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Introduction

This essay extends the examination, in volumes five and seven of this journal, of the training, institutional appointments, and teaching careers of art historians in early nineteenth-century Berlin. Here the focus falls on Wilhelm Stier (1799-1856; figures 1 and 2), who taught architectural history from 1828 until his death at the Berlin architecture academy (Bauakademie 1799-1831, 1849-1879; Allgemeine Bauschule 1832-1848). Although well known as a teacher and for his submissions to high-profile architectural competitions, Stier has received little in-depth study by either architectural historians or historiographers of art and architectural history. His training and professional career are especially well documented in both official archives and his own Nachlaß, or personal papers. These primary source materials provide the basis for an informative case history of this important if somewhat singular figure in the development of architectural history as a field of teaching and research in the early nineteenth century. Then as now, architectural history was both part of and separate from the broader field of art history. Not unlike their current somewhat contested relationship, the overlapping histories of the two remain under-investigated. Little attention has been paid to the earlier decades of the nineteenth century or to how architectural history was informed by the curricular needs and administrative practices of architecture schools, which differed considerably from those in universities.

2 Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität Berlin (AmTUB).
3 See most recently Mark Crinson and Richard J. Williams, The Architecture of Art History: A Historiography, London, Bloomsbury Visual Arts, 2019. They examine the increasing divergence of the two fields in the twentieth century as a departure from the supposed unity of the ‘German tradition’. Their discussion of this tradition begins only with the end of the nineteenth century. See also Paul Ranogajec, “Partial Eclipse: Architecture in nineteenth-century art history,” Historians of Nineteenth-Century Art Newsletter 22: 2 (Fall 2015), 1-3; Nancy Stieber, ‘Space, time and architectural history’, in Rethinking Architectural
Like the art historians examined in the earlier essays, Aloys Hirt (1759-1837), E. H. Toelken (1785-1864), Gustav Heinrich Hotho (1802-1873), Franz Kugler (1808-1858), and Ernst Guhl (1819-1862), Stier gained his subject knowledge and professional expertise primarily from independent study, personal mentoring, and travel. However, this all played out rather differently in Stier’s case. His initial training occurred in the architecture academy rather than the university, and his key mentors included artists and architects as well as scholars. Throughout his years of study in Germany, Paris, and Rome, Stier’s primary objective remained creative practice, ultimately settling on architecture after forays into sculpture and painting. His shift from architectural practice to teaching and research was due to both happenstance and lack of professional success, while his move from practical instruction in design to architectural history arose from both his own interest in history and a misalignment between his artistic outlook and the new practical direction of the architecture academy in the early 1830s. That Stier could make this shift from creative or professional practice to research and teaching shows the close connection that still existed between these fields and the key role of architects in the historical study of architecture. That the subsequent course of his career was determined by administrative decisions shows how much the separation of those fields was shaped by the institutions that came more and more to house and control them in the nineteenth century.

Where architectural history was housed and who was responsible for it in early nineteenth-century Berlin is not easily discerned or described, given the complexly intertwined histories of the art and architecture academies and the university. The architecture academy was founded in 1799 as a semi-autonomous part of the art academy (Akademie der Künste) and existed as such until 1824, when it became an independent institution focused on the practical side of architecture, primarily utilitarian structures and engineering. Instruction in ‘aesthetic’ architecture, primarily large-scale public buildings, remained at the Akademie der Künste. Despite the separation, the curricula of the two academies were to complement one another, and Karl Friedrich Schinkel (1781-1841) played a significant role in shaping both from the 1820s into the 1830s. Architectural history

was taught at both academies after the separation, as well as the university. Covering all three arts together as well as sculpture, painting, or other media separately, art history was taught only at the university and the art academy. However, where a given course was officially offered was in some respects irrelevant, as the boundaries between the university and the academies were officially open, at least in the early decades of the century. Students from one institution could and did attend classes at another, or the same course could be offered simultaneously at more than one. Similarly, the art historians examined in the earlier essays all taught both architectural history and art history, sometimes at more than one institution. Kugler, for example, taught several courses (including architectural history) simultaneously at the university and the art academy throughout the 1830s and 1840s, and until 1842 he held appointments at both.

Again, the situation is somewhat different in the case of Stier, both in what he taught and in the conditions of his employment. At the independent Bauakademie he taught only architectural history, at first along with design and then three kinds of drawing. Initially hired in 1828 to teach a capstone design studio, he quickly took it upon himself to develop an independent architectural history course to fill the gap he identified in the students’ knowledge base. Although part of the original curriculum in 1799, architectural history as a separate course had disappeared, at least from the Bauakademie itself in 1806, when Hirt refused to revise his ‘Critical history of architecture’ (Critische Geschichte der Baukunst) to make it more suitable for architecture students. Despite the stated intention to replace Hirt, and its inclusion in most curricular reforms later proposed for the Bauakademie, architectural history was not offered there until Stier took it upon himself, with administrative approval, to teach it in 1829. Subsequent changes to his history courses were, however, dictated by larger curricular revisions imposed by frequent reforms of the institution. At each stage the academy remained a professional and technical school, with a fixed curriculum that repeated over and over, year after year, for the training of architects and building officials. Instructors had no flexibility in what they taught, unlike their colleagues at the university, even the Privatdozenten, who had some freedom to teach what and how they wanted. University faculty could also receive both financial support and time off from teaching for their scholarly research, as in the case of Guhl. Despite holding the title Professor, Stier received little support, aside from money for a research trip in 1834 to prepare a new course on post-antique architecture. For him a reduction in teaching meant a reduction in income, which he had to replace by other means.

Kugler’s career, including a direct connection with Stier, further demonstrates the close relationship of art and architectural history in this period. His training as a surveyor in 1827-29 was probably much like Stier’s in 1816-17, and may have included Stier’s first design course. After working for a summer in his hometown Szczecin (Stettin), Kugler returned to Berlin in fall 1829 to attend Stier’s very first architectural history course at the Bauakademie, and to pursue his broad
interests in art and literature. Kugler never explicitly acknowledged a debt to Stier, as he did to the German philologist Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen (1780-1856), who guided his first studies of both manuscripts and buildings. Nevertheless, he put considerable effort into starting a fair copy of his notes after Stier’s lectures, the bits and pieces of which he kept his whole life. While their significance in Kugler’s formation as an art and architectural historian has been acknowledged, there has been no sustained analysis of the notes or the lectures they recorded.

The present essay seeks to fill that gap, at least partially, by providing for Stier and architectural history at the architecture academy what the first two essays offered for art historians at the university. It examines the history of the institution from 1799 to the early 1850s, in order to sketch the institutional structures that informed the teaching of architectural history for architects and state building officials. It traces Stier’s training and years of travel and study to reveal the extra-institutional frameworks through which he gained his knowledge and expertise.

The degree to which chance and personal strengths and failings determined the course of Stier’s career underscores the need to support assertions about the development of disciplines with detailed institutional and biographical research. Like the earlier articles, this one offers a chronological narrative that presents extensive archival documentation, with the goal of making it available for use in other studies and by other scholars. It does not undertake detailed analysis of Stier’s views on architecture, as expressed in his teaching and publications, seek to situate him in contemporary debates about the interpretation and use of historical styles, or examine his use of those styles in his competition designs.

For both the architecture academy and Stier the secondary literature is limited and easily described, while the primary source materials are extensive and rather difficult to work with, despite being held in just three repositories. I provide a brief orienting overview here, as a foundation for the discussion to follow and as an aid to others who may wish to consult the sources for their own research.

The ‘historical sketch’, published in 1899 by Eduard Dobbert (1839-1899), remains the only comprehensive overview of the Bauakademie’s whole history.
Dobbert was professor of art history at the Technische Hochschule (now Technische Universität), created in 1879 by combined two existing technical schools, the Bauakademie and the Gewerbeakademie (trade academy). Dobbert’s account of the successive reforms of the Bauakademie since its founding in 1799 is sound, if extremely concise, and it still provides the only substantive discussion of the full separation of the Bauakademie from the Akademie der Künste in 1824, but with scant attention to the seven years of deliberations that led up to it. He is also the only one to provide more than passing mention of the reform of 1831/32, which transformed the Bauakademie into the Allgemeine Bauschule with an increased emphasis on practical and technical training, and the reform of 1848/49, which returned to the name Bauakademie and incorporated artistic and historical concerns into a still practically focused curriculum. Several publications over the past two decades have investigated the founding and first years of the Bauakademie, with some discussion of what was taught there. Little attention has been paid, however, to architectural history or how it figured in the various reforms. An important recent exception is Christiane Salge’s study of Hirt’s role in the founding of the Bauakademie and his heated exchanges with its administration about his ‘Critical history’.  

---


Several scholars have carefully examined the archival sources for the first years of the Bauakademie, from its founding to the separation from the Akademie der Künste in 1824. Until now, no one has worked through those for the process leading up to the separation and for the subsequent decades. In the separation, most of the documents pertaining to the old, semi-independent Bauakademie were transferred to the new institution. A few, however, remained, as did many for the division of the two academies. These are now housed in the historical archive of the Akademie der Künste, which has made them available online. The archive of the independent Bauakademie, transferred to the Technische Hochschule, was reportedly destroyed in the second world war. Most of the official documents are thus found only in the Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (GStAPK), including those for the successive reforms and the appointment of instructors. The archive is organized primarily by the Prussian government ministries from which materials were received, and so those for the architecture academy somewhat dispersed. The institution was subject to several different ministries over the course of its history, with records transferred at each change. In the narrative that follows I have indicated which ministry had oversight at each stage in the institution’s history.

The literature on Stier is also limited, with only two substantive examinations to date. The first is the long obituary by the art and architectural historian Wilhelm Lübke (1826-1893), who knew him personally. The other is the

---

11 Most extensively Strecke, Anfänge, and Salge, ‘Hirt’. Salge is presently preparing a detailed study of these years based on the archival sources.

12 Akademie der Künste, Berlin, Historisches Archiv der Preußischen Akademie der Künste (PrAdK). Access via the databank: www.adk.de/de/archiv/archivdatenbank. In the notes, I provide the shelfmark (Signatur) and folio number. At the first reference I give the specific URL, from which a pdf of the whole folder may be downloaded.


15 Wilhelm Lübke, ‘Wilhelm Stier. Nekrolog’, Deutsches Kunstblatt 7:43 (23 October 1856), 371-374; cited here from the republication in Zeitschrift für Bauwesen 7: 1/2 (1857), 85-94. In a prefatory note, Lübke states that he knew Stier well and drew on years of conversation, especially regarding Stier’s teaching; thus, he claims, the obituary, in extent and even wording, has the reliability of an autobiography. Little additional information is provided by K. E. O. Fritsch, ‘Für Wilhelm Stier. Zur Feier seines Gedächtnisses am 8. Mai 1866’,
entry in Eva Börsch-Supan’s catalog of architects in her monumental study of architecture in Berlin after Schinkel. Börsch-Supan drew on Lübke’s account but supplemented it with information drawn from Stier’s Nachlaß at the Technische Universität Berlin. In studies of the architecture academy, Stier’s teaching is frequently mentioned but until recently there has been no in-depth discussion of it. Similarly, Stier is still frequently and uncritically identified as a Schinkel-Schüler, a student or follower of Schinkel, despite Börsch-Supan’s clear and correct statement that Stier never studied with Schinkel and that his relationship with the older man wavered over the years. The present examination of Stier’s life largely confirms her interpretation and provides much more evidence to support it.

In the nearly fifty years since Börsch-Supan, no one has examined the Nachlaß as a whole or drawn on it to provide a fuller accounting of Stier’s life and career. Housed in the Architekturmuseum of the Technische Universität, it includes a massive amount of material in a rather disorganized state. Aside from a few printed items, this material is mostly manuscripts, both bound and unbound, of many different kinds of texts (including but not limited to: personal and professional correspondence, diplomas and passports, research notes, drafts and notes for Stier’s lectures, student notes after his lectures, drafts of historical and theoretical essays, drafts of professional reports, drafts of literary texts). It includes only a very few drawings; these are mostly within or closely associated with manuscript texts, rather than independent studies or sketches. A number of drawings have been catalogued separately; these include presentation drawings for Stier’s ideal and competition designs and his reconstruction of Pliny the Younger’s villas, as well as some finished drawings and a few sketches, mostly undated. The separately catalogued drawings have been digitized. The other materials have not been digitized, nor have they been fully catalogued.


19 The digitized drawings are accessible on the museum’s website: architekturmuseum.ub.tu-berlin.de. Börsch-Supan, 685-688, provides an inventory of the drawings.

20 Börsch-Supan’s listing of the manuscripts, 688-689, is incomplete and does not include all of the ninety-six units listed in the finding aid of c. 1970. These units are either bound
Knowing the history of the Nachlaß and how it was assembled is essential for understanding how to make use of its contents. The core materials were produced and assembled over many years by Stier and his wife, Dorothee Caroline Luise Oswald (1804-1863), known as Caroline, to support several ambitious projects in addition to Wilhelm’s teaching: an illustrated survey of architectural history; publication, with commentary, of Wilhelm’s ideal designs for a protestant church and national cathedral and his reconstruction of Pliny’s villas; and Wilhelm’s biography. After his death, the projects were continued and expanded by Caroline and their son Ludwig Hubertus Oswald Stier (1838-1907), known as Hubert, who in turn continued working after his mother’s death. Like his parents, Hubert never completed these projects. Instead, he pursued a career as a practicing architect, first in Berlin and then in Hannover, achieving the professional success his father never did.

Caroline’s background can be pieced together from Oswald family documents preserved in the Nachlaß. Most likely born in Berlin, she came from a prosperous and well-educated family. Her father, Johann Heinrich Oswald (1768-1737), attended the elite Joachimstaler Gymnasium and studied law in Halle (1786-1789), after which he worked as a lawyer in state service and private practice. His father, Heinrich Wolfgang Oswald (d. 1772) was Stadtmedicus in Spandau. Although she signed herself both ‘Caroline’ and ‘Karoline’, the former is adopted here as the spelling employed in legal documents.

Additional information about Caroline is found in Wilhelm’s letters to friends from his time in Rome, where he described her in highly gendered and not altogether complimentary terms. Writing on 30 August 1832 to the painter Julius volumes or folders of loose and/or string bound materials. For the bound volumes, I give the shelf mark (Signatur) and page number, if the pages are numbered (e.g. II.M.35, 2). For the loose and string-bound materials, I give the shelf mark (including sub-folders designated by letters, e.g. II.M.59.A), name of the item, and page (not folio) numbers for multi-leaf items. In some cases page (not folio) numbers were assigned when the document was written or by a later hand; when no numbers are present I have assigned them myself. I have examined all ninety-one of the currently available units (five were missing already in 1970) to identify materials to support the narrative presented here.

21 The first two are discussed in detail below, the biography primarily in this introductory section.
22 The best source for Hubert’s career is the entry in the online catalog for students and associates of the Hannover architect and teacher Conrad Wilhelm Hase (1818-1902): http://www.glass-portal.privat.t-online.de/hs/s-z/stier_hubert.htm.
23 AmTUB II.M.78(Hausakten).C and P. These include affidavits regarding inheritance, official correspondence, and records for her father’s education and career. The shelf mark II.M.78 was used twice; these documents are in the one with the title ‘Hausakten’. The other bears a misleading title that refers to only some of the contents; it is cited here simply as II.M.78. It contains letters written to Johann Heinrich by his father and other family members in the years from the 1790s into the 1810s (II.M.78.F).
Schnorr von Carolsfeld (1794-1872), he recounted that at their marriage in early 1830 Caroline had brought a dowry of about 6000 Taler. An educated and noble soul, she lacked much that made women attractive, because the sensual side (die sinnliche Seite) was not dominant in her and she preferred indulging in the old poets with him to gossiping about domestic matters and fashion. Their union might be a riddle to those who knew how his senses melted before gigantic natures and beauties, but he enjoyed with her a complete and fulfilling happiness, with good communication and mutual sympathy.²⁴ On 25 December 1833 Stier wrote much the same to the diplomat and historian Christian Carl Josias Bunsen (1791-1860), calling Caroline a deep and good soul of plain appearance (eine stille gute Seele mit wenigem Schein). Her upbringing had endowed her with an understanding of and interest in the good and beautiful in art and life. She was a dear companion and entered closely into many of his activities with pleasure. She assisted him in his studies, whereby he could burden her with much mechanical work (wo ich viel mechanische Last ihr aufbürden darf).²⁵

²⁵ Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (GSTAPK), VI. HA FA von Bunsen (Dep.) B, Briefband 1833, f. 134. Caroline recognized the importance of this letter for the biography and made two partial copies (AmTUB II.M.67.A and II.M.68.A). These include passages not in the letter in GSTAPK, suggesting that she was working from a draft. Her copies do not include the passage about her, which she likely chose to omit.
That Caroline’s assistance extended beyond, but still included, the merely ‘mechanical’ is indicated by the presence of her distinctive looping hand, which contrasts clearly with Wilhelm’s rough, jagged script, on virtually every type of manuscript in the Nachlaß, beginning shortly after their marriage in 1830 and continuing until her own death in 1864. (Figure 3) She was actively engaged in all of the projects listed above, as well as basic research to support Wilhelm’s teaching and publications. Her work consisted largely of such secretarial tasks as transcription, but it also included taking notes and organizing material and even extended to some independent texts on aspects of architectural history.26 Her letters also show that in addition to running their household, she was actively engaged in and well informed about Wilhelm’s professional and scholarly career.27

After Wilhelm’s death on 19 September 1856, his estate was divided evenly between Caroline and Hubert, then just eighteen, represented by his guardian, the architect Hermann Friedrich Waesemann (1813-1879). While most assets, including the house, were sold, Wilhelm’s personal papers could not be assigned a monetary value or divided, and so they became the joint property of the two heirs. The document settling the estate includes a summary listing:

50 folders with prints and drawings, 14 notebooks written by the deceased for lectures he delivered, 45 folders of notes and individual treatises, an essay treating the question of style, further 98 sheets of drawings of various designs created by the deceased, 4 folders with sketches and studies related to these, 450 sheets of travel drawings, 6 copper plates with etchings depicting the villa of the younger Pliny, 20 zinc plates with architectural details for an unfinished work on the history of architecture.28

Although the list is inexact regarding contents of the notebooks and essays, the items listed roughly correspond to materials now in the Nachlaß. The

26 For example, AmTUB; II.M.2.A, ‘Geschichte des Mittelalters von Caroline’; II.M.10.O, notes on catacombs from J. B. L. G. Seroux d’Agincourt, Histoire de l’art par les monuments, depuis sa décadence au IVe siècle jusqu’à son renouvellement au XVe, 6 volumes, Paris, Treuttel and Würtz, 1810-1823.
27 Her letters are in AmTUB II.M.76.A to S.
Architekturmuseum holds a small portion of the drawings for ‘designs created by the deceased’, i.e. those for the competitions and other projects. The fifty folders of prints and drawings and the 450 sheets of travel drawings, however, seem to have disappeared. Wilhelm’s library, valued at 415 Taler, had been inventoried separately and sold.29

On 8 December 1856, the Berlin publisher Ernst & Korn signed a contract with Caroline and Hubert (represented by Waesemann) for publication of ‘artists’ letters, novellas, and biographies’ from Wilhelm’s literary estate. Editorial work was to be carried out by Wilhelm Lübke.30 Lübke completed his work with Wilhelm’s manuscript drafts very quickly, and in late 1857 the book appeared under the title Hesperische Blätter. It contained recollections from Wilhelm’s time in Italy and several Künstler-Novellen, or novellas from the lives of Italian Renaissance artists.31

That Caroline continued the two earlier publication projects, with some initial assistance from Hubert, is indicated by a series of letters she wrote to him in July, August, and September 1860.32 Hubert was away on an extended trip to western and southern Germany, which was to culminate in Frankfurt am Main in time for the convention of German architects and engineers (Versammlung deutscher Architekten und Ingenieure). Here Hubert’s primary task was to present his father’s designs for a monumental protestant church and national cathedral, which had been carefully packed and sent to coincide with his arrival; he was also to read aloud his father’s explanatory text. The goal was to keep Wilhelm’s memory alive in the profession and to seek a publisher for prints after Wilhelm’s presentation drawings. In addition, Hubert was to seek out a young architect they could hire as a draughtsman to work in Berlin, to replace or supplement Wilhelm and Caroline’s longtime assistant Gustav Geldern (life dates unknown).33 Caroline complained that Geldern was working too slowly due his general unreliability and work on other jobs. Geldern was producing drawings to illustrate the survey of architectural history as well as for the publication of Stier’s ideal church designs.

29 AmTUB II.M.78(Hausakten).M, section A, item 5e. Partial lists of the books are found in II.M.79.K.
30 AmTUB II.M.78(Hausakten).H.
31 Wilhelm Stier, Hesperische Blätter. Nachgelassene Schriften, ed. Wilhelm Lübke, Berlin, Ernst & Korn, 1857. I have not attempted to correlate this publication with the many drafts, some quite finished, for novellas found in AmTUB II.M.60, II.M.61, II.M.62, II.M.78.E, II.M.80.A-D, II.M.83. Lübke received twenty-five free copies in lieu of monetary compensation; the heirs received a small royalty and twelve free copies.
33 Originally from Goslar, Geldern came to Berlin as a young man, probably in 1840 or 1841. He was supported by the Stiers while he studied drawing and painting (AmTUB II.M.75.E, Geldern [Gustav’s father] to Wilhelm Stier, Goslar, 30 October 1843). Occasional references in Caroline’s letters indicate that Geldern lived, off and on, in their household (AmTUB II.M.76.A, Berlin, 18 September 1843; Pillnitz, 1846).
The letters show increasing tension between Caroline and Hubert, culminating in the bitter postscript to the final letter of 21 September 1860. She had mostly accepted Hubert’s decision to pursue a professional career rather than the scholarly research undertaken by his father, noting that she could not fault him for rejecting a path that even Wilhelm had found agonizingly difficult. She had desperately wanted him to follow this path, and her earlier letters contain repeated admonishments not to neglect his studies and to practice recording his observations. She was also coming to realize how much work remained, and despaired of it ever being finished. The beginning of the end had already come, however, with the return of ‘the carefully collected examples from the works of the Bauakademie’, which might have been prevented, had she not lost her head entirely, suggesting contentious negotiations with the academy’s administration.34 These ‘examples’ were probably the fifty folders of prints and drawings listed in the settlement document, which in turn likely correspond to the teaching materials Stier had assembled over the course of his career, as discussed below.

While it is impossible to know how much Caroline changed earlier plans for the architectural history survey and publication of Wilhelm’s ideal church designs, there is clear and convincing evidence that she reconceived the biography and made it into her own project. Its initial conception as a personal memoir (written in the third person) is represented by three relatively finished text fragments covering the early part of Wilhelm’s life up to and including the first years at the Bauakademie.35 These show both their hands, sometimes within the same document and on the same page, suggesting shared work. (Figure 3) In addition, there are several brief texts, lists and chapter outlines, all written by Wilhelm alone.36 Caroline’s later expansion of the project is documented in several ways. Many of her working notes are gathered in a folder labeled, by Hubert, ‘Mother’s notes and sketches about Wilhelm Stier’.37 These are mostly excerpts copied from letters to and from Wilhelm, ranging in length from a few lines to several paragraphs; excerpts from Wilhelm’s own autobiographical texts; her recollections of things he said; and short text fragments that combine excerpts with her own explanation or commentary. She was clearly working from other materials, now dispersed throughout the Nachlaß:

35 Two of these fragments are in AmTUB II.M.59.C. Based on internal evidence the earliest (here designated Biography A) dates to the early 1830s, the second to the early 1840s (Biography B). A third fragment in II.M.59.D bears the title ‘Zur Einleitung in die Studien der Baukunst’.
36 Dispersed in AmTUB II.M.59 and II.M.61.
originals of letters sent to Wilhelm by his friends; Wilhelm’s letters or drafts of letters to friends; official correspondence, to and from Wilhelm, with his side often in draft form; and official documents for his education and employment. While she may already have had some of this in hand, Caroline also collected Wilhelm’s letters from his friends. Writing to Hubert on his trip in 1860, she asked him to remind the painter Ludwig Pose (1786-1877) to send her the letters he had received. She also asked Hubert to seek out specific letters from Wilhelm to his mentor in Düsseldorf, Adolph von Vagedes (1772-1842), which she suspected were in the possession of someone he was likely to meet in Frankfurt.  

Why Caroline needed all this material is shown by her notes about the models she had in mind and what she hoped to accomplish. She cited earlier biographies that included the subject’s own words, with an extended commentary on Julius Eduard Hitzig’s (1780-1849) publication on the life of E.T.A. Hoffmann (1776-1822).  

She praised Hitzig’s attempt to let the deceased speak for himself as much as possible, with little intervention by the biographer, but she faulted the format he had adopted. Ten sections give a quick narrative of Hoffmann’s life based on his works, correspondence, diaries, personal papers and direct statements; each is followed by the full text of documents from Hoffmann’s Nachlaß. Caroline stated that these would have been better presented as excerpts. As suggested by her notes and drafts, she probably envisioned a book more like the other biographies she cited, which wove together excerpts from letters and other documents with explanatory text to create a single narrative. She noted approvingly that Hitzig had avoided the partisan panegyrics common in biographies of famous men, describing both the positive and negative aspects of his subject. Flawed men, she emphasized, were more interesting to read about than simply and undeniably great men like Schiller, Lessing, or Winckelmann. Hitzig had thus produced a work as instructive as it was pleasing, and she hoped that Wilhelm’s early life would guide young artists in following their own paths.  

As much as she admired Hitzig for presenting both sides of Hoffmann, she was clearly interested in burnishing Wilhelm’s legacy. She thought that the biography of Karl Friedrich von Rumohr (1785-1843) could

38 AmTUB II.M.76.R, Caroline Stier to Hubert Stier, Berlin, 5 September 1860, 3. From letters she already had, Caroline determined that she needed one from 1837 and another from 1839, as they contained much information on medieval architecture in Halberstadt, Goslar, and the Harz. I did not find these letters in the Nachlaß. Letters to Pose are in II.M.65.H (1820-1821) and II.M.54.A and B (1822-1823, from Paris and Rome).  


40 AmTUB II.M.74.4.
provide a model for describing the prodigalities (Wunderbarkeiten) of Wilhelm’s mind, and she compared his early struggles as a teacher to those of Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805).\footnote{Citing Heinrich Wilhelm Schultz, K. F. von Rumohr, sein Leben und seine Schriften. Nebst einem Nachwort über die physische Constitution und Schädelbildung sowie über die letzte Krankheit Rumohrs von C. G. Carus, Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1844; and Edward Bulwer-Lytton, The Poems and Ballads of Schiller, with a Brief Sketch of Schiller’s Life, Edinburgh, W. Blackwood and Sons, 1844, probably from the German translation: Schiller’s Leben und Werk von E. L. Bulwer, trans. H. Kletke, Berlin, Gustav Hempel, 1848.}

At Caroline’s death on 5 October 1863, Hubert, as her sole heir, inherited the materials assembled by his parents.\footnote{AmTUB II.M.78(Hausakten).B, Erblegitimations-Attest, 1 June 1864.} In 1867, he published the first and only installment of an ambitious project to secure his father’s legacy, which he believed was already fast disappearing from public memory. He planned to publish the drawings and explanatory texts for Wilhelm’s public competition designs and those for the reconstruction of Pliny’s villas, a biography based on Wilhelm’s own recollections, studies on the essence and history of architecture drawn from Wilhelm’s Nachlaß, and a collection of smaller sketches and designs.\footnote{Architektonische Erfindungen von Wilhelm Stier, ed. Hubert Stier, Berlin, Hubert Stier, 1867, iii-iv.} The first installment includes only the introductory text for the whole project, Wilhelm’s texts on the villas, Hubert’s discussion of the reconstructions, and an atlas of seven prints for Pliny’s Laurentine villa.

Most likely in connection with his publication plans, Hubert reorganized the materials he inherited, creating new rubrics, like the one for his mother’s notes for the biography. These have been retained only partially in the current state of the Nachlaß, which is the result of yet another reorganization. More recently some attempts have been made at more detailed cataloguing of items within the unsystematic overall organization. The shuffling and mixing up of individual items has not been rectified, however, such that both related documents and parts of individual documents are dispersed. I have not investigated how the Nachlaß came into the collection of the Architekturmuseum or what became of the prints, drawings, and plates listed in the settlement document of 1857.\footnote{According to the entry for Wilhelm in the Thieme-Becker Künstlerlexikon, vol. 32 (1938), 43-44, Hubert’s son, the architect Hubert Stier, was in possession of Wilhelm’s letters, notes, and diaries, as well as Hubert’s manuscript biography.} My focus has been instead on working with the available manuscript sources to produce a chronological narrative that makes this documentation accessible for use in other studies and by other scholars. I have not attempted to write the biography that Caroline and Hubert never finished, but rather to produce what
might be characterized as a micro-history. Where Hubert and especially Caroline sought to present Wilhelm as an heroic if flawed figure struggling against external circumstances and personal weaknesses in the unflagging pursuit of a higher artistic calling, I examine specific aspects of his life for what they reveal about the larger institutional structures and intellectual frameworks that shaped research and teaching in art and architectural history. Still, it is hard to resist some of the biographer’s identification with the subject. Stier’s complaints about too much teaching and lack of research support resonate with present frustrations, and it is fascinating to observe in his life early forms of what art and architectural historians do today. At the same time, he is a frustrating figure to study. Börsch-Supan’s characterization of his lectures and few publications as muddled, prolix, and subjective applies as well to all his writings and indeed to his whole life, such that it is easy to become so lost in the voluminous archival material that one risks becoming like Stier, unable ever to finish.

This essay presents that material in eight sections. The first briefly traces the history of the Bauakademie from its founding into the 1810s, with emphasis on the teaching of architectural history by Hirt. Although this part of the institution’s history is well studied, there is little available in English, and it is hard to understand the later history without this background. The second section examines the bureaucratic wrangling that led up to the Bauakademie’s separation from the Akademie der Künste (1817-1824) and the years leading up to the next reform in 1831. Architectural history figures in the various curricula put forth for both institutions, most prominently in the one devised by Schinkel for the Akademie der Künste in 1823, but never implemented (Appendix One). The third section recounts Stier’s life from his earliest years through his initial training in Berlin, employment in the Rhineland (1817-1821), and study in Paris (1821) and Rome (1821-1827). The next three sections survey his professional career in the three stages defined by his initial appointment and two reforms of the architecture academy: 1828-1831, 1831/32-1848, and 1848/49-1856. The last two sections examine Stier’s teaching through the many student notes after his lectures. The first considers methodological issues in the study of student notes and offers a summary analysis of the notebooks preserved in the Nachlaß. From these, it then draws some general conclusions about how Stier taught his courses. The second provides an overview of how Stier’s history courses were structured from the first one in 1828 up to the reform of 1848. The foundation for this is provided by Stier’s impossibly ambitious plan for a ‘Comparative history of architecture,’ submitted for Schinkel’s review in 1833. A condensed outline of this is given in Appendix Two along with Schinkel’s critique.

46 Börsch-Supan, 685.
The first years of the Bauakademie and Hirt’s ‘Critical history of architecture’

The founding of the Bauakademie in 1799 had been anticipated by repeated attempts, since the mid-eighteenth century, to improve and expand architectural instruction in Berlin, but it was the immediate result of ministerial consultations with academic and professional stakeholders that began just two years earlier. These discussions were informed by an unresolved tension between ‘higher’ or ‘aesthetic’ architecture and its practical and technical side and attempts by exponents of each to assert control over architectural education. Architectural history is barely mentioned at this stage. More informative is the internal conflict that soon arose between the Bauakademie’s administration and Hirt over his ‘Critical history of architecture’. As Salge has shown in her detailed analysis of the documents, the dispute reveals differing views on how architectural history should be taught, with differences revolving around the overarching tension between the aesthetic and the practical. The documents also show that the role of architectural history as a separate course within a largely practical curriculum was not just uncertain, but also difficult for both sides to articulate clearly.

By the late 1790s it had become evident that the Akademie der Künste was unable to train the architects and especially the engineers required by the modernizing and expanding Prussian state.\(^{47}\) In late 1797 the king, Friedrich Wilhelm III (b. 1770, r. 1797-1840), tasked members of the Oberbaudepartement (public buildings department) with devising a plan for an engineering school. In response, the architects David Gilly (1748-1808) and Heinrich August Riedel (1748-1810) proposed a school to train both architects and engineers, staffed and overseen by the Oberbaudepartement. The curriculum encompassed drawing, mathematics and physics, surveying, mechanics and hydraulics, and several courses simply called ‘architecture’ (Baukunst). It did not include architectural history. In early 1798 the council of ministers (Generaldirektorium) sought further opinions from two members of the Oberhofbauamt (court buildings administration), the architects Carl Gotthard Langhans (1732-1808), designer of the Brandenburg Gate, and Friedrich Christian Becherer (1747-1823), who had overseen architectural instruction at the Akademie der Künste since 1790. Langhans simply advocated a reorganization of the art academy, while Becherer objected to the overemphasis on engineering at the expense of aesthetic concerns and warned against an independent school that would grant the Oberbaudepartement a monopoly on both training and employment.\(^{48}\) A committee from the Akademie der Künste was then formed to consider the reorganization of all instruction there, consisting of Hirt, the printmaker and rector

\(^{47}\) For the earlier, unsuccessful reforms see Strecke, Anfänge, 117-129; Bollé, 454-460.

\(^{48}\) Strecke, Anfänge, 129-132, quoting extensively from the ministerial documents; Salge, ‘Hirt’, 116-117.
Daniel Berger (1744-1825), and the architect Hans Christian Genelli (1763-1823). The committee’s report of 30 June 1798, authored by Hirt, acknowledged the need to reform architectural instruction at the Akademie der Künste but rejected the idea of a separate institution, denouncing the supposed distinction between aesthetic and vernacular architecture (ästhetische Baukunst, Landbaukunst) as a merely arbitrary assumption (bloß willkürliche Annahme). Furthermore, the same foundational knowledge was required by both the practical architect (Landbaumeister) and the fine architect (Schönbauemeister). In his decree of 15 December 1798 the king split the difference, so to speak: while acknowledging the need for reform, he rejected the idea of a fully independent architecture academy. Since the Akademie der Künste was already teaching the fundamentals of both fine and practical architecture (Pracht- und Oekonomie-Baukunst), he saw no need to duplicate the curriculum and pay for two sets of faculty.

The ministers then appointed a planning committee of ten members drawn from both camp, the the Akademie der Künste (Hirt, Genelli, Johann Gottfried Schadow [1764-1850]) and the Oberbaudepartement (Riedel, Gilly, and Johann Albert Eytelwein [1764-1849]), and the Oberhofbauamt (Langhans, Becherer, and Michael Philipp Daniel Boumann [1747-1803]), with an outside chair, the chancellor of the university in Halle. After meeting five times in early 1799, the committee submitted a report on 14 February recommending the establishment of an architecture academy as an integral part of the Akademie der Künste and providing instruction in both architecture and engineering. The curriculum largely followed the plan submitted by Gilly and Riedel in 1797, but it also included two courses to be taught by members of the art academy, ‘City architecture’ (Stadtbaukunst) and ‘Critical history of architecture’. On 30 March the king approved a set of preliminary policies for the new institution. As Becherer had feared, these policies represented a victory for the Oberbaudepartement. Not only had it set the curriculum (largely taught by its own members), it had also secured administrative control by appointing three of the four Directors (Eytelwein, Gilly, and Riedel), with the fourth coming from the Oberhofbauamt and Akademie der Künste (Becherer). The directors were responsible for monitoring the content and quality of instruction, the primary purpose of which was to train practical architects, engineers, and

---

49 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, f. 20-33r; Strecke, Anfänge, 132-133; Salge, ‘Hirt’, 117-118.
50 GSTAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, f. 80; quoted in Strecke, Anfänge, 133; Dobbert, 22.
52 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, f. 93-107; Strecke, Anfänge, 134; Salge, ‘Hirt’, 119, 126.
building officials to serve the Prussian state.\textsuperscript{53} Ultimate authority, however, rested with the Kuratorium, a two-person committee consisting of the directors of the Akademie der Künste and the Oberbaudepartement.

On 1 October 1799 the new Bauakademie began instruction with a fixed curriculum based on the approved policies. The seven courses of the summer semester (April through September) emphasized practical applications (including business practices) but also continued two of the drawing courses (free-hand, architectural). The winter semester (October through March) included 14 courses, focused on architecture (\textit{Stadtbaukunst, Oekonomische Baukunst}), civil engineering (roads, canals, bridges, locks, harbors), practical study of sciences (mathematics, optics, physics, materials), construction, four types of drawing (free-hand, architectural, machines, site plans), and finally Hirt’s ‘Critical history of architecture’. With the exception of Hirt’s, which extended over two winters, all courses were to begin anew every April, to accommodate each fresh class of students, known as \textit{Eleven} or \textit{Baueleven} (from the French \textit{élève}). The curriculum was to prepare students for two levels of state exams: the surveyor’s exam (for low-level building officials) and the architect’s exam.\textsuperscript{54}

The structure and content of Hirt’s two-semester ‘Critical history of architecture’ were first set forth in a document submitted to the planning committee on 28 January 1799.\textsuperscript{55} The course was divided into three sections. The first comprised ‘a systematic encyclopedia of construction types in all their parts from the earliest times to the present’ (\textit{eine razonirte Encyclopedie der Constructionsarten in allen Theilen seit den ältesten Zeiten bis auf uns}). After a general introduction to the origins and purposes of architecture and the Vitruvian principles of solidity, comfort, and beauty, it reviewed the elements of architectural construction: columns (with their parts: base, shaft, capitals, entablature); materials; walls (including their covering and decoration), arches and vaults; roofs, ceilings, and floors; stairs, windows, doors; and stoves and fireplaces. The second section presented a chronological survey of architecture in three sections: 1) ancient, 2) medieval (Byzantine, early medieval in Europe, Arabian, and Gothic), and 3) modern (since 1400). Each section was further broken down into subsections: a) the construction techniques of each people; b) invention, improvement, and decline of each; c) preserved buildings, with references to publications providing measurements and drawings; d) key buildings

\textsuperscript{53} GSTAPK, I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, f. 86, 93-99, 119-122. Dobbert, 24-29; Strecke, \textit{Anfänge}, 134-136; Salge, ‘Hirt’, 118-119.


\textsuperscript{55} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 2, f. 35-36v, reprinted in Salge, ‘Hirt’, 133-135.
only documented in textual sources; and e) writers on architecture and the value of their texts. The third section provided ‘a systematic encyclopedia’ (eine razonirte Encyclopedie) of building types in two sections, ancient (temples, theatres, amphitheaters, baths, basilicas, and so forth) and modern (churches, baptistries, mosques, cemeteries, town halls, hospitals, and so forth).

The course was included in the preliminary policies of March 1799. On 29 June Hirt accepted the invitation to teach it according to the plan submitted in January but subject to the oversight of the directors, and without additional compensation. He also reiterated his promise to provide the printed texts that would guide his lectures. As Salge has noted, the three sections of the course corresponded to Hirt’s three books on architecture, which focused exclusively on the ancients: origins, principles, and materials in Die Baukunst nach den Grundsätzen der Alten (Berlin, 1809); historical survey in Die Geschichte der Baukunst bei den Alten (Berlin, 1821/22); and building types in Die Lehre der Gebäude bei den Griechen und Römern (Berlin, 1827). The published texts follow the internal organization of parts one and three of the course quite closely, while the history in part two takes a somewhat different form. After Hirt had taught the course only once (over two winters, 1799/1800 and 1800/1801), he became enmeshed in a long conflict with the administration prompted by the first reform of the Bauakademie and characterized by ill will and mutual misunderstanding.

On 28 February 1801 the king had responded to a recent report on the new institution by tasking his ministers with correcting two significant problems: the curriculum was too fragmented and the incoming students too unprepared. He gave specific instructions for fixing the second problem, but left the first to the ministers and their subordinates, with a reminder never to forget that the Bauakademie was to train ‘practical building officials and not professors’ (praktische Baubediente und keine Professoren). In response, the Directors of the Bauakademie (Riedel, Eytelwein, and Gilly) drafted a plan for an administrative and curricular reform that was put in place over the next year or so and published in 1803. Although the directors asserted the need to train future instructors and to provide essential theoretical training for both public servants and architects engaged at the

56 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 1, f. 98; GStAPK I. HA Rep 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden IV, Nr.30, f. 1-2; Salge, ‘Hirt’, 120.
57 Salge, ‘Hirt’, 126-128, describes the content of Hirt’s course and how he taught it.
58 See Salge, ‘Hirt’, 120-126, for a more detailed account of the dispute. With a large debt to Salge’s foundational work, I present a somewhat different narrative.
59 Reprinted in Dobbert, 34.
60 Dobbert, 34-38, reprints sections of the Directors’ response and their plan from the archive of the Technische Hochschule. He also quotes from the Deklaration des Publikandi vom sechsten Juli 1799, wegen der vorläufigen Einrichtung der, von Seiner Königlichen Majestät, unter dem Namen einer königlichen Bau-Akademie zu Berlin gestifteten allgemeinen Bau-Unterrichts Anstalt. I cite this from the copy in PrAdK 0004.
higher levels of the profession, their reform largely followed the king’s admonition to maintain the institution’s practical focus. It also put in place stricter administrative controls over both admissions and instruction. The Directorate became the Akademische Ober-Bau-Deputation of the Oberbaudepartement, still consisting of Riedel, Gilly, Eyelwein, and Becherer, but now presided over by Oberfinanzrat Morgenländer. The reform also included minor adjustments to the curriculum, all emphasizing the practical focus ordered by the king. Hirt’s ‘Critical history of architecture’ was to become instead ‘Encyclopedia of architecture with a short critical history’ (Encyclopädie der Baukunst nebst einer kurzen kritischen Geschichte).

