit sehr geschwächter Kraft sich gewidmet hat, den Studierenden, namentlich denen, die sich mit dem classischen Alterthum beschäftigen, eine Anleitung geboten werde. Nach dem Urtheil des Professor Gerhard ist der Dr. Friederichs hierzu sehr geeignet und er verdient alle Empfehlungen sowohl nach seinen schriftstellerischen Leistungen, besonders seinem Werke über Praxiteles, als auch nach dem, was uns über seine Lehrfähigkeiten und seiner Lehrthätigkeit an der Universität Erlangen bekannt geworden. Es scheint nicht zu bezweifeln, daß derselbe, wenn ihm durch Ernennung zum außerordentlichen Professor die Verpflichtung auferlegt würde die zur Erfüllung dieses Bedürfnisses erforderlichen Vorlesungen privatim zu halten, er ersprießlich für die Studierenden wirken würde. Auch können wir nicht umhin zu seinen Gunsten zu bemerken, daß er durch die Annahme einer Anstellung an dem Königl. Kunst-Museum ein bedeutendes Opfer gebracht hat, da ihm eine Professur an der Universität Erlangen mit einem verhältnißmäßig nicht geringen Gehalte, in Aussicht gestellt war.

¹⁴⁵ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 189v-192.

also desirable that Dr. Friederichs offer archaeological courses at the university; in recognition of the professorship offered to him by Erlangen, he would be absolved of the onerous *Habilitation* requirements if he wished to seek appointment as *Privatdozent*. Finally, while the faculty fully recognized Bötticher's contributions, they anticipated that his other appointment would take too much of his time and energy. He should thus remain a *Privatdozent*.¹⁴⁶

Gerhard's separate opinion expanded on his views as stated briefly in the faculty's report, offering more detail but nothing that contradicted the majority opinion. Friederichs was born in Oldenburg and educated in Göttingen and then in Erlangen, where he received his doctoral degree in 1853 with a dissertation on the chorus in Greek tragedy.¹⁴⁷ Shortly thereafter he came to Berlin in order to train himself for the archaeological field by attending lectures and visiting local collections. The next year he published the book on Praxiteles, which Gerhard found youthful but comprehensive, and more qualified and productive in both art history and the explication of art than one might expect of a young scholar in this declining field. The text won well deserved praise for its feeling for art, critical acumen, and clear presentation. It had brought its author much recognition, as had two recent ceremonial lectures on famous works in Berlin and Munich. In Erlangen Friederichs lectured with success on Greek sculpture and assisted in the founding of an art museum.¹⁴⁸ From Erlangen he travelled to the collections in Munich and had good prospects of support for a trip to Italy. The success of his lectures on Pindar and the history of Greek literature caused him, in agreement with the ordinary professors of philology, to restrict his teaching primarily to classical literature. The offer of a position at the Berlin museum brought him back to the study of art history, and his predilection for such studies led him to prefer the position at the museum, left vacant at Panofka's death, to the better paying professorship offered him in Erlangen. Friederichs had kept open the option of a return to Erlangen or Munich, should a permanent teaching position not materialize in Berlin.

¹⁴⁶ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 192-193.

¹⁴⁷ References here are to the final copy sent to the ministry, as the draft in HUBUA, PhilFak 1458, 121-122, is not fully legible; significant revisions were made only to the final paragraph, as noted below. GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 198-202. *Chorus Euripideus comparatus cum Sophocleo*, Erlangen, Deichert, 1853.

¹⁴⁸ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 198: Ein Jahr später ließ er die Schrift über Praxiteles drucken, welche zwar jugendlich aber inhaltsreich, für Kunstgeschichte und Kunsterklärung berufener und ergiebiger ist als ich es sonst von einem der allerdings nicht zahlreichen jüngeren Bearbeiter dieses Faches zu rühmen wüßte. Kunstgefühl, gesunde Kritik und lichtvolle Darstellung gereichen dieser Schrift zu verdiente Lobe und haben dem Verfasser derselben auch neuerdings in zwei Festvorträgen über berühmte Kunstwerke, den anbetenden Knaben des Berliner Museums und die Leukothea der Münchener Sammlung, viele Anerkennung verschafft. In Erlangen wo er auch so dann als Privatdocent auftrat, hat der Dr. Friederichs mit Erfolg über die Geschichte der griechischen Plastik gelesen und die Gründung eines dortigen Kunstmuseums vermittelt. *Die Eröffnung des archäologischen Museums der königlich Bayerischen Friedrich-Alexanders-Universität zu Erlangen, eingeleitet durch zwei öffentliche Vorträge*, Erlangen, Junge, 1857.