The conflict with Hirt began even before the revised curriculum was published. On 4 June 1801 Hirt submitted a long response to a directive received in May from the Akademische Ober-Bau-Deputation that his course should not emphasize ‘critique of the aesthetics of decoration’ (Kritik der Aesthetischen Dekoration) and instead present an encyclopedia or the whole of architecture.\(^61\) Hirt did not understand what the Deputation meant by encyclopedia or overview of all architecture, and it is hard now to interpret their brief directive. He complained that the Deputation did not know what he had been teaching, as both the initial proposal and his actual teaching did indeed present an overview, just under a different and better name. Along with the aesthetics of decoration he also covered materials and techniques among the various peoples and periods, as well as a typology of buildings. He defended the need for the instructor to demonstrate why a particular historical example was good or bad. Subsequent directives from the Deputation suggest that they objected to the way he structured his overview and the emphases he set within it. Ultimately, however, Hirt refused to comply for contractual reasons: because he was following the plan approved at the founding of the Bauakademie and working without pay, he was not subject to the Deputation’s authority. Besides, he added, everyone knew that his course was intended for students of both the architecture and the art academies.

In its response of 21 October, the Deputation simply referred to the king’s decree from earlier in the year regarding the practical focus of the Bauakademie and asserted the clarity and terminological correctness of their directive. Offended by their nitpicking (spitzfindige Wörter), Hirt responded on 28 October with a reiteration of his earlier arguments.\(^62\) In a report of 5 December, the Deputation informed the Kuratorium of Hirt’s intransigence and that they had given up all hope of making him change his course.\(^63\) There the matter rested for two years.

---


\(^63\) GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr.30, f. 5v. Salge, ‘Hirt’, 121.
The conflict resumed with preparation of the course list for the winter semester 1803/04. On 10 September 1803 Hirt objected to the listing of his course under the title fixed in the now-published reform curriculum: ‘Encyclopedia of architecture with a short critical history’. He was teaching not a short but rather a complete history of architecture, as stipulated at the time of his appointment, and so the course should be listed by its proper title, ‘Critical history of architecture’, and with the requirement that students have taken courses in geometry, perspective, optics and the physics of construction. Without this preparatory knowledge, students could not follow his lectures, as he had learned from bitter experience. He also reiterated his claim that he was not subject to the Deputation’s authority because he was teaching without pay. In its response of 23 September, the Deputation rejected the listing of prerequisites as against usual procedure and noted the impossibility of requiring them for Hirt’s or any course.

Resuming the fight about terminology, they noted that Hirt’s initial plan of January 1799 did in fact use the term ‘encyclopedia’ for its first and third parts. After a flattering if formulaic assertion of how much they valued Hirt and his teaching, they noted that students at the Bauakademie were still not provided the comprehensive, foundational overview of the history of architecture called for in the new curriculum, which left them to grope about in the dark. Changing to such a general overview would also eliminate overlaps with the courses on construction and city architecture. To avoid immediate disruptions they allowed him to use the old name for the coming semester, but stipulated that the matter was to be sorted out for the next winter semester (1804/05).

On 10 October 1803 Hirt countered with long, peevish response. It did not matter to him if the Deputation wanted an ‘encyclopedia of architecture’. While he had no opinion on its potential utility, he definitively declared that he would never teach it, and he rejected the term ‘encyclopedia’ as so vague it could mean anything. He had no objection to changes in other courses, but he could not change his own, as it constituted a comprehensive system in which the elements could only be understood with reference to each other. Besides rejecting the Deputation’s legal authority over him, he attacked them personally, as mere tradesmen (Geschäftsmänner) who lacked sufficient knowledge and were too distracted by practical concerns to administer an educational institution devoted to all architectural science (die gesammte architektonische Wissenschaft). They could not possibly have any competence in architectural history, a field that had not existed.

---

64 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr.30, f. 7. These complaints about the poor organization and administration of the Bauakademie were expressed already in Hirt’s report of 6 April 1801 and echo many of his concerns during the initial planning for the new institution, summarized in Salge, ‘Hirt’, 116-120.

65 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr.30, f. 8-9.

until he created it. Hirt also challenged the Deputation’s interpretation of the king’s order of February 1801. It did not explicitly call for a change in his course, nor did the mandate to train practical building officials, not professors, preclude all theory and aesthetics. Theoretical knowledge never harms practice, Hirt insisted, and a true theory of architecture can only comprise such laws and rules as are to be abstracted from a purified experience of those peoples greatest in the art of building. Training even practical building officials could not be done while neglecting so-called fine architecture; true architects make the best building officials, and only the former can contribute to a true improvement of public building.

There the matter rested until April 1805, when a dispute flared up over Hirt’s failure to submit the required attendance and progress reports and to prevent unmatriculated students from attending his lectures.67 He asserted, yet again, that his course was also open to art students not matriculated at the Bauakademie and that progress reports served no purpose, given longstanding problems that made effective teaching impossible. Lacking adequate preparation and overburdened with too many courses, students were unable to complete the drawings or essays he assigned, or to respond to questions posed to them directly. The Deputation opted not to force the matter. In its report to the ministry of 6 May it suggested that Hirt’s course simply be made optional for those architecture students wishing to learn more about ‘aesthetic’ architecture from its history.68

By the next year, however, Hirt had had enough. On 3 April 1806 he asked the Kuratorium for permission to resign his unpaid position at the Bauakademie and go back to teaching only at the Akademie der Künste every winter, alternating between the history of art and the history of architecture.69 On 22 April the Kuratorium approved his request, with the suggestion that the Deputation propose a new instructor for the course they could not force Hirt to teach, ‘the actual encyclopedia of the science and art of building, and a history of construction’ (eigentliche Encyclopedie der Bau-Wissenschaft und Kunst, und eine Geschichte der Construction).70 On 17 May the Academic Oberbaudeputation communicated partial agreement, observing that Hirt’s disquisitions on aesthetic appearances were of limited utility, since only a few architects ever had the opportunity to design fine buildings. It did not matter where the architecture students heard his lectures, which, despite their deficits, did provide some basic knowledge.71 No one was ever officially put forward to teach the missing course.

67 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 30, f. 21-22, Hirt’s response of 22 April 1805 quotes instructions dated 13 April.
68 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 30, f. 19v.
69 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 30, f. 34-35.
70 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 30, f. 36-37v. Salge, ‘Hirt’, 125, quotes extensively from this and the following document.
71 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 alt Ältere (Kultus) Oberbehörden, Tit. IV, Nr. 30, f. 39v-39r; f. 42v-45v are the ministerial memos of 12 June making the decision official.
Removing Hirt’s course from the required curriculum somewhat solved the problem of overlap with ‘Construction’, initially taught by Becherer, and ‘City architecture’, taught by Heinrich Gentz (1766-1811), also a member of the Oberhofbauamt. Becherer’s year-long course provided a science-based introduction to structural principles and the properties of materials (summer) and demonstration of their application to actual buildings (winter). This corresponded roughly to the first part of Hirt’s course, but updated it with instruction based in the natural sciences.

Gentz’s course was far more than just city buildings, and it also overlapped with Hirt’s ‘Critical history’. ‘City architecture’ combined three days of lecture per week with two half-days of practical training at actual building sites. In the first semester it provided an introduction to the classical orders, to the Vitruvian principles of strength, comfort, beauty (both in part one of Hirt’s course) and good proportions. In the second semester it demonstrated those principles in the several kinds of urban buildings (churches, city halls, libraries, schools, factories, armories, and so forth, or a survey of building types as in part three of Hirt’s course) and their placement in the fabric of the city. It also included practical instruction, in the form of drawing after the orders from the generally preferred authors and ‘practice in the design and construction planning of these [city] buildings’ (Übung im Entwerfen und Veranschlagung dieser Gebäude).

Hirt’s resignation became effectively moot in 1809/10 when the Bauakademie was fully integrated into the Akademie der Künste. Although there was now only one institution, administered by a single director, the name Bauakademie continued to be used as if it still existed, and some architecture courses were taught in the building set up for it in 1806. This change occurred within a larger reform of public administration in Prussia that further diminished the attention paid to the architecture curriculum. The Akademie der Künste now fell under the new Sektion für Kultus und Unterricht (section for religion and instruction) of the Interior Ministry. The Oberbaudepartement had become the Oberbaudeputation, incorporating the Oberhofbauamt, and was subject to a different section of the Interior Ministry, the Sektion für Gewerbepolizei (section for industrial oversight).
In 1814 it moved to the Finance Ministry. While the Oberbaudeputation no longer played a role in the training of surveyors and architects, it continued to administer the state examinations. This inherently problematic arrangement lasted until the establishment of the fully independent Bauakademie in 1824.

The architectural curriculum at the Akademie der Künste was also reduced given the availability of foundational courses (physics, chemistry, materials) at the new university. Hirt, appointed as one of the first university professors, continued to offer his ‘Critical history’ at irregular intervals, in some semesters listing it at both the academy and the university. Very occasionally he offered (but rarely taught) courses with similar titles at one or both institutions. Some architecture courses did continue at the Akademie der Künste. Upon Gentz’s death ‘Construction’ and ‘City architecture’ passed to a new instructor, Martin Friedrich Rabe (1765-1856), in summer 1811 and winter 1811/12 respectively. Although Rabe seems to have had some difficulty maintaining regular instruction, he is listed as teaching both courses until 1824. From the titles in the official course lists, it appears that he taught each much as his predecessors had, with principles set forth in the first half (summer) and their application demonstrated in the second. The design exercises, however, appear to have been dropped.

The independent Bauakademie

Like its founding a quarter century earlier, the Bauakademie’s full, final separation from the Akademie der Künste in 1824 resulted from protracted bureaucratic deliberation and negotiation, this time lasting seven years. The initial impetus for discussion was the need to improve the practical and technical training of architects and state building officials, but the main cause for the creation of a fully independent Bauakademie for the practical side of architecture was a financial disagreement between ministers. Although often mentioned as a necessary foundation, architectural history received only passing attention in these seven years of contentious negotiation. It figures most prominently in Schinkel’s never

---

74 Dobbert, 40; Strecke, Anfänge, 216, and 146-166, for the change in function of the new Oberbaudeputation.
76 For his courses see Uta Motschmann, ‘Synoptische Tabelle der Vorträge Hirts’, in Fendt, Sedlarz, and Zimmer, 223-256; Garberson, ‘Art history in the university’, Table 1.
77 For the course lists see PrAdK Nr. 0008: https://archiv.adk.de/objekt/2307374. Rabe’s irresponsibility is mentioned in a budget report of 17 October 1818 prepared during planning for the separation: GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Ve Kultusministerium, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 80v.
implemented plan for instruction in ‘aesthetic’ architecture, which remained at the Akademie der Künste. The scholarship on this period in the Bauakademie’s history is very limited, with little attention to the course offerings of the two academies.78

In summer 1817 the interior ministry under Friedrich von Schuckmann (1755-1834) undertook to gather supporting materials and request proposals for the reform not just of architectural training, but also of technical instruction more broadly. On 12 June the ministry’s section for religion and instruction sent documents pertaining to the Bauakademie and a description of the École polytechnique in Paris to Johann Georg Tralles (1763-1822), mathematician, physicist, and professor at the university.79 On 24 June Tralles returned these materials along with a plan to transform the Bauakademie into a mathematical-technical school modelled after the French école polytechnique, for its science-based curriculum, and the écoles d’application, for their focus on professional training.80 He defined technicians (Techniker) as those whose works are the products of ideas and based on established principles; they are distinct from mere craftsmen (Werkmann) and from artists, whose works are mimetic and based on feeling. They are also distinct from scientists who create new knowledge and thus establish principles for others. Because technical education prepares students for specific jobs, it requires a fixed curriculum and is thus difficult to provide in universities. Tralles’s three-year curriculum follows a clear progression from basic principles to independent application. The first year consists of foundational math, science, and drawing courses (plans, maps, and the classical orders). The second moves to higher mathematics and physics and a course on construction (Baulehre) combining lecture and simple design exercises. The third year consists of applied physics and a course on building types (Lehre von Gebäuden) also combining lectures and advanced design exercises. He simply states, without explanation, that architectural history could be taught in the third year or perhaps earlier. On 1 July another proposal came in from Rabe with a curriculum hardly different from the current one. It garnered little attention and was quickly filed away.81 Although Tralles’s plan, too, was soon filed

79 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd 1, f. 1 (cover letter indicating that the description, not included, was sent by the Prussian Ambassador in Paris), 2 (cover letter to Tralles). Also here (f. 3-5) is a copy of Weinbrenner’s plan for a ‘Bauakademie’ in Dresden, dated 31 May 1817 and addressed to Heinrich Vitzthum zu Eckstaedt (1770-1837), director of the Dresden Kunstkademie.
80 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 6-13. Dobbert, 41, and Bollé, 469, cite this as an isolated, unrealized proposal.
81 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd 1, f. 16-20, 21, 22.
away, it raised many of the issues at the center of the debates about architectural education in Berlin for the next several decades.82

On 8 July Ludwig Nicolovius (1767-1839), acting for Schuckmann, forwarded Tralles’s proposal to the finance minister Hans von Bülow (1774-1825).83 Schuckmann had become aware of the deterioration of instruction at the Bauakademie and was convinced that this institute, of great importance to the state, needed a new organization to make it more effective. He had also heard that von Bülow’s ministry had, quite some time ago, conceived the idea of founding a mathematical-technical institute that students of mining and forestry could also attend. He requested von Bülow’s opinion on the enclosed plan for such an institute and an estimate of what the finance ministry could contribute, since the funds from the existing Bauakademie would cover only a very small portion of the cost.

On 8 September von Bülow responded with a letter drafted by Eytelwein, which included Eytelwein’s own proposed curriculum.84 They noted the urgent need for better trained architects and building officials, both in Berlin and in the provinces, and thus for a reorganization of the Bauakademie. They rejected the name change, arguing that ‘Bauakademie’ was generally understood to mean technical training. They agreed to keep foundational courses at the Bauakademie, but suggested limiting the number of more advanced courses in math and science. Eytelwein’s proposed curriculum was mostly technical, but it did include a single course on architectural history with reference to related arts. Von Bülow gave his conditional support for Schuckmann’s plan with Eytelwein’s suggested changes but also offered to propose another, more detailed plan.

There the matter rested, ignored during the formation of two new ministries, beginning in November and December 1817. The section for religion and instruction of the interior ministry became the Ministerium der Geistlichen Unterrichts- und Medizinalangelegenheiten (Ministry for religious, instructional, and medical affairs), known as the Kultusministerium. It was overseen by Karl Freiherr vom Stein zum Altenstein (1770-1840), known as Altenstein. A new ministry for commerce and trade (Handel und Gewerbe) was created from sections of the

82 A notation on the first page of Tralles’s cover letter reads ‘zu den Acten 16ten December 1818’. It is rarely mentioned in the discussions before that date and never again after.
83 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 10, 11-23 (Tralles’s plan). Lundgreen, 32-33, misidentified this letter as coming from the Kultusministerium, which did not yet exist (see below). He thus mistakenly attributed the idea for a new Bauakademie to Kultusminister Altenstein, who, as the later documents show, had no interest in it at all.
84 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd 1, f. 23-33; GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 37-43 (draft), and f. 24-31 (Eytelwein’s initial report to von Bülow of 27 July).
finance ministry and overseen by the former finance minister von Bülow. All subsequent negotiations occurred between these two ministers and their subordinates.

On 1 August 1818 von Bülow wrote to Altenstein to complain that the situation at the Bauakademie was becoming ever more dire and that its graduates were producing bad work detrimental to the public good. Instruction was so inadequate that students were spending considerable sums on private instruction to prepare for the architect’s exam. On 24 August Altenstein responded that he had appointed Wilhelm Uhden (1763-1835) to represent his ministry in negotiations, to which Bülow responded by appointing Eytelwein. After three meetings (8, 10, and 15 October 1818) they produced a detailed proposal, based largely on Uhden’s initial draft. They defined the Bauakademie as an integral part (integrierender Theil) of the Akademie der Künste for the training of both practical and fine architects. They omitted most of the foundational courses included by Tralles as inconsistent with the purpose of the institution and proposed a three-year curriculum of eighteen courses very similar to the one proposed by Eytelwein in 1817. Their more detailed course descriptions also included possible instructors. Their ‘critical history of architecture’ is very similar to Hirt’s and covers five topics: theory of architecture following the principles of the ancients, history of construction as such, history of building types down to the present, decoration in painting and sculpture, and history of other arts related to architecture. To teach it they suggested Hirt himself and Ludwig Theodor Liemann (d. 1821).

As Uhden and Eytelwein were meeting, Altenstein appointed another committee to consider the reform of the Akademie der Künste and its relation to the Bauakademie as well as the organization of subordinate art schools. The committee consisted of Nicolovius and Uhden; two additional members of the education section, Johann Wilhelm Süvern (1775-1829) and Johannes Schulze (1786-1869); plus

---

86 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 45 (draft by Eytelwein) 46-47 (fair copy); I. HA Rep. 76 Ve Kultusministerium, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd 1, f. 34.
87 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 48, 49; I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 34, 35, 36.
88 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 60-76; I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 85-104. Uhden’s text was set off in quotes to facilitate extraction for the academy’s new statutes.
89 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 62v, 76v. On Liemann see Börsch-Supan, 616.
Hirt and Schinkel. In addition, they were to brief the minister on the funds and facilities required and the expansion of the teaching collections.\textsuperscript{90}

Even before the committee met, reports began circulating. Hirt immediately sent a blistering response to the proposal by Uhden and Eytelwein, calling it a warming over (\textit{aufwärmen}) of the old, fortunately defunct Bauakademie. Returning to his old objections, he adamantly rejected the idea of an independent architecture academy as unable to foster the aesthetic feeling (\textit{das aesthetische Gefühl}) essential to higher architecture. He included a lengthy, detailed proposal (\textit{Entwurf}) for three separate schools, one for actual art (\textit{die eigentliche Kunst}), including architecture, to be called an academy; a general institution for disciplines not purely artistic or scientific, to bear the new name ‘polytechnical school’; and a school for practical matters and technical drawing. To support his plan he also sent the recently printed statutes of the imperial polytechnic institute in Vienna.\textsuperscript{91} On 4 December Schinkel circulated his own plan for a fundamental reorganization that questioned the continuing viability of academies as institutions for art training.\textsuperscript{92} This provoked an agitated response from Hirt, composed the very day he received it (17 December).\textsuperscript{93} The committee also received two long reports on the proposal by Uhden and Eytelwein from Peter Beuth (1781-1853), since 1814 a member of the section for commerce and trade in von Bülow’s ministries and a future director of the Bauakademie. He objected at length to retaining the name ‘academy’ and commented on several individual items, although not on the architectural history course.\textsuperscript{94}

Deliberations in the Kultusministerium ceased as Altenstein waited to learn whether he would receive funds for the full restructuring of all the art schools. Meanwhile, von Bülow was becoming impatient, imploring Altenstein to act on 19 April and again on 29 May 1819. On 2 June Schuckmann forwarded a similar plea from the Oberbaudeputation, to which Altenstein responded on 5 July that he was still waiting for an answer about funding.\textsuperscript{95} Finally on 1 August Altenstein informed Nicolovius that he had a partial answer and tasked him with preparing the

\textsuperscript{90} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 38-39, memorandum of 5 October 1818.

\textsuperscript{91} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 40 (20 November 1817, Nicolovius’s cover letter to the committee), 103-105 (Gutachten), 117-134 (\textit{Entwurf}, in Kanzleischrift), 135-148 (\textit{Verfassung des kaiserl. polytechnischen Instituts in Wien}, Wien, 1818).

\textsuperscript{92} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 41, 43-54.

\textsuperscript{93} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 55-57.

\textsuperscript{94} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f.89 -95 (10 December), 96-99 (22 December). The documents, in Beuth’s miniscule hand, are extremely difficult to read.

members of the committee for a meeting.\textsuperscript{96} The proposals by Hirt and Schinkel were to be distributed again, along with the one for the Bauakademie by Uhden and Eytelwein. Altenstein reminded the committee of the questions before them and provided further directions for the deliberations. Their primary task was to examine the validity of the academy as an institutional form of art instruction and whether the older model of independent masters with their own studios might be a better means to promote the arts. Altenstein would share his own view at the meeting, after hearing concrete proposals for each option. The status of the Bauakademie and the supposed deficiencies in the training of building officials were secondary concerns to which no definitive answer was yet possible. Still, Altenstein needed a preliminary response for the commerce ministry and suggested removing the training of surveyors and building officials from the Bauakademie altogether. This could be done now, without compromising any later decision about the art academies.

For the next several months there were further inquiries from von Bülow and half-hearted replies from Altenstein.\textsuperscript{97} On 2 June Schuckmann forwarded a plea for action from the Oberbaudeputation, to which Altenstein replied that he was still waiting for word on funds.\textsuperscript{98} On 26 February 1820 Altenstein informed von Bülow that he had abandoned his larger plan for a full reform of art instruction for financial reasons. His ministry was now devising a proposal for a separate institution to train surveyors and building officials.\textsuperscript{99} On 21 April Altenstein wrote to confirm this reduced plan; he had again appointed Uhden to work out the details; von Bülow responded by appointing Eytelwein.\textsuperscript{100} On 29 July Uhden and Eytelwein submitted a plan that limited the curriculum to subjects directly necessary for the training of surveyors and architects. Students were to attend foundational courses in the natural sciences at the university. They included a budget and a list of possible instructors. Because Rabe had proved so unreliable, some of his courses should go to Bau-Inspektor Schramm. When Liemann returned from his research trip to the

\textsuperscript{96} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 113-115; I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, I. Sekt 30, Nr. 155, f. 1-3.
\textsuperscript{97} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 106 (19 April 1819), f. 107 (29 May 1819), f. 151 (7 October 1819).
\textsuperscript{98} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 108-109, 110-111.
\textsuperscript{99} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 159 and 160 (3 and 21 March 1820, Altenstein to Schulz, about scheduling the committee meeting); GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 63.
\textsuperscript{100} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 162; 163 (7 May 1820, Bülow appoints Eytelwein).
'orient' he could teach city architecture, history of architecture, and drawing. Until then, these courses could simply be omitted.\textsuperscript{101}

The decision to transfer the independent architecture academy to the commerce ministry arose from von Bülow’s objections to this plan and Altenstein’s peevish response. On 6 September 1820 von Bülow expressed his general agreement and offered to contribute funds. However, he objected to the students taking courses at the university. These were never offered in the regular sequential order required, and university professors could not be told when to teach their courses. By walking over to the university (actually a very short distance) students would lose valuable time that could be spent drawing, always an essential part of their training. He found the Kultusministerium’s reluctance to support foundational courses in mathematics misguided, arguing that only if offered within an integrated architectural curriculum could such courses promote higher architecture.\textsuperscript{102}

Altenstein countered on 16 November that the subjects in question only served the training of practical surveyors and building officials (\textit{praktische Feldmesser and Baubediente}) and thus did not belong to the portfolio of his ministry. He proposed that von Bülow assume the cost of providing them, while he would continue to finance the ‘higher education of actual architects’ (\textit{die höhere Bildung eigentlicher Architekten}) at the Akademie der Künste.\textsuperscript{103}

In his response of 13 December 1820 von Bülow agreed that the Akademie der Künste was indeed the appropriate institution for the ‘aesthetic branch of architecture’ (\textit{der ästhetische Theil der Architektur}). The ‘training of common surveyors and practical master builders’ (\textit{Ausbildung gewöhnlicher Feldmesser und praktischer Baumeister}) belonged to the commerce ministry. He offered to take this over, provided Altenstein would give him some of the Bauakademie’s budget and its rooms in the Oberbaudeputation’s building. He also specified a division of the curriculum: the purely aesthetic part of architecture and the related fine arts and the history of architecture would remain with Altenstein. His own ministry would assume responsibility for instruction in pure and applied mathematics and natural sciences, construction, building types, civil engineering, machines, and drawing.\textsuperscript{104}


\textsuperscript{102} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 165-166; I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 77-79 (Eytelwein’s draft).

\textsuperscript{103} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 168 (draft); I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 80.

\textsuperscript{104} GStAPK I. HA Rep 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 169; I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 106 (draft).
At first Altenstein simply ignored this offer. Over the next two and a half years von Bülow sent several insistent inquiries,\textsuperscript{105} to which Altenstein responded only occasionally with various excuses.\textsuperscript{106} Within the Kultusministerium, however, work was slowly proceeding on the curriculum for the Akademie der Künste, which Altenstein needed for his negotiations with von Bülow about finances. On 18 January 1822 a committee consisting of Schinkel, Schadow, and Rauch submitted a plan for separating the drawing school (Zeichen und Modellier-Schule) from the Akademie der Künste, as well as a curriculum for higher architecture prepared separately by Schinkel at the request of the ministry.\textsuperscript{107} Schinkel also sent this directly to Altenstein.\textsuperscript{108} The minister then sent it back to Schadow expressing his approval but requesting further discussion at a meeting to include all the relevant documents and a plan previously submitted by Hirt.\textsuperscript{109} There is no record that this meeting occurred.

Schinkel’s ambitious curriculum proposed a sequence of fourteen courses in nine divisions, given here in a condensed translation. The original text is reproduced in full in Appendix One.

1. Geometric and stereometric projection, with reference to stonemaking
2. Orders after Vitruvius, compared to the monuments and with exercises in fine drawing (Schönzeichnung) through renderings of whole buildings
3. Projection, practiced using monuments of antiquity
4. General theory of architecture
   a. history of construction from antiquity to the present
   b. development of actual construction
   c. machines used in construction
5. General history of architecture

\textsuperscript{105} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 171 (1 May 1821), f. 172 (2 July 1821), f. 175 (15 July 1821), f. 192 (2 January 1822), f. 237 (31 August 1822), f. 238 (21 October 1822), f. 241 (6 December 1822); GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 1 (4 June 1823).

\textsuperscript{106} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 176 (23 July 1821), f. 240 (26 November 1822); I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 4 (30 June 1823).

\textsuperscript{107} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 208, 209-234.

\textsuperscript{108} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 195, 196-205. In his cover letter, Schinkel noted that he had received his instructions verbally from Nicolovius, without specifying when or what was requested from him.

\textsuperscript{109} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 206. Hirt’s plan of 9 November 1821 (f. 189-190) proposed only three subjects, drawing, construction, and building types.
Architectural History in the Architecture Academy: Wilhelm Stier

a. history of buildings according to their functions down to the present
b. development of the main types of buildings down to the present

6. Architectural decoration, taught and practiced through drawing
   a. sculpture, emphasizing the human figure following the Greek canon
   b. modelling, with respect to topics in 6a
   c. painting

7. Style in architecture, along with the history of closely related arts

8. Exercises in design (Entwerfen) of building plans according to set specifications, as a capstone in which the student takes ownership of the knowledge and abilities in the previous courses and becomes an artist

9. Exercises in construction (Bau-Ausführung) at prominent public buildings

In addition to the courses taught through drawing (6 and 8), several (1, 2, 3, 4b & 4c, 5b) were to be taught by demonstrations at the blackboard (an der Tafel). This left only the specifically historical material to be delivered through lectures (4a, 5a, 7). The curriculum would take three years to complete, with the foundational drawing courses (1, 2, 3) in the first year; history, theory, decoration, and style (4, 5, 6, 7) in the second; and the two capstones (8, 9) in the third. For the foundation courses Schinkel proposed a principal instructor, Johann Erdmann Hummel (1769-1852) plus two assistants, and two more for the other drawing course (6). The theoretical and historical courses would require four instructors: Hirt for the antiquarian and theoretical courses (4a, 5a), Rabe and Johann Conrad Costenoble (1776-1840) for the practical courses (4b, 4c, 5b) and E. H. Toelken (1786-1864) for architectural style and art history (7). These last two would each need two assistants to help with classroom presentations and with the preparation of original drawings to illustrate lectures. The two capstones would be overseen jointly by several instructors: the design course (8) by members of the academic senate, the construction course (9) by practicing architects in state service. Finally, Schinkel added a long list of natural and applied sciences and civil engineering topics to be taught at a separate institution. The whole curriculum, but especially the design studio, was intended to prepare students for regular prize competitions modelled on those at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris.110

In a letter to Altenstein of 21 January marked ‘top secret’ (privatissime), Schadow stated the ideal architecture school represented by the plan could be established if the state would provide sufficient funds. He commented on Schinkel’s willful ignorance of actual architectural instruction at the Akademie der Künste. Specifically, number 8 in the plan, exercises in design, was not taught at the academy itself, but by Rabe in his home for a few select students. Schadow declined to comment further without a specific request.\textsuperscript{111}

No further discussion is documented until 30 June 1823, when Altenstein asked Schinkel to prepare a budget for his proposed curriculum.\textsuperscript{112} On 17 July Schinkel submitted an estimated budget that listed mostly the same instructors as his initial proposal.\textsuperscript{113} He noted that the two practical courses under numbers 8 (design) and 9 (construction) would entail no additional costs. Rabe and one other would teach the first, with help from members of the academy’s senate, who would also be responsible for the second.

With this budget in place, Altenstein was able to offer a more definitive, if delayed, response to a particularly insistent inquiry on 10 July 1823 from von Bülow, who had included yet another letter from the Oberbaudeputation. This time they pointed out that, due to poor training, candidates for both the surveyor’s and architect’s exams were passing with only partial qualifications or not at all.\textsuperscript{114} On 13 September Altenstein responded that he was still determining how much it would cost to teach the aesthetic part of architecture at the Akademie der Künste and how much he would need to take from the extra funds recently approved by the king. To do this, however, he needed an estimate for the cost of teaching the other, technical side at the independent Bauakademie. Altenstein expressly refused to comment on the concerns of the Oberbaudeputation.\textsuperscript{115} On 24 September von Bülow responded with a budget and a curriculum for the Bauakademie consisting of fourteen subjects.\textsuperscript{116} In his response of 8 October Altenstein tried to break off negotiations and proposed retaining the current status of the Bauakademie within the Akademie der Künste, since he saw no need for reform. Nevertheless, he was prepared to accept von Bülow’s proposed curriculum, but only if costs were shared differently.\textsuperscript{117} On 31

---

\textsuperscript{111} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 207.
\textsuperscript{112} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 3.
\textsuperscript{113} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 5-7.
\textsuperscript{114} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 139 (draft).
\textsuperscript{115} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 12; I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 142.
\textsuperscript{117} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 17-18 (draft); I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 157-159.
October von Bülow accepted Altenstein’s proposal. After one more exchange about finances the matter was finally resolved.¹¹⁸

On 5 December 1823 the two ministers sought royal approval to divide architectural instruction as they had first agreed three years earlier.¹¹⁹ They justified the need for a new, independent Bauakademie by citing the difference between the two branches of architecture. In higher, aesthetic architecture, artistic concerns dominated, rather than the concerns of daily life, and thus it was best housed in the Akademie der Künste. The technical part had as its purpose the training of provincial builders and surveyors (Provinzial-Baumeister und Feldmesser), and thus it needed its own institution, subject to the ministry of commerce; this ministry had a particular interest in filling official positions with highly capable men, to avoid recurrent and costly mistakes in public works projects. The need for dedicated technical instruction was so pressing that von Bülow and Altenstein had found themselves unable to follow the king’s directive to take account of Wiebeking’s call for a higher architecture school (eine hohe Bauschule), one that would unify the artistic and the technical.¹²⁰ Nevertheless they promised that the two ministries would continue to consult on the curriculum for the new academy, in order to maintain the necessary scientific coherence and the unity of the whole (die notwendige wissenschaftliche Uebereinstimmung und die Einheit des Ganzen). Two enclosures specified the curriculum for each institution. Enclosure A reduced Schinkel’s extravagant proposal to eleven classes in six categories by omitting the first drawing course and both capstones. Enclosure B listed fourteen courses for the new Bauakademie that roughly corresponded to the curriculum instituted in 1802, but without architectural history. Translations are given here, the original text in Appendix One.

Enclosure A: Instruction in higher architecture and its aesthetic part

1. Orders after Vitruvius, compared to the monuments and concluding with exercises in fine drawing
2. Perspective and shadowing

¹¹⁸ GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 19 (31 October 1823), f. 21 (22 November 1823, draft); I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 30, f. 162 (31 October, draft); I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 31, f. 1 (22 November).


¹²⁰ Carl-Friedrich von Wiebeking, Theoretisch-praktische bürgerliche Baukunde, 6 vols, Munich, Lindauer, 1821-26, 1 (1821), 1-2. The king had sent the book and his instruction to von Bülow on 12 May 1821 and on 2 July von Bülow forwarded both to Altenstein, in GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I. Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 172-173.
3. General theory of architecture
   a. history of construction
   b. development of construction, knowledge of materials, proportions of construction parts; experience of the most important buildings compared with the calculations of the most prominent mathematicians
   c. machines used in architectural construction
4. General history of architecture
   a. history of buildings according to their functions down to the present
   b. full development and depiction of the main types of buildings
5. Architectural decoration in sculpture and painting
   a. exercises and instruction through drawing of the most excellent sculpture on the monuments, and exercises in drawing the human body after the ancient Greek canon
   b. exercises in modelling in relation to the periods touched on in section a.
   c. exercises and instruction through drawing and coloring of the most excellent painted decoration on the monuments
6. Style in architecture and in the closely related arts

Enclosure B: Instruction in the technical part of architecture

1. Arithmetic, geometry, trigonometry, analysis, along with descriptive geometry
2. Statics, hydrostatics, mechanics of stationary bodies, hydraulics
3. Machines and machine calculations
4. Natural sciences, architectural physics
5. Practical geometry; surveying and levelling
6. General architectural principles, work of the carpenter, mason, stone cutter, metalworker, etc.
7. City and agricultural buildings
8. Streets, bridges, canals, locks
9. Hydrology and dikes
10. Machines and mills
11. Drawing of situation plans
12. Architectural ornamentation
13. Architectural and machine drawing
14. Modelling

With a decree of 31 December 1823 Friedrich Wilhelm III approved the division as proposed by Altenstein and Bülow, with the two new curricula to
commence in April 1824. Immediately the ministers charged the two directors, Schadow and Eytelwein, with dividing the old Bauakademie assets, including faculty and staff; books, prints, drawings, and models; and the archives. In the agreement reached on 31 January 1824 the division was mostly straightforward, except in the always confused case of Rabe. The man himself would move to the Bauakademie, where he would teach both ‘City architecture’ and ‘Construction’; at the Akademie der Künste he would also teach ‘City architecture’.122

On 6 March 1824 Eytelwein informed Bülow that he had published the regulations and curriculum for the new Bauakademie. The original list of fourteen courses had grown slightly to eighteen. The planned course on urban and agricultural buildings became two, ‘City architecture’ and ‘Practical architecture’; while each of these had a small historical component, there was still no separate course on architectural history.123 ‘City architecture’ was assigned to Rabe. He was hired to teach this every winter and ‘General principles of architecture’ (Allgemeine Baulehre), every summer.124 As described in the published curriculum, ‘City architecture’ continued the course he had taken over from Gentz, including the exercises in design and cost-planning. ‘General principles’ was similar to his ‘Construction’, covering materials, construction techniques, and the individual parts of buildings.125

Establishing the curriculum in higher architecture at the Akademie der Künste was a more complicated process. At a meeting in February Schinkel and Schadow reduced the list of classes in Enclosure A to just four, but they found ways to cover most elements of Schinkel’s initial proposal of 1822.126 They retained the drawing courses taught by Hummel and Zielke (orders, optics and perspective) and added two more: one taught by Niedlich for the drawing of ornament and another for the human form taught by Schadow. These covered items 1, 2, 3, and aspects of 6a in Schinkel’s first plan. They covered 4a and 5a with architectural history ‘as taught by Hirt’, by which they meant his ‘Critical history’ taught at the university.

121 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 27.
122 PrAdK 004, f. 88-90.
123 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B: Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 31, f. 63ff, including Nachricht, die Einrichtung und den gesammten Unterricht auf der Königl. Bau-Akademie zu Berlin betreffend, Berlin, 1824. The full curriculum is printed in Dobbert, 43, with indication of instructors.
124 Negotiations with Rabe lasted from 12 February to 1 June 1824, GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 6, 10, 32-33, 58.
126 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 62-63. The Kunst- und Gewerbeschule for craftsmen was to remain part of the academy.
They assigned Rabe ‘Unterricht in der Lehre von den Gebäuden’, which he had previously taught as ‘Stadtbau’, covering 4b and 5b. By including design exercises it also filled in for Schinkel’s capstone design studio (item 8). Bauleven would also attend ‘Mythology’, in which the archaeologist Konrad Levezow (1770-1835) explained myths through the monuments of ancient sculpture (partly covering 6a). This left only 6b, 6c, and 7, which, as described below, were taught by Toelken at the university. This curriculum, and especially Rabe’s design exercises, would prepare students for the cycle of prize competitions for which Schinkel now drew up a separate proposal.\textsuperscript{127}

The four courses offered at the Akademie der Künste beginning in April 1824 were the following: 1. ‘City Architecture’ taught by Rabe; 2. ‘Drawing of the orders, optics, perspective’ taught by Hummel and Leopold Zielke (d. 1861); 3. ‘Drawing of the human form according to his own canon’ taught by Schadow; and 4. ‘Drawing of ornament (Verzierungen) after models and casts taught by Johann Gottfried Niedlich (1766-1837).\textsuperscript{128} In the process of approving this final curriculum the title of Rabe’s course reverted back to ‘City architecture’.\textsuperscript{129}

This small change meant, however, that Rabe appeared to be teaching the same class at both academies, an overlap that went unnoticed for a year. On 7 March 1825 Uhden informed Schadow that Rabe’s course was to be removed from the academy’s course offerings for the upcoming summer semester. It had only been approved for the new Bauakademie, where Rabe was also teaching it.\textsuperscript{130}

In a written explanation to Schadow, Rabe explained that this was all just a misunderstanding, as he was really teaching two different courses under the same title. At the Bauakademie he only had time to survey a wide range of both utilitarian and higher building types, as appropriate to the purpose of the institution. At the Akademie der Künste he taught the higher building types, exemplified by the best ancient and modern models, and through these the students also learned the proper application of the orders, ornament, and human figures taught them by Hummel, Niedlich, and Schadow. His course was the most essential element in the teaching of aesthetic architecture and thus could not be dropped from the curriculum. Moreover, it should be expanded to include practical exercises in designing buildings (Entwurf von Gebäuden). He well knew the importance of such exercises,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{127} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 64-71; PrAdK 0004, 97-104.
\item \textsuperscript{128} PrAdK 0008, f. 79; for Schadow’s class see his description on f. 80, ‘Lehre von den Verhältnissen des menschlichen Körpers’ in Bezug auf den Architekturunterricht, 4. Febr. 1826.
\item \textsuperscript{129} This appears to have happened in the drafts for Altenstein’s memos approving the curriculum and appointment of instructors. GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 2, f. 78-84.
\item \textsuperscript{130} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VIII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1, f. 4-5; PrAdK 0189, f. 2: https://archiv.adk.de/objekt/2307549.
\end{itemize}
having long offered them privately in his home. He no longer did so, however. The exercises would also be useful at the Bauakademie, and he had had many conversations with Eytelwein about offering them there.¹³¹

Forwarding Rabe’s explanation on 20 March, Schadow reminded the ministry of the role Rabe’s course was to fill in the approved curriculum devised by Schinkel. Still called ‘City Architecture’, this course was to prepare students for the prize competitions, which constituted the ‘key stone of the whole (der Schlußstein des Ganzen). Rabe was supposed to provide practical exercises in which, as Schinkel had intended, the students would sketch buildings lightly but clearly in elevation and plan following set assignments under the instructor’s direction. However, Schadow found it difficult to offer these exercises at the Akademie der Künste, due to limited space and Rabe’s often negligent behavior (oftmals säumiges Benehmen). The course also needed to be taught at the Bauakademie, where it somewhat compensated for the overly technical nature of the curriculum and Eytelwein’s refusal to let his students take courses at the Akademie der Künste. Here, however, Rabe’s teaching was hindered by a lack of supporting visual material, since the expensive architecture books and prints had gone to the Akademie der Künste.¹³²

As instructed by Altenstein, Uhden consulted with Schinkel and devised a new title for Rabe’s course, ‘Principles of ancient and modern buildings through development and depiction of their construction’ (Lehre von den Gebäuden alter und neuer Zeit durch Entwicklung und Darstellung ihrer Construction).¹³³ Altenstein instructed the academy to offer it under the new title with the practical design exercises. Students were to draw ‘selected objects in light outlines and a not large format’ (ausgewählte Gegenstände in leichten Umrissen und in einem nicht großen Format), so that they might amass an instructive collection of examples.¹³⁴ Rabe did not teach his course regularly, apparently due to lack of interest among the students. At least in winter 1827/28, he did include design exercises.¹³⁵

The one item from Schinkel’s original plan completely missing from the offerings of the Akademie der Künste, style in architecture and the history of its allied arts, was taught at the University by E. H. Toelken (the instructor listed in Schinkel’s plan of January 1822). Aside from one course on Nubian and Indian architecture and another on Egyptian architecture (each offered only once), he taught an irregular rotation of four courses from summer semester 1824 into the

¹³¹ GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VIII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1, f. 8-9, Rabe to Schadow, 17 March 1825.
¹³² GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VIII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1, f. 6-7.
¹³³ GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VIII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1, f. 10 (Uhden to Altenstein, 29 March 1825).
¹³⁴ GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. VIII, Nr. 1, Bd. 1, f. 12 (29 March 1825); PrAdK 0189, f. 3
¹³⁵ PrAdK 189, f.9, Kultusministerium to AdK, 20 October 1827; f. 11, Altenstein to AdK, 10 January 1828; f. 12, copy of Schadow’s response, 12 January 1828.
1830s. Three were general surveys: ‘History and principles of ancient architecture to the time of Justinian’, ‘On the history, principles, and monuments of Greek architecture’, and ‘History of Roman architecture to the time of Justinian.’ The fourth was a specialized course on Vitruvius. In addition, his general survey of ancient art, offered almost every year from 1815 to 1851, included architecture, as documented in the course title and a student notebook from summer 1827.136

Finally, there is the question of Hirt’s relationship to the Akademie der Künste. On 2 April 1824 he wrote to Schadow to ask why he was listed in a public announcement as professor for architectural history.137 He had not heard anything about such an appointment or the introduction of architectural history courses. Schadow responded that Hirt had actually been listed for architectural theory, and that the academy was obliged to list him because his teaching was included in the disciplines the academy had been mandated to retain. Also, students still wished to list his classes on their transcripts (Classen-Scheine).138 Predictably Hirt wrote back to dispute the fine points of his official appointment (now only at the university) and whether he taught history or theory. More informative are the reasons he gave for teaching his university course in a room at the academy: he saw the two institutions as conjoined (als verbundene Anstalten) and he was concerned for the convenience of his students, most of whom were artists.139

Such, then, was the situation when Stier returned from Rome in the fall of 1827. Independent courses in architectural history were offered at the university and open to students of both academies. Historical instruction was nonexistent at the Bauakademie, while at the Akademie der Künste students received some such instruction in their drawing courses and in Rabe’s course on ancient and modern building types, which, however, he did not regularly teach. This course also included capstone design exercises, which he also offered privately. Such exercises were not offered at all at the Bauakademie, because Rabe did not include them in building types course. Stier was initially hired to fill this gap with a design studio, which he soon expanded with architectural history lectures, which in turn became an independent course, to provide the historical foundation his students lacked. The extensive documentation of Stier’s early life and training shows how he gained the knowledge and expertise necessary to teach both architectural design and architectural history.