It was, however, in considering the needs of the university and Guhl's qualifications that Gerhard disagreed with his colleagues. Already in July, shortly after Panofka's death, he had informed the faculty that courses in the important fields of Greek art history and the study of monuments had not been taught for several years. The result was a very problematic and hard-to-fill gap in the curriculum:

In order that art history not be taught as just an instrument of general education in connection with the teaching of modern art but rather as an integral part of philological studies and a scholarly support for the great art collections, new instructors are needed to deliver properly prepared courses in accordance with their obligations.¹⁴⁹

Just how hard it would be to find such instructors had become evident in the careful inquiries that led to Friederichs's selection, as the only qualified candidate, for the position at the museum. This relatively unknown young man had been called from outside because it seemed impossible to find, in Berlin, someone knowledgeable in ancient art history who would pursue the study of antiquity and its ruins with love and perseverance.

This was precisely the objection that, for Gerhard, arose unavoidably with the prospect of assigning a regular position for classical archaeology to a scholar who actively pursued a pronounced preference for post-antique art:

The boundaries and perspective of pre-Christian and modern art history have gradually so expanded and modified their respective study of the monuments that a quick transition from one to the other is just as impossible as the specialized treatment of both by one and the same scholar. Given its multiple connections to all the artistic concerns of the present, the treatment of modern art is always excessively directed more toward the aesthetic viewpoint than toward the philological, the application of which to the monuments of antiquity we are used to seeing as an advance of modern scholarship and as a newly won element of classical philology. Aside from many errors in the details, the departed Panofka successfully maintained that philological perspective over the years through mutual attention to the art and textual monuments of antiquity. Whoever seeks to replace him must be already versed in the now so multifarious visual elucidation of works of art, as is Dr. Friederichs,

¹⁴⁹ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 200: Sofern die Kunstgeschichte nicht bloß als allgemeines Bildungsmittel in Zusammenhang mit der neuen Kunst sondern als integrierender Theil der philologischen Studien und als wissenschaftliches Organ unserer großen Kunstsammlungen hier vertreten werden soll, sind frische Lehrkräfte erforderlich, um Vorlesungen vorgebildet und pflichtenmäßig zu vertreten.

who has the further advantage that his position at the museum puts him in daily contact with the visual monuments of antiquity.¹⁵⁰

This position paid Friederichs such a low salary that he could easily be hired at almost no cost, provided he was given an honorable enough position to prevent him from returning to Bavaria. Friederichs was thus the only one suited to replace Panofka, and Gerhard called expressly for his appointment as extraordinary professor.¹⁵¹

Toelken began his separate opinion by pointing out that his comments at the general faculty meeting on 16 December, made in response to Gerhard's dissenting opinion, were not directed against Friederichs, whom he would happily support for an additional extraordinary professorship. Advancing a not-so-veiled attack on Gerhard's position, Toelken saw the appointment of Friederichs before Guhl as compounding a negative trend:

Not appointing Guhl, who has devoted the most serious study to ancient art and just returned from a trip to Athens, because he also works on modern art would abet a view that has become detrimental to archaeology as an element in the general education offered by the university. The neglect of the aesthetic value of the ancient monuments, arising from the preference for a subsidiary category of monuments, has contributed substantially to that disdain for antiquity which makes even artists blind to its beauty, upon whose vindication Winckelmann's undying fame rests.¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 200-201v: Grenzen und Standpunct der vorchristlichen und der modernen Kunstgeschichte haben somit ihrer beiderseitigen Denkmälerkunde allmählig sich dergestalt erweitert und modificirt, daß ein rascher Uebergang aus einem dieser Gebiete ins andere ebenso unausführbar ist als die spezielle Behandlung beider durch einen und denselben Kunstgelehrten. Die Behandlung der neuern Kunstgeschichte wird bei ihrer vielfachen Verknüpfung mit allen Kunstbezügen der Gegenwart stets ungleich mehr auf den ästhetischen Standpunkt verwiesen sein als auf den philologischen, dessen Anwendung auf die Denkmäler des Alterthums man als einen Fortschritt der neueren Wissenschaft und als ein neu gewonnenes Element der klassischen Philologie zu betrachten pflegt. Der verstorbene Panofka hat, manche Irrungen im Einzelnen ungeachtet, jenen philologischen Standpunkt durch steten Wechselbezug der Kunst- und Schriftdenkmäler des Alterthums viele Jahre hindurch mit Erfolg eingehalten, und wer ihn ersetzen will, muß in der so weitschichtig gewordenen bildlichen Kunsterklärung bereits eingübt sein. Dieser Vortheil kommt dem Dr. Friederichs zu Gute, der überdies den Vorzug genießt durch seinen Beruf beim Kgl. Museum auf tägliche Beschäftigung mit den bildlichen Denkmälern des Alterthums angewiesen zu sein.