136 For Toelken’s education and an overview of his courses, see Garberson, ‘Art history in the university’, 3-49, and Table 4. The lecture notes are in Stier’s Nachlaß (AmTUB II.M.92). The hand is clearly not Stier’s, and he did not return to Berlin until October of that year. They may have been taken by his cousin Gustav.
Wilhelm Stier: youth, training, travel

Friedrich Ludwig Wilhelm Stier (known as Wilhelm) was born on 8 May 1799 in Błonie outside Warsaw, which had fallen to Prussia in the Third Partition of Poland (1795). After the Prussian military defeat in 1806 his parents, Friedrich Ludwig (1766-1815), a provincial tax collector, and Eleonore (b. Stier, 1766-1820), fled to their birthplace, Góra (Guhrau) in Silesia. They lived there in reduced circumstances until Friedrich Ludwig found employment in nearby Glogów (Glogau). Young Wilhelm attended school in Glogów until 1811, when his parents sent him to Berlin to attend the prestigious Gymnasium zum Grauen Kloster. He lived with his father’s brother, Wilhelm Stier (1780-1853), also an official in the Prussian government; upon Friedrich Ludwig’s death in 1815, uncle Wilhelm became young Wilhelm’s foster father. A poor student and a loner interested in ancient history and poetry, young Wilhelm spent his free time drawing maps and reading travel accounts. Already in Silesia, at age 12, he had begun the study of surveying (Feldmeßkunst) with a geodesist (Geometer) by the name of Ahrend, a friend of his father. This, combined with some talent for drawing and the impression made on him by the royal buildings in Berlin and Potsdam, inclined him toward an interest in architecture. With the support of his foster father he began its study, at first with Oberhofbauinspektor Salomo Sachs (1772-1855) and then at the Bauakademie. Stier attended the Bauakademie in summer semester 1816 and winter semester 1816/17. The few surviving attendance lists provide partial documentation of what he studied. In summer he appears in Hummel’s course in architecture, perspective, and optics (taught in the art curriculum but open to all students) and in architectural drawing taught by Johann Gottlieb Schlätzer (or Schlötzer, d. 1824). He also attended practical surveying and levelling taught by Zimmermann. The lists for winter show him in the second half of Schlätzer’s course but no longer in Hummel’s or Zimmermann’s. He does not appear in the few lists available for some of the more practical courses: statics and machines (Zimmermann), roads and

---

140 This account is based on Biography A, 1 (II.M.59.C) and a slightly revised fragment (of just this section) in Caroline’s hand in I.I.74.6. These probably provided the basis for the brief account by Hubert in his response of 19 July 1857 to an inquiry from the Akademie der Künste (PrAdK Pers BK 502, Hubert Stier: https://archiv.adk.de/objekt/2308020). A privately printed brochure (II.M.59.A), Uebersicht über die Stiersche Familie (1884), provides a family tree with birth and death dates. Additional information on Stier’s childhood can be found in biographical fragments in I.I.74.6 and a letter from Wilhelm to his uncle August from 1820 or 1821 (II.M.65.C).

141 In his later letters, Stier addressed his uncle Wilhelm as ‘father,’ remarking on this in a letter from Bonn of 6 July 1821 (II.M.65.C). His other uncles were August (1774-1860), also an official in Berlin, and Ernst (1776-1840), an official in Düsseldorf. That Wilhelm, rather than August, was the foster father is indicated by letters of 4 August 1822 and 1 December 1823 with the salutation ‘Lieber Vater’ that mention separate letters to uncle August (II.M.54.B).

142 Identified by Dobbert, 38, as professor at the Friedrichswerdersches Gymnasium.
bridges (Martin Friedrich van Alten [1762 - after 1829]), and Ökonomische Baukunst (Heinrich Carl Riedel [1756-1820/21]). The list for Grüson’s summer course in arithmetic, algebra and elementary geometry is missing, but Stier does not appear in the more advanced winter course on trigonometry and three-dimensional geometry. Also missing are the lists for Rabe’s year-long courses in construction and city architecture, but Stier may have attended both.\footnote{PrAdK 0421, f. 31, 33 (Hummel): \url{https://archiv.adk.de/objekt/2307554}; PrAdK 0660, f. 84-101, 108-110: \url{https://archiv.adk.de/objekt/2307609}.}

In his later recollections, Stier described the training offered at the Bauakademie as very limited and one-sided in its practical and technical focus, engaging the artistic side of architecture only superficially and very ineffectively.\footnote{AmTUB II.M.59.D, Zur Einleitung in die Studien der Denkmaehler der Baukunst, 1-8. This section is titled ‘Ideenkreis der Bauschule von Berlin im Jahre 1816’.} Here he both followed a well-established trope of architectural discourse, denigrating predecessors to make one’s own innovations seem more impressive, and engaged the recurring, and intensifying, debates about the relative importance of practical vs. artistic concerns. Although Hirt did not teach at all from 1815 to 1818, Stier still criticized his architectural history course, probably on the basis of what he had heard from others. It extended over too many semesters for anyone to complete, and, like the published Grundätze (which Stier also criticized), it offered only disjointed facts and rote rules, not a full understanding of ancient architecture relevant to actual practice. Nothing else in the curriculum promoted grounded, historical knowledge of architectural forms. Instructors made no pedagogical use of the academy’s library, leaving students to leaf aimlessly through its holdings, including important works like Stuart and Revett.\footnote{James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, \textit{The Antiquities of Athens}, 4 volumes, London, 1762-1816.} The current craze for the German Middle Ages had not yet produced much scholarship on architecture, but it already caused works on Italian, French, and English buildings to be neglected as no longer relevant. Similarly, there was little guidance in the practical application of artistic concepts, beyond Gentz’s meager, one-sided compilation of articles from the works of others, which provided the norms to be followed in the sketching (Aufzeichnung) of architectural forms. Although generally inspiring, drawing instruction was limited. Hummel presented just a paltry selection of Roman monuments, following Hirt’s rules, for students to copy, and he taught perspective and the projection of shadows only through sketching the classical orders. Schlätzer set his students to copy designs by Gilly, Riedel, Simon, and Gentz for modest buildings; from these they learned basic principles of form, composition and construction, but nothing of the more noble aspects of architecture. Particularly detrimental was the failure to provide instruction in design (Unterricht im Entwerfen) and thus in the conception of a building as an aesthetic whole.\footnote{As noted above, design exercises had apparently been dropped from Rabe’s ‘City architecture’, which he did not teach regularly.} Instead, the
anxious application of craft rules (Handwerksregeln) led to the anxious, meagre clothing of structure with poorly understood art forms. Under these circumstances, he recalled, academy students were overwhelmed by a deep feeling of confusion and despaired of ever finding their way.

Düsseldorf, Cologne, and Bonn, 1817-1821

Despite these deficiencies, Stier passed the state surveyor’s exam on 22 October 1817.\(^{147}\) With this credential, he was now able to seek work to support his widowed mother and younger brother, Theodor. A desire to see the world and a fortunate, but unspecified, happenstance took him to the Rhineland, where the new Prussian administration was carrying out many building projects.\(^{148}\) His uncle Ernst Stier, employed as military paymaster (Kriegs-Zahlmeister) by the district administration in Düsseldorf, may have helped young Wilhelm obtain a position as diätarischer Bau- Conduiteur, or a building supervisor paid a daily wage. He worked for two years in Düsseldorf under Regierungs- und Baurat Adolph von Vagedes and also for the district administration in Cologne. In late 1819 he moved to Bonn (then part of the Cologne district).\(^{149}\) He also established close and lasting friendships with Bauleiter Friedrich Waesemann (life dates unknown) in Bonn and the decorative painter Ludwig Pose, who worked closely with Vagedes in Düsseldorf.\(^{150}\)

According to Stier’s own account, he prepared plans, cost estimates, and explanatory reports for barracks and other military buildings, churches, and schools, in Düsseldorf, at first according to Vagedes’s instructions but then independently.\(^{151}\) He also supervised the construction of progressively larger

---

\(^{147}\) AmTUB II.M.59.D, Feldmesser Zeugnis, 23 October 1817. Stier demonstrated competence in arithmetic, geometry, trigonometry, geodesy, leveling, and the use of relevant instruments. He also submitted drawings with explanatory text.


\(^{149}\) Stier’s appointment letter from the administration in Cologne of 20 February 1818 is addressed to him ‘bei Kriegs-Zahlmeister Stier’. A generic and very positive recommendation from Vagedes, dated 7 August 1819, states that Stier worked for him for two years, in his atelier and as supervisor for the construction of various buildings. Another positive recommendation of 4 August 1821 from Regierungsrat Philipp Joseph Rehfuess (1779-1843), Kurator of the university, confirms Stier’s work in Bonn (II.M.59.D).

\(^{150}\) AmTUB II.M.59.C, Biography A, 3; Biography B, 3. Born in Sianów, Poland (Zanow, Hinterpommern), and educated in Berlin, Waesemann was Kriegs-baumeister in Cologne from 1818 to 1830 (Thieme-Becker, 35, 21). He was the father of Hubert’s guardian Hermann Friedrich Waesemann.

structures, including a brick kiln outside the city. For the administration in Cologne he surveyed the roads and bridges between the neighboring towns of Bensberg and Ohl; he also drew plans for and supervised the transformation of monasteries, including Groß Sankt Martin, into barracks. In Bonn, under the supervision of Waesemann he assisted in modifying the electoral palace and the palace in Poppelsdorf for the newly founded (1818) university. Stier claimed to have prepared plans, cost estimates and explanatory reports for two clinics, two observatories, two anatomical theaters, two planned hippodromes, a demonstration farm, the university church and jail, and housing for professors and the rector. He also claimed the same for a regimental storehouse, two planned military hospitals, storage for equipment for extinguishing fires, and for the construction or renovation of over twenty schoolhouses in the surrounding area.152

This position offered Stier ample opportunity to expand his expertise. He became well versed in the common practice of architecture and familiar with current building types through the ‘theoretical preparations’ (theoretische Vorarbeiten) for drawing up plans and through supervising their actual construction.153 He would also have become familiar with the practices of the Prussian public works bureaucracy, as plans for significant public buildings were sent to Berlin for review by the Oberbaudeputation. As an anonymous assistant, whose work was likely not credited, Stier would not have come to Schinkel’s notice, but he would have himself become even more aware of Schinkel’s leading position than he had been in Berlin.154

According to Stier, Vagedes’s mentorship extended beyond official duties, and it was Vagedes who directed him to the artistic side of architecture and introduced him to other branches of art.155 Daily conversation immersed Stier in his mentor’s lively creative practice. He saw how a design was built up from a simple initial idea, had the opportunity to reflect on the laws of construction and the combination of masses in plan and elevation, and learned how to discern on his own what architectural and ornamental forms were appropriate to a given design.156 In Vagedes’s library Stier studied the best recent French works, later recalling in particular illustrations of modern plans and buildings in the publications of the Grand Prix,157 the works of Percier and Fontaine,158 and Normand’s facades and

---

152 I have not attempted to connect these claims to actual buildings.
154 For the Prussian building administration in these cities see Eva Brües, Die Rheinlande (Karl Friedrich Schinkel Lebenswerk), Munich, Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1968, 10-13. Other than Waesemann’s first plans for a new observatory in 1819-20, the buildings catalogued by Brües postdate Stier’s time in the Rheinland.
157 Armand Parfait Prieur and Pierre Louis Van Cléemputte, Collections des prix que la ci-devant Académie d’Architecture proposoit et couronnoit tous les ans, Paris, chez les auteurs, 1787-
ornaments, as well as the historical-typological *Paralèlles* and theoretical *Leçons* of Jean-Nicholas-Louis Durand (1760-1834). Here he engaged his imagination and developed his artistic understanding by working to grasp the depicted buildings in plan, section, and elevation, reflecting on the basis for their composition, and storing elements of their design and decoration in his memory. He particularly valued Durand’s *Paralèlles*, which acquainted him with many important monuments from different times and places and laid the foundation for his conception of the history of architecture. At this time he also studied the works of Alberti, Serlio, Scamozzi, and especially Palladio. He compared their rules and familiarized himself with their depictions and descriptions of ancient buildings as well as their own plans for modern buildings, with an emphasis on Palladio’s villas.

Along the Rhine Stier found much to feed his earlier enthusiasm for medieval German architecture. However, his daily duties and his own studies in Vagedes’s library left him time only for ‘active observation’ (lebendiger Anblick) of the many historically significant buildings in the region.

As his responsibilities grew, especially after his move to Bonn in 1819, Stier had less time for his own pursuits and by July 1821 he had decided to leave his secure position. In a letter to his foster father he explained that he had come to resent the mundane work of a provincial building official, with its endless reports and wearying preparation of artistically indifferent plans, for which others took credit. He had long since mastered the practical side of architecture and now had too little opportunity to engage its artistic side, to develop what he felt passionately was his own artistic calling. To pursue that calling and to prepare himself for a career in Berlin as a higher official or an independent artist, he had decided to

---


embark on a study trip using his savings (400 Taler), which he estimated would last him two years. On the advice of well-informed friends he planned to stop briefly in Paris before continuing on to Italy. On the advice of uncle Ernst, he would use his time in Paris to prepare designs to present to Schinkel in hopes of securing a recommendation for state subvention to finance further study. Unstated in the letter was the additional factor that his mother’s death the previous year freed him from the obligation to support her.

That Stier was advised to go first to Paris is not surprising, given the increasing importance of the city for the practice and study of modern architecture and engineering, as well as painting and sculpture; that he followed that advice is also not surprising, given the central role of French architectural publications in his studies with Vagedes. As Stier himself noted, by going to Italy, he was following the example of Schinkel and other great German architects from Andreas Schlüter (1659-1714) to Gilly and Gentz. He was, of course, not alone in this, but he was somewhat unusual in making an independent trip at a young age and, at least initially, without support from a patron, government, or educational institution.

Most architects stayed in Italy for only a few months or at most a year or two, but Stier ultimately managed to finance a sojourn of five years by supplementing his savings with extensive free-lance work and a stipend from the Prussian state, as well as an inheritance and money from his uncles.

Paris, 1821

In early August 1821 Stier left Bonn by wagon with three friends, stopping first in Cologne. He then proceeded alone on foot to Düsseldorf, where he spent two days with Vagedes and his family. With another friend Stier continued on foot to Liège and from there by coach to Paris. Although this was just an ordinary journey, not a Kunstreise, Stier kept a detailed diary (now lost). Many of the cities were uninteresting, but he did see much, especially in Brussels, that was worth recording. Stier arrived in Paris on 15 or 16 August. He had no specific plan for what he

---

164 Elisabeth Spitzbart, Karl Joseph Berckmüller 1800-1879: Architekt und Zeichner, Karlsruhe, Braun, 1999, 11-17, 47-109, provides an excellent contextual analysis of very similar, and well documented, travels by Berckmüller and his friend, the Swiss architect Melchior Berri (1801-1854). On German architects in Italy see Andrea Maglio, L’Arcadia è una terra straniera. Gli architetti tedeschi e il mito dell’Italia nell’Ottocento, Naples, CLEAN, 2009.
165 A four-page fragment in TU II.M.54.A bears a later notation that it probably comes from the lost Tagebuch. Further details about the trip are provided by two letters from Paris (also in II.M.54.A), one to ‘theuerer hochgeehrter Freund’ (Waesemann) of 8 September 1821 and another to his foster father of 2 October 1821.
would do or how long he would stay, just the vague idea that Paris would prepare him for his ultimate goal, Rome. At first he was overwhelmed by the tumult of the city and disappointed that everything was smaller and more mean-spirited than he expected. Still, he remained optimistic about what he could learn.166 His initial optimism rapidly deteriorated into extreme unhappiness and a self-confessed hatred of the French (Franzosenhäß). By early October he was ready to leave, but discovered that he had to have a new passport issued in Düsseldorf for his journey to Rome.167 The new passport arrived on 10 December. He left three days later, having stayed only four months.168

Letters from Paris to Waesemann, Pose, and his foster father provide a detailed account of Stier’s activities and growing discontent. He immediately sought the advice of Franz Christian Gau (1790-1853), an architect from Cologne who was well established in the city. Gau provided an introduction to Jakob Ignaz Hittorff (1792-1867) and Jean-François Joseph Lecointe (1783-1858), partners with a reputation as both artists and teachers. Stier quickly joined the community of their students, primarily in Lecointe’s atelier, and he became aware of how much he had to learn. He happily associated with five fellow Germans, although he found himself somewhat constrained by his limited means and the high cost of living in Paris.169

By 24 September, after just five weeks, Stier had left Lecointe’s atelier. He had become dissatisfied with the anxious imitation and aping (Nachäffen) of antiquity current among French architects and with their disregard for present practical needs. For a while he visited current building sites on his own, but soon

166 AmTUB, II.M.54.A, Stier to theurere hochgeehrter Freund (Waesemann), Paris, 8 September 1821, 1-2. This is probably the first letter he wrote from Paris. Stier’s experience of being overwhelmed by a city far larger than any he had known in Germany is similar to that of many German painters, as documented in France Nerlich and Bénédicte Savoy, eds., *Pariser Lehrjahre. Ein Lexikon zur Ausbildung deutscher Maler in der französischen Hauptstadt*, volume 1: 1793-1843, Berlin; De Gruyter, 2013, ix.

167 The Prussian ambassador in Paris lacked the authority to change the destination (Paris) specified on Stier’s initial passport. He had requested the new document on 1 October, and on 24 October he asked a friend in Düsseldorf to help speed the process. AmTUB II.M.54.A: Stier to theuerer hochverehrter Freund (Waesemann), Paris, 8 October 1821, 2; Stier to theuerer geliebter Freund (Pose), Paris, 24 October 1821, 1.

168 AmTUB II.M.54.A, Stier to father (Wilhelm Stier), Nîmes, 10 January 1822, 1-2.

169 AmTUB II.M.54.A, Stier to theuerer hochgeehrter Freund (Waesemann), 8 September 1821, 2-3. Both Hittorff and Lecointe were students of François-Joseph Bélanger (1744-1818) and Charles Percier (1764-1838). From 1818 to 1830 they were co-directors of the Menus-Plaisirs, producing ephemeral decorations for royal ceremonies under Charles X. They also built many public and private buildings in Paris, few of which have survived. Unlike Hittorff, Lecointe has faded into obscurity. The most recent source is Michael Kiene, *Die Alben von Jean-François-Joseph Lecointe (1783-1858). Architekturen, Skizzen, und Visionen*, Cologne, Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek, 2005.
decided to move on to pursuits other than architecture. He had no plans to work in France, and the larger construction projects were already published and well known in Germany.\(^{170}\)

As the weeks dragged on with no new passport, Stier became increasingly aggravated by the crowds and congestion of Paris and increasingly impatient to leave for Rome. There he expected to find the freedom and sustenance to develop as an artist.\(^{171}\) His low opinion of modern French architecture only grew more intense and he found less and less to draw that had not already been reproduced ‘a thousand times’ in prints. Although he had a similarly low opinion of modern French decorative painting (Zimmermahlerey), he appreciated aspects of current work in sculpture and especially painting. In addition to daily walks around the city, he spent more and more time in the Musée du Luxembourg and in the Louvre, where he studied both old master paintings and ancient sculpture.\(^{172}\) By late October he was also studying and drawing after prints in the Bibliothèque royale and going to theaters in the evenings to examine their architecture and decoration.\(^{173}\) These activities continued through at least late November, when he was also frequenting the stalls of the print and drawing sellers along the Seine.\(^{174}\) His patience was wearing thin, however, and he complained that he could no longer really see anything except in the library.\(^{175}\)

In his most extended later account of his time in Paris Stier observed that although he did not benefit as much as he could have, it was an instructive, formative experience.\(^{176}\) Besides being overwhelmed by the city, he had brought with him the anti-foreign and specifically anti-French bias typical of his generation. He now acknowledged French technical innovations and gave a more positive assessment of historical and contemporary French architecture. Without referring directly to his own experience with Lecointe, he provided a detailed description of the French system of architectural training, with its separate institutions and

170 AmTUB II.M.54.A, Stier to theuer verehrter Freund (Waesemann), Paris, 24 September 1821, 1-2; Stier to father (Wilhelm Stier), Paris, 2 October 1821, 2-3.
172 AmTUB II.M.54.A, Stier to Pose, Paris, 8 October 1821; Stier to theuerer hochverehrter Freund (Waesemann), Paris, 8 October 1821.
173 AmTUB II.M.54.A, Stier to theuerer geliebter Freund (Pose), Paris, 24 October 1821.
174 AmTUB II.M.54.A, Stier to theuerer verehrter Freund (Waesemann), Paris, 19 November 1821.
curricula for architects and engineers. He focused on the École des Beaux-Arts and the private ateliers run by prominent architects that prepared students for and supplemented training at the École itself. He noted with particular approval that the ateliers emphasized not ‘systematic scholarly lectures’ (*systematische wissenschaftliche Vorträge*), but rather ‘lively teaching and practice’ (*lebendige Lehre und Kunstübungen*). This entailed demonstration and critique by the master as well as independent study by the students, with the more advanced actively mentoring their younger colleagues. Together the ateliers and formal instruction at the academy offered a course of study that progressed from a foundation in freehand drawing after prints and casts, to an introduction to the classical orders, to instruction in chiaroscuro and perspective. Under the master’s direction in the atelier, students carried out regular exercises in the design of buildings: following a program set by the master, they produced plans, elevations, views and detail drawings for an entire architectural ensemble. These prepared them for the regular academy competitions and the large Prix de Rome competition. As a paying member of Lecointe’s atelier, Stier would have had access to the courses and collections at the École, without having to enroll formally as a student.

Of particular significance is Stier’s observation that there was no separate instruction in architectural history. He claimed to have observed no interest in a comprehensive general history of architecture and a narrow, practical focus on individual Roman and Italian monuments of immediate relevance to the current French style. Sufficient general orientation was found in the historical survey by the architect Jacques-Guillaume Legrand (1753-1807) that accompanied the comparative plates in Durand’s *Paralèles*. While no French work could match the learnedness of Hirt’s *Grundsätze*, eager study was devoted to the illustrated descriptions of ancient building types in *Les ruines de Pompéi* published by François Mazois (1783-

---

177 This is consistent with accounts in current scholarship and other primary sources. See Garleff, 393-433, with earlier literature.
178 Stier’s account is strikingly similar to the experience of Berckmüller and Berri as described by Spitzbart, 48-61.
179 A chair in architectural history had been created in 1819 for the architect Jean-Nicholas Huyot (1780-1840) at the École des Beaux-Arts. The impetus was not the need for architectural history but rather to provide a job for a promising young architect, as documented by Talenti, 28. As Garleff, 422-424, has shown, Huyot did not begin teaching until 1823, following his return from an extended trip to Greece and the Middle East. His courses, offered until 1839/40, remained focused on antiquity.
1826) and the views of ancient ruins by Giambattista Piranesi (1720-1778). Students also studied prints of Italian architecture, without neglecting the appended texts. The general study of antiquity was actively pursued, through modern and ancient texts and direct observation of the antiquities in the Louvre.

Stier left Paris on 13 December 1821, on foot, for Rome. He carried just a few clothes, his drawing tools, an Italian grammar, and a Bible, having sent the rest of his possessions ahead by freight wagon. He stopped in Fontainebleau, Sens, Dijon, and Autun, and spent Christmas Eve in Lyon Cathedral. To avoid the mountainous route through Switzerland, he proceeded south to Avignon and then Nîmes, where he arrived on 2 January. Here he sought treatment for a painful infection in his foot. The unexpected delay allowed him time to study and draw many architectural monuments as well as fragments of Roman ornament and sculpture. He also experimented with drawing techniques learned in Lecointe's atelier. His foot healed, he left for Marseilles on 10 February. From there he went to Nice and then down the Ligurian coast to Genoa, where he arrived on 16 February. He continued inland to Pisa, Florence, Viterbo, and finally Rome, where he arrived on 7 March 1822.

**Rome, 1822-1827**

Stier spent the next five and a half years in Italy, mostly in Rome. The biographical fragments, letters to friends and family, and official correspondence document his activities in considerable detail. They also show how those activities sharpened his practical skills, expanded his historical knowledge, and shaped his artistic and intellectual views. As in Paris, he continued his direct study of works of art and architecture alongside reference to both text and images in printed publications. As in the Rhineland, employer-mentors continued to be important, but now the work involved the study, rather than the design and construction of buildings. New, and especially important, in Rome was the opportunity to carry out his studies in conversation with an extended circle of other artists and architects.

Stier's savings were quickly drained by the high cost of living in Rome, and he soon decided to take his share of his parents' estate, about 600 to 700 Taler, rather
than cede it to his brother.\textsuperscript{185} He still hoped to secure a stipend from the Prussian state, which did not happen until 1825. In the mean time he supported himself by working as a draughtsman for other foreigners in Rome. His first jobs were relatively minor, drawing a collection of ancient marble furniture for Graf Gustav Adolf von Ingenheim (1789-1855) and a collection of architectural terracottas for a ‘German artist’, possibly August Kestner (1777-1853).\textsuperscript{186}

Despite limited funds, the first year and a half of Stier’s stay in Rome, from his arrival in March 1822 to July 1823, was a period of exploration and discovery. He had come prepared with letters of introduction, and he used these to begin establishing himself in the large community of expatriate artists and scholars resident in the city.\textsuperscript{187} Writing to Waesemann on 14 March, Stier recounted how, the evening of his arrival, he had hurried to the Caffè greco, long the central meeting place for German and Scandinavian artists. He met almost all to whom he had introductions, and several offered themselves as mentors and guides. With great excitement, he described lively discussions, in which hierarchies of age, education, and fame were ignored; these took place in the early evening at the Caffè greco and later in various wine taverns. Every Sunday the artists gathered at a communal art library, where they presented and judged the latest happenings in the European art world.\textsuperscript{188} He also paid a call on Bunsen, then Legationsrat in the Prussian legation to the Papal Court. In Rome since 1816, Bunsen had established himself as a leading figure in the artistic and intellectual life of the city, expanding this role after becoming chargé d’affaires in 1824. His official duties included the care and promotion of the German artistic and intellectual community in the city, and his residence in Palazzo Caffarelli on the Capitoline Hill became a focal point for those communities. Along with his wife, Frances, he fostered free and open exchange

\textsuperscript{185} Stier discussed financial matters with Waesemann, with whom he had left his savings, in several letters: 14 March 1822, 18 May 1822, 30 July 1822, undated (July 1823), and 10 October 1825 (all TU II.M.54.B). He received the inheritance in two installments (1823, 1825).


\textsuperscript{188} AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to Waesemann, Rome, 14 March 1822, 1. He does not name the artists to whom he had introductions. Stier’s descriptions of his life in Rome are consistent with the forms of sociability among German artists described by Noack and Ursula Peters, ‘Das Ideal der Gemeinschaft’, in \textit{Künstlerleben in Rome}, 157-187. The library was founded in 1821 by a large group of artists and a few scholars, with Bunsen’s support (Noack, \textit{Deutschtum}, 1:39-94).
among scholars, artists and travelers of all sorts, in weekly salons and other activities.  

Stier soon had a large circle of artist friends. Most were painters associated with what he called the *neu-teutsche Kunsthochschule*, now loosely referred to as the Nazarenes. Broadly speaking, they sought a renewal of modern art through a return to late medieval and Renaissance models, especially in religious subjects and portraiture; rejection of fixed academic rules while retaining many aspects of the classical-Renaissance tradition; and direct observation of nature. Although there was no stark confessional divide in the German community, Stier appears to have had less contact with Catholics or Catholic converts like Friedrich Overbeck (1789-1869). He associated mostly with the Protestant painters, known as the *Kapitoliner*, who lived in or frequented Bunsen’s home on the Capitoline Hill. He developed particularly close friendships with the painters Schnorr and Ludwig von Maydell (1795-1846); his friends in the group also included Theodor Rehbenitz (1791-1861) and Josef von Hempel (1800-1871), as well as the painter turned historian Johann David Passavant (1787-1861). Beyond the *Kapitoliner* his circle included the history painters Carl Schumacher (1797-1866, also an engraver and lithographer), Josef Anton Draeger (1800-1833) and Heinrich Maria Heß (1798-1863); the landscape painters Ferdinand Flor (1793-1881) and Karl Wilhelm Götzloff (1799-1866); the painter of architecture Ernst Verflassen (1806-1845); the portrait painter Friedrich Wigand (1800-1853); the painter of portraits and Jewish life Moritz Daniel Oppenheim (1800-1882); the engraver Christian Ernst Stölzel (1792-1834); and finally the somewhat older landscape painter and caricaturist Josef Anton Koch (1768-1839), who had long been a mentor to younger German artists. Stier also counted several sculptors among his associates: Christian Johann Lotsch (1793-1873, also a caricaturist); Ferdinand Pettrich (1798-1872); and Johann Christian Hermann (1800-1869). All three were students of the neo-classical sculptor Bertel Thorwaldsen (1770-1844), who was still a leading figure in the Roman art community.

In assessing his chances for securing state support, Stier noted that he was the only Prussian studying architecture in Rome at the time. There were three Bavarians, all about ten years older than he and fine draughtsmen, from whom he

---


190 The following list is based mainly on the Plan zu den Lehrjahren, as Stier rarely mentions friends by name in his letters or the other biographical fragments.

191 The most useful overview of artists working in Rome in the years 1815-1850 is still the one provided by Noack, *Deutschum*, 461-534.

192 On Thorwaldsen and his German students, see Harald Tesan, ‘Deutsche Bildhauer bei Thorwaldsen in Rom’, in *Künstlerleben in Rom*, 259-277.
expected to learn the mechanics of drawing. One was certainly Josef Thürmer (1789-1833), another probably Johann Gottfried Gutensohn (1792-1851), who was born in Switzerland but educated in Munich and supported by the Bavarian state. There were also several architects from southwestern Germany, all closely associated with Friedrich Weinbrenner (1766-1826), a prominent architect and teacher in Karlsruhe. Stier was close to and later collaborated with one of these, Gutensohn’s collaborator, Johann Michael Knapp (1793-1856). He also knew the architect and theorist Heinrich Hübsch (1795-1863) as well as three other students of Weinbrenner: Berckmüller, Berri, and Friedrich Eisenlohr (1805-1854).

After just a week of walking around to orient himself, Stier devised a routine for his studies. He would make colored sepia views, primarily of ancient ruins but also modern buildings, and practice the drawing of figures, details, and architectural ornament. Just a few days of direct observation allowed him to revise his assessment of the existing scholarship. He now found the prints in French publications overly finished (geleckt) and inaccurate, while the available texts on Italy for architects now seemed imprecise and insufficiently comprehensive. He was already thinking of making his own contribution by publishing a small volume of etchings (a technique he had learned with some success in Paris).

Over the next sixteen months this routine remained the primary, but not sole focus of Stier’s intense but unfocused activities. He complained that, although he was working constantly, he had put nothing on paper that he found satisfactory. The monuments were all too dispersed around the city, and it was taking him too long to establish the overview (Übersicht) needed to guide well regulated study (ein geregeltes Studium). Still, he wandered among all the ancient ruins and modern buildings throughout the city, observing everything and producing views and studies of details and ornament. To draw works of painting and especially sculpture he visited gardens and art collections, including the Vatican, the French academy in Villa Medici, and the Villas Borghese, Farnesina, Malta, and Poniatowski. Further
opportunities for study drawings came on several excursions with his friends to towns frequented by artists, including Tivoli, Olevano, Subiaco, Ariccia, and Genazzano.198 From this description, it appears that Stier was following established conventions, as seen in drawings by Schnorr, Weinbrenner, Berckmüller, and others.199 As noted above, his own travel drawings have disappeared from the Nachlaß.

Pursuing another interest begun in Düsseldorf under Vagedes, Stier turned his attention to the other arts, with a pronounced emphasis on sculpture. He drew after works on display throughout the city (in collections, palaces, and churches), especially Raphael and Michelangelo at the Vatican, and he shared his friends’ enthusiasm for Albrecht Dürer (1471-1558). He also studied the work of the more contemporary painters Overbeck, Peter Cornelius (1783-1767), and Karl Philipp Fohr (1795-1818), whose drawings he saw at Passavant’s; and of the printmakers Johann Heinrich Ramberg (1763-1840) and Bartolomeo Pinelli (1781-1835). He undertook an intensive, focused study of Antonio Canova (1757-1822), examining his character as a man and an artist, but was generally critical of new work being produced in Rome. He frequented artist’s studios, especially Thorwaldsen’s ‘sacred grove’ (Götterhain).200 He took up landscape painting for a time, and early on participated in portrait sessions (Portraitgesellschaft) at Wigand’s. His primary interest, however, was in depicting the human figure. On his own, he drew ancient sculptures, often at the French academy, and heads from life. He studied books on human proportion by Dürer and Heinrich Lautensack (1522-1568). He traced works by Pinelli, probably his print scenes of Roman life, and made his own collection of bodies in motion. He took lessons in modelling in clay from Hermann, eventually producing some small torso studies. He also participated in the life drawing sessions, with nude female models, organized by Passavant and Pettrich. This caused him to reflect on how drawing after the model related to his study of statues. Such reflection was common among his friends: he participated in (or observed) a

198 The excursions are obliquely mentioned in the letters, with the places visited listed in the Plan zu den Lehrjahren. Literary accounts are included in Hesperische Blätter: ‘Der Zug nach Tivoli’, ‘Villegiatura (Ariccia)’, ‘Das Blumenfest von Genazzano’.
200 AmTUB II.M.59.C, Biography A, 11; II.M.61.C, Plan zu den Lehrjahren (for 1823). Comments on contemporary art occur mostly in the letters to Pose, a painter.
'dialog' on the proper use of the model and the value of direct observation of nature (Naturstudien).201

Given the small number of architects among the German artists in Rome, it is not surprising that Stier had few, if any, such opportunities for the communal study of architecture. In the first months in Rome he practiced the application of ink washes for the rendering of shadows by copying Thürmer’s drawings. Around the same time Thürmer was ‘working on a capital’ (Das Capitäl von Thürmer in Arbeit), probably a model (drawn or three-dimensional) for one of the orders.202 Stier also spent much time with Knapp (oft bei Knapp), who was engaged in his own study of ruins and buildings. With Gutensohn, Knapp was working on a multi-volume publication of Christian basilicas in Rome titled Denkmale der christlichen Religion.203

Architecture was, however, a frequent topic at the regular social gatherings that Stier described in his letters and autobiography. In addition to the Caffe greco, Stier met his friends at the Osteria del Sole, where, in 1822, he regularly joined Hempel, Draeger, Wigand, Götzloff, Flor, Schröter, Schnorr, Rehbenitz, Heß, and Verfläßen. He also met up with friends in the evenings, in 1822 at Schumacher’s and in the winter of 1822/23 with Koch, Heß, Hempel, Lotsch, and Stölzel. During these first months Stier shared quarters with Hempel and Oppenheim and then with Lotsch and Hempel.204 In their evening gatherings, always with wine, the artists sought to emulate the simple and honorable ways of their Renaissance heroes. Given the wide variety of views among the mostly youthful participants, however, exchanges could be lively and contentious.205 Stier was among the most vocal in these gatherings as he presented the results of his daily studies (certainly in both words and drawings) and discussed his interests. The assembled company helped him correct his errors and shape his views. In particular, his closest friends urged him to limit his activities and focus on his own art (architecture). He lacked sufficient clarity, however, to follow this advice, and his letters record an ongoing struggle to subordinate sculpture to his primary interest in architecture.206

Stier was also unable to follow the wider neu-teutsche Kunstschule in its advocacy of a return to German medieval models in architecture as in painting and

201 These activities receive passing notice in the letters and Biography A, with most detail provided by the Plan zu den Lehrjahren.
202 AmTUB II.M.61.C, Plan zu den Lehrjahren.
204 AmTUB II.M.61.C, Plan zu den Lehrjahren.
205 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to father (Wilhelm Stier), 4 August 1822, 2.
sculpture. Although he still held to his earlier desire to revive that style, he felt that he lacked sufficient knowledge to make it a guiding model for the present, as others had done for ancient architecture. It had become his goal to develop a clear concept of architecture as such, as well as principles that met the needs of contemporary Germany. Despite the most intense efforts, however, he continued to vacillate between antiquity and the Middle Ages. He lacked both the calm necessary for deep reflection and the comprehensive historical knowledge needed for understanding individual periods. Here, as through many subsequent years, he followed the principle: ‘First clarity for the whole, then study of the parts’ (Erst Klarheit fürs Ganze, dann Studium des Einzelnen). Although this kept him from taking full advantage of all Rome had to offer, these first months had been immensely fruitful and provided the foundation for his whole subsequent life.207

Indeed, by July 1823, Stier had made some, but still not satisfactory, progress as he continued his program of study in Rome and the surrounding hills. His skill as a draughtsman had improved. No longer feeling compelled to record every window frame and volute, he now concentrated on what he found personally useful and what had not been published. This selectivity required much exploration, careful observation, and familiarity with many print sources, as ‘almost the whole country’ (fast das ganze Land) had already been documented in prints. To Pose, Stier recommended a new series of views of ancient buildings by Luigi Rossini (1790-1857) as better drawn and less mannered (manirirt) than most of those by Piranesi.208 Nevertheless, Stier had not yet achieved clarity on the big questions outlined above, and he was still confused and troubled by modern and contemporary architecture, dominated as it was by the senseless, the useless, and the ugly. He had produced no independent work of significance, and thus had had nothing to show the Prussian king on his visit to Rome in November. He expressed frustration with life in Italy and a desire to return home in the fall of the next year. The serious, brotherly tone among the German artists had been ruined by the arrival of too many fops and know-it-alls, causing him to withdraw into a much smaller circle of close friends. He was optimistic that an upcoming trip to Naples and Sicily with Hittorff would provide the breakthrough he needed.209

207 AmTUB II.M.59, C, Biography A, 4-5, 6-7; Plan zu den Lehrjahren. In the letters this internal conflict is only implied, as in the passing comment to Pose (20 May 1822) that he now understood how Schinkel and Moller could have spent so much time in Rome and still remain true to ‘our old German buildings’, how Weinbrenner could live there for six years, diligently measuring both ancient and modern buildings, and still return home without putting together something right for the present.

208 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to Waesemann, Rome, undated (July 1823), 2; Stier to Pose, Rome, undated (July 1823), 1. Luigi Rossini, Le antichità romane ossia raccolta delle più interessanti vedute di Roma antica, 2 volumes, Rome, Scudellari, 1819-1823.

209 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to Waesemann, Rome, undated (July 1823), 1-2; Stier to Pose, Rome, undated (July 1823), 2.
Hittorff arrived in Rome on 28 January 1823, accompanied by Ludwig von Zanth (1796-1857). Hittorff quickly established himself in both the French and German art communities. He and Zanth spent the next several months in and around the city, studying ancient and modern art and architecture. Hittorff and Stier extended what had been a passing acquaintance in Paris, and Hittorff hired Stier at a small daily wage. For four months, Stier worked as a draughtsman, mainly tracing drawings Hittorff had acquired from others. Stier claimed that he had done so in such a manner that Hittorff could pass the tracings off as his own. Through Hittorff, Stier became more closely acquainted with French architects in Rome and the architecture students at the French academy. He later fondly recalled the intensity and exactitude of their study of antiquity, often under difficult conditions; their practice of sharing and tracing or copying each other’s drawings. He was impressed, as he had been in Paris, by the cooperative, collegial interaction among the students in all aspects of their studies.

On 6 July 1823 Stier signed a contract to accompany Hittorff and Zanth on an extended trip to Naples and Sicily. Hittorff would cover all travel costs and pay Stier a small daily wage (but only while in Sicily). All work done by Stier would belong to Hittorff, but in return Stier would be free to make copies of all drawings, both his own and Hittorff’s. He was happy with the contract, he wrote to Waesemann, because the trip would take him to Sicily, which was inaccessible due to the high cost of travel. He would have the opportunity to think and draw on site and to make his copies very quickly in comparison with the original work. He would not let fear of bandits and difficult working conditions deter him, as his artistic development and thus the main goal of his life depended on making the

---


Such fears were justified, given conditions on the island, including the often oppressive weather. Still unexcavated, the ruins were mostly imposing, jumbled heaps of stones.214

The three left Rome on 15 July 1823, arriving in Naples five days later. Here they stayed for six weeks, making several excursions to nearby sites, including Salerno and Pompeii.215 On 30 August they sailed for Palermo, arriving on 5 September.216 After a few days, they began their arduous and often dangerous journey around the island. They stopped first in Messina, where they stayed for ten days to document a wealth of impressive modern structures. After a stop in Taormina and a side trip to climb Mount Etna, they arrived in Catania on 12 October, where they stayed for two weeks. Next they spent three weeks in Syracuse to study the ruins and to visit the archaeological collections of Baron Gabriele Judica (1760-1835) in nearby Palazzolo. They then proceeded along the southern coast, stopping for five weeks in Agrigento and six weeks in Selinunte. In mid-January 1824 they went north to Trapani, and from there by boat to Palermo. In the city they studied mostly modern buildings and made an excursion to the ruins in Segesta. After a rough crossing the three arrived back in Naples on 11 February. They made excursions to Paestum and Pompeii before returning to Rome at the end of the month. Stier received his final payment on 28 February.217 Hittorff and Zanth spent March and April in Rome, leaving for Paris on 8 May.

To understand what Stier did for and learned from Hittorff, it is necessary to consider the purpose of the trip, Hittorff’s role as leader of the enterprise, and his exacting methods for the study and documentation of architectural monuments. Discussion of those methods provides necessary context and background for the specific, detailed statements by both Hittorff and Stier about Stier’s duties.

With the French annexation of the left bank of the Rhine in the 1790s, including his native Cologne, Hittorff had become a French citizen. In 1810 he went to Paris to expand his architectural training, first with François-Josef Bélanger (1744-1818) then with Charles Percier (1764-1838) and then at the École des Beaux-Arts.

---

213 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to Waesemann, Rome, undated (July 1823), 1. The contract is lost but recorded on a list of documents assembled for the biography (II.M.61.C). The requirement to surrender work to Hittorff is noted in Biography A, 7, which also includes an illegible passage about their relationship.
214 Michael Kiene, ‘“Restitution” as Fact and an Ideal: From Vision to Documentation and Transfer of Knowledge’, in Kiene, Lazzarini, and Marconi, 27, 33-34.
215 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to father (Wilhelm Stier), Agrigento, 1 December 1823 (II.M.54.B); Klinkhamels, 32-34; Maglio, 227, documents Stier’s requests to visit the Museo Borbonico in Naples, the Museo Ercolanese in Portici, and Pompeii on 5 August and 23 August 1823.
216 This account lists the main stops on the journey as described in Stier’s letters to his foster father (Agrigento, 1 December 1823) and to his cousin Gustav (Rome, October 1825). For more detailed discussion see Klinkhamels; Kiene, Sicile moderne; and Kiene, Lazzarini, and Marconi, Sicile ancienne.
217 Kiene, Sicile moderne, 30; Hittorf to Lecointe, Rome, 28 February 1824.
When Cologne was ceded to Prussia after the Congress of Vienna (1814/15), Hittorff lost his French citizenship, making him ineligible to compete for the Prix de Rome. Despite lacking this essential credential, Hittorff, along with his friend Lecointe, replaced Bélanger at the Menus-Plaisirs du roi, the office responsible for court ceremony and spectacle. In 1822, with the help of influential supporters, Hittorff was granted eighteen months' paid leave for a study trip to Italy. He also had earnings from his work for the court and financial support from his father, a successful tinsmith and building contractor in Cologne. Hittorff’s trip was in effect a substitute for the Prix de Rome, except that his study was independent and compressed into a much shorter period. Also, as an established professional, he had the means and stature to hire two younger men as his assistants. Hittorff was 31, Zanth 27, Stier 24.

Hittorff’s main purpose was the same as that of any architect traveling to Italy: detailed on-site examination and drawing of monuments. How he went about this can be discerned in part from his travel diary and letters, but also from his original drawings and those reproduced in two sets of prints published after his return. Among the Hittorff drawings in the Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek (USB), Cologne, are four albums: one for the journey from Paris and the first stay in Rome (‘Voyage d’Italie’), two for ancient architecture in Sicily (‘Sicile ancienne’), and one for modern architecture in Sicily (‘Sicile moderne’). Additional drawings from the
trip are preserved, but no longer accessible (due to poisonous mold) among the approximately 8,000 Hittorff drawings in the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum. Hittorff published some results from his expedition to Sicily in two volumes: Architecture antique de la Sicile and Architecture moderne de la Sicile. As common for such projects, publication was supported by subscriptions and carried out in regular installments (livraisons, Lieferungen or Hefte) to be bound by individual owners upon completion. Architecture moderne began appearing in 1826, with completion, including explanatory text, delayed until 1835. Of thirty installments announced in the prospectus for Architecture antique only the first eight (for Segesta and Selinunte) appeared in Paris in 1827. No text was published until the expanded second edition in 1870.

Although Hittorff left for Italy with a clear plan and familiarity with the existing scholarship on Sicily, it is not clear that this included publication or perhaps not publication on this scale. In the prospectuses published with the initial installments in 1827 and 1835 Hittorff stated that he made many more new discoveries than he anticipated, and that seeing the monuments made him aware of the errors propagated by The Antiquities of Magna Graecia, published in 1807 by the British architect William Wilkins (1778-1839). Stier tells a similar story, stating explicitly that a change of plan occurred in Sicily. Already in Palermo, artists and connoisseurs had alerted them to the inaccuracy of Wilkins’s work. Soon after leaving Palermo, they saw that it was indeed misleading and full of mistakes, and that in its focus on temples it omitted many other types of buildings. They then decided to make a careful survey of all existing antiquities on the island and to include as many monuments of modern art as time would allow. Work in Sicily lasted five months, not three as anticipated.

222 Klinkhamels, 43-44; Kiene, Die Italienische Reise, 14-15, Kiene, Sicile moderne, 13-14. Copies after a few drawings Hittorff sent to Lecointe in Paris are included in Lecointe’s albums in the USB. In her analysis Klinkhamels includes, uncritically according to Kiene, copies and drawings by Lecointe, who made his own trip to Italy in 1827.


Eric Garberson  
Architectural History in the Architecture Academy: Wilhelm Stier

The expansion of work in Sicily did not necessarily assume publication only, or immediately, in the single mode now equated with publication, namely print. Back in Rome, Hittorff and Zanth worked from the survey drawings to produce reconstructions, all at the same scale, of the fourteen best preserved among the temples at Agrigento, Selinunte, Segesta, and Syracuse. Hittorff exhibited these drawings to much acclaim in Rome; in Milan, at the Academy of Fine Arts; and finally in Paris when he delivered his report in July 1824.227 It is not known exactly which drawings Hittorff exhibited, but they most likely included some reproduced in Architecture antique for Selinunte and Segesta and some of the finished drawings in the album ‘Sicile ancienne’ for Selinunte, Agrigento, and Syracuse. As Hittorff noted in the prospectus, Architecture antique followed the system of Stuart and Revett. In addition to some views and site plans, it provides reconstructions as well as actual-state representations (often in independent drawings) and many architectural and structural details.228 In contrast, Architecture moderne represents intact buildings and has more in common with Percier and Fontaine’s publication of modern palaces in Rome. Both have scales but no measurements on plans and elevations; include fewer details, also with scales but no measurements; and are selective in what aspects of a given building they represent, rather than consistently giving plan, elevation, and sections.229

The drawings in the three Sicily albums show, however, that Hittorff employed essentially the same working method for both ancient and modern, ruined and intact, buildings. He followed the then-standard practice of making sketches (minutes) or survey drawings (Bauaufnahmen) on site to be used later as the basis for finished drawings (mise au net, Reinzeichnungen), which also included reconstructions of ruined structures. Most of the Reinzeichnungen were completed in Rome, and only a few of the minutes are included.230 All the drawings in the albums are based on direct observation, consistent with the comprehensive survey of ancient and modern structures that Hittorff and his assistants decided to carry out shortly after leaving Palermo. Most are highly detailed survey drawings, with measurements and some notations, of plans, elevations, and details of architectural members and figural and other decoration. The two ancient volumes include more drawings of small structural details and individual architectural elements (such as capitals or triglyphs), as required for the documentation of the ruins’ actual state.

227 Kiene, ““Restitution””, 34. The exhibitions are mentioned in Hittorff’s letters of 1 April 1824, 15 April 1824, 10 June 1824, and 4 July 1824. Mention of publication occurs only in the last.
228 Clemente Marconi, ‘Sicile Ancienne: An Appraisal’, in Kiene, Lazzarini, and Marconi, Sicile ancienne, 16-19, provides a good analysis of the visual means used by Hittorff for documentation and reconstruction.
229 A similar contrast is drawn by Garric, Recueils d’Italie, 209. Klinkhamels, 222-229, relates this selectivity to Hittorff’s specific interests in different building types and periods.
and the preparation of accurate reconstructions. The modern volume has more perspective views as appropriate for intact structures. The final drawings are highly finished, with delicately applied pink and grey washes, fewer measurements, and no notations. Some were exhibited and some were transformed into prints for publication, with further loss of detail. There are also some site plans and views of cityscapes and ruins in the landscape.\textsuperscript{231}

Stier’s role in this exacting process can now be established from statements by Hittorff and Stier himself. In the two prospectuses Hittorff indicated that he had been accompanied to Sicily by his friend and student Zanth and ‘by another architect, M. Stier, whom I had brought from Rome at my expense’ (\textit{d’un autre architecte, M. Stier, que j’avais amené de Rome à mes frais}). He acknowledged their support only in very general terms, citing their talent, zeal, and friendship. He stated that only he and Zanth had prepared the finished drawings for the engravers.\textsuperscript{232} Nearly all the plates in \textit{Architecture ancienne} bear the inscription \textit{H et Z mens. et del.}, crediting them with both measuring and drawing. Stier appears, along with Zanth, only on figures 24 and 25, two metopes from Selinunte. In \textit{Architecture moderne} only the engravers are credited. Hittorff repeated the formulation ‘an architect I brought along at my expense’ in numerous instances, including the announcement in the \textit{Kunstblatt}.\textsuperscript{233} Stier was offended by this, as he later wrote to Zanth, because it suggested that he had either taken charity or worked only for monetary gain. Rather, he had accepted work as a paid assistant so that he could pay his own way and pursue his studies. Stier wrote that he would have let the matter go, but his friends had teased him.\textsuperscript{234}

In one sense, Hittorff’s statement was accurate: he had borne the cost of travel (for a trip Stier could not afford), and he had hired Stier primarily as an assistant. Despite doubts about Zanth’s physical stamina, Hittorff had brought him along for his exceptional technical and mathematical knowledge, command of ancient languages, and outstanding facility as a draughtsman.\textsuperscript{235} By July 1823 Hittorff had grown so tired of Zanth’s hypochondria and dark moods that he considered leaving Zanth behind if he did not improve on the way to Naples. Anticipating the worst, Hittorff hired Stier as a replacement; in any case he expected to benefit from the assistance of this young man, who drew well and had sufficient strength and good humor to withstand the rigors of the trip.\textsuperscript{236} All further mentions

\textsuperscript{232}\textit{Architecture ancienne}, prospectus; \textit{Architecture moderne}, prospectus.
\textsuperscript{233}\textit{Kunstblatt} 8:6 (7 June 1827), 182.
\textsuperscript{234}\textit{AmTUB} II.M.68.D, Stier to Zanth, Berlin, undated (fall 1832), 1-2.
\textsuperscript{235}Klinkhamels, 18; Hammer, 41-42.
\textsuperscript{236}Klinkhamels, 32, partially citing Hittorff’s letter to Lecointe, Rome, 5 July 1823, Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln, Nachlaß Hittorff, Bestand 1053, Nr. 1.
of both Stier and Zanth in Hittorff’s letters are just that, passing mentions that give no indication of what each actually did.\footnote{Agrigento, 4 December 1823, to Baron de la Ferté; Selinunte, 30 December 1823, to Ludwig Schorn (1793-1842); Rome, 17 February 1823, to Percier; Rome, 28 February 1824, to Lecointe (final payment to Stier); Rome, 1 April 1824, to Lecointe; Rome, 15 April 1824, to Politi; Paris, 4 July 1824, to Politi.}

The only source for this is Stier himself. He recorded that in Naples he did work for Hittorff indoors (probably more tracings and perhaps some finished drawings) and after nature \textit{(nach der Natur)}, probably original drawings on site and in museums. He worked with perspective aids, including a camera lucida.\footnote{The Plan zu den Lehrjahren just lists \textit{Hilfsmittel zur Perspektive, Camera Lusitana}. In his texts and letters Hittorff often states that he brought along the necessary equipment, without specifying what that was. There is, however, much discussion of the paper Lecointe sent him from Paris, on which see Kiene, \textit{Die italienische Reise}, 17-20.} He claimed to have done much of the basic on-site investigation and documentation of the ruins in Sicily. As he wrote to his cousin Gustav Stier (1807-1880)\footnote{On Gustav see Börsch-Supan, 679-683.}:

\begin{quote}
We spent seven months in Naples and Sicily, where, besides [making] exact measurements, I drew and measured much ornament, many views, and sundry secondary elements. In Sicily I executed the majority of the details (capitals and cornices) of the ornament and other sculpture, as well as the plans of the theaters and amphitheatres (especially the intricate survey drawings); Hittorff and Zanth, however, [executed] especially the plans, main views, and sections of the temples.\footnote{AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to Gustav Stier, Rome, n.d. (early October 1825), 3: 7 Monate brachten wir in Neapel und Sicilien zu, wo ich außer strengen Vermessungen viele Ornamente, Veduten und sonstige Nebentheile für ihn zeichnete und aufnahm. In Sicilien habe ich den größten Theil der Details (Kapitäle und Gesimse) der Oramente und der andern Sculpturen, wie die Grundrisse der Theater und Amphitheater (überhaupt die verwinkelten Aufnahmen) bearbeitet; Hittorff u Zandt aber besonders die Pläne, Hauptsichten und Durchsnitte der Tempel.}
\end{quote}

In a later letter, he specified that he had drawn the site plan of Selinunte and, almost entirely on his own, works in Naples that would be published along with the modern monuments of Sicily.\footnote{AmTUB II.M.67.B, Stier to Altenstein, Rome, 18 October 1824, 3. Kiene, \textit{Sicile moderne}, 159-160, notes that of the drawings made in Naples, only a few of S. Filippo Neri are at the USB. One of these of the roof construction (Inv. nr. 220) bears annotations in German, and is possibly by Stier. Maglio, 135, lists several ancient and modern monuments studied in Naples and states that drawings of them are among those in the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum.} The work on Sicily had been very demanding, requiring him to clamber over fallen columns and climb on high ladders, often at
barely accessible sites and under very unfavorable conditions. It was also exceedingly boring, often consisting mainly of measurements and calculations (viel Arbeit von purem Maß und Zahlenweisen). This left no time to appreciate the landscape or make any drawings for himself as promised. He had no regrets, however, as the most essential things, both ancient and medieval, would be published in prints.242

Although he regretted the lack of a true personal connection with Hittorff and Zanth, Stier wrote to his uncle August that the three had worked well together. Despite lacking their academic training, he had held his own with the two gentlemen from Paris in every way and helped with things not found in books. They had treated him with kindness and respect, as much as could be expected from self-involved courtiers. Hittorff was ambitious and driven by the advantages the project would bring him, such that Stier expected he would take credit for the work of ‘our trinity’ (unsere Dreieinigkeit). Still, Stier felt honored to have contributed to a work of lasting and general importance, and he had expanded his own experience and knowledge.243 He later recalled that a lively exchange of views had occurred among all three, as they shared their discoveries and encouraged, even competed, with each other. After spending all day measuring and drawing on site, they worked deep into the night finishing drawings and recording measurements on them.244

The two ‘Sicile ancienne’ albums largely support Stier’s claims. Since he was contractually obligated to surrender all work done, it is logical to assume that some drawings in the albums were produced by him. These almost certainly do not include the finished drawings, which were executed by Hittorff and Zanth after Stier left the team. In any case, it is not possible to distinguish individual hands or to identify the contribution of assistants in these drawings.245 The albums also contain many minutes and Bestandsaufnahmen of precisely the sort Stier listed in his letter to Gustav, often with detailed site measurements. A few of these bear notations in German cursive (Kurrentschrift), sometimes along with notations in French, but the text on most of the drawings is in French. Notations would likely have been added later, in what was a very collaborative enterprise. Although German by birth and early education, Hittorff and Zanth used French, so the German text is most likely Stier’s.246 The German inscriptions appear only on the least finished, most sketch-

242 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to Gustav Stier, Rome, n.d. (early October 1825), 5, 8; Stier to uncle (August Stier, Gustav’s father), Rome 10 October, 1825, 3.
243 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to uncle (August Stier, Gustav’s father), Rome 10 October, 1825, 3-5. Displaying casual anti-Semitism, Stier attributed Hittorff’s superficiality to his Judennatur (Jewish nature). He felt closer to Zanth (who was actually Jewish), a good sort spoiled by his wealthy upbringing to be overly sensitive and impractical.
245 Kiene, Sicile moderne, 16.
246 The reproductions published by Kiene, while good, are too small to allow definitive comparison with documents in Stier’s Nachlaß.
like survey drawings of architectural details, never on the plans of the temples (which Stier credited to Hittorff and Zanth). This is seen, for example, in the drawings for the Temple of Concord at Agrigento. Stier likely gathered the calculations in the list labelled Verjüngung der Concordien Säulen (tapering of the Concordia columns), with further annotations in German; these were then applied to a finished drawing labelled Diminution des Colonnes. The detailed site drawings for the theater at Segesta could be Stier’s work, as he claimed, even though they lack German text. The minute for the site plan of Selinunte is labelled in French, as is the finished drawing. Although Stier, a trained surveyor, claimed to have made or at least prepared the plan, Hittorff took credit for it. The print in Architecture antique (pl. 10) bears the usual credit H et Z mens. et del. Even though Stier probably made most of the site measurements and many of the minutes of architectural details, this was all ‘work for hire’ under Hittorff’s direction. The results, both the information gathered and its graphic record, belonged to Hittorff.

Taken together with statements by Hittorff and Stier, the drawings document Stier’s significant, if largely mechanical, contribution to what he rightly considered a project of lasting importance. They also show that working for Hittorff offered the opportunity to develop practical skills in the examination and documentation of both ruined and intact structures, either for the first time or together with earlier documentation. Stier thus gained extensive experience in the taking and interpretation of highly precise measurements of architectural details. As he reported to Gustav, he had also gained a good bit of facility and dexterity (eine ziemliche Leichtigkeit und Gewandtheit) and was now able to make as elegant an architectural drawing as anyone could want, something easily learned from the French. Stier possessed many of these skills already, and it is impossible to know to what extent Hittorff provided further guidance or training.

It is also difficult to determine the precise role played by Hittorff, as the eldest and leader of the expedition, in expanding Stier’s ‘experience and knowledge’. Stier never credits Hittorff with a defining role in his formation, as he had Vagedes, although this may be due, at least in part, to their somewhat troubled relationship. Stier’s letters and later accounts of the trip do not mention two issues of great importance to Hittorff: his discovery that the ancient buildings had been painted and his theories on the origin and use of the pointed arch in Sicily (published in Architecture moderne). Instead, those accounts state that the principal benefit of the trip was the direct, personal experience of the monuments, and that it was friends in Rome who would help him make sense of that experience over the next three years.

248 Kiene, Lazzarini, and Marconi, Sicile ancienne, Inv. nos. 258-264.
249 Kiene, Lazzarini, and Marconi, Sicile ancienne, Inv. nos. 16-17. Hittorff to Schorn, Rome, 6 April 1824.
Writing in the 1830s, Stier identified the principal insights gained on the trip. The few weeks spent in Pompeii had been a profoundly transformative experience. Wandering through the well-preserved ancient city, he came to appreciate buildings of many different types, especially the houses and villas. No longer blinded by arbitrary academic rules of proportion, symmetry, and ornament, he could now see in them an admirable joining of the materially functional with an ideal beauty (eine wunderbare Vereinigung des materiell zweckmäßigen mit einer idealischen Schönheit), of ingenuity and poetic fantasy (von Scharfsinn und dichterischer Phantasie). He found a natural, organic freedom in the ordering of plans, in the proportions of masses and spaces, in architectural and ornamental details that he had sensed all along, and he now felt free to pursue his earlier, intuitive appreciation for things conventionally dismissed as poor or barbaric, such as Roman baths, the architecture of the entire Christian and Islamic Middle Ages, fifteenth-century Italian architects, and the rural vernacular architecture of the Alps and England. He saw a similar unselfconscious freedom in many medieval buildings in Naples and Sicily, which he connected with related works in northern Italy and Germany. More clearly than the works of antiquity, these all showed him that the essence of architecture arises from the most basic considerations of purpose and site and from actual structure (aus den einfachsten Situationen des Zweckes u. Lokals und aus den Elementen der wirklich gebrauchten Construction). It was these experiences, he recalled, that finally allowed him to adopt a free, unbiased view of the whole of the history of architecture, unconstrained by current taste or the French academic doctrine which had dominated his training. They also provided the basis for the conception of architecture he would develop by the time he left Rome in 1827.

At the time, however, Stier was not yet able to make sense of these experiences, to move beyond the mechanical work he had been doing for Hittorff over the past year. From February through September of 1824 he returned to sculpture, incorporating studies of the body in motion he had managed to carry out during the trip. He spent time in the Vatican, Thorvaldsen’s studio, and the cast collection at the French academy, and he made his own bas-relief of the Expulsion from Paradise. Architecture, however, provided the guiding thread through all his activities and remained a topic of conversation with his friends. Seeing his ideas begin to coalesce, they had new hopes for his success. His principal interlocutor was Maydell, with whom he made plans to write a primer for architects (Baumeister-
Despite some homesickness, Stier felt he needed to remain in Rome. He had not yet learned all he could, and certainly not what he needed to move beyond his initial practical training and experience and into a higher position in public service back in Berlin. Thus he resolved to wait for Schinkel’s arrival, anticipated in the fall. He still hoped that Schinkel could secure him state funding to extend his stay. To support himself in the meantime, he took on what he expected to be a small job working with Bunsen. While the project proved far larger and more time-consuming than he anticipated, the relationships he established with and through Bunsen would significantly shape the course of his career.

Bunsen hired Stier as a contributor on the multi-volume, multi-author Beschreibung der Stadt Rom, of which he had recently become the principal editor. The project had been initiated in 1817-18 by the publisher Johann Friedrich Cotta (1764-1832) as a revision of an eighteenth-century guidebook. By 1824, it had grown into a new work based on original research in ancient and modern textual sources and original investigation of monuments and art collections. The new text was to consist of a general introduction (covering geography, geology, and climate; history; art history; and topography) in one volume with subsequent volumes describing individual parts of the city, plus another collecting ancient and modern source texts and inscriptions. There were to be two sets of illustrations: small ones, mainly of individual areas and buildings, to be bound with the text and larger ones for purchase and binding separately. Ultimately only three volumes were published (one for the introduction and two for the description), and not always with the planned illustrations. The independent prints appeared in two installments, as portfolios (Bilderhefte) rather than bound volumes. Most of these were based on drawings by Knapp.

---


256 Ernst Platner, Carl Bunsen, Eduard Gerhard, and Wilhelm Röstell, Beschreibung der Stadt Rom, 3 volumes, Stuttgart and Tübingen, Cotta, 1829-42.

257 The principal source for the history of the project remains Bunsen’s preface to the first volume. The earlier guidebook was Johann Jakob Volkmann and Joseph Jérôme Le Français de Lalande, Historisch-kritische Nachrichten von Italien, 3 volumes, Leipzig, Caspar Fritsch, 1770-1771, specifically volume 2, Beschreibung der Stadt Rom.

258 Bunsen, Beschreibung, ‘Vorrede,’ lxvii-lx.

259 These are not catalogued with the text in most libraries. The first, undated, installment is available from the Bibliotheca Hertziana (http://lupa.biblihertz.it/Dg450-4291-2-3), the
Stier was brought in primarily to work on three maps. Together he and Knapp drew a reduced version of the enormous map published in 1748 by Giovanni Battista Nolli (1701-1756), still the most accurate and detailed map of the modern city. They added a new inset to situate the city in its environs. On his own Stier drew a geological map (*Geognostischer Plan*) based on an earlier one by Giovanni Battista Brocchi, making corrections using the research of Friedrich Hoffmann (1797-1836), a contributor to the project. Stier’s main task, however, was to make a new ‘comparative map’ (*vergleichender Plan*) of the ancient, medieval and modern cities. Under Bunsen’s direction he consulted primary source texts and made extensive observations in the field. The nature of their work together is documented in an undated letter, in which Stier responded to a question about calculating the number of structures in a *rione*, or one of the ancient regions of the city. Stier referred to a map of Pompeii, noting the size of houses and other buildings, and provided intricate mathematical calculations for the area occupied by individual structures. He also explained the scales applied to plans sent for Bunsen’s review, most likely sections of the larger, unfinished plan.

As Bunsen noted, the comparative map entailed ‘almost endless work’ and would only be delivered with the final volume. Never published, it is known only from Bunsen’s description. Over a corrected representation of the city’s natural topography, Stier superimposed the first orthogonal map of the city, made in the mid-sixteenth century by Leonardo Bufalini (d. 1552). Bufalini’s map was already very rare, and so he worked from Nolli’s reduced copy of it and tracings after the incomplete version in the Barberini collection (now in the Vatican). Over this, Stier superimposed the main streets of modern Rome as shown on Nolli’s map, the first orthogonal map since Bufalini. Based on his own observations, Stier corrected errors in Bufalini’s often crude rendering. Finally, using two different graphic modes he distinguished the extant ruins from those listed by Bufalini and his contemporaries.

---


261 Not delivered for binding in the first volume as intended, both of these were included in the first *Bilderheft*. The Hertziana album lacks the geological map, which recently appeared as a hand-colored engraving on the art market (Antiquariat Clemens Paulusch, Berlin). Stier is credited as the draughtsman. The reduction of Nolli’s map was also likely available separately, as suggested by the copy at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0009/bsb00095219/images/). Only the geological plan is included Armando Pietro Frutaz, *Le piante di Roma*, 3 vols., Rome, Istituto di Studi Romani, 1962, 1: 87, 2: pl. 85.

262 GSTAPK VI. HA FA von Bunsen (Dep.) A Nr. 29, Bd. 4, f. 158-160.

263 On Bufalini’s map see Meier, 77-118.
but now destroyed or covered over. Stier’s work with the sources and in the field also provided the basis for the introduction to the rioni that he was to provide for the volume of source texts. His brief but very detailed description (with measurements) of the structure of the Aurelian wall was included, with attribution, in the topographical section of the introduction.

Although the work was difficult and mechanical, Stier found his involvement with the project advantageous in several respects beyond the income it provided. The many detailed, on-site investigations made him thoroughly acquainted with all the noteworthy archaeological features of the city; in particular, he found working with the ruins enjoyable, stimulating, and instructive. For a few months he lived in Bunsen’s household in Palazzo Caffarelli. Here he spent many beautiful hours and met many fine comrades. Chief among these was Schnorr, with whom he developed a deep friendship and whose accomplishments he sought to emulate. Stier also developed a close personal relationship with Bunsen, who would ultimately prove to be an important supporter and intellectual mentor.

The immediate benefit of this relationship was the opportunity to meet Schinkel when he arrived in Rome that fall (1824) on a state-funded study trip accompanied by the art historian and museum curator Gustav Friedrich Waagen (1794-1868). Schinkel was a frequent guest at Bunsen’s, and by early October Stier had shown Schinkel his work. For the next two weeks Stier figures often in Schinkel’s diary, appearing at meals and as an evening visitor. Stier reported to his uncle August that his interaction with Schinkel had been very warm and cordial, and that Schinkel had praised his ‘studies thus far’ (meine bisher verfolgten Studien). Which of the drawings discussed above Stier presented is not documented, although he did report showing Schinkel his relief of the Expulsion from Paradise. In any event Schinkel was sufficiently impressed to suggest that Stier pursue his project to publish little-known artworks and prepare a request to the Kultusministerium for a stipend to support the project.

---

264 Bunsen, Beschreibung, 1, ‘Vorrede,’ lxx-lxxi. In the preface to volume 3 (1842), Stier’s comparative map was announced as appearing soon.

265 Bunsen, Beschreibung, 1, ‘Vorrede,’ xii; 651-653.


268 Entries of 8, 14, 16, 18, 21, and 22 October 1824, in Koch, 295, 305, 310, 313, 318.

On 18 October Stier composed his request to Kultusminister Altenstein, which Schinkel forwarded to Berlin four days later.270 After describing his training and experience, Stier expressed his desire to remain in Italy to continue his studies. He requested support for his project to publish architectural decoration of the late Italian Middle Ages, which he identified as the fourteenth, fifteenth, and early sixteenth centuries, exemplified by the arabesques in the Villa Madama and the Villa Lante (on the Gianicolo) and those in the Vatican by Raphael. It would be, he claimed, a great public service to disseminate reproductions of these mostly unknown works in reasonably priced outline drawings.271 He had already begun to etch the drawings himself, and he requested financial support to cover the cost of materials, travel, and living expenses for two years.

Altenstein responded to Stier on 2 January 1825, awarding him a stipend of 500 Taler per year for two years. Its purpose was primarily to prepare him for a teaching position in ‘higher architecture’ at the Akademie der Künste. Stier was to provide, immediately, a study plan for the first half of 1825, with a report on those studies and a new plan to follow mid-year. The same was to occur in 1826. Schinkel had been informed and would communicate specific instructions.272 Altenstein had written to Schinkel on 26 December, informing him that the king had approved the award and that further instructions for his supervision of Stier’s studies would follow. The king’s approval had come in response to a report that Altenstein had written together with von Bülow.273 The idea of training Stier for the Akademie der Künste must have originated from this report (now lost), and the consultation between the two ministers suggests that his teaching was to benefit both academies in some way. There is some evidence that Stier was already known to von Bülow. In his request to Altenstein he mentioned drawing a tripod in the Vatican for ‘a ministry’; the letter bears a pencil notation identifying this as the commerce ministry.274

Schinkel did not wait for the documents from the ministry (which have not been located), writing to Stier already on 27 December with news of the award and expressing his great joy at having been able to be of assistance. He noted the requirement for Stier to provide reports of his work from time to time and offered some preliminary instructions. First, in the villas (Giulia, Madama, Lante, Raphael) and the rooms in the Vatican that they had discussed, Stier should copy the painted and stucco decoration, the main compartments in color and the whole just in outline.

271 On the Villa Lante, see Koch, 313, n. 706.
274 AmTUB II.M.67.B, Stier to Altenstein, n.d. (18 October 1824), 4. This might be the drawing, dated 1824, of a dreibeiniger wandfester Tisch in the Kupferstichkabinett, SMBPK (SM 53.4).
drawings. Second, he should study and practice the painting of arabesques on plaster. Third, he should study and practice the Florentine and Venetian manners of painting walls in porphyry with embedded bits of marble. Fourth, and above all, he should stay for an extended period in Mantua, where Schinkel had just seen Giulio Romano’s incomparable works for the first time. In particular Schinkel recommended drawing after both the figures and the compositions in the Palazzo del Te and Palazzo Vecchio, as well as other works by Giulio Romano and Alberti. Stier’s studies in Mantua could be aided by ongoing publication of paintings in the Palazzo del Te. Once Stier had decided on other such tasks, they could discuss the details.  

The last three years of Stier’s stay in Rome, from January 1825 until September 1827, are sparsely documented, in just four long letters and the biographical fragments. After the letters to his uncle August and cousin Gustav in October 1825, there is just one more letter to his family, to his foster father, on 20 February 1827, which includes profuse apologies for not having written for a long period. The fourth letter is to Schinkel, dated 15 August 1827. Here, too, Stier apologized for a long silence; his last communication appears to have been in late 1825 or early 1826. Together these letters show what Stier was doing and how he finally resolved the big questions that had occupied him since his arrival. The letter to his foster father states that Stier’s relationship with Schinkel had become increasingly fraught. Although praising Schinkel as a fine man and a brilliant artist, Stier now rejected his approach to architecture, and especially his choice of style, as superficial and wrong in its recent rejection of the Middle Ages in favor of a stricter classicism. Nevertheless, Stier found himself in agreement with Schinkel on some matters, especially architectural training, and he still hoped to work with Schinkel in Berlin. This suggests extensive discussion during Schinkel’s visit in October 1824 and in subsequent, but lost, correspondence.

Stier submitted the required reports to Schinkel only in 1825. Neither the reports nor Schinkel’s instructions have been located. A likely fragment of one such report is the single undated sheet titled ‘Raphael’s Villa’ with a brief

---

278 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to father (Wilhelm Stier), Rome, 20 February 1827, 6-8, partially quoted in Börsch-Supan, 65. She finds Stier’s critique unfair and based on an incomplete understanding of Schinkel’s demanding official position and his artistic accomplishments. In a postscript to the letter to Schnorr of 30 August 1832, Stier recalled Schinkel’s lively defense of the antique on the evening they had spent with him in 1824 (Lier, 63).
279 In the letter of 15 August 1827, Stier asks to be excused for not submitting reports in 1826, suggesting that he had done so in 1825 (von Donop, 80).
description of the paintings with which Raphael had decorated his bedroom. In Caroline’s unmistakable hand, this is probably a fair copy after a draft that Stier had saved. Stier was also required to submit study drawings, as indicated in Schinkel’s letter of December 1824. In February 1827, Stier remarked to his foster father that he owed Schinkel some drawings and that he could produce them in only about two weeks. He planned to send the drawings with a long exculpatory letter. Stier did not write to Schinkel until August, sending no drawings, just a promise to send a ‘cycle of studies’ (Zyklus von Studien) in a few weeks.

Indeed, Stier neglected his obligation to study under Schinkel’s guidance, preferring instead to focus on other commitments and interests. At first Stier focused briefly on architectural studies of his own, making some experiments in historical construction (Versuche in historischen Constructionen). But he was soon troubled by his old doubts. He also lost focus because work on the comparative map of Rome for Bunsen kept expanding and taking up large amounts of his time, as it would right up to his departure for Berlin. Work on his own publication project was impeded as well, by his own ill health and the ongoing inaccessibility of the Villa Lante (the custodian was away, the owner was in residence). These difficulties were all the more discouraging because he now realized that the project would require an unreasonably long period of purely mechanical work. This would put him under the same pressure that had so harshly oppressed him as a Bauconducteur and since arriving in Rome. Overcome with the same doubt and confusion as before, he turned, once again, to the other arts. He made several drawings and sculptures of subjects from mythology, history, and literature. He had many happy days and thought seriously of making his career as an artist. Although the publication was never completed, he returned to Berlin with the drawings, two of which were later published in Vorbilder für Fabrikanten und Handwerker.

AmTUB II.M.61.A. The modest structure in the gardens of the Villa Borghese, known as ‘Raphael’s Villa’, never belonged to Raphael; the paintings, in the Borghese collection since the late nineteenth century, are also not by Raphael (Koch, 290, 633).


AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to August Stier, Rome, 10 October 1825, 9; Stier to Gustav Stier, Rome, n.d. (October 1825), 4; von Donop, 79.

AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to August Stier, Rome, 10 October 1825, 9; Stier to Gustav Stier, Rome, n.d. (October 1825), 4; von Donop, 79.

http://www.smb-digital.de/eMuseumPlus?service=ExternalInterface&module=collection&objectId=1517474&viewType=detailView
By October 1825 Stier seems to have regained some focus, reporting to his uncle August that he was working on a collection of study drawings of Greek architectural ornament, household objects, and marble furniture on quarto or small folio sheets. These were detailed outline drawings combined with sculptural profiles. He was doing this difficult and time-consuming work in the evenings, and he planned to send the drawings back to Berlin, where they would provide the basis for further work. This appears to have been an independent project and likely formed the core of the approximately 180 folio drawings he used in his teaching at the Bauakademie.

In early 1826 Stier hit upon yet another new project: the design of a large church appropriate to an updated Protestant liturgy. In the letters to his foster father and Schinkel, Stier situates the project in his renewed focus on architecture and his desire to return home with more than just a portfolio of drawings or empty fantasies. He needed to create an extended work of his own invention (eigener Erfindung), one that would demonstrate his capacities as an artist, his suitability for state service, and all that he had learned in Italy. The work had to be relevant to current architectural and cultural concerns, highly challenging, and actually buildable. Most suitable, he thought, was the design of a large protestant church that both fulfilled practical liturgical needs and, in its monumentality and artistic integrity, was a worthy house of worship. Given the current state of architecture, these two requirements were all but irreconcilable, and nothing satisfactory had been built or even proposed. There had been some fruitless learned discourse, and the latest designs were merely fashionable. He recalled that Bunsen had raised the question of a liturgically appropriate church design during Schinkel’s visit in 1824, but, despite many extended conversations, nothing had been accomplished then or since.

As Stier noted, this question was widely discussed, but it was of particular and long-standing interest to Bunsen, partly in response to initiatives for liturgical

http://www.smb-digital.de/eMuseumPlus?service=ExternalInterface&module=collection&objectId=1517475&viewType=detailView
http://www.smb-digital.de/eMuseumPlus?service=ExternalInterface&module=collection&objectId=1507113&viewType=detailView
http://www.smb-digital.de/eMuseumPlus?service=ExternalInterface&module=collection&objectId=1507114&viewType=detailView

289 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to father (Wilhelm Stier), Rome, 20 February 1827, 1-3; Donop, 77.
reform pursued by Friedrich Wilhelm III. Where the king sought to impose a new liturgy by governmental fiat, Bunsen believed that a new liturgy should grow naturally out of the past and present life of the church. To ground his reform, Bunsen carried out extensive research into the history of Christian liturgical practice, stretching back to early Christianity, and into German hymns and prayers since the Reformation. His efforts resulted in a new liturgy for the legation’s chapel in Rome, a collection of hymns and prayers published in 1833, and, after a long delay, a major publication on the liturgy in 1854. In the 1820s Bunsen was also conducting research on early Christian basilicas for essays to be published in volumes two and three of the Beschreibung and coordinated with the plates in Gutensohn and Knapp’s Denkmale der christlichen Religion (also published by Cotta). Stier assisted Bunsen in this research, as well as Bunsen’s work in the 1830s on the introduction to the second edition of the Denkmale.

It was after a particularly detailed conversation with Bunsen at Pentecost in May 1826 that Stier hit upon the idea of offering his own solution to the problem of a liturgically appropriate church plan. To guide his work, he asked Bunsen to write out the architectural requirements for a well-ordered church service. What Bunsen provided was a copy, or perhaps a version, of the theses on protestant church design that he had read aloud on the evening of 6 October 1824, in the presence of Schinkel, Stier, and Waagen. Writing to Schinkel, Stier politely remarked that, given the current uncertainty and disagreement about church design, he had followed the essay Bunsen had read to them in 1824. Schinkel did not mention the theses in his


292 Beschreibung der Stadt Rom, 2.2 (1832), 50-133 (Old St. Peter’s), 3.1 (1837), 505-526 (Lateran), 577-586 (S. Clemente).