¹⁵¹ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 201v-202; see HUBUA, PhilFak 1458, f. 122, for revisions to the final call for the appointment of Friederichs, making it a general statement of Gerhard's personal view and not a thinly veiled appeal to the faculty to change their minds. The first version stated that Haupt was expected to join Gerhard's position, which did not happen.

¹⁵² References here are to the final copy sent to the ministry, as the draft in HUBUA, PhilFak 1458, 118-119, is not fully legible. GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 195-196: Allein die Hintansetzung des Dr. Guhl, welcher der antiken Kunst die ernstesten Studien gewidmet hat, und aber

Furthermore, he found Guhl's many years of service to the university to be no less a sacrifice than Friederichs's in coming to Berlin. It would be a grave insult (*schwere Kränkung*) to Guhl to give preference to his much younger competitor.

In March, the new minister, Bethmann-Hollweg, wrote to the Prince Regent requesting permission to appoint both Guhl and Friederichs to extraordinary professorships; express permission was needed because the statutory number of such professorships had been reached. Most of this report was drawn directly from the documents just reviewed, but it also acknowledged an overall weakness in both art history and archaeology, not just the latter. Toelken was no longer teaching at all, and Gerhard taught only a public course of archaeological exercises. Otherwise only Waagen gave lectures on general art history, which Hotho also covered, but within his lectures on aesthetics. Completely neglected were the key courses identified in the faculty's report, the history of the art of antiquity, the study of monuments, the explication of ancient art works, and mythology. The two appointments would thus ensure completeness of instruction in the fields named (*in die gennanten Fächer*), i.e. art history and archaeology. Guhl was presented as qualified to cover the whole of art history from antiquity onward at the university, Friederichs as a talented young archaeologist of great value to both the university and the museum.¹⁵³ Permission was granted in a royal decree of 16 March and the appointments finalized on 27 April.¹⁵⁴

Meanwhile, Guhl had submitted a plan to the Akademie der Künste to add his previously proposed sequence of history courses to the curriculum. On 23 February 1859, the academy forwarded Guhl's plan to the ministry with a request to implement it on a trial basis, beginning with the coming summer semester. While advanced academy students could attend lectures at the university, they lacked the necessary academic preparation to comprehend rigorous scholarly lectures, which also tended to distract young artists from their proper studies. Furthermore, a disordered mass of historical knowledge was unproductive and worthless for artists. Thus it would be worthwhile to test whether the artistically representable (*das künstlerisch Darstellbare*) could be extracted and presented in a way inspiring to artists. No one was more suited to attempt this than Guhl, who had first proposed the idea. A committee had been appointed to study the distribution of the course content over four semesters, and the ministry was promised a report on the endeavor. The request was granted, with the remark that there was no prospect of

jetzt von einer Reise nach Athen zurückgekehrt ist, weil er sich auch mit der modernen Kunst beschäftigt, würde einer Ansicht Vorschub leisten, die der Archäologie als Theil des allgemeinen Lehrbereiches der Universität bereits sehr nachtheilig geworden ist. Die Vernachlässigung des ästhetischen Werthes der antiken Denkmäler, hervorgegangen aus der Vorliebe für eine untergeordnete Gattung derselben, hat wesentlich zu jener Misachtung der Antike beigetragen, welche selbst Künstler blind macht für ihre Schönheit, auf deren Geltendmachung Winckelmanns unsterbliches Verdienst beruht.

¹⁵³ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 204 (draft dated 11 March).