293 Christian Carl Josias Bunsen, Die Basiliken des christlichen Roms nach ihrem Zusammenhange, mit Idee und Geschichte der Kirchenbaukunst, Munich, Cotta, 1842. The plates and explanatory text appeared in 1843-44. In the preface Bunsen acknowledged Stier’s ongoing assistance, thanking his friend and co-researcher of many years for his many contributions


295 von Donop, 77.
diary entry for 6 October, but a copy of the text is preserved in Bunsen’s papers.296

Spurred on by some friendly teasing from Bunsen about the overweening ambition of the undertaking, Stier committed himself to this project more fully than to any other, and he sought Bunsen’s advice at all stages of the design process. Within six to eight weeks he had a rough design to show Bunsen and his circle, from whom he received much encouragement but also criticism and advice.297

While Stier’s initial conception of a large almost semi-circular church did not change, he found it necessary to conceive the project almost entirely anew based on this advice. He struggled to design a feasible and durable wooden structure (Zimmerconstruction) to span the main space, and he expended much effort on the style (Baustyl) until he could make it a more or less harmonious and consistent whole. He also found that this work went beyond his present knowledge, requiring many rather extensive study drawings. To keep the project manageable he decided to limit himself to outline drawings of the architectural elements, on about ten sheets, saving the details for later.298 The preliminary work had been difficult, causing him much despair and many sleepless nights, but it had also required him to organize his thoughts. Throughout this process, both he and Bunsen continued to seek the advice of ‘knowledgeable men of all disciplines and the most disparate views’ (verständiger Männer aller Fächer und der verschiedensten Ansichten). From the beginning, Stier had also received advice and encouragement from his friend Maydell, who fully shared his views on art and religious practice.299

By February 1827 Stier was starting the finished drawings and a written text explaining his underlying conception and defending each decision taken.300 He anticipated much criticism for the innovative, unconventional design and the audacity of its construction. By summer he planned to send a cost estimate (Kostenanschlag) to the king. He was optimistic that his plan stood a good chance of being built. Bunsen had promised to secure Schinkel’s support and recommend the plan to the king, who was likely to have an interest in it. Still, he had conceived the

297 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to father (Wilhelm Stier), Rome, 20 February 1827, 4; Donop, 78. Drawings from this early stage may have been among those listed in the Nachlaß in 1857; none appear to be included in the texts related to the project.
299 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to father (Wilhelm Stier), Rome, 20 February 1827, 4-5, 6.
300 These drawings are lost. Two of them, obtained from Hubert, were published by K. E. O. Fritsch, Der Kirchenbau des Protestantismus von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart, Berlin, E. Toeche, 1893, 191-193, figs. 330 (section) and 331 (ground plan). They are reproduced as line drawings, not photographs.
explanatory text like a publication, so that if the plan were not built, it might make him known and secure other potential advantages. Fearing Schinkel’s criticism and meddling, Stier was not yet ready to discuss the project with him, preferring to present a completed whole that could speak for itself. It is unclear whether the explanatory text was ever completed. Only a partial draft of the fourth section and a separate, possibly later, general introduction survive among the notes and drafts for the project in Stier’s Nachlaß. The finished drawings are not currently in the Architekturmuseum, and none of the texts have illustrations, except for some undated but probably early drafts with a few rough sketches in the margins.

When Stier wrote to Schinkel in August, neither the full church plan nor the long overdue study drawings were included. The purpose of the letter was to mend relations with Schinkel and seek his advice in approaching the ministry about the promised appointment in Berlin. He was open to anything, but thought himself best suited to teach construction. So that Schinkel might judge his qualifications, he sent three separate texts as enclosures: 1) a brief exposition of the conception of architecture underlying his church design; 2) an explanation of the design, with a single drawing of the ground plan; 3) his views on architectural training. Stier was quite circumspect in the first two, which dealt with topics on which he anticipated Schinkel’s disagreement, but he was quite open about his views in the third, where he was confident of Schinkel’s agreement. When the two met in October 1824 Schinkel had just spent the last several years involved in the separation of the Bauakademie and formulating a new curriculum for the Akademie der Künste. As Stier intended, the three enclosures sum up his views at the end of his time in Rome. They also allow for some conclusions about Bunsen’s contribution to their formulation.

Work on the church plan had been so all-consuming, Stier recalled, not just because the design problem was so complex, but also because it was his first attempt to put into practice the ‘deeper artistic views’ he had developed since coming to Rome (seine bisher gewonnenen tieferen artistischen Ansichten). These views

301 AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to father (Wilhelm Stier), Rome, 20 February 1827, 5-6, 9.
302 AmTUB II.M.89.C.2, Allgemeine Lage der Sache; II.M.89.D, IV. Abschnitt: Vertheidigung der gewählten Grundform der Predigtkirche. II.M.89.A is a folder of various draft fragments, which I have not attempted to correlate with the more finished drafts.
303 AmTUB II.M.89.B (draft fragment discussing the roof structure with sketches of trusses) and C.1 (rough draft of the text in C.2).
304 von Donop, 80.
305 Beilage I: Skizze unmaßgeblicher allgemeiner Meinung und Ansichten über Wesen der Bau-Kunst; welche vornehmlich beim Versuch des Entwurfes eines Planes von einer größeren Protestantischen Kirche im Auge gehalten wurden; Beilage II: Skizze des Planes einer größeren evangelischen Kirche; Beilage III: Skizze unmaßgeblicher Meinungen und Ansichten über das Studium der Architektur. von Donop, 82-84, 215-230. The ground plan was drawn directly on the first page of Beilage II. The drawing is reproduced by von Donop, 215-216; and Steckner, 234.
are set forth in the first enclosure for Schinkel as unnumbered and somewhat disjointed theses, loosely modelled on Bunsen’s theses on the ideal church plan. They formed the basis for the twenty theses presented in Stier’s first course in Berlin in 1828 and the twenty-two published by Hubert in 1867 as the principles that his father had followed throughout his life.

The theses build on insights gained in Pompeii, but they also include some fairly standard ideas that Stier would have encountered in his earlier experiences. The invention (Erfindung) of an architectural work must begin by meeting practical needs and must be undertaken as a conscious, thoughtful process. Each individual architectural invention must be and appear as an organic, consistent whole that uniquely and naturally fulfills its function in plan, structure, and architectural forms. Nothing may be imposed by supposedly universal norms, models, rules of proportion, fashion, or unfounded craft traditions (grundloser Handwerksgebräuche). Architectural details and decoration must find their natural place within both the design of the whole and the framework provided by actual structure. Cost and construction methods must be appropriate to the building’s function and purpose, consistent with the latest scientific and technical knowledge, and suited to the local building materials and climate. Just as every building must be a coherent whole within itself, every building, especially every public building, must be appropriate to and fully expressive of the culture of the people (Volk) for whom it is built, encompassing morals, mentality, religion, knowledge, and its accomplishments in science, poetry, and art. Architectural invention thus requires the study of all relevant historical precedents, as models to adopt or develop.

Expanding on the importance of history, Stier posits ideas that likely reflect his interaction with Bunsen. The past provides not just specific models useful in individual projects, it also reveals the true principles of architecture; it shows the path to follow in the development of true architectural style. In all times and ‘among all cultivated peoples’ (bei allen kultivirten Völkern) these principles were followed, and the resulting architectural styles are complete wholes that fully express their local and historical conditions. In other words, architectural style must arise freely and naturally from land, people, and time like a natural growth; it cannot simply be borrowed as a finished product (ein schon fertiges und vollendetes Ding). Among strong peoples borrowings from other times and places never appear as foreign elements, but are reworked and naturalized to the new context. Individual

---

306 *Architektonische Erfindungen von Wilhelm Stier*, vi-xiii. These last were the result of ongoing revision by Wilhelm (e.g. the partial draft in II.M.64 from the 1840s). The order was changed slightly to create a clearer sequence, with the most general principles brought to the start, redundancies removed, and a few revisions made to update discussion of construction. On the course see Garberson, ‘Stier’s Entwerfung’.

307 von Donop, 81-84. Here I present a synopsis to bring out key ideas that are obscured in Stier’s disjointed and repetitive text.
architects may depart from the style of their time, so long as they do not go against its general direction and the totality of their culture.

Albeit obliquely, these theses offered a partial answer to the existential question that Stier had been struggling with since coming to Rome. Without quite saying so, he rejected the imposition of any single style as the dominant one in the present, which had its own unique needs and circumstances unlike those found in any other time or place. All past styles were available for present use, so long as they were used consciously and in a manner appropriate to the function of the building, its actual structure, and to the local climate and building materials. In the critique of Schinkel sent to his foster father, Stier addressed this topic much more directly, arguing that an historical style is not like a costume that can be put on for the sake of fun or fashion. He also denigrated the current dogmatic and exacting use of the classical style, or individual elements of it, as something new in world history, standing in stark contrast to the long tradition of successive cultures learning from each other but making all borrowings their own.\textsuperscript{308} Implied in these initial theses, but brought out in the later iterations, is an emphasis on the plan as the starting point for all architectural invention. Through development of the plan, the architect ensures that each space, or group of spaces, fulfills and expresses its function, and provides the framework for developing the unified, organic conception of the whole (massing and exterior articulation) and its parts (architectural and decorative details).\textsuperscript{309} Stier stated that the architectural style chosen must be consistent with the actual structure of the building and appropriate to its function, although he did not address how that appropriateness is to be determined.

In the second enclosure, a brief description and justification of his church plan, Stier avoided drawing any overt connection between the plan and his choice of style.\textsuperscript{310} The main emphasis falls on the ground plan and how each of its elements fulfills the functional needs of a well-ordered church service. (Figure 4)

\textsuperscript{308} AmTUB II.M.54.B, Stier to father (Wilhelm Stier), Rome, 20 February 1827, 7.
\textsuperscript{309} These ideas are also brought out more clearly in Biography A, 13-15.
\textsuperscript{310} von Donop, 82-84, with a line drawing after the small plan on the first page of Stier’s text. This differs slightly from the one published by Fritsch, Kirchenbaukunst, which lacks the carriage porches flanking the transept.
As such, it was as acoustically superior to all other forms and thus ideally suited to allowing the voice of the preacher to be heard by the assembled congregation. Perhaps to avoid offense or disagreement, Stier provided Schinkel no explanation for his choice of a medieval style. He simply described it as coming closest to the Byzantine and old Italian styles, by which he meant what is now commonly understood as Romanesque. Instead he stressed how both the vertical elements (piers, pilasters, and pilaster strips) and horizontal elements expressed structural forces. He gave no explanation or justification for the use of round arches throughout, although he defended the use of iron elements as structurally sound and cost effective.

In the third enclosure, where he was sure of Schinkel’s agreement, Stier directly addressed the importance of history to the practice of architecture, but in ways that avoided advocating for any particular style. Running a full twelve pages, this presumptuous document covers the purpose and potential (Vermögen) of an architecture school, the duties of an architecture instructor, and the current state of architecture schools in Germany. It also includes an ideal curriculum for the improvement of those schools. Reprising earlier criticism of architectural training at the Bauakademie, Stier faulted current German architecture schools, especially in Prussia, for offering an incoherent and overly technical curriculum with too much

---

311 Curran, 109. As she demonstrates (18), Byzantine was then a general term applied to pre-Gothic medieval architecture in most of Europe.

312 In the explanatory text (AmTUB II.M.89.C.2, 12), Stier also glossed over the relation of plan to the choice of style, simply stating that the style had been chosen to suit the building’s function, its historical moment, and its actual structure. In devising his design, he had started from the plan and allowed all elements, including the choice of an historical style to grow organically from it.

313 von Donop, 218-230.
emphasis on mathematics and the natural sciences. Too little attention was paid to the relationship between the mechanical and the intellectual, and the essence of architecture and its underlying principles were ignored completely. The latter were both essential foundations for free, independent artistic vision, the sole basis for original creation not bound by arbitrary rules or the taste of instructors.\textsuperscript{314}

In his ideal curriculum, Stier downplayed the natural sciences and proposed three courses that anticipated his teaching in Berlin and recalled elements of Schinkel’s proposal of 1822. Placed at the end of the curriculum, the three courses provide the theoretical, historical, and practical foundation for independent architectural creation. The first, a ‘general introduction’ (allgemeine Einleitung) defines the various branches of the arts and how they are determined by local and historical context. The second is a survey of architectural history in eleven chronological-geographic sections; each consists of an introduction defining the cultural, historical, and geographic context followed by a survey of monuments.\textsuperscript{315} This course also includes drawing exercises through which students actively study and thus better retain the historical forms. The third course is a capstone that combines lectures and design exercises following the format that Rabe was to have followed in his ‘Stadtbaukunst’ and ‘Lehre von den Gebäuden’. The main organization was by building types, with lectures to introduce best past examples of each type from the historical survey. Alternatively, the surveys of the monuments, could be incorporated into the design course itself.\textsuperscript{316}

While Bunsen’s guiding role in Stier’s church design emerges quite clearly in the two letters of 1827, his role in shaping the ideas expressed in the other two enclosures for Schinkel is not directly documented. Stier almost certainly consulted Bunsen on the content of all three enclosures, drawing on discussions, going back at least to mid-1824, that engaged the history, theory, and practice of architecture as well as architectural education. Schinkel’s visit in October of that year undoubtedly provided one occasion to discuss these matters in depth. As Stier noted, he also discussed these broader questions with his other friends, primarily Schnorr and Maydell, but also the architects he knew in Rome: the Deutsch-Franzosen Hittorff and Zanth; the Bavarians Thürmer and Gutensohn; and the Weinbrenner students Knapp, Hübsch, Berckmüller, and Eisenlohr. Distinguishing what Stier learned from

\textsuperscript{314} von Donop, 218-222.
\textsuperscript{315} von Donop, 226: The chronological-geographic divisions, in translation: 1) Ancient Indians; 2) Ancient Egyptians; 3) Ancient Persians; 4) Speculation on the architecture of the Jews and Phoenicians; 5) Greeks and Etruscans; 6) Romans to Constantine; 7) Italy from the fourteenth to the end of the sixteenth century; [8 omitted] 9) Reigning architectural style in Europe from the start of the seventeenth century to the present; 10) Architecture in Germany, England, France, Portugal, and Spain from Charlemagne into the sixteenth century, in so far as it is closely connected to the previous; 11) Arabs and other Orientals contemporary with them; 12) Chinese
\textsuperscript{316} von Donop, 222-230.
Bunsen from the specifically architectural and art theoretical discourses of the 1820s would require a broader but also more detailed investigation. It is clear, however, that Stier’s work as an architectural historian was significantly informed by Bunsen. The historical courses in the curriculum for Schinkel show the same grandiosity and unchecked ambition as Bunsen’s various research projects, especially the Beschreibung and his research on hymns and the liturgy. These qualities would characterize all of Stier’s plans for his teaching and especially for his publications, which, unlike Bunsen’s, never came to fruition. Stier’s intricately complex prose style also owes much to Bunsen’s similar, if more successful style.

More specifically, Stier’s insistence that architectural practice and, consequently, architectural education depended upon a good understanding of architecture as such, of its fundamental principles, echoes a guiding idea followed by Bunsen. In the Beschreibung, in his liturgical and hymnological research, and in the basilicas essay, Bunsen grounds his historical research in a clear definition of the phenomena under investigation. Likewise, Stier’s understanding of architecture as informed by, and expressive of, its local, cultural, and historical context is consistent with the approach to all forms of cultural production pursued across Bunsen’s projects. Both men stressed that the study of historical monuments (architectural, visual, textual) should survey a large number of examples across time and be unbiased by contemporary fashion and that all monuments are instructive in some way.

What Schinkel thought of Stier’s long letter is unknown, as he had little time to respond. Stier left Rome for Berlin on 24 September 1827, about six weeks after sending the letter. He had planned to return in November, but again Bunsen provided an advantageous opportunity. To conceal an official visit to Berlin, Bunsen used the pretext of delivering Raphael’s Madonna della famiglia Lante (better known as the Madonna Colonna; Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), which he had recently purchased for the royal collections. To help with the transport he hired Stier, who had proven his usefulness on many past excursions. In order to arrive by 15 October, the birthday of the crown prince, the future Friedrich Wilhelm IV (b. 1795, r. 1840-1861), Bunsen outfitted a wagon for sleeping so that he and Stier could drive through the night. They spent two days in Florence, but otherwise stopped for no more than a

---

317 These qualities also characterized Bunsen’s projects from his student days, as noted by both Toews, 69-73, and Foerster, 31-32.

318 This very condensed overview is based on Bunsen’s introduction to the Beschreibung, the basilicas essay, and the helpful examinations of Bunsen’s intellectual foundations provided by Foerster, 17-96, and Toews, 69-90.


few hours in Perugia, Spoleto, Assisi, Arezzo, Bologna, Mantua, Verona, Bolzano, Mittenwald, Innsbruck, and Munich. Stier wrote to Maydell that he was deeply moved by Assisi as well as Santa Croce, Santa Maria Novella, and San Miniato, and the works of Simone Martini, Orcagna, and the Gaddi. He had been an ass (ein Esel) not to have travelled north with Maydell when he had the chance. Stier and Bunsen arrived in Berlin on 12 October.

**Stier at the Bauakademie, 1828-1831**

In Berlin, Bunsen continued his support of Stier, introducing him at court and promoting his church design. It was Schinkel, however, who played the most direct role in securing his appointment to the Bauakademie. Stier’s first course, “Design of Buildings” (*Entwerfung der Gebäude*), initially resembled the capstone described in the ideal curriculum for Schinkel, combining historical lectures with design exercises. After just one semester he recognized the need to expand the lectures as an independent course. This course, ‘Studies of architectural monuments’ (*Studien über die Monumente der Baukunst*), laid the foundation for his subsequent career. He taught both courses until summer semester 1831, the last before yet another reform of the institution under Peter Beuth, who replaced Eytelwein as director in late 1830.

Immediately upon arriving in Berlin in October 1827, Bunsen established a personal connection with the crown prince and joined his inner circle. Asked to share the results of his historical research and plans for religious reform, Bunsen would certainly have mentioned his young friend. Stier reported to Maydell that he had shown his church plan to the crown prince soon after they arrived and then to other members of the court, among whom it created something of a sensation. The crown prince also asked him to share his thoughts on the design of a massive cathedral to serve as a national monument. Stier had ideas and a design to present, having thought about the matter and made a sketch on the trip from Rome, doubtless in conversation with Bunsen. The crown prince voiced his approval and requested an elaboration of the initial idea. In eight weeks Stier had prepared four sheets of drawings, developing the design in a Gothic style adapted to the present. The king had asked to see the drawings, which were submitted to the cabinet for

---


321 AmTUB II.M.74.1.4, excerpt from a letter to Maydell, Berlin, n.d. (late 1827 or early 1828). Stier’s passport for the trip is in II.M.67.D.

322 Waddington Bunsen, 275-299, includes no further mention of Stier during Bunsen’s time in Berlin. Foerster, 99, reports that Bunsen’s diary for the trip is lost.
review in early 1828. At this point, Stier’s design disappeared into the ongoing discussions about a more impressive replacement for the existing cathedral. A later (undated) description of both plans indicates that Stier’s monumental Reichsdom consisted of a round preaching church with four projecting arms for the altar church (with a five-sided apse), baptismal and funeral chapels, and the entrance.

Meanwhile, efforts had begun to secure Stier the teaching position for which he had been prepared at state expense. In a note of 15 November Schinkel informed Stier that the crown prince had recommended to interior minister Schuckmann that Stier be hired at the Bauakademie. (The Bauakademie had reverted to the interior ministry upon the dissolution of the commerce ministry at von Bülow’s death in 1825.) The prince had made this recommendation because Schinkel had personally conveyed to him a request from Eytelwein. Schinkel advised Stier to call on Eytelwein that day or the next, and he raised the possibility that permission for a definitive appointment might be required from Altenstein. Stier should not, however, mention this to Eytelwein. The crown prince had in fact written on 12 November to interior minister Schuckmann. He noted that Stier’s knowledge and skills made him especially suited to teach the aesthetic side of architecture, and specifically design and drawing (Projectiren und Zeichnen). Schinkel had evidently conveyed that the matter was pressing, because the prince made his recommendation ‘with utmost urgency’ (auf das angelegentlichstle). The urgency probably arose from two concerns: a desire to secure Stier for state service before he found other employment and the need to fill gaps in the curriculum at the Bauakademie. Design exercises were missing from Rabe’s ‘City architecture’, and there was no course in perspective, which was the type of drawing that Stier taught once hired. It is not known whether anyone consulted Altenstein, whose ministry had paid Stier’s stipend in Italy.

Stier followed Schinkel’s advice. On 26 November Schuckmann informed the prince that although there was no regular position open, Eytelwein had offered

323 AmTUB II.M.74.5, Caroline’s excerpt of a letter from Wilhelm to Maydell, Berlin, March (?) 1828. Caroline added the notation ‘Aus dem Brief an Maydell vom 27. März 1827’; the year cannot be correct as Stier had not yet left Rome.
324 That Stier made a second plan specifically for a new cathedral was unknown to the scholars cited above, all of whom discuss the church plan made in Rome as if it were the cathedral plan.
325 AmTUB II.M.89.E, Kurze Beschreibung von beiliegenden zwei Planen (sic) zu einer evangelischen Kirche fuer 8000 Kirchengaenger; Beschreibung der Skizze zu einem Reichsdom. This is a fair copy by Caroline of a draft in II.M.78.B. Both the fair copy and the draft lack illustrations. It is not known if the drawings submitted to the cabinet were returned to Stier; they are not currently in the Architekturmuseum.
326 AmTUB II.M.67.A, Schinkel to Stier, 15 November 1827. Eytelwein was a personal friend and professional colleague of Schinkel’s.
327 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Vb, Kultusministerium, Sekt 4 Tit III Nr. 11 Bd. 1, f. 125.
Stier, verbally, a temporary position at the Bauakademie for ‘exercises in design and drawing’ (Uebungen im Entwerfen und Zeichnen). Because Stier had requested a permanent position, with a higher salary, the ministry had broken off negotiations. It could not appoint someone without first ascertaining if he possessed the necessary gift for lecturing (Gabe des Vortrages). On 20 December the prince instructed Schuckmann to resume negotiations and forwarded a letter from Stier dated 6 December. In it Stier explained that he had rejected the initial offer because, at 400 Taler, the compensation was insultingly below what he had earned in Düsseldorf (600 Taler) and his stipend in Rome (500 Taler), and it was not sufficient for life in Berlin. In further discussion with Eytelwein, compensation of 800 Taler had been offered, but with no mention of a permanent position. Stier suggested a temporary appointment with the proviso that he receive a permanent appointment within a year upon fulfilling whatever conditions might be set. On 2 January 1828 Schuckmann’s ministry offered a provisional position, pending final approval by the king, and asking if Stier would agree to take the architect’s examination administered by the Oberbaudeputation. By 9 January Stier had submitted a sample of work and agreed to take the exam. On 24 January he accepted the formal offer of appointment, effective 1 April, to teach exercises in design and drawing for a yearly salary of 800 Taler plus one Taler Kopfgeld per student.

On 11 April Bunsen and Stier presented Stier’s first design for a protestant church to the king and the crown prince. They showed the finished drawings Stier had made in Rome, but carefully put aside his explanatory text. Bunsen left for Italy the very next day, suggesting that this was a final attempt to help his young friend. Writing to Schnorr in November, Stier reported that his affection and respect for Bunsen had only deepened during the trip from Rome and while Bunsen had been in Berlin. As in Rome, Bunsen had helped him in both word and deed. Although Schinkel was friendly and supportive, Stier found it hard to resume the deep connection they had in Rome; Schinkel was lost in a cloud of pretentious

328 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 126.
329 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 129; 130-131v.
330 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 132.
331 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 132, 133, 134, 136.
332 GSTAPK VI. HA FA von Bunsen (Dep.) A Nr. 29, Bd. 1, f. 24-26, ‘Uebergabe des Stierschen Plans einer evangelischen Kirche, 11 April 1828’.
333 Notation by Caroline on the letter from Stier to Maydell, Berlin, March (?) 1828 in AmTUB II.M.74.5.
334 Waddington Bunsen, 327, describes Bunsen’s departure from Berlin, but does not mention Stier or this event.
superficiality (Geistreichigkeit) and failing to realize his great potential. Bunsen had likely offered advice in the negotiations with Eytelwein and Schuckmann and also as Stier prepared to teach his first course at the Bauakademie. As with his family, however, Stier did not maintain regular correspondence with his mentor. Writing from Rome in November 1829, the architect Friedrich August Stüler (1800-1865) conveyed Bunsen’s disappointment at Stier’s failure to write and his wish for a report on Stier’s teaching.

Stier’s first course at the Bauakademie bore the title ‘Design of buildings and exercises in perspective’ (Entwerfung der Gebäude und perspektivische Uebungen). In the summer semester it met four days per week for three hours, in the winter four days per week for two hours. The conception and structure of the course are documented in the manuscript of Stier’s lecture on the first day of class. Its primary purpose was to impart fundamental architectural principles and historical knowledge and to promote their retention and application through practical exercises. Addressing the students as a practicing artist, not as a scholar or philosopher, Stier set forth the fundamental principles in a slightly revised version of the theses sent to Schinkel. He then offered an overview of the course to come over the next two semesters. The primary organization would be typological. Modest, mainly functional buildings would take up the first (summer) semester; more extensive buildings with complex programs would follow in the second (winter) semester. Every week or two Stier would distribute a new group of written programs. To introduce each group, he would present a survey of existing buildings from periods where the type was common and which he considered most instructive for the present. These lectures would examine each individual building for its relation to its time, the specifics of its design, its disposition, construction, and architectural articulation. From these historical examples students would learn how to produce design solutions to meet the needs of their own time. The detailed programs would encompass the most common requirements for each type and require the selection of an appropriate historical style. Practice in perspective was incorporated into the design exercises; for those who might have missed them in earlier courses, Stier planned to provide a brief exposition of its basic principles.

At first Stier was optimistic about his prospects if somewhat daunted by the work that lay before him, as he wrote to a friend in mid-1828, shortly after he had

336 AmTUB II.M.74.2.14, excerpt of a letter from Stier to Maydell, Berlin, undated (late 1827 or early 1828).
338 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 126, 140; I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 31, f. 179.
339 AmTUB II.M.64, Rede bei Eröffnung der Vorträge auf der Bauakademie zu Berlin, Ostern 1828 (section 1); TU II.M.91, Aus der Eröffnungsrede meines Lehr-Amtes: Auffassung des Unterrichts (sections 2 and 3). For more detailed discussion of the lecture and the course, see Garberson, ‘Stier’s “Entwerfung”’.
started teaching. His position required him to teach the fundamentals and practice of design, setting him on a ‘theoretical path’ (theoretische Laufbahn). He saw this as fortunate, since he had already given up all hope of a practical career in Berlin. While his superiors granted him much freedom, he had set high expectations for himself with an ambitious plan for the historical foundation in his design course that drew heavily on the ideal curriculum for Schinkel. The work required, however, was daunting. His own knowledge and understanding were insufficient, and what little scholarship existed was incomplete, superficial, and confused. The academy had few teaching materials, and existing publications were unsuited to teaching, requiring him to produce a large number of folio drawings to illustrate his lectures. Once he had worked out a coherent plan, he expected the ministry would approve a semester off for research travel.340

By the time he wrote to Schnorr in November 1828, Stier had come to resent the physical and spiritual coldness of Berlin and an art scene he found uninspiring. He remained optimistic, however, about his professional career. His probationary year was going well, with success among the students and approval from superiors. He was happy to have given up a practical career in order to dedicate himself to the betterment of his art (i.e. architecture) through the study of its history. The main impediment to that betterment, he believed, was that people simply did not see or were uniformed about historical precedents. Accordingly, he had decided to make it his main task ‘to describe existing works; to present their causes and origins; and, through word and image, make them alive and graspable’ (die vorhandenen Werke zu beschreiben, in ihrem Grund und Ursach darzulegen und durch Wort und Bild so lebendig wie möglich zur Anschauung zu bringen). His immediate intention was to accomplish this in a comprehensive survey of the history of architecture extending over three semesters. In addition, he planned to spend a good bit of his life on a publication that would serve as a building block for future scholarship. To conduct the necessary research he hoped to travel widely. Vacations would allow time for small trips, and he hoped to secure research leave every fourth or fifth semester.341

Stier laid the initial groundwork for his ambitious survey with lectures in the design course on the Greek orders in winter semester 1828/29; the following winter (1829/30) he expanded the lectures to include ancient India and Egypt.342 From this point onward they constituted a nominally separate course titled ‘Studies of architectural monuments’ (Studien über Monumente der Baukunst) that met at exactly the same time as the now retitled ‘Architectural designs’ (Architektonische Entwürfe), four days per week for two hours in winter, four days for three hours in summer. In

340 AmTUB II.M.54.B, fragment of a letter to an unnamed friend, Berlin, undated (after April 1828), 2-6. The first page or pages are missing. Although a fair copy in Stier’s own hand, it lacks a closing salutation and signature, suggesting that it was not finished and thus not sent. I have assigned a date based on internal evidence and correlation with Stier’s activities.
342 AmTUB, II.M.74.4, excerpt of a letter from Stier to Maydell, Berlin, 1832.
winter 1830/31 and summer 1831 the monuments course met independently three
days per week for two hours, while the design course met one day per week for two
hours.\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium der öffentlichen Arbeiten, Nr. 31, f. 189 (WS 1829/30), 195 (SS 1830); I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 2 f. 120 (SS 1831), 121 (WS1830/31).} Documentation for the structure and content of the monuments course is
presented in the final section below.

From winter 1829/30 to summer 1831 Stier worked to expand his lecture
notes and produce more study drawings. The extent of this work figured
prominently in his correspondence with Schuckmann about the terms of his
employment. On 22 February 1829 Stier wrote to request a permanent appointment
with a salary increase. He stressed that he had taken on an entirely new subject and
that the students did not all possess the necessary preparation. Despite this, he had
succeeded in inspiring most of them to lively and serious study. He asked for a
salary increase to 1000 Taler to cover the cost of basic necessities in Berlin, to maintain the social connections necessary to his position, and to continue his trips
between semesters. Such travel, within Germany and to neighbouring countries,
allowed him to keep up with the latest scholarly and artistic developments and to
study the artworks and collections necessary for comprehensive treatment of his
field. He also asked for the title of Professor, not out of vanity, he claimed, but for
the advantages it would bring to him in the world and in carrying out his scholarly
duties.\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 161-162.}

Schuckmann responded on 12 March 1829, denying the increase and
declining to petition the king for a permanent appointment until Stier took the
architect’s examination, for which specific instructions had been issued to the
Oberbaudeputation. Schuckmann could not waive this obligation: it would
compromise Stier’s authority as an instructor if he had not passed the test for which
his course prepared students.\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 163-164, draft of memos to Stier and Eytelwein, mentioning but not including the instructions for Stier’s examination.} On 1 May Stier responded that he had not had time
to prepare for or to take the examination because he had had to invent the design
course from scratch and was currently doing the same for the monuments course.
He promised to fulfill his obligation as soon as possible.\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 168.}

All this work led to considerable success with the students. Early Christmas
morning in 1829, twelve of them appeared at Stier’s home with paper lanterns,
singing Christmas carols, and bearing an impressive gift, Dürer’s Small Passion
series (1511). All were moved to tears of mutual affection, and Stier recalled the
moment as one of the most beautiful of his life.\footnote{AmTUB II.M.74.4, extract of a letter to Maydell, Berlin, 1832.} A card, bearing a poem written for
the occasion, was signed by eleven students, including Kugler, Carl Boetticher (1806-1889), Ludwig Lohde (1806-1875) and Stier’s cousin Gustav.\textsuperscript{348}

Stier’s success did not go unnoticed in the ministry. On 16 March 1830 Schuckmann informed the Oberbaudeputation that according to public opinion Stier had proven himself the most enterprising (\textit{thätigste}) instructor at the Bauakademie. Stier now intended only to continue his current teaching; he would not take up other subjects or pursue a position in state service as a practicing architect. Consequently, the Oberbaudeputation could amend the instructions for Stier’s examination (issued on 12 March 1829) to take account of his work thus far and to focus on evaluating his qualifications to teach his courses at the Bauakademie. Stier received a copy of this memo, but still he did nothing.\textsuperscript{349}

On 28 April 1831 Schuckmann sent Stier an ultimatum: if he did not take the examination immediately, his provisional appointment would be terminated.\textsuperscript{350} This finally moved Stier to act, and he soon began a modified examination. Rather than drawings produced at home following prompts set by the examiners, he submitted four portfolios of drawings mostly related to his teaching. He then appeared at the offices of the Oberbaudeputation over four days in July for the standard second portion, consisting of more drawings in response to a prompt and sessions with the examiners requiring oral answers, in-the-moment calculations, and more drawings.\textsuperscript{351} In a detailed cover letter he described the contents of the four portfolios.\textsuperscript{352} The first contained student work from the design course, specifically drawings made in response to his written programs. He had offered critiques as the students worked, so the designs included many of his own ideas. The second contained a selection of drawings, mostly of medieval buildings, made by some of his closest students on excursions (\textit{Fußwanderungen}) to nearby sites between semesters. Besides fostering a sense of community and making his teaching more engaging, these excursions also promoted a better understanding of chronology through direct observation. The third held two drawings from the earlier church design, which, he noted, did not represent his most current efforts. The final portfolio contained a few drawings of ancient ornament for teaching drawing. These were selected from the cycle of 200 he had made to accompany his lectures on Greek ornament in winter 1828/29.

\textsuperscript{348} AmTUB II.M.74.5. The others were Fr. Ark, August Dieckhoff (d. 1891), Theodor Dieckhoff (d. 1830), St. Lauenburg, G. Leunert, F. Nietz, Schoeneberg. Those with life-dates are listed in Börsch-Supan’s catalog of architects.

\textsuperscript{349} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 1, f. 171 (draft); AmTUB II.M.67.A (fair copy). The instructions of 12 March 1829 were included again, but they are not preserved in either archive.

\textsuperscript{350} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 2, f. 31.

\textsuperscript{351} For a typical exam see the one passed by Scheppig in 1832, in Bärnighausen, 17-18.

\textsuperscript{352} AmTUB II.M.71.F, Stier to Oberbaudeputation, Berlin, undated draft (May or June 1831).
On 25 July 1831 the Oberbaudeputation informed Schuckmann that Stier had passed the examination and provided an evaluation of the work submitted. The original designs made on-site for the second portion demonstrated great facility and knowledge in architectural planning. In the oral exam Stier had shown his knowledge of construction, stereometry, and statics and hydrostatics, although he had proven less than adept with mathematical proofs and calculations. The examiners gave a uniformly positive evaluation of the four portfolios of drawings. Those for the church design showed invention and facility in the handling of architectural forms and ornament, especially given the difficult structural forms chosen. The study drawings of Greek ornament were fully suited to their purpose and indicated that the series would be continued in a more than satisfactory manner. The studies of medieval monuments showed an ability to recognize and understand the significant aspects in this period of art. Finally, the student designs indicated that Stier’s instructional method was appropriate; they also suggested an especially strong ability to inspire students and to develop their facility in architectural composition.

Although Stier had now obtained the credential that qualified him to continue offering both the design studio and lectures in architectural history, he was unable to do so. In the reform of the Bauakademie that Beuth had initiated earlier that year Stier lost the design studio. This took him further away from professional practice and set him more firmly on a ‘theoretical path’.

**Beuth’s Reform of 1831-32 and Stier’s Professional Activities, 1832-1849**

Shortly after assuming the directorship in late 1830, Beuth began work on an administrative and curricular reform that led to the transformation of the Bauakademie into the Allgemeine Bauschule. Although the documentation for Beuth’s reform is rather limited, there is some evidence for how Stier was appointed to teach a regular rotation of five classes, two for architectural history, three for drawing, and none for design. Further documentation shows how Stier’s teaching related to his ambitious and ultimately unrealized publication plans, as well as the various factors that impeded those plans. How he taught the two architectural history courses in the 1830s and 1840s follows in a separate discussion below, drawing on the student notebooks.

A report to the king of 6 August 1831, drafted by Beuth and submitted by Schuckmann, explained that the current reform would resolve difficulties similar to those addressed by the reform of 1817-1823. The Bauakademie’s curriculum was still too broad and undifferentiated, so that students learned much that they did not need in their careers, and then only superficially. Beuth and Schuckmann proposed

---

354 The documents for Beuth’s reform have not been examined in detail since Dobbert.
that the institution redirect its focus to the training of professionals for state service. The new name, Allgemeine Bauschule, would better convey this focus and its similarity to other professional schools. It would also help restore discipline. The architecture pupils (Zöglinge) saw themselves too much like university students (Studenten), thus neglecting their studies and falling into the abuses typical of academic classrooms.\footnote{Partially quoted in Dobbert, 47; GStAPK I. HA Rep. 89 Geheimes Zivilkabinett, jüngere Periode, Nr. 20399, Bausachen, f. 16-21; GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 32, f. 5-7 (Beuth’s draft).}

The new statues and curriculum were finalized in July but not approved and published until September 1831.\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 32, f. 10-19 (manuscript), f. 20-27 (print), statutes dated 8 July 1831. The excerpts published in Dobbert, 46-49, mostly correspond to the July statutes, except that he gives the curriculum as a composite of what was taught over the years, including the names of instructors.} They stipulated that surveyors (Feldmesser) would be trained elsewhere and defined the two categories of building officials the institution would prepare for state service: practical architects (Wege- und Landbaumeister) and building superintendents (Bau-Inspektoren). In addition to tightening admissions requirements and revising the state examinations, the statutes instituted a two-year curriculum for the practical architects and a one-year curriculum for the building superintendents. The two-year curriculum provided foundational instruction in mathematics, natural sciences and drawing; practical courses on construction, hydraulic engineering, roads, functional buildings (Cameralbau), machines, cost estimates and building-site management. A two-semester course on ancient architectural monuments was included in the foundational courses taught in the first year. The more advanced one-year curriculum encompassed higher mathematics, physics, and geodesy; complex machines; general hydraulic engineering, city architecture; design exercises for city buildings and buildings of the ‘higher style’; and, in the final semester, ‘Comparative History of Architecture’ (Vergleichende Geschichte der Baukunst). All three years were to run concurrently, so that a new cohort could matriculate every April.

This meant that the two curricula had to be implemented in stages. In March 1831, the interior ministry had begun firing or reappointing old instructors and hiring new ones for the two-year curriculum. (Rabe was among those fired.)\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 2, f. 6 ff.} The two-year curriculum had been scheduled to start in winter 1831/32 but it was delayed until summer 1832 and all instruction suspended until then.\footnote{Allgemeine Preußische Staatszeitung 249, 8 September 1831.} Its second year began in summer 1833. The one-year curriculum began in summer 1834. Beuth and Schuckmann did not start hiring instructors for it until 1833.
Documentation for the hiring of instructors is incomplete, with none at all for Stier’s initial appointment in 1831 for the two-year curriculum. There is, however, an exchange with Beuth about his title and status. In announcements of the new curriculum Stier was listed as Bau-Conducteur, even though he had recently passed the architect’s exam. On 16 March he wrote a long, anguished letter to Beuth, expressing great distress at this demotion. Besides asking to be designated Architekt, Stier renewed his request of February 1829 for the title Professor der Bau-Kunst. Many who knew his position at the Bauschule already called him Professor, causing him much embarrassment, as he was reluctant to explain that he held the job but not the title. Despite Beuth’s dismissive response of 20 March, ‘the man makes the man, not the title,’ Stier was soon restored to Architekt in official documents and published course lists. His elevation to Professor, initiated by Beuth, was approved by a cabinet order of 17 November 1834.

Stier taught four courses in the two-year curriculum: ‘Lectures on ancient monuments’ (Vorträge über antike Monumente), ‘Architectural drawing’ (Architekturzeichnung), ‘Freehand drawing’ (Freies Handzeichnen), and ‘Drawing of ornament’ (Ornamentzeichnen). The table shows the distribution of the courses over four semesters and how often each was to meet (days x hours per week) according to a curriculum overview from the planning process. Stier’s actual teaching varied somewhat from year to year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Semester 3</th>
<th>Semester 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient monuments</td>
<td>2 x 3 = 6 hours</td>
<td>1 x 3 = 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural drawing</td>
<td>2 x 4 = 8 hours</td>
<td>2 x 4 hours = 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freehand drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x 4 = 8 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing of ornament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x 4 = 8 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caroline’s notes for the biography explain why Stier was not hired to teach design in either of the two curricula. She assigned no responsibility for the decision, stating simply, ‘The Bauschule was to train builders, not artists, and it was feared that his design instruction would attract too many artists’. After having sole responsibility for design instruction for four years, Stier had high hopes for his

360 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 2, f. 136.
361 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 3, f. 84-88; I. HA Rep. 89 Geheimes Zivilkabinett, jüngere Periode, Nr. 20399, Bausachen, f. 34-35.
362 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 2, f. 118-119. The published lists of courses and the records of instructors’ pay are found in GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 2 – Bd. 4.
role in the reformed institution, given his relationship with Beuth and Schinkel. Losing the design course was a great disappointment, as he saw it as his principal activity. The disappointment must have been especially bitter, as content from Stier’s course was expanded across both curricula, with two design studios in the two-year curriculum taught by Stüler and one in the one-year curriculum taught by G. A. Linke (before 1800-1867).

Beuth must have informed Stier early on that he would not be allowed to teach design, because in mid-1833 Stier applied to teach either ‘Comparative history’ or ‘City architecture’, with a clear preference for the former. This was a new course, likely conceived by Beuth in consultation with Schinkel. It was scheduled to meet for just nine hours per week (three hours on three days) in a single semester. In his letter, Stier explained that he would present a correct, clear, and lively account and explanation (Darstellung und Erklärung) of construction and artistic elements across the whole history of architecture. This would provide the understanding of buildings required of a well-informed architect. He was ready to teach the course, he claimed, with most of the preparation already complete. The first monuments course at the old Bauakademie had covered most post-antique building styles. From over fifteen years of study and travel he had solid knowledge of the most important monuments in these styles, often from direct observation. His knowledge exceeded that in the existing scholarship, which was also not suited to the needs of practicing architects.

On 3 September 1833, after significant delay and in response to a request from Beuth, Stier submitted a detailed outline of his course. This was a bound manuscript of 101 pages with the awkward title ‘Sketch of a plan for a comparative history of architecture’ (Skizze eines Plans zu einer Vergleichenden Geschichte der Baukunst). It covers the whole history of architecture from ancient India to the present in sixteen chronological-geographical divisions, with uneven emphasis on the ancient world. As Stier indicated in a prefatory note, the comprehensive treatment of Greece and Rome showed how he was presenting those periods in his monuments course and how he intended to treat all building styles in the new course.

---

363 AmTUB II.M.74.6: Die Bauschule sollte Baumeister, keine Künstler bilden, und man fürchtete sein Projektierunterricht würde zu viele Künstler heranziehen.
364 For these and subsequent design studios, see Garberson, ‘Stier’s Entwerfung’.
365 AmTUB II.M.71.E, Stier to Beuth, undated draft (Berlin, 1833). ‘City architecture’ went to Stüler.
366 GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 2, f. 119.
367 AmTUB II.M.71.E, Stier to Beuth, undated draft (Berlin, 1833).
368 The bound manuscript, returned to Stier, is preserved as AmTUB II.M.15. GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 15, Bd. 1, f. 98, is Stier’s cover letter. It conveys only apologetic excuses for the delay and formulaic gratitude for Beuth’s continuing favor. A condensed outline of Stier’s plan is given in Appendix Two.
On 6 September, Beuth sent Stier’s outline to Schinkel with the initial observation that the proposed course included too much already covered in the ‘Lectures on ancient monuments’ and that the ancient orders and ornament should instead be treated in a cursory and comparative manner. On 12 September Schinkel sent a brief report to Beuth in preparation for an upcoming meeting. He recommended omitting any parts that had the character of comprehensive, specialized instruction, which more properly constituted preparatory study for the ‘Comparative history’. This is consistent with the placement of the new course in the advanced one-year curriculum. Expanding on Beuth’s observation, Schinkel identified parts to delete in the sections on the Greeks and Romans. He stated that his recommendations on specific points would be better conveyed in person.

On 18 September, after his meeting with Schinkel, Beuth returned Stier’s outline along with Schinkel’s report and a letter confirming a follow-up conversation between Beuth and Stier. Beuth stated that Stier had agreed to omit all material that students would have learned in his ‘Lectures on Ancient Monuments’ and in Stüler’s courses, in order to save time for new material and the actual ‘comparative’ purpose of the course. Beuth repeated his verbal request that Stier undertake the preparation of study drawings (Vorlageblätter) depicting characteristic examples to represent the various period styles and as a means for their comparison. In an earlier note acknowledging receipt of the outline, Beuth had stated that these drawings were to be presented in class; they should also be few in number, so as not to confuse the students. At some point Stier also met with Schinkel, perhaps alone or perhaps with Beuth.

Although not definitive, these documents suggest that the decision to change the course from a comprehensive survey to one covering only post-antique architecture was made during discussions among Beuth, Schinkel, and Stier. The comparative component was to be retained, although none of the written correspondence offers any explanation of how they understood this. That Beuth set the term ‘comparative’ in quotes suggests that it was new or unusual in some way and that it had been a topic of discussion. It may have had a significant visual

369 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 15, Bd. 1, f. 99 (draft).
370 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 15, Bd. 1, f. 100-101; AmTUB II.M.67.C, official copy sent to Stier by Beuth. The full text is transcribed in Appendix Two.
371 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 15, Bd. 1, f. 102 (draft); AmTUB II.M.67.C (fair copy to Stier in Beuth’s hand).
372 AmTUB II.M.67.C, Beuth to Stier, undated (3 September 1833 or shortly thereafter).
373 This is confirmed by Stier’s note of 18 April 1849 on Beuth’s letter of 18 September 1833 (AmTUB II.M.67.C).

He submitted it in connection with his project for Hülfsblätter (discussed below) to illustrate his lectures, which he claimed arose from Beuth’s instructions in 1833 to prepare drawings for this purpose.
emphasis, judging from Beuth’s repeated instructions to prepare drawings to illustrate his lectures. Stier began preparing these the next year, as indicated by a receipt he submitted to Beuth from one Conducteur Reisfert for 82 sheets of tracings. Like all the drawings Stier assembled for his teaching, these were returned to the Bauakademie after his death and have not been located.

Stier taught the course for the first time in winter semester 1834/35. It met for eight, rather than nine, hours per week (two days for three hours, one day for two hours). As discussed below, the student notes, along with supporting documentation, show that this was a chronological survey of architecture from Constantine to the present and that Stier divided it into two main periods: the Middle Ages beginning with Constantine and the ‘Italian art period’ (die Italienische Kunstperiode) from the early fifteenth century to the present. Although there is no discernible ‘comparative’ aspect to the course, the official title never changed.

Stier had claimed he was ready to teach the course, this was not quite the case. In January 1834 he requested permission to extend his summer vacation for a study trip to expand his knowledge of German architecture beyond the area surrounding Berlin, which he had been investigating with his students. Careful research on the Rhein and the Mosel in Belgium would reveal the direct connection and transition between the architecture of antiquity and the Middle Ages with much greater precision than had previously been possible. Also in need of investigation were secular buildings (monasteries, houses, castles) as well as buildings from post-medieval periods down to the present. He left in mid-July 1834, returning slightly later than planned in mid-October. Caroline accompanied him as far as Bamberg in early August, before returning home to save money for Wilhelm’s journey through the more expensive Rhineland. The trip is documented in Caroline’s letters to her father (while traveling) and to Wilhelm (from Berlin), and in Wilhelm’s letters to Caroline and her father, as well as their passport.

While the

374 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 15, Bd. 2, f. 16, Reisfert’s bill; f. 17, Stier to Beuth, 22 February 1835, requesting payment.
375 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III Nr. 11, Bd. 3, f. 78 (printed class list).
376 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III Nr. 11, Bd. 3, f. 68 (Stier to Beuth, Berlin, 30 January 1834); f. 69 (Stier to Beuth, Berlin, 27 January 1834); f. 70 (draft of ministerial approval, 7 July 1834). Besides time off with no reduction in salary, Stier was given 200 Taler for travel expenses.
377 AmTUB II.M.76.A (Caroline’s letters) and II.M.76.B (Wilhelm’s letters); II.M.71.E (passport). They traveled on foot and by coach or wagon, and Stier took steamers for part of the journey up the Rhine. The full itinerary, not including intermediate stops, can be reconstructed as follows: Halle, Merseburg, Weißenfels, Naumburg, Freyburg an der Unstrut, Jena, Erfurt, Arnstedt, Paulinzelle, Rudolstadt, Saalfeld, Coburg, Bamberg, Nuremberg, Munich, Augsburg, Ulm, Stuttgart, Baden-Baden, Strasbourg, Karlsruhe, Speyer, Heidelberg, Worms, Oppenheim, Darmstadt, Mainz, Koblenz, Kobern, Cologne, Düsseldorf, and finally home via Soest.
letters provide very little specific information on Stier’s research, they indicate that he made many drawings and notes, and that he sometimes found more than he expected, sometimes less. In summer 1835 he made another, shorter trip along the northern edge of the Harz to Hildesheim.\textsuperscript{378} From 15 July to 8 August 1836 Wilhelm traveled through the Harz itself, this time with Caroline.\textsuperscript{379} He may have made additional trips in subsequent years, as suggested by Caroline’s statement to Hubert in 1860 that missing letters to Vagedes of 1837 and 1839 contained information on medieval architecture in Halberstadt, Goslar, and the Harz.\textsuperscript{380}

With the winter semester 1834/35, Stier’s full teaching schedule was finally in place. Not only was he now teaching only architectural history and drawing, but the number of hours he spent in the classroom was significant, 22 hours per week in the summer and 27 in the winter, with 16 hours each week in drawing classes. Stier maintained this schedule with some variation until summer 1840, when he gave up the two advanced drawing courses (freehand, ornament) in order to work on his publications.

The three years between the suspension of instruction in winter 1831/32 and the start of his full schedule in winter 1834/35 was a period of transition for Stier, both personally and professionally. As Caroline recorded in her notes for the biography and is echoed in his letters to friends, he was reconciling himself to life in Berlin, a city he claimed to dislike intensely, and to the abandonment of his practical career for the life of a teacher and scholar.\textsuperscript{381} In 1832 he described his situation in Berlin as ‘not brilliant but tolerable’ (\emph{nicht glänzend aber erträglich}) in a letter to Maydell in Tartu (Dorpat, then part of Russia). He was seeking Maydell’s advice about an offer from the German university there to teach architectural history and serve as superintendent of university buildings.\textsuperscript{382} Although initially interested, Stier ultimately decided that his prospects were better in Berlin after all.\textsuperscript{383}

In 1831-32 Stier built his Stierburg, a large house in a fantastic mix of medieval and Renaissance styles. Located in an undeveloped area of woods and

\textsuperscript{378} AmTUB II.M.76.C, Stier to Caroline, outside Magdeburg, late July 1835; Hildesheim, 1 August 1835. He also stopped in Halberstadt, Wernigerode, and Goslar.

\textsuperscript{379} AmTUB II.M.79.D, list of events from Stier’s life, 1828-1841, 3. II.M.76.D contains her account of the trip and letters to her father from Magdeburg (17 July) and Quedlinburg (28 July)

\textsuperscript{380} AmTUB II.M.76.R, Caroline Stier to Hubert Stier, Berlin, 5 September 1860, 3.

\textsuperscript{381} AmTUB II.M.74.6, Caroline’s notes for the biography; GStAPK VI. HA FA von Bunsen (Dep.) B, Briefband 1833, f. 130-134, Stier to Bunsen, 25 December 1833; Stier to Schnorr, 30 August 1832, cited from Lier, 60-62.

\textsuperscript{382} AmTUB II.M.68.B, Stier to Maydell, Berlin, undated draft (late 1832). There is no direct documentation of the offer, which was communicated to him in Berlin by Gotthilf Hagen (1797-1884), a prominent hydraulic engineer and member of the Oberbaudeputation.

\textsuperscript{383} AmTUB II.M.58.B, Maydell to Stier, Tartu (Dorpat), 9, 12, and 13 December 1832; II.M.68.B, Stier to unnamed official, undated draft (probably 1833).
fields just outside the city, it was a peaceful refuge from the urban tumult. He purchased the land from Caroline’s father, and paid half the construction costs with funds she had brought into the marriage. Still, the house put them in a precarious financial situation. He found it necessary to supplement the income from the Bauschule with other work, including designs for vases for the royal porcelain manufacture. Throughout the 1830s and 1840s he most likely offered private instruction, like the design course for which he contracted with 22 students in 1848. Caroline was acutely aware of how Wilhelm’s teaching and other jobs impeded work on his scholarly projects. In 1834 she complained that his income from the Bauschule was insufficient and wished that he could devote himself to a higher purpose than boring, soul-destroying drawing instruction. She also proposed to do her part by economizing and moving their household to the attic, so that they could rent out another floor and increase their income from tenants.

This transitional period was also one of relative leisure that allowed Stier time to conceive two large scholarly projects, neither of which were fully completed or published: a full reconstruction of Pliny the Younger’s villas and a multi-volume, extensively illustrated history of architecture. The Pliny project was mostly finished, although not published, by the early 1840s. It consisted of explanatory text and two sets of finished drawings, one for each villa. In order to make prints for sale himself he studied printmaking at the Akademie der Künste with Ludwig Buchhorn (1770-1856). Unsatisfied with the results, Stier held back from publishing, although he exhibited his reconstructions and eventually presented them to the king. He was unaware of Schinkel’s work on a similar project until he showed Schinkel his finished drawings.

384 It was located on the street now known as Am Karlsbad, running east from the Potsdamer Strasse and on the south bank of the Landwehrkanal (constructed 1845-1850). It was torn down already upon its sale in 1857 as real estate speculation moved into the area. Arnold Körte, Martin Gropius: Leben und Werk eines Berliner Architekten. 1824-1880, Berlin: Lukas Verlag, 2013, 238-239. For a drawing of the exterior see Fritsch in Unser Motiv, 18.
385 AmTUB II.M.78(Hausakten).G, contract between Stier and Oswald, 14 June 1831; Stier to Schnorr, 30 August 1832, cited from Lier, 62, for the use of funds from Caroline’s dowry.
386 AmTUB II.M.74.6, Caroline’s notes for the biography. G. Kolbe, Geschichte der Königlichen Porcellanmanufaktur zu Berlin, Berlin, Verlag der königlichen geheimen Ober-Hofbuchdruckerei, 1863, 258, records that both Wilhelm and Gustave contributed designs. AmTUB II.M.73.B, contract of 16 May 1848. The students agreed to pay one Taler per month of instruction, renewable monthly. The format was that established in his design course at the Bauakademie.
387 Huberts’s account in Architektonische Erfindungen, 1-3. Drafts for the texts in II.M.42.A, II.M.42.C, and II.M.78.A. See also Pierre de la Ruffinière du Prey, The Villas of Pliny from Antiquity to Posterity, Chicago, U of Chicago Press, 1994, 195-211; and Börsch-Supan, 687, numbers 42-58. Stier’s drawings are available from the Architekturmuseum:
The architectural history publication, however, never even came close to completion. As Caroline explained in her notes for the biography, Wilhelm failed to publish his scholarly research because his many and varied professional activities left him no time and dispersed his attention. Another, even greater factor, was what he called his *Verbesserungssucht*, or perfectionism. Nothing was ever good enough, and he could not stop correcting and revising. As various documents for the project suggest, he never had a realistic sense of how much work would be required or how long it would take. The project was exceedingly grandiose and wildly ambitious, recalling the enormity of Bunsen’s historical projects. Unlike the Pliny reconstruction, the architectural history text required a type of scholarly research in which Stier had little training or experience beyond his work for Bunsen.

By late 1832 Stier had more fully developed his publication plans beyond the vague desire, conveyed to Schnorr in 1828, to produce a work that would be a ‘building block’ (*Werkstein*) for others. In letters to Schnorr and Maydell he described two separate but related publications. The first was, he claimed, almost ready for the printer and bore the title ‘Studien über die Baukunst der Alten’ (Studies of the Architecture of the Ancients). It had two sections: the first examined the totality of ancient architectural forms from an entirely new scholarly perspective, while the second focused on the plans of ancient buildings. Illustrations of the architectural forms would be drawn from the folio drawings of architectural ornament used to illustrate his lectures. The second publication, still in the planning stages, was to be a comprehensive survey of the whole history of architecture and its monuments. It was to consist of several folios of illustrations with a brief explanatory text. He soon expanded the planned text to six or seven quarto volumes, because understanding individual buildings in their historical contexts required linking the development of architecture to the life of peoples and the whole span of history. A few jumbled ideas would be of no more practical use to beginning architects than Pindar’s praise of a horse to those learning to ride.

Writing to Bunsen in late 1833 Stier again discussed the second publication, now to be titled ‘Artistic studies of the monuments of architecture’ (Artistic studies of the monuments of architecture). This would demonstrate his ever-stronger conviction that all later developments were deeply rooted in antiquity. It would also


390 AmTUB II.M.74.2.18, II.M.74.4.


392 Stier to Schnorr, 30 August 1832 in Lier, 61; AmTUB II.M.68.B, Stier to Maydell, Berlin, undated draft (late 1832), 2.

393 AmTUB II.M.59.C, Biography A, 16.

394 Stier to Schnorr, 30 August 1832 in Lier, 61; AmTUB II.M.68.B, Stier to Maydell, Berlin, undated draft (late 1832), 3.
provide the foundation (*Fundamentstein*) for a philosophy of architecture as such and for a philosophy of the history of architecture.\textsuperscript{395}

To Maydell Stier expressed both regret and optimism about the work before him. He was not fully reconciled to sacrificing the active life of the artist, in which he found such joy, for the solitary life of the scholar. He had already shut himself away for months and years, pasting together some sensible conclusions gleaned from the boring and often useless material in books and laboring to write them down in an understandable way. As he had previously written to Schinkel, he still felt that a full understanding of art could not be achieved by scholars or artists alone. However imperfectly, he combined in himself the professor, the artist, and the craftsman, and he was thus going beyond what others had accomplished previously. For antiquity he had a good amount of earlier scholarship to draw on, but very little for the middle ages. For this period he would need to travel, back to Italy and France, further afield in Germany, and on to England and Spain.\textsuperscript{396} He was confident of further support for this travel from the government in Berlin, and he would only consider moving to Tartu if he could be assured of equal support there.\textsuperscript{397}

Stier’s statements to his friends were overly optimistic, if not outright delusional, and he made little if any progress on the publication projects in the 1830s. The first book on antiquity could not have been ‘ready for the printer’ in 1832. Although Stier had been lecturing on the topic since 1828, there is no full set of lecture notes in the *Nachlaß*, nor is there any securely identifiable text for publication from these years. The comprehensive history was little more than an idea at this point, and he only began serious research on post-antique periods with his long trip in summer 1834. The official support he expected did not materialize, and subsequent trips in the 1830s were shorter and most likely self-financed. As Caroline reported in September 1834, the long trip provoked much professional jealousy at the Bauschule. People could not grasp that Wilhelm was actually conducting research that would benefit both art and the state, believing instead that it was all an empty pretext to justify personal travel, especially the visit to Düsseldorf. Even Beuth was dubious, asking if Stier was going to Paris. When Caroline responded that this did not serve the main purpose of the trip, Beuth retorted that such a purpose was all just pro forma. Caroline saw no bad intentions.

\textsuperscript{395} GStAPK, VI. HA FA von Bunsen (Dep.) B, Briefband 1833, f. 132, Stier to Bunsen, Berlin, 15 December 1833. The passage varies somewhat in Caroline’s excerpt from the draft (AmTUB II.M.67.A, 3).

\textsuperscript{396} GStAPK, VI. HA FA von Bunsen (Dep.) B, Briefband 1833, f. 132, Stier to Bunsen, Berlin, 15 December 1833.

\textsuperscript{397} AmTUB II.M.68.B, Stier to Maydell, Berlin, undated draft (late 1832), 3. He also asked about the availability of architectural publications in the university library and whether the printers and booksellers in Tartu could produce and publish the lavishly illustrated works he envisioned.
here, but still she advised Wilhelm to make sure people understood what he was doing and to seek an audience with the minister upon his return.398

Furthermore, Schinkel’s support appears to have diminished. In 1834 Stier reported to Bunsen that he only visited Schinkel every few months and then only during Schinkel’s office hours. Schinkel always received him warmly and engaged in lively conversation, and he had always expressed his approval of Stier’s work at the Bauakademie. Stier felt that it was perhaps his own fault that the relationship was not closer, as he had held back from pursuing the friendship that Schinkel had offered upon Stier’s return to Berlin.399 In her notes for the biography, Caroline saw their initially close friendship declining due to Stier’s overly polite reluctance to disturb an honored elder and Schinkel’s jealousy of the younger man’s talent. Schinkel’s public recognition and support had been conditional, and in private he had not supported Stier at all.400

By October 1839 Stier had become so frustrated with his lack of progress, and concerned about his advancing age (40) and declining health, that he petitioned Beuth for a reduction in the many hours of drawing instruction Caroline had complained about several years earlier. He was prompted to make the request now, he wrote, because the book on ancient architecture was almost ready for publication. He provided no further explanation of his projects, just another long-winded description of the amount and difficulty of the work involved, now compounded by the rapid increase in new sources to consult.401 A relatively clean draft of a text on the ‘Proportion of architectural members’ (Größenverhältnis der architectonischen Glieder) probably dates from around this time and was likely intended for publication.402 Beuth quickly approved a plan to shift half of Stier’s drawing courses to Boetticher, specifically ‘Free-hand Drawing’ and ‘Drawing of Ornament.’ Stier continued to teach ‘Architectural Drawing’.403

It appears, however, that Stier had again misrepresented his progress on the publication, perhaps even to himself. In any event, he used the additional free time to continue other projects and start new ones. From 1840 into early 1842 he worked

398 AmTUB II.M.76.A, Caroline to Wilhelm, Berlin, 7 September 1834, 1v.
400 AmTUB II.M.74.5.
401 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 4, f. 1-3, Stier to Beuth, 6 October 1839; AmTUB 67.A (partial draft).
402 AmTUB II.M.81.D. This is a string-bound manuscript in Wilhelm’s usual draft hand, but with few corrections. It bears the notation ‘Nach dem Kursus 32, 33, 34, 37, 38. The introduction refers to the interested reader (geneigter Leser). Probably related to this is II.M.78.G: Gliederverhältnisse, letzte Feststellung 38, a very rough draft of text with many tables showing how proportions for various architectural members vary by schools (Attic, Doric, etc.), monuments (Parthenon, Temple of Apollo at Bassae, etc.), and theorists (Vignola, Scamozzi).
403 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 4, f. 4-5, Stier to Beuth, 18 October 1839; f. 7-10, Beuth to Stier and Boetticher, 31 October 1831 (drafts).
primarily on four impossibly grandiose alternatives for the design of a new cathedral for Berlin, expanding the designs worked out in 1827 and composing an even longer explanatory text. Although exhibited in Berlin and at the Versammlung deutscher Architekten (see below), these played no role in ongoing work on the building.404 Between 1843 and 1848 he designed a complex for the housing and care of the poor in Berlin, submitted to and rejected by the Prussian government.405 In 1838/39 he had entered the competition to rebuild the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg; in 1846/47 he entered another for the new parliament in Pest.406 Like the designs for Berlin cathedral, these were impossibly extravagant and employed an eclectic mix of historical, mostly medieval styles.

Beginning in 1842 Stier further dispersed his energies with active but unfocused participation in a new professional organization, the Versammlung deutscher Architekten und Ingenieure. He was repeatedly elected to the managing committee (Vorstand); at the annual meetings he delivered scholarly papers of varying extent and gave long-winded toasts at festivities and excursions to view local monuments. The Allgemeine Bauzeitung, edited in Vienna by Ludwig Förster (1797-1863), published detailed conference reports, which sometimes included the text of toasts and lectures, as well as papers revised for publication.407 At the first meeting in Leipzig in 1842, Stier exhibited the four designs for Berlin cathedral and delivered a related paper on Protestant church architecture.408 At the second meeting in Bamberg in 1843 he exhibited drawings for his Pliny reconstructions, competition designs for the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg, and a greatly expanded set of

404 Börsch-Supan, 162, 685, number 1-5; Schümann, 111-116, describes the four designs and the documents in Bunsen’s papers in GSTAPK, which include the long explanatory text. Further documents in AmTUB II.M.89 and II.M.53 (notes and drafts on modern church design, including responses to Bunsen’s basilica book). For the few drawings in the Architekturmuseum: https://architekturmuseum.ub.tu-berlin.de/index.php?p=51&O=101231.
407 The Nachlaß contains a range of materials relevant to these activities. II.M.17: notes and drafts for his lectures and the essays to be published from them. II.M.63.E: toasts and speeches at the meetings. II.M.76.F, G, I, and K: letters from the meetings in 1843, 1844, 1846, and 1847. II.M.79.I: miscellaneous.
drawings for Berlin cathedral.\textsuperscript{409} He also delivered three papers: 1) a survey of current attempts to define architecture, 2) a discussion of the Renaissance style and its origins, and 3) a consideration of trabeation vs. vaulting and the appropriate use of each in current practice.\textsuperscript{410} The first was printed with the report, but the second was revised for publication. Only after an urgent ultimatum from Förster did Stier send it, claiming that it was the first of about a dozen essays defining the principles of architecture for the present that he hoped Förster would publish. He had a thick stack of notes that just needed some revision. He also sent two additional drawings for the article on church design from 1842, for which he just needed to write out a final draft.\textsuperscript{411} At the third meeting in Prague in 1844 Stier exhibited the same drawings as in Bamberg but gave two new talks only tangentially related to the series he proposed to Förster: one on the development of the cross-vault in the middle ages and another on the principle of the cornice (\textit{Kranzgesims}) in antiquity.\textsuperscript{412}

In her notes for the biography, Caroline observed that Stier stopped submitting to the \textit{Allgemeine Bauzeitung} because he was deeply offended by Förster’s decision to publish Bötticher’s derisive (\textit{höniisch}) response to the trabeation vs. vaulting essay. Bötticher, she wrote, had seen a hidden attack on his own position, which Stier had not intended. Stier became embittered and reluctant to express his views, as he could not tolerate disagreement.\textsuperscript{413} Bötticher’s essay had been completed in January 1844 and was likely known to Stier before its publication in 1845.\textsuperscript{414} At and after the meeting in 1844 Stier had also received derisive criticism from another younger colleague, Johannes Andreas Romberg (1806-1868), as

\textsuperscript{409} ‘Die zweite Versammlung deutscher Architekten und Ingenieure gehalten in Bamberg’, \textit{Allgemeine Bauzeitung} 8, 1843, 265-296.


\textsuperscript{411} AmTUB II.M.68.B, Förster to Stier, Vienna, 1 November 1843; Stier to Förster, Berlin, undated draft (November/December 1843).

\textsuperscript{412} ‘Die dritte Versammlung deutscher Architekten und Ingenieure gehalten in Prag’, \textit{Allgemeine Bauzeitung} 9, 1844, 237-248; ‘Das Centralmoment bei der historischen Entwicklung des germanischen Baustiles’, 301-311, is based on a lecture delivered in part without notes.

\textsuperscript{413} AmTUB II.M.74.4. These observations follow a long excerpt from the letter to Förster cited above.

reported in Romberg’s own journal. The next year in Halberstadt Stier exhibited nothing and spoke only in response to Romberg’s critique of past meetings and suggestions for improvement (which had been circulated in advance). Stier rejected Romberg’s call for less socializing, fewer excursions, better organization, and more formal discussion after scholarly papers. This provoked an outright attack from Romberg, who dismissed Stier as lacking basic architectural knowledge and able to speak only in generalities. In Gotha in 1846, Stier again exhibited nothing and delivered a short paper on the state of architecture in the present. Stier attended the next year’s meeting in Mainz, for which no report was published.

This bitter reluctance to express himself in public may have caused, or at least contributed to, Stier’s abandonment of his ever-changing plans to publish a major architectural history text. In 1844 he prepared, but apparently never submitted, a direct request to King Friedrich Wilhelm IV for funds and release from teaching to support work on a comprehensive survey of the most important architectural monuments. For inclusion with this he also wrote a short sample text that traced the ‘artistic idea’ (die künstlerische Idee) in the history of architecture from antiquity through French and English architecture since the mid-eighteenth century. This project is clearly a somewhat modified version of the survey Stier had been planning since 1832. In his justification, he reminded the king that no one had yet produced a history of architecture suited to the needs of practicing architects, one that presented structural and aesthetic aspects in a proper sequence and with an explanation of their specifically architectural significance. Gone is the earlier concern with situating each building in its local and historical context and linking the developmental sequence of architectural history with that of general history. In Stier’s new history, the practicing architect would find the richest and most reliable source for understanding the nature of his art, the most comprehensive and grounded guide for his practice. Similarly, Stier no longer spoke of the author of such a work needing to be both artist and scholar. Instead he

418 AmTUB II.M.71.I, Stier to Friedrich Wilhelm IV, undated cover letter (fair copy). Dating to 1844 is based on Stier’s claim that preparations for the project had occupied him for 16 years. As documented above, he first conceived the project in 1828. There is no trace of the request in GStAPK. AmTUB II.M.12.D is the detailed request in ornate, formal Schönschrift. II.M.85.E (second item) is the sample text in a less formal fair copy; it corresponds exactly to the description given under point seven of the request.
observed that every practical discipline needed men who could devote themselves primarily to theoretical concerns; this need was becoming ever more acute as practice grew more complex and its literature more extensive. Stier believed he could be such a man for Prussia, if only his position could be modified to allow him the necessary time and concentration. He had been successful thus far as a teacher, but he now felt himself at a standstill in his personal development and increasingly out of touch with the rapid developments in his field after 16 years locked in the classroom with just books and illustrations.420

Stier claimed to have most of the material for his ambitious publication well in hand, having collected and organized notes and drawings, repeated his lectures many times, and prepared several articles. Now it just needed a revision (eine Ueberarbeitung) to make it ready for publication. The size of Stier’s request, however, shows that ‘a revision’ was an understatement, and the sample text is a brief overview of just 17 pages. He asked for a further reduction in his teaching hours to complete the text from his improvised lectures (die Vollendung des Textes für mein Unternehmen aus den improvisirten Diktaten), which also entailed filling in gaps in content, and to prepare a large number of drawings for the illustrations. He also requested financial support of 6,000 to 8,000 Taler per year for six years. This would pay a draughtsman to assist with the finished drawings for the illustrations.421 It would also pay for Stier to make additional trips to study monuments in person, many of which had been reproduced insufficiently or not at all, and to expand his contacts with colleagues outside Berlin. He proposed to travel to France and Italy again, with a possible side trip to Greece, as well as to England, Spain, and Portugal. The trips could be made without extra time off, simply by extending his summer vacations (as he had done in 1834).422

A few years later Stier mounted one last, futile attempt to realize his plan for a major publication, this time by connecting it with a set of Hülfsblätter (study aids), also referred to as figures (Figuren), for his history lectures. The original proposal of May 1848 simply mentioned an accompanying text to be delivered after the study figures had been completed. Subsequent, repeated requests for additional funds revealed that Stier, as usual, was planning something impossibly grandiose.

The initial proposal, submitted to the director of the Bauschule, Adolph von Pommer-Esche (1804-1871) on 25 May 1848, presented the Hülfsblätter project as having been authorized by Beuth during discussions about the new ‘Comparative history’ in 1833.423 As described above, Beuth, in consultation with Schinkel, had

421 AmTUB II.M.12.D, 3-7. The number of hours per week per semester listed here does not correspond to those in the documents cited above, suggesting either an error here or a later change in Stier’s teaching.
422 AmTUB II.M.12.D, 10-12.
423 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 10 Bd. 1, n.f., Stier to Pommer-Esche, 25 May 1848 (fair copy); AmTUB II.M.71.K (partial draft). Most of the
instructed him to prepare a limited number of characteristic examples to show in class, which he had begun doing already by 1835. The request to Pommer-Esche shows that work had continued and expanded to support both of Stier’s history classes. Making his usual excuses, he claimed that he had been unable to complete the project due to its inherent difficulty and the extent of basic research required. He now had 93 portfolios filled with prints and tracings catalogued for use in his lectures, and he had redrawn selected figures at an appropriate scale for reproduction. The need for the Hülfsblätter had only grown over the years, and students were requesting them more than ever. Drawing on the chalkboard took too much time and was not precise enough. Furthermore, most students could not afford the very expensive publications in which architectural prints were still usually disseminated.

Stier’s initial request was for funds to pay a ‘lithographic draughtsman’ (lithographischer Zeichner) for a trial period of four months. He proposed hiring his longtime assistant Geldern, whom he described as experienced in architectural drawing. The study sheets would be produced using transfer lithography (Umdrucktinte), a process in which the image is first drawn on specially prepared paper for transfer to the lithographic stone. The image appears reversed on the stone; in the final print it is oriented like the original drawing. Geldern would thus be re-drawing figures Stier (with Geldern’s earlier assistance) had already copied at an appropriate scale from other sources. With his letter Stier submitted a demonstration proof prepared by Geldern showing the types of figures to be produced. (Figure 5) The proof also showed Geldern’s command of the technique. Despite lacking the precision and elegance (Schärfe und Eleganz) of copper-plate etching, this produced clarity (Deutlichkeit) sufficient to the purpose of the project, at one-third the cost.

Figure 5 Wilhelm Stier and Gustav Geldern, Demonstration proof for Stier’s Hülfsblätter project, 1848. Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, I. HA. Rep 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 10 Bd. 1, n.f. (Photo: GStAPK) CC-SA-3.0

documentation for this project is in the Nachlaß, consisting mainly of Stier’s drafts and some fair copies sent to him.
The project was quickly approved, but work proceeded slowly. Stier submitted a request for more funds in October 1848 (with proofs of the first eight sheets, now lost) and again in January 1849 (with four more proofs, also lost). The second prompted a request from the commerce ministry for a progress report and justification of the high cost. In the resulting exchange with the new director of the Bauakademie, Johann Carl Ludwig Schmid (1780-1849), Stier expanded upon his earlier arguments at great length and submitted supporting documents from 1833. He also claimed to have spent 4,000 Taler of his own money, identified as the remainder of Caroline’s funds. Responding to direct questioning, he finally specified the total number of figures (115: 45 for antiquity, 40 for the Middle Ages, and 30 for the Italian art period), the time needed to complete the project (three and a half years), and the nature of the two accompanying texts. The first would be a text book (Hülfsbuch) to support his lectures, in the form of an octavo volume of 350 to 400 pages. It would give identifying information and supporting literature for each figure as well as a comprehensive historical table for the entire history of architecture and references to the original source for the figures. The second would require no less than three rather thick quarto volumes for a collection of essays presenting the results of his research on individual topics. He had not been able to complete his comprehensive history of architecture as planned, and in topical essays he would not need to repeat what had now been said by others. As always, he claimed that all preparatory work was done, requiring only a few additions and final revisions, which, however, he could not complete until all the figures were finished. In May the next director of the Bauakademie, Carl Ferdinand Busse (1802-1868), reduced the number of Hülfsblätter to 75 (25 for each period), without mentioning the text.

Over the next several months, Stier submitted several quite detailed (and excuse-filled) progress reports that secured further extensions of funding. By July 1850 the first 25 prints for ancient architecture were complete and distributed to the students, with no text. Responding to a stern admonition from the ministry, Stier...
complained that he was too busy to begin the next section, and he went back on a promise to reduce the text.\textsuperscript{428} Finally in January 1851 the ministry informed Busse that payments would stop until Stier resumed work and that he should simply prepare a subject index.\textsuperscript{429} The documents end here, and the project was apparently never finished. No examples of these \textit{Hülfsblätter} are present in Stier’s \textit{Nachlaß} or included with the documents at the Geheimes Staatsarchiv.

Stier’s excuses included, as always, complaints about how much time he spent teaching. Currently he had the added burden that his courses were new, as necessitated by the latest reform that had transformed the Allgemeine Bauschule back into the Bauakademie. What he did not mention was his involvement in the planning and execution of that reform.

The Reform of 1848-1849 and Stier’s Last Years

The reform of 1848-49 was prompted by a recognition, widely shared in Berlin for some time, that the training and credentialing of architects and building officials no longer met the needs of the state and society. Unlike Beuth’s top-down reform, it resulted from a process of consultation and deliberation that engaged the Bauschule, the Berlin Architekten-Verein, and the new ministry for commerce, industry, and public works (Ministerium für Handel, Gewerbe und öffentliche Arbeiten).\textsuperscript{430} Architectural history received little attention except from Stier, who submitted a detailed proposal early in the process. His suggestions were not, however, fully incorporated into the final curriculum, which was decided upon in meetings for which there are no records. While the return to the old name ‘Bauakademie’ signaled a rejection of Beuth’s emphasis on training bureaucrats, the reform realized his goal of orienting instruction more fully toward practical application, albeit with a more thorough separation of architecture and engineering and a greater emphasis on the artistic aspects of the former.

The need for reform and the direction it would ultimately take are indicated in a brief report on the Bauschule submitted on 6 October 1846 by Stüler.\textsuperscript{431} A member of the Oberbaudeputation since leaving the school in 1842, Stüler had consulted with many colleagues, including the future director of the reformed Bauakademie, Busse. Both private enterprise and the state were steadily increasing

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{428} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 10, Bd. 1, n.f., ministry to Busse, 17 August 1850; AmTUB II.M.71.K, Stier to Busse, July 1850 (progress report and part 1 submitted).
\item \textsuperscript{429} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 10, Bd. 1, n.f., ministry to Busse, 8 January 1851.
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\item \textsuperscript{431} GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 32, f. 108-112.
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their building activities in ways that furthered the distinction between engineering and architecture. While industrialization and the rise of the railroad posed new tasks for engineers, a greater interest in good, historically informed design placed new demands on architects. The king sought a higher level of artistic design in all types of buildings, even the most insignificant, and he required the use of many different historical styles. Restoration and expansion of existing buildings called for greater historical knowledge as well. Among the public, interest in and knowledge of architecture had become widespread, even fashionable, requiring architects to have a broader, more thorough knowledge of their field and greater facility in expressing their ideas in both quick sketches and fully developed drawings. Such knowledge and facility were not currently provided by the Allgemeine Bauschule, where instruction was too theoretical and abstract. It was also too focused on producing civil servants, which was appropriate for engineers but not for architects.

Stüler called for a sharper division between engineering and architecture, with specific changes in the latter. Because students were now entering without practical experience, they lacked basic skills, requiring instructors to waste time on teaching fundamentals like the use of drawing instruments. Students also lacked the practical experience that would allow them to understand, on their own, the relevance of what they were learning. Work in the atelier of an established architect should be required for admission. The lack of text books wasted valuable class time, and students wore themselves out endlessly taking and copying lecture notes. All instructors should be tasked with producing or adopting printed texts (Lehrbücher, Leitfaden) for their classes as soon as possible. The time gained could be used for more drawing instruction, expanded practice in the design of buildings (Entwerfen von Gebäuden), and more extensive study of medieval German architecture through both lecture and drawing. Foundational math and science courses wasted too much time on the internal concerns of those disciplines, rather than teaching the practical applications few students were capable of learning on their own. These courses should be taught by instructors with practical experience, with preference for architects where possible.

Similar concerns were raised in a letter of 5 May 1848 submitted by students at the Allgemeine Bauschule to the new commerce ministry. They found the current state of the school wholly untenable because it impeded all free scientific and artistic development. Its sole purpose seemed to be to habituate students to the constraints of bureaucracy. They called for its immediate transformation back into an academy with full Lehr- und Lernfreiheit, or the freedom of instructors to teach and students to study whatever they wished.432

By early 1848, however, administrative moves toward reform were already well underway. Even before transferring public works to the new commerce ministry, the finance ministry had solicited proposals for reforming the Bauschule.

432 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 32, f. 94.
from the Berlin Architekten-Verein. A committee that included students, building supervisors (Bauführer), a state official, and a private architect presented an initial proposal to the full association. After protracted and contentious discussion, two alternative proposals were approved for submission. Both were concerned primarily with defining professional responsibilities and establishing protocols for the state exams, as there had been no time to formulate a detailed curriculum for the Bauakademie. While the architects returned to the old name without comment, they sought to restore, and expand, the academic character that Beuth had sought to obliterate. Admission should require the same proof of secondary education as the university, and students should enjoy the same Lernfreiheit as university students. Both alternatives created two main classes of professionals, building supervisors or Bauführer, responsible for overseeing construction under the direction of the higher class, the architects or engineers, who also had responsibility for design. The second further divided the engineers, but to avoid the foreign word (Ingenieur), called them factory architects (Fabrik-Baumeister) and transportation architects (Wasser- und Wegebaumeister). The first proposal assumed two levels of instruction (building supervisor and architect/engineer), but followed Stüler in requiring a year of professional experience before admission to the Bauakademie. The second provided instruction only for its three kinds of architects, with building supervisors eligible to take their examination after two years of professional work. Only the first proposal addressed the organization of the Bauakademie, albeit briefly, stating simply that enough instructors should be hired to teach the topics included in the two examinations. As in the initial, rejected draft, these included architectural history described in the most general terms as knowledge of styles and monuments. The second proposal required knowledge of art history (Kunstgeschichte) and its monuments only of the architects.

At the Bauschule some of the instructors had prepared detailed proposals addressing the issues outlined by Stüler in 1846. The only one to survive is Stier’s, submitted to the director, Pommer-Esche on 15 April 1848 and forwarded to the ministry. Stier had developed this in consultation with several colleagues, including Stüler, over an extended period. He repeated Stüler’s criticisms and proposed removing foundational courses to a separate surveyors’ school. This

433 An account of the deliberations and all three versions were published in ‘Ueber die Ausbildung und Prüfung der Kandidaten der Baukunst in Preußen’, Allgemeine Bauzeitung 12, 1848, Notizblatt, 9-19. Manuscript versions of the two final alternatives in GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 32, f. 166-185.
434 Dobbert, 54, most likely referring to documents available to him in the Bauakademie archive at the Technische Hochschule.
would allow the existing two-year curriculum for architects to accommodate more
drawing instruction and expanded practice in design, as Stüler had advocated.

As for his own courses, Stier noted that ‘Lectures on ancient monuments’
was appropriately placed at the start of the two-year curriculum, because it
provided an essential foundation in the aesthetics of architecture and knowledge of
forms and principles still relevant to the present. His still-misnamed ‘Comparative
History’ should be expanded into two separate six-hour courses. One would cover
the Middle Ages and include both Christian and Islamic architecture; it should
remain in the second semester of the advanced one-year curriculum. The other
would be devoted to the ‘Italian art period’ and moved to the fourth semester of the
two-year curriculum. Placing it earlier in the full three-year sequence would make
this essential historical foundation available to students when they needed it:
concurrent with the second design course (city buildings) in the two-year
curriculum and before the advanced design courses in the one-year curriculum.436

In the summer Pommer-Esche circulated Stier’s plan and the two from the
Architekten-Verein among the instructors at the Bauschule. Several submitted
responses, most of them brief.437 In September Stier submitted a second proposal
that incorporated the Verein’s two specialized engineering curricula, which did not
include architectural history.438

On 14 February 1849 the new commerce minister, August von der Heydt
(1801-1874), sent instructions to the Bauschule for finalizing the statutes
(Vorschriften) of the reformed Bauakademie. After some delay, these were approved
in the summer and published on 1 August along with new examination protocols.439
The protocols specified four classes of building professionals: building supervisors,
architects (for Land- und Schönbau), engineers (for Wege- und Wasserbau), and private
architects. The statutes stipulated three curricula at the Bauakademie: a two-year
foundational curriculum for building supervisors, a one-year curriculum for
architects (including the private ones), and a one-year curriculum for engineers.
Admission to the foundational curriculum required a year’s work with a
credentialed architect, as well as proof of secondary education. After a transitional
period, each curriculum would begin anew every October (not April as previously).
Individual classes were not listed (nor were specific topics in the exam protocols). In
keeping with the new name, the fixed curriculum was to be replaced with a regular
cycle of courses from which students could choose according to their needs and

436 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 32, f. 136-142.
437 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 32, f. 149-150, 154-165.
438 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 32, f. 212-230. Draft in
AmTUB II.M.73.C.
439 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 33, n.f.. The
instructions, which do not survive, are cited in repeated reminders from the ministry to
complete the process. The final Vorschriften are cited here from the Allgemeine Bauzeitung 13,
1849, Notizblatt, 161-168.
interests (Lernfreiheit). Any regular faculty member, as well as any architect or instructor at another institution, could offer additional classes (partial Lehrfreiheit).