¹⁵⁴ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 217, 222-223.

additional remuneration for Guhl.¹⁵⁵ Payment may not have been an immediate concern: on 13 August Guhl was appointed secretary of the academy to succeed Toelken, who had recommended him, with a salary of 225 Taler.¹⁵⁶

Guhl's courses were very well received, even as he fell further and further behind each semester. On 16 September 1859 the academy reported that students, professors, and some older artists had eagerly followed Guhl's lectures. History presented so many interesting occurrences that, even when only the most important were selected, more than a few weeks were needed to present them usefully to the art students. He had covered only pre-classical antiquity in summer 1859 and thus sought permission to lecture on Greek and Roman history in the coming winter semester.¹⁵⁷ In February 1860 the academy informed the ministry of Guhl's report to the senate that he would only finish Greek history in the current semester (winter 1859/60), Roman history in the next (summer 1860), and then treat the rise and Christian-Germanic middle ages in the next semester (winter 1860/61) (see [Table 1](#)). Guhl, however, had made continuation of the sequence contingent on the academy's support for making it a permanent part of the curriculum. Recognizing the importance and usefulness of the lectures, as confirmed by the active participation of the students, the senate voted unanimously in favor of Guhl's request.¹⁵⁸

Having received no response from the ministry, Guhl submitted a report to the academy administration in October 1860 renewing his request and asking for remuneration for one and half years of hard work on his lecture notes. If the courses were made permanent, he would continue with preparations for the final segment on the middle ages in the coming winter semester (1860/61); if not, he would turn his attention to other projects. Forwarding Guhl's report, the academy explained its support for both requests. Guhl's courses had been well received by the students and praised by the senate, and they constituted an essential element in the education of artists. Furthermore, the particular nature of history courses for artists had made the preparation of his lecture notes both time-consuming and difficult:

While the university instructor could simply present the results of his historical research to a well prepared audience, historical lectures at an art school must take a form that is as far from superficiality as it is from critical rigor. Through years-long effort Dr. Guhl has brought his lectures into the proper form: He brings to the fore the purely human, the mores and life ways of peoples, as well as the artistic depiction of suitable moments in the intimate circle of the family as well as in the effects of world historical events. Critical analysis

¹⁵⁵ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 2, f. 228-229, 230. Guhl's plan, dated 7 February, is not preserved, but presumably it was similar to the one submitted in 1850.

¹⁵⁶ AdK 0172, f. 6, 8; GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 4, f. 287.

¹⁵⁷ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 2, f. 234.

¹⁵⁸ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 2, f. 240.

remains wholly subordinate, and the practical and documentary are considered only as required by the historical context.¹⁵⁹

In November, the ministry made the historical courses a permanent part of the curriculum and granted Guhl a remuneration of 200 Taler.¹⁶⁰ Subsequent payment appears to have been irregular. On 14 March 1862 Guhl successfully asked the academy to apply on his behalf for either remuneration or a salary, and the ministry granted him another remuneration of 200 Taler.¹⁶¹

On 25 January 1861 Guhl submitted a request for leave from his teaching and administrative duties at both the university and academy in the coming summer semester (1 April to 1 October) to make a trip to Italy. As in his previous requests, he stated his belief that successful treatment of art history and other art studies was impossible without repeated, direct observation (*Anschauung*) of works of art, and especially the architectural monuments, in the places where they had come into being. Over the course of his career he had made several study trips with significant personal sacrifice, given his limited means. Now more than ever he realized how much study on site contributed to the ongoing success of his lectures at the university and the academy. Additionally, he was nearing the end of several projects on ancient and modern art whose completion required repeated study of works (*Kunstdenkmäler*) and collections in Italy. While summer might not be the best time for such a trip, it was the best time for him to take leave from his duties in Berlin. Enrollments were lower in the summer at both institutions, so that cancelling his courses would present no hardship, especially since he had reached points in both of his course rotations amenable to a break. He had made appropriate arrangements in the secretariat of the academy, no exhibition was planned for that year, and he would have completed projects and held his ceremonial speech on the King's birthday before leaving for Italy.