On 17 September, Busse, the new director, submitted to von der Heydt the final roster of regular classes devised by the directorate of the Bauakademie in consultation with the instructors. Busse simply provided an explanation of the final curriculum; no documents survive for the final deliberations that produced it. The foundational cycle for building supervisors (Bauführer) modified the old two-year curriculum in ways that responded to the various critiques and proposals. It added pure mathematics and surveying (previously demonstrated by the admission exam), and directed the old applied mathematics courses toward practical application and future architectural study. Drawing and design classes now extended across all four semesters and some lecture classes incorporated drawing and design exercises. Ferdinand von Arnim (1814-1866) taught an introduction to all forms of construction that included drawing exercises (semesters one and two) as well as design and drawing as such (all four semesters). The course on agricultural buildings also included design exercises (all four semesters). There were two more drawing classes that extended across all four semesters, linear and architectural drawing (taught by Bötticher) and landscape drawing. Although Stier lost ‘Architectural drawing’ as as separate course, its connection with his ‘Lectures on ancient monuments’ was now formalized in a new course titled ‘The forms of ancient architecture in general, as well as their application to buildings of the present time, with exercises in drawing’ (Die Formen antiker Baukunst im Allgemeinen, so wie deren Anwendung auf Bauwerke der jetzigen Zeit, mit Uebungen im Zeichnen). The curriculum also included a course on materials and building site administration, one on civil engineering (Wasser- und Wegebau), and another on machines.

The one-year curriculum for architects focused on more important and complex types of buildings, both public and private, in one lecture and two design courses. It also included Bötticher’s course on the drawing of ornament. Stier’s ‘Comparative history’ finally became the comprehensive survey that Beuth and Schinkel originally intended. It now bore the long title ‘The most important building styles of all lands and times, their development and the relevant better buildings in their arrangement and particularity’ (Die wichtigsten Baustyle aller Länder und Zeiten, ihre Entwicklung und die betreffenden vorzüglichern Bauwerke in ihrer Anordnung und
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440 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 33 (unfoliated). Dobbert, 57-58, gives the three curricula as a composite of how they were taught over the subsequent years. His very abbreviated course titles do not show the important changes in course content. The directorate consisted of Busse, Stüler, and Emil Hermann Hartwich (1801-1879).

441 Following Busse’s commentary each curriculum is given a tables that includes full course titles, names of instructors, and hours per week in each semester. In many cases the number of hours is revised in red, reflecting modifications to keep the number of total student classroom hours below 40 per week. These changed again after instruction began.
Eigentümlichkeit). The long span of history was broken down into four sections: a) Egypt, India, Assyria, Persia, Phoenicia (winter); b) Greece and Rome (winter), c) Christian and Islamic Middle Ages (winter and summer), d) Italian architecture from the fifteenth century to the present (winter). Coverage of the ‘Italian art period’ was thus increased as Stier had proposed. It did not, however, move into the foundational two-year cycle. This may have been seen as unnecessary with the newly instituted Lernfreiheit and with the expansion of his other course to include current applications of ancient architectural forms.

The curriculum was approved by von der Heydt on 25 September 1849, with instructions for a transitional period to end the old curriculum and institute the new one in stages. On 30 September instructors were informed of their new permanent appointments to begin with the winter semester in October. Previously instructors had been hired to teach individual courses and automatically renewed from year to year, but with no guarantee of continued employment. Stier was unsatisfied with the salary offered, claiming that the pro-rated amount per classroom hour worked out to less than that of his original appointment in 1828. Given this dispute, and the transitional period, it is difficult to determine exactly how many hours per week Stier ultimately taught, which seems to have varied. Despite the variations, however, he taught the two courses specified in the curriculum submitted by Busse and in his appointment letter. There are only a few student notes for these last years, and then only for the ‘The forms of ancient architecture.’

Stier died in September 1856, after an illness of eight weeks, which Caroline described as resulting from years of overwork at the Bauakademie and excessive dedication to his art. During these last years Stier made his first trip back to Paris, partly to gather information about architecture and architectural training in connection with continuing discussions of reform at the Bauakademie. He also submitted designs to the competitions for an Atheneum in Munich (1852) and a new Rathaus in Hamburg (1854); he completed but did not submit designs for the

442 GStAPK I. HA Rep 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 33, n.f.
443 GStAPK I. HA Rep 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 33, n.f., draft letters to instructors; Stier’s in II.M.67.E.
444 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 5, f. 135-140, Stier to Pommer-Esche (now an official in the commerce ministry), 8 October 1849; draft in TU II.M.67.A. The dispute dragged on until 1851 (AmTUB II.M.67.E, Pommer-Esche to Stier, 13 June 1851).
445 See the course lists in GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 6.
446 AmTUB II.M.31, Stoll, winter 1854/55, summer 1855; II.M.30 and 32, winter 1854/55, summer 1855, winter 1855/56, summer 1856; II.M.34, Heino Schmieden, no date. Some of Stier’s own texts for this course are in II.M.13 and II.M.26.
447 AmTUB II.M.66 and II.M.84.
Votivkirche in Vienna (1855).\textsuperscript{448} That summer the Bauakademie held a memorial exhibition of the drawings for his seven design projects.\textsuperscript{449}

**Student Notes and Stier’s Lectures**

Stier’s Nachlaß contains a collection of student notes unusual, if not unique, in extent and potential to document nearly the entirety of a single instructor’s career. The notes comprise an overwhelming, dispersed mass of material totalling hundreds if not thousands of pages, with at least a fragment identifiable for nearly every semester from summer 1832 to summer 1856. While art and architectural historians have not yet undertaken dedicated studies of student notes, scholars in other disciplines, especially German philology, have examined the phenomenon of student note-taking in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and the nature of the manuscripts produced.\textsuperscript{450} Their work establishes the broader pedagogical context for student notes and provides helpful methodological guidelines for their use as historical documents. I draw on this work to structure my analysis of the huge mass of student notes in the Nachlaß. Examined as a group and in connection with other documents, the notes provide a fairly detailed picture of how Stier prepared for and taught his architectural history courses, and further conclusions can be drawn about he and Caroline used them to prepare the surveys of architectural history that they hoped to publish. The specific content of the courses is examined separately in the next section.

The practice of taking notes during lectures and working with them afterwards received a great deal of attention in the theoretical and advice literature about study at university. Many of the issues raised were also relevant to all post-secondary instruction, and Stier, through Bunsen, was familiar with current academic concerns. As Holger Dainat has shown, lectures were the principal form of instruction at German universities from 1770 to 1870. Seminars existed in only a few disciplines (mostly classical philology, history, and theology) and served only the


\textsuperscript{449} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 10, Bd. 1, n.f.: Cathedral, Berlin; Pliny’s villas; Winter Palace, St. Petersburg; Parliament, Pest; Atheneum, Munich; Rathaus, Hamburg; Votivkirche, Vienna.

very best students until after 1870. Somewhat more numerous and less elite were smaller tutorial or laboratory courses, like Eduard Gerhard’s ‘Archaeological exercises’ (*Archaeologische Uebungen*). Only in the seminars and tutorials was there written work (often meant to be read aloud) or interaction between instructor and students and among students during class time. Lecture classes required neither written work nor participation, and professors attested to students’ attendance and engagement with formulaic set phrases. Monitoring of student learning, through questions in class or outside assignments, was seen as appropriate only to the Gymnasium, which, ideally, prepared students to pursue university study with complete independence and self-direction. Universities had no set or required curriculum, and most students left without earning a degree. None was required for admission to the state exams, the primary credentialing mechanism for government service and most professions. Notes taken in the lecture courses were used to study for the exams.

The format of lectures varied widely, as described in advice manuals, often polemical in tone, published for both professors and students. These books gave directions on how to prepare lectures and how to listen and take notes. They described formats ranging from the straightforward reading of a text, either a previously published handbook or compendium or the instructor’s own new text, to extemporaneous delivery on the basis of notes and/or memory. They also presented different ways of structuring lectures and organizing content. Professors were increasingly expected to present new, original research, rather than simply reading out or glossing existing compendia and handbooks. This ensured, at least in theory, that students would receive up-to-date information as professors presented material for which there were few if any current supporting textbooks. Consequently their lectures were the principal, if not sole, mode for delivering course content; much the same was true at the Allgemeine Bauschule, where students spent too much time copying lecture notes because they lacked text books, as Stüler and Stier observed in 1848. In several instances university professors never published the underlying research or their lecture text. Student notes thus constituted the only record and were often used as the basis of editions (not always posthumous) by their

---

451 Dainat, 314, 321-325. He rightly challenges the tendency to overestimate the importance of seminars in the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century. For Gerhard’s exercises, see Garberson, ‘Art history in the university II’, 12-13.
452 Dainat, 313-314, 318; see also Garberson, ‘Art history in the university’, 7-8.
students. A famous, but by no means unique, case is Hegel’s Lectures on the Philosophy of Fine Art compiled by his student Gustav Heinrich Hotho from his own and others’ notes, as well as some of Hegel’s own notes.

The advice manuals endowed lectures with almost mystical powers, especially those, like Hegel’s, that were both basic introductions to whole disciplines or specific sub-fields and based on the instructor’s original conception or synthesis of the material. A scholar truly versed in the art of lecturing, Emil August von Schaden advised, could let an intellectual structure take shape before the eyes of his audience, so that students, if they followed along attentively, gained practice in agile thought. By internalizing the structure of their field of study directly and immediately as the teacher spoke, students gained the ability to find their way in it and to understand all its parts. For von Schaden, taking notes was an essential part of the process, and he deemed those unable to do so unsuited for university study. At a basic level, note-taking focused the listener’s attention and instilled discipline. The point, however, was not the mere recording of the spoken word, but immediate comprehension and summarizing, which in turn promoted independent thought and critical judgment.

In his manual for students, published in 1826, Christian August Fischer demonstrated two methods for taking notes: condensing or paraphrasing the ideas or abbreviating individual words by omitting vowels and middle and final syllables. In his examples, the first produces a simplified but readable text, while the second results in a jumble of letters barely comprehensible without knowing the method. As Matthias Janssen has pointed out, verbatim transcription requires the use of actual shorthand. Such systems existed and were taught at some German universities, but students tended to use methods similar to those recommended by Fischer, which Janssen called semi-shorthand (Halbkurzschrift). Fischer’s methods were easier to learn, and unlike verbatim recording, they required the notetaker to process the information as he heard it, which, as von Schaden asserted, was an
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454 Dainat, 314, 318. He describes an ideal scenario that held only in some cases and for a short time. As indicated by the lecture types listed in Fischer, many professors continued to read and gloss existing texts, or returned to doing so when new ones became available, as Gerhard did (Garberson, ‘Art history in the university II’, 12-13).


456 von Schaden, 133-134. Thilo, 91, claimed that a proper lecture could promote independent thinking and thus moral behaviour.

457 Fischer, 59-69, provides several brief lecture texts and their translation into a condensed or abbreviated version.

458 Janssen, 55-60. He supports his reading of the primary sources with recent studies of short-term memory and note-taking.
essential aspect of the learning promoted by lectures. From his study of several sets of notes after Jacob Grimm’s (1785-1863) lectures on the history of German literature (1834-1837), Janssen observed that while no two notetakers recorded exactly the same information in exactly the same way, they all captured most of the essential ideas using similar methods of condensation. He proposed that ‘student notes’ be considered a particular type of text, with its own conventions and linguistic structures.

Building on these observations, Janssen proposed that student notes be seen not as recording, but rather as referring to the ‘virtual’ text of the lecture, albeit imperfectly. Editions based on them should be as transparent as possible about the source manuscripts and take account of notes as evidence of reception by students. He thus advocated a departure from the editorial practice, standard since the early twentieth century, of using student notes to reconstruct the ‘ideal’ lecture text (Vorlesungstext), usually as a substitute for the instructor’s own lost notes or never-published book. As programmatically described by Walter Jaeschke, this practice proceeded from the assumption that the actual spoken text could be reconstructed from student notes by using methods of rigorous textual criticism. Jaeschke presented this as a corrective to the uncritical nineteenth-century practice of combining several sets of notes, often after lectures spanning years or decades, to produce a supposedly definitive but actually ‘fictive’ text. Hotho’s edition of Hegel’s Lectures on Fine Art was not the only instance of this practice.

The material production of the student manuscripts further demonstrates their importance in the period and reinforces their status as a specific type of text. According to Fischer, note-taking was a multi-stage process directed, from the beginning, toward the production of a revised text to be bound and retained for life. German libraries contain countless examples of such manuscripts, often beautifully transcribed on high quality paper and richly bound in fine materials. Fischer advised against using a pre-bound notebook, recommending instead several loose sheets of strong, medium quality paper, each folded once to form four pages (a bifolium). These could be grouped into gatherings and easily stitched together by a bookbinder. If necessary, one or more of these gatherings could be rewritten and replaced, without having to tear apart a whole notebook. Each page should have a margin ‘at least two strong fingers wide’ (ca. 5 cm) for additions and corrections. After each lecture, ideally within a week, one should revise one’s notes, correcting
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and adding to the content (names, dates, citations, mis-heard words) and editing the text itself (for orthography, grammatical errors, incorrect or unclear passages). Additions and corrections could be obtained from the notes of friends and acquaintances, or, if one had a reputation as diligent and orderly, by speaking with the instructor. Most instructors, however, would not themselves correct student notes, although the young ones might, for a fee. Finally, Fischer addressed the common practice of re-copying notes to produce a pleasing and beautiful manuscript. This could be kept as a memento of student days or presented to family and benefactors as proof of diligent study. The process of copying also allowed one to move additions and corrections from the margins into the text, and it was like hearing the lecture over again. Copying was best done during vacations, but it should not interfere with needed relaxation. In some university towns poor students did such work for pay.\textsuperscript{464}

Combined with Janssen’s attention to practical and linguistic factors, the methods set forth by Jaeschke can still be helpful in working with student notes and exploring their relationship to the lectures they record. Manuscripts do not always identify the instructor, course, semester and year, and notetaker. These can be identified using basic methods of source criticism: tracing provenance; drawing on secondary sources, such as letters and diaries; and comparison with other manuscripts.\textsuperscript{465} Internal evidence usually allows identification as one of the several types of manuscript produced by nineteenth-century students. A Mitschrift was made during a lecture, and it may contain later corrections and additions. A Reinschrift or Nachschrift is a manuscript entirely recopied at a later point. A Reinschrift may be based on a student’s own Mitschrift, on those of a friend or several friends, or even another Reinschrift. A variant of the Reinschrift is the Ausarbeitung (elaboration), which reworks the text and adds new material.\textsuperscript{466} For any given lecture the number of surviving student notes may vary from one to several, and the relationships among multiple sets of notes may also vary. For instance, all might be independent Mitschriften or Reinschriften, or one might be the source for the rest. These relationships can provide the basis for identifying a principal text (Leittext), the one that provides the most or most evidently accurate information.\textsuperscript{467} Identifying such a text can be helpful, even if the goal is not to reconstruct a putative spoken text. Furthermore, student notes should also be seen as significant in themselves, as evidence of reception, as Janssen suggested.

All evidence indicates that the manuscripts in the Nachlaß were collected by Wilhelm and Caroline for a large editorial project of the sort usually carried out by former students like Hotho. The never-submitted request of 1844 stated that Stier was preparing his survey of the history of architecture from the student notes of his
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improvised lectures (*aus den improvisirten Diktaten*) by correcting them and filling in gaps; he was also preparing the illustrations. First mentioned in 1832, this project had begun in earnest sometime in the mid-1830s, as indicated by four lists in Wilhelm’s hand, one dated 6 November 1837, of *Kollegienhefte* already collected. All identify the manuscripts by year and student, and the dated one sets out a plan for organizing the visual materials at hand into folders. Collection of manuscripts continued throughout the 1840s and 1850s, down to summer semester 1856, the last before Wilhelm’s death in September.

The current state of the student notes and associated drafts in the *Nachlaß* makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible to reconstruct the structure and content of the new text Wilhelm and Caroline were constructing from them, and I have not attempted to do so. Still, it is possible to draw some solid conclusions about how they worked and the nature of the student manuscripts themselves. Some they left mostly intact in their bindings, sometimes cutting out just a few pages. Others they cut up into many small fragments for sorting into new groupings. At some point they instituted two broad categories for organizing the materials: developmental history (*Entwicklungsgeschichte*) and detail studies (*Detailstudien*). These are seen on some manuscripts but also on the green and white labels, with Roman numerals and other notations, on the covers of some folders and bound manuscripts. Because the original order of the *Nachlaß* was not retained, and some folders re-used or lost, it has not been possible to reconstruct the contents of the two categories or to determine the relationship between the two sets of labels.

The intact bindings vary in quality and materials, suggesting that they are the ones applied by the notetakers. All are similar in size, measuring roughly 27 to 30 x 17 to 20 cm. Many were trimmed down for binding; page numbers are either partially cropped or appear only on pages where they were placed further down from the top edge of the sheets. Most are good quality paper with a margin as recommended by Fischer. This margin varies in width, but it was always created by a vertical crease or fold in the paper. Usually the margin was left blank with just a few additions or corrections. Only four of the intact manuscripts contain drawings, which range from quick sketches to carefully worked-out, detailed renderings, sometimes including measurements. (Figures 6 and 7) Other manuscripts, including some of the fragments, lack drawings but have references to figure locations.
numbers in the text, suggesting that students kept separate notebooks or portfolios for their drawings.\textsuperscript{470}

The fragments are of two types, likely representing two stages of editorial work. The first are loose but intact pages from bound manuscripts that were dismembered, of which there are only a few dispersed sets.\textsuperscript{471} Far more numerous, the second type are narrow strips created by cutting vertically along the margin

\textsuperscript{470} AmTUB II.M.50 (Comparative history, 1836/37); in II.M.80.G (undated fragment of Ancient monuments) some of the references include sheet (Blatt) numbers as well.

\textsuperscript{471} AmTUB II.M.19.C, II.M.80.G, II.M.83.B, and II.M.83.N3, all of which may be from the same manuscripts for ‘Ancient monuments’.
fold, leaving just the text. They vary in length depending on where they were cut horizontally. Many were placed into new groupings that combine sections from several different manuscripts from different years. Some of the groupings are still loose in folders; some of the folders are original, with titles and notations by Wilhelm or Caroline. More permanent groupings were created by pasting the narrow fragments onto strips of paper about the same width as the standard margin and then binding the resulting full-size pages. (Figure 8) Still more fragments are dispersed randomly throughout the Nachlaß, having become separated from their original context. The cut-up fragments show no evidence of drawings, as the vertical cut is always very close to the text, while the intact but loose pages have a few small drawings in the margins, as described above for the still-intact manuscripts.

All the notes appear to be Nach- or Reinschriften, copied out neatly with few corrections. While most students may have copied their own Mitschrift, there is some evidence that notes were shared and even copied by those who may not even

472 AmTUB II.M.16, II.M.28, II.M.29, all assembling loose sheets from ‘Ancient monuments’ in the early 1830s.
473 AmTUB II.M.18 and II.M.25.A both combine fragments of ‘Ancient monuments’ from the 1830s. II.M.94 assembles sections copied on full sheets from ‘Ancient monuments’ for 1835 and 1837 by both Wilhelm and Caroline, sections cut and pasted from two manuscripts (showing two different hands) and another section cut and pasted from a transcription by Caroline.
have attended Stier’s lectures. Within several of the new groupings of fragments are many long sections cut from transcriptions by Caroline and at least one other person, often with no indication of the source. Without comparison to the originals, it is hard to say why this was done, beyond reorganizing the contents and/or producing a cleaner copy of the desired text. Nearly all the notes use full words, mostly complete sentences, and a few standard abbreviations, similar to the condensation method recommended by Fischer and examined by Janssen. Versions of Fischer’s more involved abbreviation system appear in only two of the still-intact manuscripts, both clearly Nachschriften.

Only some of the student notes have notations that identify them with a specific semester and/or year, or name the student who took them. Most such notations were added later, almost always by Wilhelm; there are only a very few in the notetaker’s hand. The students seem not to have included dates in their Reinschriften, judging from the few intact manuscripts. Only two of these have a few dates in the notes themselves, and then only for a few days. The first has the dates in the margins, which helps explain why there are none (that I have found) in the many fragments: Wilhelm and Caroline cut off the margins when they dismembered the notebooks. Sometimes the later notations were made directly on the manuscript, both the intact ones and the fragments, but some can only be identified by the notations on the folders in which they are grouped. In some cases notes lacking any identifying notations can be connected to a specific course (but not to a specific year) by their placement in a folder or pasted-together volume, comparison with other notes, and coordination with Stier’s official roster of courses. The same hand can sometimes be recognized among several dispersed fragments, but I have not made any attempt to relate these to each other.

In addition to the few on the notes themselves, some student names are included on the four lists cited above; in most cases these cannot be connected with specific manuscripts or fragments. Most of the named students cannot be identified, although a few appear in Börsch-Supan’s catalog of Berlin architects. The most prominent is von Arnim, who later taught at the Bauakademie; he attended the

---


475 Those by Caroline are too numerous to list, but see the reference above to II.M.94. One fragment in II.M.25.A bears the notation ‘nach dem Cursus von Gottgetreu 35’ in the same hand (not Caroline’s) as the notes themselves. One of Caroline’s transcriptions has drawings pasted in on small pieces of tracing paper, but these may have been added as part of the publication project (II.M.77.A & B, Comparative history, transcribed from Scholz, probably early 1840s.).

476 AmTUB II.M.33 (Ancient monuments, 1837/38), II.M.47 (Comparative history, 1836/37 or later).

477 AmTUB II.M.35 and II.M.36, both for ‘Ancient monuments’.
monuments course in 1836/37 and the comparative history in 1838/39. The others were much less prominent: Anton Ferdinand Benda (1817-1893), Georg Erbkam (1813-1885), Moritz Wilhelm Gottgetreu (1813-1885), Friedrich Wilhelm Nottebohm (b.1808), and Theodor Weishaupt (1817-1899). Only one identifiable, and quite prominent, name appears among the notes from the 1850s, Heino Schmieden (1835-1913), who attended ‘Forms of ancient architecture’ in the 1850s.\textsuperscript{478}

Kugler’s notes in the Kunstbibliothek are undated, but they are certainly earlier than any identified in the Nachlaß, dating from winter semester 1829/30. He returned to Berlin from his home in Stettin (Szczecin) in the fall of 1829 specifically to attend Stier’s course on architectural history, and he was among the students who signed the Christmas card for Stier that year.\textsuperscript{479} The notes consist of six now separated sections of an unfinished Nachschrift and two fragments of a corresponding Mitschrift. Only one section bears an original notation connecting it to Stier’s lectures at the Bauakademie; the rest have been identified by comparison with Stier’s own notes and the other student notebooks.

Five sections of Kugler’s Nachschrift consist of continuous but incomplete text written on several unbound gatherings of multiple bifolia (sheets folded once to produce four pages). The text is for a general introduction, one section each on Ancient India and Egypt, and two sections for Greece (introduction and Ionic order).\textsuperscript{480} A sixth grouping assembles disparate, discontinuous gatherings and ungathered bifolia. The text is mostly for the Corinthian order, with some passages on arches and frames for doors and windows.\textsuperscript{481} Among these is an unfinished, partially cut sheet with text oriented in different directions, in a pattern just like the imposition (Ausschießen) employed in the making of a printed book. Presumably Kugler wrote out his fair copy on larger sheets that were then folded and cut to produce gatherings for binding. The six sections vary in size, suggesting that Kugler intended to bind them as individual booklets. In all sections the pages have a wide margin created by a fold or crease, used mainly for corrections or additions. There are only a few drawings, mostly in the margins, but sometimes in reserves left in the text or occupying whole pages. These range from relatively rough sketches to more precise drawings requiring the use of compass and ruler. The Mitschrift consists of

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{478} AmTUB II.M.34, notes from
\textsuperscript{479} Garberson, ‘Art history in the university’, 62; AmTUB II.M.74.5
\textsuperscript{480} KuBi, Nachlaß Kugler. In the current cataloguing the sections of the Nachschrift are dispersed: Einleitung zum Studium der Baukunst (M-1 and interpolated in M-5.1); Alt-Indische Baustyl (M-12), Aegyptische Baustyl (M-11 and M-6), Griechische Architektur (K-6), Ionische Säulenordnung (M-5.1). K-6 bears the notation, in Kugler’s hand on the last, blank page: ‘Nach Stier’s Vorträgen über griech. Architektur (Bau-Akademie). No illustrations are provided here the Kunstbibliothek’s rules for online publication of images could not be reconciled with the format of the Journal.
\textsuperscript{481} KuBi, Nachlaß Kugler, M-4.2.
two fragments with text for the Ionic order, in a loose, uneven hand. Reserves were left in the text for quick sketches, although not all reserves have drawings. Kugler used the condensation method, albeit with many common abbreviations, especially for word endings; in the fair copy he wrote these out and made corrections. The start of the first fragment corresponds to the last two and a half pages of the Ionic section of the Nachschrift and continues past the point where Kugler stopped transcribing. The very loose hand and many unfinished bits of text suggest in the unfinished sixth section of the Nachschrift suggest that Kugler was growing weary of what was likely a larger and more laborious undertaking than he had anticipated.

The cutting up, transcribing, and reassembling of the manuscripts in the Nachlaß indicates that Wilhelm and Caroline saw the student notes as mostly reliable records of his words and thoughts and thus as an appropriate basis for a published text. This is further confirmed by two types of notation in his hand. The first are brief descriptive comments on the bound manuscripts and the folders containing fragments. Stier never commented on the quality of the notes themselves or on how well they captured his words. If material was missing, he usually just noted the omission; he never attributed an omission to the notetaker, but sometimes he placed it in his own lecture. Mostly he was concerned with the content recorded, usually just identifying it (especially for the fragments) but occasionally providing additional information about the lecture recorded. The other type of notation corrects and adds to the student’s notes, sometimes to polish the text (changing word choice or sentence structure), sometimes adding long passages of new text. These are neither systematic nor thorough.

As odd as it might seem, Stier appears to have used the student drawings as records of the visual component of his teaching, just as he used their notes for the verbal component. There are a few detailed drawings of Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian capitals, with measurements and explanations, labeled in his hand as having been copied from the notebooks of Gottgetreu (1835) and von Arnim (1836). (Figure 9) These are large drawings, filling the width of the sheet, rather than the smaller drawings found in the margins of the intact manuscripts. They may have come from separate portfolios or notebooks maintained by these students. Later notations in both ink and pencil (one is dated November 1844) indicate that Stier continued to work with them over the years.

KuBi, Nachlaß Kugler, M-4.1 M-4.3.
AmTUB II.M.77.C (Comparative history, 1841/42) is the best example. Stier’s edits diminish after the first few pages.
AmTUB II.M.19.C, consisting of three similar sheets in a string-bound gathering of six sheets of varying sizes and paper.
Stier depended on the student notes because he had no record of what he said, or the illustrations he showed, in lectures that changed from year to year, albeit within a fairly consistent overall structure. There is ample evidence beyond the 1844 request that his lectures were mostly improvised rather than read from a written lecture text. His notation on a fragment from the comparative history for 1845/46 records that the lectures that year had been ‘delivered wholly off the cuff and not dictated’ (ganz aus dem Stegreif vorgetragen und nicht dictirt). This suggests that sometimes he may have read from a prepared text, as in 1844/45, when the introduction and first section in the monuments course were ‘newly dictated’ (neu dictirt). ‘Newly dictated’ does not necessarily mean from a fully worked out text, however, and I have found fragments for one only one such lecture text in the Nachlaß. These are all for the lectures on the Greek orders first delivered in winter 1828/29 and then repeated in both the initial monuments course and the first iterations of the ‘Lectures on ancient monuments’. The introduction bears a notation in Wilhelm’s hand dated 26 December 1843 that states: ‘Delivered fairly verbatim

485 AmTUB II.M.10.E.
486 AmTUB II.M.38 (Ancient monuments, 1843/44). The notation concerns the next year, for which student notes are not preserved.
from this notebook in the years 1832 and 1833. This probably represents his practice only early in his career. The lively, electrifying lecture style described by Lübke, who doubtless heard Stier in person, could only have been achieved through largely free delivery. Over time Stier would have needed fewer notes, as his knowledge and experience grew, especially as he maintained the same overall organizational structure into the 1840s.

This structure was worked out in the early prepared texts, and it provided the basis for the one outlined in the ‘Sketch of a plan’ submitted to Beuth and Schinkel in 1834. Comparison of the student notes with the plan (presented below) shows that Stier largely maintained the same structure in both history courses but varied what he covered from year to year. His own notations bear this out; besides signaling the contents of a bound manuscript or set of fragments, they sometimes describe when and how specific topics had been included. Stier’s lectures changed as he continued to conduct research and to refine his understanding of the material, especially for the new comparative history. With his attention dispersed by his many commitments and his perfectionism, he most likely had no consistent or systematic procedure for incorporating new material into his lectures. Beyond the full lecture texts just noted, I have not seen anything that can be securely identified as ‘lecture notes’ as opposed to working notes, although I have not attempted to sort through the countless unidentified slips of paper dispersed throughout the Nachlaß. Some are clearly excerpts from standard texts (Wiebeking, Stieglitz, d’Agincourt) or study notes (Studierzettel), and there are many tables and chronological lists of monuments.

A testy exchange with Beuth and the finance ministry in 1843 includes a brief but informative description of how Stier prepared for class. It shows that he assembled his supporting materials, both textual and visual, mostly anew for each lecture. On 4 March Stier requested a pay increase for his two historical courses and

487 AmTUB II.M.81.A: Nach diesem Heft scheint ziemlich wörtlich vorgetragen Im Jahr 1832 und 33 (d. 26/12 43). The other two fragments are for the Ionic and Corinthian orders (II.M.81.B-C; II.M.80.F). These are all discussed in more detail below.

488 The best example describes fragments from the monuments course in AmTUB II.M.25.A: ‘Die Construction der Säulenordnung aus Stein u. andere damit zusammenhängenden Gebäudetheile (z. b. Zellenmauer u. a.). Von S. 1 bis 10 aus dem Vortrag 35/37 (in dem allein dieser gesonderte Abschnitt über Construction gebildet worden ist) eben daher die Nebenblätter der Deckenkonstruktion. Der Haupttext der Deckenkonstruktion eine ältere Abhandlung die im Vortrag 33/35 zuletzt zum Grunde gelegt scheint (34 ist der Abschnitt d. Deckenconstr. ganz weggelassen). Diese Abh. ist sehr weitläufig im Ausdruck und ist in diesem Bezug 33 wohl besser behandelt.’ See also Stier’s detailed notations on early manuscripts for the comparative history, discussed below.

his one remaining drawing course. As justification he cited his fifteen years of dedicated service, hard work and personal expenditures to remain current in his field, and low pay in comparison to other instructors at the Allgemeine Bauschule.\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 4, f. 86.}

On 14 March finance minister Ernst von Bodelschwingh (1794-1854) sent a prevaricating response, citing budget constraints and Stier’s voluntary reduction of his teaching hours in 1839. The minister also pointed out that the instructors for scientific and technical subjects worked just as hard to remain current in their fields and, additionally, that they deserved their higher pay because of the extra time required, both before and after lectures, to acquire and organize the necessary instruments and specimens.\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 4, f. 88 (Beuth’s notes on Stier’s request, illegible), f. 89 (draft response to Stier); AmTUB II.M.67.E, Bodelschwingh to Stier (fair copy).}

In his response of 30 March Stier addressed the minister’s additional comparison with other instructors in some detail. The drawing course required about the same amount of work before and after each class as those in the natural sciences.\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 4, f. 122-125v, Stier to Beuth (fair copy); AmTUB II.M.67.E (corrected draft by Caroline with sections of a preliminary draft by Wilhelm).}

The two lecture courses, however, required far more, to prepare illustrations to show the students as well as materials to consult while lecturing:

For this purpose not only must I gather thick, unwieldy books of prints over and over again from various libraries and, before teaching, insert markers, because the figures in the books do not follow one another as scholarly consideration requires – a task that often consumes many hours – but I must also surround myself during these lectures with an apparatus of almost countless illustrations, written notes, and memory aids; these must be arranged now in one way, now in another, according to how the general idea of an area of art or an individual building type within it is to be presented; according to the parallels to be drawn among plans, sections, and elevations; or according to whether the historical phenomena are to be presented chronologically or to show artistic relationships or the peculiarity of individual masters.\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11 Bd. 4, f. 122v: Ich habe für diesen Zweck nicht nur fortwährend dicke Folianten von Kupferwerken aus verschiedenen Bibliotheken zusammengesetzt und vor dem Unterricht mit eingelegten Zeichen zu durchschießen, da die Figuren in den Büchern in der Art nicht aufeinander folgen wie die wissenschaftliche Betrachtung dies fordert – ein Geschäft das nicht selten mehrere Stunden in Anspruch nimmt – sondern ich habe bei diesen Vorträgen noch außerdem mit einem Apparate von fast zahllosen Abbildungen, schriftlichen Notizen und}
Besides consulting the drawings and tracings gathered around him to organize his thoughts, Stier probably showed them to the class, by holding them up or placing them on an easel.

Stier thanked Beuth for helping him obtain some of these illustrations, probably a reference to the first set of tracings paid for in 1835 and probably others as well. Stier pointedly added that the rest were drawings after the monuments or tracings (Durchzeichnungen) from expensive publications that he had gathered himself with great expenditure of time, effort, and personal funds. These sheets would have been drawn from the portfolios mentioned in connection with the Hülfsblätter project in 1848, which were apparently surrendered to the Bauakademie after Wilhelm’s death.

Stier also presented two other types of drawings beyond those just described: in-the-moment sketches on the chalkboard and drawings made specifically for teaching. Lübke described how drawing on the chalkboard was an integral aspect of Stier’s teaching: calling on his memory of the monuments he had so carefully studied on his travels, Stier drew the most remarkable forms with a sure and practiced hand, thus enhancing the clarity of his descriptions.494 The profile outlines with proportional scales in Kugler’s Mitschrift, may be examples of such in-class drawings. In discussions about a replacement to teach the general survey of architectural history after Stier’s death, the directorate of the Bauakademie noted that the need to draw while lecturing had prevented him from covering all the material. This need had arisen because there was no parallel drawing course, as there was for ‘Forms of ancient architecture’. They proposed a separate lecture course, taught from a printed compendium, and two specialized courses incorporating drawing exercises, one on ancient temples and one on Christian medieval architecture.495

One reason Stier drew on the chalkboard so much was that he did not have a full set of drawings made specifically for teaching. He never managed to follow through on Beuth’s instructions to make such drawings for the ‘Comparative history’, even with considerable financial support for the expanded Hülfsblätter project starting in 1848. In his justification, he noted the students’ desire for

Gedankenzetteln mich umherzuschlagen, welche bald so, bald anders müssen zusammengestellt werden: jenachdem die allgemeine Idee eines Kunstgebietes oder eine einzelne Gebäudegattung desselben soll aufgestellt werden, oder jenachdem Parallellen von Planen, Durchschnitten, Aufrissen oder Details nothwendig werden, oder jenachdem die historischen Erscheinungen chronologisch oder unter dem Gesichtspunkt artistischer Verwandtschaft oder der Eigenthümlichkeit einzelner Meister gebracht werden.

494 Lübke, 91.
495 GStAPK I. HA Rep 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 142-146, Busse, Stüler, and Hartwich to von der Heydt, 8 November 1856. In the end Gustav Stier taught Wilhelm’s ‘Forms’ and Lübke taught the general survey over two semesters, the Middle Ages in one, antiquity and the Italian art period in the other.
inexpensive reproductions of study figures they could own and use outside of class. Ample evidence suggests, however, that Stier’s students already had access to his drawings of such figures outside class time. In the first years Stier seems to have made them available for communal study sessions in the evenings that he organized or at least attended. Drawings circulated among the students, as indicated by an undated receipt for seven sheets given to thirteen students, several of whom had signed the Christmas card in 1829. These may have been drawn from the 200 folio drawings of ancient ornament begun in Rome and submitted for the architect’s exam in 1831. With the reform of 1832, basic drawing instruction moved to a separate course, which, given its connection to the monuments lectures, could have been where students had the opportunity to study and copy the drawings. As noted above, there was no drawing course associated with the ‘Comparative history’, but the drawings in the students’ notes strongly suggest that they had access to study drawings of some sort.

The presence, but also the absence, of drawings in the student’s notes supports the conclusion that they had access to Stier’s study figures outside class time. The drawings in the four intact manuscripts from the mid-1830s are too finished and detailed to have been made during the lecture or even immediately after from memory. (Figures 6 and 7) Maintaining separate notebooks or portfolios, as many students appear to have done, would have made it easier for them to make copies of Stier’s study figures. As noted above, some of these were even good enough for him to recopy for his planned publication. (Figure 9)

Drawing on the work of textual scholars, it has been possible to make some sense of the overwhelming mass of student notes in the Nachlaß, describing their current state and how Wilhelm and Caroline used them as the basis for their planned surveys of architectural history. While it has been relatively easy to draw some solid conclusions about how Stier prepared for and illustrated his lectures, determining the content of those lectures is more difficult and requires a separate discussion.

Stier’s Architectural History Courses, 1828 to 1848

By correlating several types of sources it is possible to examine how Stier conceived his architectural history courses and how he changed them over time in response to the needs of his students, curricular reforms, and administrative direction. The

---

496 AmTUB II.M.67.A, copy by Caroline of an undated biographical fragment, 3: ‘Dabei wurden Auszüge aus den Kunstwerken gemacht, wir sassen in langen Winterabenden hiebei bis spät in die Nacht zusammen, die schönsten Details wurden größer gezeichnet, so ergab sich immer klarer der Begriff der einzelnen Style...’

above narrative of his initial appointment and subsequent career establishes the sequence of the courses he taught and situates them in the institutional history of the architecture academy. The official documents and private correspondence presented there also provide more specific information, not yet discussed, about course content, and still more is provided by Stier’s own notations on the student notes and a few early lecture texts. By far the largest source of specific information is the mass of student notes themselves. Despite their current chaotic state, these provide a good, if still partial, understanding of what Stier taught in his classes. The goal is not a reconstruction of lectures that he usually delivered without a prepared text, which would be impossible even under the best of circumstances, but rather to demonstrate how he organized the material and the categories and rubrics he employed.

Monuments of architecture and ancient monuments

Stier was first hired to teach exercises in design and perspective to fill gaps in the curriculum of the Bauakademie. From the start he included historical and typological lectures, which he soon expanded into an independent course. In a general sense he was following earlier precedents. Both Gentz and Rabe had combined historical and typological lessons with design exercises in their courses on (Stadtbaukunst), while Schinkel’s curricula for the Akademie der Künste from 1822 and 1824 had moved these lessons into separate courses and placed the exercises in a capstone design studio.498 The evidence strongly suggests, however, that Stier did all this on his own initiative, without much guidance or interference from the administration of the Bauakademie. In the earliest letter on his teaching, to an unidentified friend in mid-1828, he stated that his superiors allowed him a relatively large degree of freedom, and so he put all the more pressure on himself to realize his ambitious plan to expand his teaching to provide the historical foundation his students so sorely lacked. The underlying conception (Grundauffassung) of this plan draws on core ideas from the theses on architecture sent to Schinkel in 1827. Every art, especially architecture, must seek to be in sync with its time, unless the tendency (Richtung) of the time has been misdirected by fashion and error away from nature and truth (by which Stier means the true nature of architecture itself). Just as art must keep pace with the developmental state of its culture, so, too, must it keep up with the current state of scholarship (Wissenschaft). Currently scholarship is well advanced and draws lessons from the whole past; art, above all architecture, must do the same. In designing a new work, the architect must draw on appropriate models from the past.499

498 For the relation of Stier’s course to these precedents see Garberson ‘Stier’s Entwerfung’, 60-61.
499 AmTUB II.M.54.B, fragment of a letter to a friend, Berlin, undated (mid-1828), 2, 3. For the theses see above and von Donop, 81-84.
The actual plan consisted of four elements, which do not necessarily represent separate courses: a three-part historical-theoretical foundation and design exercises. The three foundation elements expand on the two history courses in the ideal curriculum sent to Schinkel, and they also correspond, closely but not exactly, to the way Stier organized his presentation of each architectural style in all his architectural history courses into at least the 1840s. The first foundation element, titled ‘Principles of all Building Styles’ (Lehre der gesammten Baustyle), expands the general introduction course in the ideal curriculum. It begins with an introduction to the nature and essence of art as such and of architecture in particular, describes proper methods for the study of art, and defines the general character of all styles to guide the overview of the whole. It then surveys individual styles, covering the functions satisfied by their major works, the construction methods required by those functions, available materials and techniques, how architectural forms arise from structure, and the proportions of architectural ornament. It concludes with the explication of individual buildings and whole types, in their form and determinant conditions. From this develops the second element, the ‘Principles of the Building Plan’ (Lehre von der Anlage der Gebäude), which is essentially a study of building types with their specific requirements. The third element satisfies the fundamental principle that art always remains incomprehensible without knowledge of its general historical situation (Kenntnifs des allgemein Historischen dem sie anschlieβt). For each style or period there is to be a condensed introduction to the principal historical and especially literary sources. This expands the period introductions in the survey in the ideal curriculum, but separate from a survey of monuments, which was already included in the first foundation element. Here Stier says little about the design exercises, stating only that their goal is to transcend mere book learning and to promote true life, free creation, and desire for the truly beautiful and good.500

By November 1828, when Stier wrote to Schnorr, he mentioned only a comprehensive survey of the history of architecture extending over three semesters: in the first, the monuments of the ancient world; in the second, those from the fifteenth-century to the present, as the continuation of ancient forms; and finally monuments in the Arabian, Byzantine, and pointed-arch styles and those in Italy from the fifth through the fourteenth century.501 The scope and sequence of the three main divisions correspond roughly to the sequence of eleven chronological-geographic divisions in the ideal curriculum for Schinkel.