In conclusion, Guhl added a personal motivation for the trip. On New Year's day, he had lost his dear mother, with whom he had lived his whole life in deepest sympathy (and to whom he had dedicated his *Frauen in der Kunstgeschichte*). Grief now cast a heavy and painful weight over his scholarly and professional work, a weight that would be considerably eased by travel. Guhl expected to return to his

¹⁵⁹ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 2, f. 258-259, 260-261; f. 258v-259r: Während der Universitätslehrer einfach die Resultate seiner historischen Forschung einem gründlich ausgearbeiteten Auditori vorträgt, müssen die historischen Vorträge an Kunstschulen noch eine Form suchen, die ebenso weit von Oberflächlichkeit als kritischer Strenge sich fern hält. Durch jahrelange Bemühungen hat Prof. Guhl seine Vorträge in die geeignete Form gebracht, die mehr das rein Menschliche, die Sitten und Lebensweise der Völker, so wie die zu künstlerischer Darstellung geeigneten Momente in engen Rahmen der Familie wie in der gewaltigen Wirkung welthistorischer Ereignisse hervorhebt, während die Kritik nur ganz untergeordnet und das Pragmatische und Diplomatische nur in so weit berücksichtigt, als es der geschichtliche Zusammenhang erfordert.

¹⁶⁰ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 2, f. 262.

¹⁶¹ AdK 0665, f. 65; GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VII, Nr. 1, Bd. 2, f. 283, 285.

work fortified and invigorated by the study and experiences of the trip.¹⁶² In approving the leave, with full pay, the ministry noted only the professional reasons.¹⁶³

After his return from Italy Guhl taught for only two more semesters as he died, after a short illness, on 20 August 1862 at the age of just 43.¹⁶⁴ Somewhat surprisingly, given his repeated claims of limited personal means, he left a bequest of 6000 Taler to the Akademie der Künste for the support of needy artists.¹⁶⁵

Surveying Guhl's career from the vantage point of his early death, it becomes evident that even though he finally secured a professorship at the university, his biggest accomplishments lay in his publications and at Akademie der Künste. While his scholarship may not have broken new ground, he produced useful reference works, and publishing five books by 43 is no mean accomplishment.

At the academy he rose to the position of secretary and ultimately succeeded in introducing a new sequence of courses that was well received by students and faculty. Guhl's teaching reports to the academy senate were particularly detailed, and, despite the loss of several semesters, they allow for a partial reconstruction of his art history courses and the historical sequence instituted in 1859 (see also [Table 1](#)). The course on ancient art concentrated on the Greeks, although it usually began with a short introduction to pre-classical civilizations and concluded with the Romans. Like all of Guhl's courses, it was illustrated with reproductions and drawings, the latter mostly for architecture and likely a mix of drawings on paper and demonstration drawings on the blackboard.¹⁶⁶ As described for summer 1851, the course on Christian art in the middle ages began with an introduction to the historical factors (*Verhältnisse*) underlying the development of art (*Kunstentwicklung*). A comprehensive treatment of early Christian art took up the rest of the semester, with uninterrupted demonstration through drawings (*Erläuterung durch Zeichnungen*) for the discussion of architecture. In summer 1849 and summer 1851 he made it to the end of the middle ages.¹⁶⁷

Given its greater importance for artists, modern art was offered in the winter semester (summer always had lower enrollments) and divided into two courses, one on the fifteenth century and one on the sixteenth. In the sixteenth century course, Guhl taught only painting, focusing on the great masters; in winter 1852/53 these included Leonardo, Fra Bartolomeo, Andrea del Sarto, Michelangelo, and Raphael.

¹⁶² SBPK, Sammlung Darmstaedter, 2i 1848 (5) Ernst Guhl, 25 January 1861; GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 5, f. 175.

¹⁶³ GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Va, Sekt. 2, Tit. IV, Nr. 47, Bd. 5, f. 177, Bethmann-Hollwege to the king (draft), 11 February, 1861; f. 189-190, final approvals and notifications, 1 March 1861.

¹⁶⁴ AdK 0172, f. 11 (draft notification to the ministry); GStAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. IV, Nr. 21, Bd. 3, f. 155.

¹⁶⁵ The financial and legal documents in AdK 0722 indicate that he had inherited the money as his mother's sole heir. Documents for the bequest at the GStAPK are lost (I. HA Rep. 76 Ve Sekt. 17, Tit. III, Nr. 6).

¹⁶⁶ AdK 0665, f. 40, 46, 62, for summers 1850, 1852, and 1860.

¹⁶⁷ AdK 0665, f. 41, 39, 56.

These courses, too, were illustrated and employed lecture, elucidation, and description. (*Vorlesung, Erläuterung und Beschreibung*).¹⁶⁸ The report for winter 1859/60 provides an especially detailed overview of how Guhl taught the course on the fifteenth century. He began with an introduction to the history of architecture illustrated with reproductions and his own drawings of the most important buildings. Next came the history of sculpture in Italy and Germany, with illustrated descriptions of the most important works by the great masters, including Donatello, Luca della Robbia, and Lorenzo Ghiberti. The history of painting received the most comprehensive treatment, beginning with the Italian schools: the Tuscan from Masaccio to Ghirlandaio and Signorelli, the north Italian from Squarcione to Mantegna, Giovanni Bellini, and Francesco Francia. In conclusion he surveyed Netherlandish and German painting, including Memling, Holbein the Elder, and Michael Wohlgemuth.¹⁶⁹

The new historical sequence did not follow the staggered rotation outlined in Guhl's original proposal, which would also have required an adjustment to the art historical sequence. It began in summer 1859 with a survey of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia. In winter 1859/60 it moved on to cover ancient India and the Greeks. To create a compelling picture (*anschauliches Bild*) of ancient India and to inspire and enrich the students' artistic inventiveness (*künstlerische Phantasie*), he presented carefully selected passages from Sanskrit epics. The more extensive presentation of Greece began with the character of the land, the origin and spiritual constitution (*die geistigen Anlagen*) of its people, and its earliest free-standing sculpture. Epic poetry of the heroic period then followed, with the necessary examples from the most beautiful passages of the Iliad and the Odyssey. Then came a survey of the histories of Athens, Sparta, the Persian wars and the subsequent flowering of both Athens and Greece. Again he interspersed passages from the most important lyric and tragic poets, chosen to complete the depiction of Greek life and to inspire and enrich the students' imaginations.¹⁷⁰ The next semester presented the Romans in much the same way, from their first beginnings to their decline. This course ended with the slow degeneration of antiquity and the history and nature of the Germanic tribes down to founding of the Germano-Christian empires and the great achievements of Charlemagne. In winter 1860/61 the sequence concluded with medieval history from Charlemagne to the start of the modern period.¹⁷¹

At the university, as shown in [Tables 1 and 2](#), Guhl did not succeed in his early attempts to introduce new courses that would likely have provided disciplinary grounding for the historical study of art. His 'disputations on the theory and history of the visual arts' may well have been similar to the 'archaeological exercises' he had experienced with Gerhard and Panofka, focused on the description and elucidation of individual monuments. His 'encyclopedia of art studies' was probably a

¹⁶⁸ AdK 0665, 40, 47.

¹⁶⁹ AdK 0665, 60.

¹⁷⁰ AdK 0665, 61.

¹⁷¹ AdK 0665, 62.

systematic introduction to the materials, methods, and primary and secondary literature in the field. In this respect it would have complemented the historical survey he provided in 'general art history', although as he admitted in September 1858, this covered mainly the art of antiquity. As a historical or narrative survey, this course could have been intended for both a general audience and, in theory, specialized students seeking a base of knowledge. The same was likely true of Guhl's period and medium surveys, with the possible exception of the one on modern art (*neuere Kunst*). As a public course offered only one hour per week (usually Saturday evening, no less), this cannot have been very substantive. Finally, Guhl's enrollments did rise from about 1854, mostly in the public course on *neuere Kunst*, but also in the private course on general art history. Otherwise his courses tended to attract few, if any students, which, as he and his supporters noted, was due to the students' lack of interest and 'proper participation' in studies with no professional application.

Art history in the university

The case of Ernst Guhl, until now barely acknowledged and virtually unknown in its particulars, demonstrates that art history had a relatively minor place in the university, at least in Berlin. It had not yet established itself there as a distinct academic discipline serving both general education and the training of future scholars. This was due to a range of local factors, not all of them intellectual or scholarly in nature. Budgetary constraints and a pattern of favouritism in appointments impeded the hiring of young scholars with new ideas until the previous generation began to die off. Lack of interest on the part of students helped reinforce art history's minor position and its primary function as general education. Furthermore, given the considerable control exercised by the ministry (extending to the granting of leave and support for travel) and the need for professors to hold appointments at other institutions, it could be argued that teaching was the only part of art history actually to occur in the university proper. As the case histories of Guhl, Kugler, and Toelken also show, much teaching about art and its history, especially when it involved professional training, occurred outside the classroom in personal and social interactions still rooted in early modern social forms and quite foreign to twenty-first-century pedagogical practice. Understanding the university as an institution and what it both allowed and impeded provides the foundation for the much larger task of demonstrating how art history came into being as a discipline within the university and beyond.

eggarberson@vcu.edu