Between winter semester 1828/29 and summer semester 1831 Stier worked hard to implement his grandiose plan. Letters to friends and interior minister Schuckmann show that he was conducting research and gathering visual materials. He complained about the mechanical work of synthesizing lectures from his notes and making new drawings to show in class. In the report submitted with the

500 AmTUB II.M.54.B, fragment of a letter to a friend, Berlin, undated (mid-1828), 3-5. For the ideal curriculum see above and von Donop, 222-230.
architect’s exam in May or June of 1831, he stated that his teaching included lectures on ancient architectural forms, begun in winter 1828/29, for which he had prepared a set of 200 sheets with drawings of ancient ornament. He also lectured on existing buildings, covering primarily Greco-Roman, Indian, Egyptian, and Italian monuments (from the Middle Ages and after); those of other periods still suffered from a more elementary treatment. Holiday excursions on foot (Fusswanderungen) to nearby cities and towns to study and draw medieval buildings were also part of his teaching, at least for his closest students. Besides fostering a sense of community and making his teaching more engaging, these excursions also promoted a better understanding of chronology through direct observation. A letter to Maydell of 1832 confirms this account, indicating that the studies of antiquity had indeed begun in winter 1828/29 and were expanded in winter 1829/30 to include India, Egypt, and Persia. The study excursions had begun in 1829; on the excursion at Easter 1830 Stier and his students had made several hundred drawings of medieval artworks in all media, with emphasis on architectural ornament and painting. On these excursions Stier must have lectured and engaged students in didactic conversation; only with such guidance could their attention have been directed to questions of chronology, as he claimed in his report.

After a hiatus in winter 1831/32, instruction resumed in summer 1832 with the two-year foundational curriculum of the newly reconstituted Allgemeine Bauschule. Stier’s ‘Studies of architectural monuments’ became ‘Lectures on the monuments of antiquity’. Because Beuth’s reform is sparsely documented, there is no information for how this change came about or what instructions Stier may have received. The official title signals a shift from the comprehensive overview he had been working towards to a more limited focus on antiquity. What the change from ‘studies’ (Studien) to ‘lectures’ (Vortrage) was intended to convey is unclear. It may have been part of the larger institutional shift toward training professionals for state service with emphasis on practical instruction and away from academic and artistic pursuits.

Stier did, however, eventually receive specific instructions regarding the new ‘Lectures’. These came in September 1833 during discussions with Beuth and Schinkel about the new history course in the one-year curriculum. To show how he intended to teach this one-semester comprehensive survey, Stier had submitted a detailed outline, titled ‘Sketch of a plan for a comparative history of architecture’ (Skizze eines Planes zu einer vergleichende Geschichte der Baukunst). On the table of contents he indicated that the section on ancient Greece and Rome corresponded to his lectures in the existing course on ancient monuments. This section is by far the most detailed; running from page nine to sixty-six it makes up the bulk of the manuscript. In a prefatory note Stier stated that the purpose of including so much

502 AmTUB II.M.71.F, Stier to Oberbaudeputation, Berlin, undated draft (May or June 1831), 4-6.
503 AmTUB, II.M.74.4, excerpt of a letter from Stier to Maydell, Berlin, 1832.
detail was to demonstrate how he would treat all periods in the new course. Initial discussion between Beuth and Schinkel and then with Stier focused on how to fit this grandiose plan into one semester, but it was soon decided that the course would cover only post-antique periods. Within these discussions, Stier also received instructions about the monuments course from both Beuth and Schinkel, as he explained in a request of March 1848 to change its title to ‘The aesthetics and history of the classical architecture of the ancients’ (Die Aesthetik und die Geschichte der klassischen B. K. bei den Alten). This would reflect how the course had changed in response to those instructions; the old title had simply been retained from the curriculum of the old Bauakademie. The request was rendered moot by the curricular reform instituted the next year.

While it is impossible to know exactly what Beuth and Schinkel said to Stier in 1833, the gist of their instructions can be gleaned from Schinkel’s written comments on the ‘Sketch of a plan’ (Appendix 2). He recommended deleting some sections to avoid unnecessary repetition and reducing the number of examples to save time, echoing Beuth’s admonishment to limit the number of illustrations so as not to confuse the students. It seems logical that Beuth and Schinkel would redirect these recommendations to Stier’s presentation of this material in the monuments course, once the decision had been made to omit it from the new one. It is also quite plausible that in conversation they made explicit what is suggested by their written recommendations, namely a culling of the material to emphasize clear communication of general principles. This may be what Stier hoped to signal with the change of title from ‘Lectures’ to ‘Aesthetics and history.’ The student notes indicate that this is indeed what he tried to do, beginning by the later 1830s and continuing through the 1840s.

Given its pivotal position in Stier’s career, the ‘Sketch of a plan’ constitutes an essential source for examining his teaching. It presents his ideal conception of how the history of architecture should be taught and what he was trying to accomplish. It provides a framework for examining the student notes, as well as the few fragments of his own lecture texts from 1828-29, to arrive at a general understanding of how he taught both the ‘Studies’ and the ‘Lectures’ from 1829/30 into the 1840s.

The ‘Sketch of a plan’ is exactly what one would expect from Stier: obsessively detailed, intricately constructed, and impossibly ambitious. As seen in Figures 10 to 15, it employs a complex multi-level system of heads and sub-heads. The hierarchy of levels is denoted by letter size and form, double and single underlining, Roman and Arabic numerals, and upper and lower case Latin letters. There are unnumbered main sections for the principal chronological-geographic

504 AmTUB II.M.15, ii. The prefatory note is transcribed in Appendix Two. The other reads: Füllt die Vortragstunden im ersten Lehrgang unter dem Titel Monumente der Baukunst.
505 AmTUB II.M.73.B, Stier to Pommer-Esche, undated draft fragment, 1-2. References to Linke’s retirement and the ‘just concluded winter semester’ place this in March 1848.
categories; these are further subdivided by numbered sections, which are in turn broken down according to the level of detail required, with the most intricate for Greece and Rome employing books, chapters, sections, and paragraphs. Appendix Two provides a condensed outline that simplifies and somewhat regularizes Stier’s complex system to render the organizational structure more readily apparent. The students’ notes show that they struggled to capture this structure. Stier’s intricate system for setting off heads and subheads is often only partially or inconsistently applied, if at all; individual heads and subheads are often left out, and their numbering is inconsistent. These variations strongly suggest that Stier conveyed his organizational scheme orally, rather than writing it out on the chalkboard, which both he and Lübke stated was only used for drawings.

The pages reproduced here show that Wilhelm and Caroline produced the final manuscript together. He wrote all the front matter: introduction, marginal notations, and table of contents (Figures 10 and 11). In the text (Figures 12 to 15), he wrote the main headings, both the block capitals and the additional notes below them. She followed with the sub-heads and their associated text. Although her work here was primarily as a copyist, her hand is seen throughout the many working notes for the post-antique sections dispersed in the Nachlaß.

Figure 10 Wilhelm and Caroline Stier, ‘Skizze eines Planes zu einer vergleichenden Geschichte der Architektur’, 1833, i-ii. Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität zu Berlin, Inv. Nr. II.M.15 (Photo: Architekturmuseum)
Eric Garberson     Architectural History in the Architecture Academy:
Wilhelm Stier

Figure 11 Wilhelm and Caroline Stier, ‘Skizze eines planes zu einer
vergleichenden Geschichte der Architektur’, 1833, iii-1.
Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität zu Berlin, Inv. Nr. II.M.15
(Photo: Architekturmuseum)

Figure 12 Wilhelm and Caroline Stier, ‘Skizze eines planes zu einer
vergleichenden Geschichte der Architektur’, 1833, 8-9.
Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität zu Berlin, Inv. Nr. II.M.15
(Photo: Architekturmuseum)

Figure 13 Wilhelm and Caroline Stier, ‘Skizze eines planes zu einer
vergleichenden Geschichte der Architektur’, 1833, 10-11.
Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität zu Berlin, Inv. Nr. II.M.15
(Photo: Architekturmuseum)
The main organizing principle demonstrated in the ‘Sketch’ is a blend of chronology and geography, expressed in sixteen unnumbered main sections set off by double-underlined heads in outline capital letters. The main emphasis falls on the peoples of the ancient world and then Europe beginning in late antiquity, as seen here in translation (original in Appendix Two):

- Ancient Indians
- Ancient Egyptians
- Phoenicians and Jews
- Babylonians
- Persians
- Greeks and Romans
- First Christian basilicas, 4th through 6th century
Pre-Byzantine art, i.e. New Greeks, Goths, and Lombards in Italy and the east, 5th to 10th century
Byzantine church architecture in western Europe, 11th to 13th century
[i.e. Romanesque]
Arabs, Turks, and modern Persians and Indians
German church architecture in western Europe, 12th to 16th century
[i.e. Gothic]
Secular buildings of the Middle Ages in northern and western Europe, i.e. Byzantine and German styles, 11th to 17th century
Italian schools from the end of the 10th to the end of the 14th century
Works of architecture from the start of the 15th century to the present
Notices on the architecture of the Chinese
Notices on the architecture of the ancient Mexicans

The list expands and reorders the eleven categories from the ideal curriculum of 1827 and its variation in the 1828 letter to Schnorr. Chronology now supersedes the stylistic continuity between antiquity and its revival in the fifteenth century, so that the medieval periods directly follow antiquity. The most detailed sections are those already developed in the first monuments course, Greece and Rome and ancient India and Egypt. The other ancient peoples seem to have been included pro forma, with barely any discussion indicated.

The main geographic-temporal divisions are then organized using a fairly consistent set of second-level rubrics indicated by Roman numerals:

I. Introduction
II. Structural and architectural system
III. Buildings in their fundamental principles (i.e. typology)
IV. Historical overview

These are most consistently applied in the main sections for the ancient Indians and Egyptians and the Greeks and Romans. In the post-antique periods the same sequence of topics is roughly followed, with variations to accommodate the specifics of individual periods. The introductions provide differing combinations of recurring elements: historical, geographic, and cultural context; available building materials; capsule description of the style and its essential characteristics. In the second sections, structural system refers to methods of construction (post-and-lintel, types of vaulting), while architectural system refers to architectural elements (columns, pilasters, cornices, moldings, etc.) and their relation and application to structure. The third sections present thematic overviews of building types. The principles for the typological classification vary a bit for the different periods, with differing emphasis on three key factors: structure, plan, and function. The fourth sections are chronological surveys of individual monuments, organized in different ways as
appropriate to the material (sometimes as a single chronology, sometimes broken down geographically).

As Schinkel observed in his report, even half of what was proposed for the ‘Comparative history’ could fill two, three, or more years. He focused mainly on the treatment of the Greeks and Romans, and it is easy to see how he and Beuth could have become concerned about Stier’s handling of the ‘Lectures on ancient monuments’. Schinkel’s recommendations are color coded on the condensed outline of the ‘Sketch’ in Appendix Two: red for deletions, purple for sections to combine with others, and blue for sections to consider combining.506 This makes evident the large degree of repetition in Stier’s outline, especially in the section on Greek and Roman structural and architectural systems. Here Schinkel recommended deleting the full, separate treatment of each of the three orders and the encyclopedic survey of architectural ornament (Buch II, Cap. II, Abschnitt I.C, D, and E; Abschnitt IV). The Roman orders in temples (Buch III) and Vitruvius (Buch X) also needed no separate treatment and could be integrated into the examination of the Greek orders. For all of the main chronological-geographic divisions Schinkel recommended incorporating the separate historical overviews into the history of buildings (by which he meant the typologies). He was not sure of this, however, observing that the results would become clear in presenting the material. As noted above, he also recommended limiting the examples presented. This likely applied to the number of sub-types within the typologies (shown on the condensed outline) as well as to the number of individual monuments in the historical overview (not shown).

Schinkel’s report draws attention to one of the most striking features of Stier’s teaching, the exhaustive, minutely detailed presentation of the classical orders. The student notes show that in class Stier provided extended, illustrated explanations of even the smallest details of each architectural element. (Figure 16, see also Figures 6 and 9). As he wrote to Maydell in 1832, the orders had cost him three times more work than the other parts of the history of ancient art (the typology and the history). Ever since beginning his study of architecture, and especially in Rome, he had worked to discern the essential nature and underlying principles within the many, often contradictory, historical manifestations of the orders. Continuing this work in Berlin, he struggled to make sense of the existing research, but found it did not help him explain these principles or ‘the why’ (das Warum?) of the orders. As the existing tables of measurements and proportions were almost useless for his purposes, he had assembled his own, searching repeatedly through several thousand prints. This work, and the difficulty of making it comprehensible in his lectures, drove him almost to despair and cost him many

506 In the manuscript of the ‘Sketch’, faint pencil marks are visible next to most of the sections listed in Schinkel’s report. These could have been made by either Schinkel or Stier at any point in the process.
tears and sleepless nights, especially in his first two years at the Bauakademie. In the Nachlaß there are various drafts and fair copies of tables and drawings that attest to this work.  

Schinkel’s report also highlights another noteworthy feature of Stier’s teaching, the treatment of the Greeks and Romans in a single chronological-geographic section. Schinkel’s recommendation to incorporate the Roman orders with the Greek was not, in fact, a major change. As Stier himself noted, his presentation of the Roman orders drew on the principles already established for the orders as such and for their perfection by the Greeks. Furthermore, this combined treatment was consistent with the rest of the ‘Sketch’, where aside from this one section (Book III), the two are always treated together. This is also true of the one section where the Romans are predominant, Book VI on vaulting, which traces the

507 AmTUB II.M.74.5, Caroline’s excerpt from Wilhelm’s letter to Maydell, Berlin, 1832. She noted that this passage was to be used in the introduction to her biography.

508 For example, AmTUB II.M.19, II.M.21, II.M.22, II.M.78.G, II.M.81.D.
history of this structural form from before and then among the Greeks and the Romans. In this the ‘Sketch’ is consistent with Stier’s practice before and after 1832, as seen in the student notes discussed below. At first glance this seems to contradict his vociferous denunciation, recorded in Kugler’s Nachschrift, of the standard practice, in classrooms and text books, of treating the Greeks and Romans together. He saw this as a misrecognition of their profound cultural and artistic differences. The student notes show, however, that he consistently called attention to these difference within an overall discussion structured by chronological sequence and the Romans’ adaptation of Greek forms to their own purposes.

Comparison with the student notes from after 1832, carried out below, shows that the ‘Sketch’ quite faithfully represents what Stier was teaching in the supposedly new ‘Lectures on ancient monuments’, although he did not actually cover all that he claimed. Further comparison with two sources for the earlier ‘Studies of ancient monuments’, Kugler’s notes in the Kunstabibliothek and fragments of Stier’s own lecture texts in the Nachlaß, shows that the ‘Lectures’ were at first largely based on the ‘Studies’, with substantive revisions beginning only in the later 1830s. Stier’s first lecture texts include the first version of what would become the four-part organizational structure employed within the main chronological-geographic divisions (introduction, systems, typology, history) of the ‘Sketch.’ Overall, there is considerable continuity in content, but it is also clear that Stier was consistently revising his treatment of the orders from year to year, as he described to Maydell.

The three fragments of Stier’s initial lecture texts consist of an introduction to the Greek orders in a Reinschrift by Caroline; a partial draft for the Ionic order in Wilhelm’s hand, the first part of which is transcribed in a Reinschrift by Caroline; and a fragment of a draft for the Corinthian order also in Wilhelm’s hand. Notations on the manuscripts show that the initial texts were produced in 1828 and/or 1829, re-used until at least 1833, and then re-worked in some way in the early 1840s. The introduction bears two notations in his hand. One simply dates the manuscript to ‘Ostern 28-33’. The other (quoted above) is dated 26 December 1843 and states that the text had been delivered mostly verbatim in 1832 and 1833. The draft for the Ionic order bears the notation, also in Wilhelm’s hand, ‘Berlin, d. 7ten October 1829, W. Stier’. Both drafts have many corrections, deletions, and additions; the one for the Ionic order has a few small drawings in the margins.

The first fragment provides a general introduction to the study of Greek architectural system (Bausystem). It takes as its starting point the idea that this

---

509 KuBi, Nachlaß Kugler, K-6, 1.
510 AmTUB II.M.81.A (Introduction), II.M.81.B-C (Ionic), II.M.80.F (Corinthian). All were string-bound with new covers, probably in the 1840s. All are still intact, except the Corinthian draft, which has lost its cover and several pages.
511 ‘Easter’ usually refers to the start of the academic year in April. Here it is either an error (the lectures began in winter 1828/29) or it may refer to the whole academic year.
system reached its highest level of development in its principal building type, the
temple, and more specifically in the portico or colonnade surrounding the cela. Its
elements (columns, ceiling, roof) established the systems of architectural form that
constitute the essence of Greek architectural system. This idea was picked up from a
more general introduction (In der Einleitung ist bereits gesagt...), for which no
manuscript has been identified. It then states that the presentation of Greek
architecture will be organized under four main heads:

I. The porticos (orders) in structure, architectural form, and
ornament. The roof.
II. Other structural and architectural forms. Arcades, windows,
doors.
III. The buildings: temples, propylaea, theatres, monuments, graves --
introduced by a description of Greek city plans -- in technical
and artistic descriptions, with brief historical notices
IV. Synthetic historical overview.512

The first two anticipate the more generalized ‘Structural and architectural system’ in
the ‘Sketch of a plan’. The other two anticipate the typological and historical
surveys, and they resemble the foundation elements in the letter to a friend of mid-
1828. The rest of the fragment covers just the first two heads, in a sequence of sub-
heads that correspond to most of those in the general section on Greek and Roman
structural and architectural systems in the ‘Sketch, but in a somewhat different
order.513 The treatment of the Ionic and Corinthian orders in the other fragments is
also organized under sub-heads more or less like those in the ‘Sketch’.514

There appears to be one more draft for the first monuments course that is
later than these three. It has extensive revisions and numerous marginal drawings

512 AmTUB II.M.81.A, 1-6: Cap. I. Die Portiken (Säulenordnung) in Konstruktion,
architektonischer Form und Ornament. Das Dach. Cap. II. Sonstige Konstruktions- und
Architekturformen. Bogenstellungen, Fenster, Thüren. Cap. III. Die Gebäude: Tempel,
Propylaen, Theater, Ehrenmonumente, Gräber -- Eingeleitet durch eine Schilderung der
griechischen Städteanlagen -- in technischer und artistischer Darstellung, mit kürzen
historischen Notizen.
Cap. IV. Zusammenhängende historische Uebersicht.
513 BAUWERKE DER GRIECHEN UND ROEMER, II, Buch II, Cap. I, ¶1-3, ¶6-10. The text
ends in the middle of ¶10.
514 AmTUB II.M.81.B (Ionic), draft: BAUWERKE DER GRIECHEN UND ROEMER, II, Buch
II, Cap. II, Abschnitt 1, D, ¶1-5, 9-16, 18; fair copy: BAUWERKE DER GRIECHEN UND
ROEMER, II, Buch II, Cap. II, Abschnitt 1, D, ¶1-3. II.M.80.F (Corinthian): corresponds less
directly to BAUWERKE DER GRIECHEN UND ROEMER, II, Buch II, Cap. II, Abschnitt 1, E,
¶3, 5, 8-12.
and corresponds to another section of the ‘Sketch of a plan.’\textsuperscript{515} Titled ‘The architectural members, their purpose, origin, and the types of their forms’ (\textit{Die architektonischen Glieder, ihr Zweck, ihr Ursprung, die Gattungen ihrer Form}) it pursues the questions noted in the letter to Maydell. Stier’s notation on the manuscript assign it two different chapter numbers, neither of which correspond to the ‘Sketch’, suggesting that it was prepared prior to 1833. This section does not appear in the manuscripts from 1832 and after.

Of the six text fragments that make up Kugler’s \textit{Nachschrift} in the Kunsthbibliothek, three correspond to the first three fragments of Stier’s lecture texts just discussed; two more, ancient India and Egypt, which correspond to the expansion of 1829/30; and an ‘Introduction to the study of architecture’, which corresponds to the general introduction referred to in Stier’s introduction to the orders. In addition, the disjointed Corinthian section contains small passages of text on arcades and frames for doors and windows, corresponding to the ‘other architectural elements’ also referred to in Stier’s earliest lecture text.\textsuperscript{516} The close, often verbatim, correspondence of Kugler’s notes to Stier’s lecture texts and/or the ‘Sketch of a plan’, as well as to later student notes, confirms Kugler’s undated notation: ‘After Stier’s lectures on Greek architecture (Bau-Akad)’.\textsuperscript{517} This correspondence, and Kugler’s success in capturing Stier’s system of heads and sub-heads, suggest that he was an exceptionally good notetaker, although it is possible that he had access to some of Stier’s lecture materials.

The sixth fragment of Kugler’s \textit{Nachschrift} bears the title ‘Introduction to the study of architecture’. It records the first part of the lecture Stier delivered to begin his course. It ends with the transition to a missing second section, a capsule overview of all building styles from antiquity to the present. The first part presents the basic principles that guide the historical study of architectural monuments in five sections.\textsuperscript{518} It begins from the premise that understanding historic monuments

\textsuperscript{515} AmTUB II.M.20.A. It corresponds to BAUWERKE DER GRIECHEN UND ROEMER, II, Buch II, Cap. I, ¶4, in the sketch. A dismembered Reinschrift by both Caroline and Wilhelm in II.M.24.C covers similar material, which is, however, not in the earliest text in II.M.81.A.

\textsuperscript{516} KuBi, Nachlaß Kugler, K-6 (Griechische Architektur), M-5.1 (Ionische Säulenordnung, \textit{Reinschrift}), M-4.1 and 4.3 (Ionic order, \textit{Mitschrift}), M-4.2 (Korinthische Säulenordnung), M-12 (Alt-Indische Baustyl), M-11 and M-6 (Aegyptische Baustyl), and M-1 and sections interpolated in M-5.1 (Einleitung zum Studium der Baukunst).

\textsuperscript{517} KuBi, Nachlaß Kugler, K-6 (Griechische Architektur), last page: Nach Stier’s Vorträgen über griech. Architektur (Bau-Akademie).

requires understanding the nature of the building systems or building styles (Bausysteme, Baustyle) that they employ to achieve the fundamental purpose of architecture, the enclosure of an internal space. These systems are divided into two types, trabeation and vaulting, followed by principles for how all buildings employ architectural forms to fulfill specific functions and achieve certain aesthetic goals. A descriptive catalog of various architectural forms (columns, capitals, moldings, and so forth) constitutes a primer of architectural vocabulary, which Kugler recognized as he carefully underlined each term in his Nachschrift. 519

Kugler also carefully listed the nineteen heads to be employed in the presentation of each building style in the lectures to follow. These include several heads also seen in the ‘Sketch of a plan’, although in somewhat different order. 520 The sections on ancient India and Egypt then employ these nineteen heads with only slight variations down to the concluding overview of monuments, which is incomplete in India and completely lacking in Egypt. In the ‘Sketch of a plan’ these two main sections have more extensive contextual-historical introductions, but otherwise they include essentially the same elements as Kugler’s Nachschrift.

Kugler’s notes for the introduction to the Greek orders include only the first few sections of Stier’s lecture (through the discussion of the entablature), and they correspond to some of the same sections of the ‘Sketch of a plan’. 521 The text repeats, often verbatim, the first passages from Stier’s lecture text, establishing the temple portico or colonnade as the defining element of the Greek structural and architectural systems. The notes for the Ionic order overlap with the first part of Stier’s lecture text and some sections of the ‘Sketch of a plan’. 522 The section on the

519 This brief synopsis concentrates on the pedagogical purpose of Stier’s introduction, leaving out much that expresses the foundational understanding of architecture that guided his teaching.


521 BAUWERKE DER GRIECHEN UND ROEMER, II, Buch II, Cap. I, ¶ 1 - ¶6, with ¶4 and ¶5 treated very briefly.

522 BAUWERKE DER GRIECHEN UND ROEMER, II, Buch II, Cap. II, Abschnitt I, D, ¶1-4, portions of ¶5-16.
Corinthian order has minimal overlap with the fragment of Stier’s draft, but considerably more with the ‘Sketch’.\textsuperscript{523} The passages on windows and doors and on arcades also correspond to those in the ‘Sketch’.\textsuperscript{524}

The evidence provided by the student notes confirms that when Stier began teaching ‘Lectures on ancient monuments’ in 1832 he re-used the sections on the Greeks and Romans from the old ‘Studies’. The notes from the 1830s show that the ‘Lectures’ incorporated all four of the second-level heads employed throughout the ‘Sketch of a plan’: 1) introduction, 2) structural and architectural systems, 3) building types, and 4) historical overview. In the classroom, however, the introduction was incorporated into the second section on the systems, so that the course was seen as consisting of just three parts: 1) systems, 2) typology, 3) history. This is also confirmed by Stier’s lists of student notes from 1837 and 1840.\textsuperscript{525}

The amount of material was so extensive that students apparently bound each part separately, and some students may not have considered all parts worth binding. For part one, there are two intact manuscripts that bear notations, by the students, identifying them as the first of the three parts, and dates for individual class meetings that place them in 1833/34 and 1834/35 respectively. These are both about 450 pages, employ a condensation method like Kugler’s, and have many drawings in the margins.\textsuperscript{526} A third intact manuscript from 1837 can be identified as part three from its contents.\textsuperscript{527} It is 250 pages, uses an abbreviation system, and has drawings in the margins. These three manuscripts provide the most convenient way to access Stier’s lectures in the mid-1830s, although it must be borne in mind that they may have remained intact because he found them inferior and not worth cutting up.

The overall introduction, preserved from the ‘Studies’ in Kugler’s ‘Introduction to the study of architecture’, was probably part of the course, at least in some years. It appears to survive in only two manuscripts. The earliest is a partial Reinschrift from 1832/33 by a rather unskilled notetaker. It covers many of the same topics as Kugler’s Nachschrift, with some passages repeated verbatim, but in far less detail. It includes the historical overview missing from Kugler, but in condensed form, running from antiquity to the present in just seven pages.\textsuperscript{528} A more detailed version of the overview alone is found in the second intact manuscript for part one, without the first section on the study of architectural history.\textsuperscript{529} Similarly, it is

\textsuperscript{523} BAUWERKE DER GRIECHEN UND ROEMER, II, Buch II, Cap. II, Abschnitt 1, E, §§1-3 (most), §§5 and §§8 (small portions).
\textsuperscript{524} BAUWERKE DER GRIECHEN UND ROEMER, II, Buch V; Buch VI.A.
\textsuperscript{525} I.I.M.78, unnumbered folder.
\textsuperscript{526} AmTUB I.I.M.35, unpaginated (first page), marginal list of the parts; II.I.M.36, 25, listing of the parts in the text.
\textsuperscript{527} AmTUB I.I.M.33, no listing of parts.
\textsuperscript{528} AmTUB I.I.M.12.B. Identified by a notation in Stier’s hand.
\textsuperscript{529} AmTUB I.I.M.36, 2-24.
unclear whether and how the sections on the ancient Indians, Egyptians, and Persians were included from the ‘Lectures’, as there are apparently no manuscripts for them in the Nachlaß.530

One of Stier’s lists of student notes from 1837 gives the internal subsections for part one as treated in the course to that point. These correspond to only about half the main sections, or ‘Books’, for the Greeks and Romans in the ‘Sketch of a plan’, namely I (introduction), II (structural and architectural systems), III (Roman orders), V (windows and doors), and VI (arches and vaults).531 Several sections are not included and were likely never prepared, as they do not appear in either of the intact manuscripts or in any of the fragments that I have examined. Other than the section on decoration in painting, sculpture, and mosaic (VIII), these are all peripheral to the main topic: IV (on the use of wood and its combination with stone), VII (remarkable examples and reports on ruins), IX (vessels, furniture, weapons, etc.), and X (Vitruvius).

The two intact manuscripts for part one confirm that Stier did in fact cover the material in books I, II, III, V, and VI, largely following the many lower-level subdivisions set forth in the ‘Sketch of a plan.’ The notetakers did not fully capture Stier’s complex system, however, and their order of the subsections varies somewhat from that in the ‘Sketch’. The later of the two (II.M.36) varies more, perhaps indicating changes in Stier’s own organization, but this might also be due to the somewhat lesser skill of the notetaker.

There are also several fragments that can be identified as coming from part one. Some are still loose and randomly dispersed.532 Some were string-bound and given covers with identifying notations. One set assembles material on windows and doors from 1832/34. A second consists of passages on ceiling structure from 1833/35, in a transcription by Caroline. The third is a small section on construction that did not appear in any other year; this is identified as having been copied from Gottgetreu’s notes (i.e. 1835).533

530 The Indians, Egyptians, and Persians do appear in a collection of fragments from part three, AmTUB II.M.94, 7-40.
532 The loose, undated fragments include AmTUB II.M.19.C, II.M.80.G, II.M.83.N-3, all of which appear to be from the same student notebook. These will not be discussed here. There may well be other dispersed fragments among the loose papers in the Nachlaß.
533 AmTUB II.M.25. These are in unlettered sub-folders with Stier’s original titles and notes on the covers.
Less can be said about how Stier taught parts two and three given that fewer manuscripts can be identified, and it is difficult to discern when he might have attempted to follow Schinkel’s advice to combine them. For part two, the building types, I have identified only one set of fragments. This is a very incomplete assembly of loose clippings that vary greatly in size, with text in several different hands on different paper, including those of both Wilhelm and Caroline. Apparently original folders organize these into the historical periods with further subdivisions for building types (temples, theatres, secular buildings). The text fragments range from long paragraphs to single sentences and are primarily brief descriptions of individual buildings.

For part three, the historical overview, there is the one intact manuscript from 1837, by a less skilled notetaker. Headings and subheadings are inconsistently applied, and some sections seem to be missing. The text begins with a very brief historical introduction before presenting the ‘History of architecture among the Greeks and Romans’ divided into four temporal divisions that vary only slightly from those in the ‘Sketch of a plan’. The first three sections combine general explanations of the orders and their parts (following the organization and repeating material from part one) with summary overviews of individual monuments categorized by type (temples, domestic and/or public buildings). The fourth section just presents a sequence of monuments. All examples are Greek, omitting the Romans.

Four sets of fragments can be associated with part three. Two of these sets are loose, incomplete collections of dismembered student notes, the second of which was transcribed by Caroline. These cannot be associated with any particular semester. The other two sets are bound manuscripts of pasted-together fragments that significantly re-organize the material in ways quite different from the ‘Sketch’ and the one intact manuscript. The first of these bound manuscripts bears the title ‘Typical forms. History and criticism of the orders’ (Typenformen Geschichte u Critic d Ordnungen). It re-organizes the history of the three orders into four temporal-geographic divisions or schools: 1. Aegina-Sicily, 2. Attic, 3. Ionic or Asiatic, 4. Roman. Within each section there are three sub-sections: a. introduction (very brief), b. manifestation of architectural forms typical in the period, c. discussion of individual monuments. An annotation on the title page in Wilhelm’s hand indicates that all introductory passages come from 1835; the typical forms from a year he could not identify; and the monuments, he thought, from 1832. Annotations within the manuscript identify the notetaker from 1835 as Gottgetreu or Schüler 35. The hand is the same in both, and it is also the same as in the small section on

534 AmTUB II.M.16.
535 AmTUB II.M.28 and 29 (transcribed by Caroline). The first bears a notation by Wilhelm identifying it with the first lecture (Erster Vortrag) and noting that the sections had been incompletely transcribed and should be compared to the second lecture.
536 AmTUB II.M.18.
construction from part one copied from Gottgetreu. The second bound manuscript brings together fragments in several hands, including transcriptions by Wilhelm and Caroline.\textsuperscript{537} Only the initial section bears a date, 1835/37, but there are cross-references in the text to other notes from the 1830s. This initial section bears a new heading by Wilhelm, ‘For the introduction to the developmental history’ (\textit{Zur Einleitung für die Entwicklungs geschichte}). The emphasis here is on the development of the orders over time, and a section from part one appears to have been included to begin discussion of the Doric order. The manuscript ends, on page 425, in the middle of the Corinthian order and includes no discussion of actual buildings.

All the manuscripts discussed so far bear notations that securely place them before 1837. It is, however, very difficult to associate the student notes from 1832-37 with specific semesters, or to determine how long it took Stier to cover this great mass of material. Officially, the ‘Lectures on ancient monuments’ was a two-semester course that began anew each summer semester and met twice per week for three hours in summer and once per week for three hours in winter. As the published class schedules and payment records show, however, the number of days and hours fluctuated from year to year. Some of Stier’s notations appear consistent with the two-semester scheduling. He usually identified manuscripts with a single year, e.g. \textit{Cursus 32, Ostern 33, Heft von 1837}, presumably indicating the academic year that began in April. In some instances he identified them as extending over two years (e.g. 1832/34), noting that the lecture given in the intervening year differed.\textsuperscript{538} This makes sense if the course extended over two years, such that 1832/34 refers to a course that began in summer 1832 and ended in winter 1833/34, with another beginning in 1833 and continuing to winter 1834/35. Alternatively, the course may not have started from the beginning in April each year, and Stier may not actually have taught all three parts consistently. Such departure from an official curriculum was not unusual in universities, where instructors were notorious for delivering course content at their own pace.

Conflicting, or at least ambiguous, evidence is provided by dates for individual class meetings in 1834 and 1835 in the two intact manuscripts for part one. These are the only such dates I have found on any of the student manuscripts in the \textit{Nachlaß}. 1834 was the year Stier adjusted his teaching to accommodate his research trip to prepare the ‘Comparative history’: he ended his history lectures early, just before his departure in early July, and finished them in extra sessions after his return on 4 October.\textsuperscript{539} The first date is for 29 April 1834, early in the

\textsuperscript{537} AmTUB II.M.94.
\textsuperscript{538} II.M.25, a collection of fragments cut from several student not es all dating between 1832 and 1837. The relevant text from folder A is cited above. Other fragments from 1835/37 were pasted into the compilation in II.M.94.
\textsuperscript{539} GSTAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III Nr. 11, Bd. 3, f. 51-53, payments showing hours taught summer 1834 to summer 1835, f. 69, Stier to Beuth, Berlin,
summer semester, when the course met on Tuesdays and Fridays for 3 hours. This date appears on page 301 of the 446-page manuscript, in the section on the Corinthian order. The first 300 pages must have been recorded the previous year, beginning in either summer 1833 or winter 1833/34. The dates continue through May and June to 4 July, just before Stier’s departure, completing the Corinthian order, anomalous forms, and doors and windows in eighty-one pages. Gaps mostly reflect dates not recorded rather than classes missed. Dates resume with 7 October, just after Stier’s return, and continue every Tuesday and Thursday until 6 November. Classes met for only an hour each day, and the notes for arcades, vaults, and their decoration (from antiquity to St. Peter’s) take up only sixty-four pages (382 to 446). In the other intact manuscript, a single date, 18 October 1835, appears in the section on vaulting that corresponds to material covered on 4 and 6 November the previous year. Without an extended summer vacation, Stier would have been covering the material faster. Presumably he delivered parts two and three in the remainder of the winter semester and the following summer, although this is hard to verify.

How Stier taught and revised his ‘Lectures on ancient monuments’ between 1840 and the reform of 1848/49 is even more difficult to discern, given the fragmentary state of the manuscripts and their unclear relation to each other and to the official curriculum. It appears that he was working on two separate recastings of the earlier material. He began teaching the first one in 1839/40 and continued until at least 1844/45; the second began in 1843/44 and was repeated at least once the next year. Whether they were taught concurrently or as part of a single year-long whole is impossible to determine.

For the first there are two intact student Reinschriften. The earliest is identified by Stier as ‘Cursus 39/40 on the first page. He identified the second as from 1843/44, also noting that in the next iteration, in 1844/45 (starting at Easter), the introduction changed, chapter one was wholly new, and the discussion of proportions made more clear. The two manuscripts have the same overall organization, with some verbatim passages and no drawings. The lectures recorded

27 January 1834, request to alter his teaching; AmTUB II.M.76.B, Wilhelm Stier to Caroline Stier, Düsseldorf, 29 September 1834, announcing his return.

540 AmTUB II.M.35. I have counted the pages, as the manuscript is unpaginated. For orientation, see Appendix Two; these notes follow the ‘Sketch of a plan’ quite closely.

541 AmTUB II.M.36, unpaginated.

542 I have not attempted to locate or identify all of these. In addition to the those discussed here see AmTUB II.M.11.J, II.M.13, II.M.19.A-B, II.M.26.D.

543 AmTUB II.M.37, unpaginated. At the start there is a single page of text with the notation in pencil: Heft 40/41 ist durchgesehen (nach [illegible name]), suggesting that the text was copied from there. An old label on the spine reads: ‘Ordnungen von 39/40, 40/41, 37/38, [illegible] Schalscha aus der Geschichte’. A few additional passages added throughout by Stier and at least one other person.

544 AmTUB II.M.38. The first page is numbered 76 in the same ink and hand as the main text.
by both appear to combine the old part one on structural and architectural systems with the historical survey in part three, although they could also be seen as a new version of the latter. Both notetakers were fairly successful in recording the overall structure of the lectures, although this system appears to be less intricate and complex than previously, with fewer numbered subheads. The introduction states that the discussion of the Greek system will incorporate an historical overview, now using five periods rather than four: 1. oldest Greek school, 2. Aegina-Italic, 3. Attic from the time of Pericles; 4. Alexandrian, 5. Asiatic Greek, Roman, and Italian. The main text then presents an introductory overview very similar to that provided by the old part one, but now also tracing the successive historical stages of the structural system established by the temple portico and its subsequent application by the Romans and modern Italians to the arches and vaults of their structural system. There is also greater, and more explicit, emphasis on the proportions of individual elements. Rather than drawings, both have tables showing the differing proportions of the elements of the orders in the different schools.

At the same time, Stier was also working on the other re-casting of the old material, this time more thoroughly and under a version of the new title he submitted for approval in 1848, ‘Aesthetics and history of classical architecture among the ancients.’ A bound manuscript with the title ‘Sketch for a general aesthetics of architecture’ (Entwurf zu einer Aesthetik der Baukunst) bears the date, in Stier’s hand, ‘Easter 43’ and his notation that this course was repeated, albeit partially, in 1844/45. The manuscript is paginated, but it was assembled from a mix of fragments in different hands each with its own original pagination. There are extensive notations and corrections in Wilhelm’s hand at the start, as well as several notations that sections had been transcribed (abgeschrieben). Some of these transcriptions, unbound and in different hands, are grouped together along with two copied from the repetition in 1844/45. Like the other ‘new’ course from this period, this one covered much the same material as the earlier ‘Lectures’. There is a

545 The main heads from the more complete of the two (II.M.37), with obvious errors corrected, gives a sense of what was covered: (Introduction) Das Construktivensystem, welches von den Griechen ausgeht; Säulenordnung; Kunstepochen bei der Auffassung des Portikus (Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, Etruscan/Tuscan); Proportions-Systeme; Behandlung der Form; Größenklassen der architektonischen Glieder innerhalb der Gesimse der Ordnungen überhaupt; Grundsatz für die Schönheit der Formen; Modulmaß; Spezielle Darstellung der alten Säulenordnungen mit Rücksicht auf die wichtigsten Kunstepochen und Schulen und mit Rücksicht auf den bezeichnete drei Proportions-Systeme; Hauptverhältnisse der Capitale; Glieder Verhältnisse; Constructionen und Formen der Decken der Portiken; Architektonische Auffassung überwölbter Stützen-Systeme, Bogenstellungen; Architektur-Formen bei Thüren und Fenstern

546 AmTUB II.M.90.

547 AmTUB II.M.85.
definite shift of emphasis toward discussion of proportions, in both plan and the architectural system, at a higher level of abstraction than in the previous lectures.  

Comparative history

Here it is somewhat easier to reconcile the student notes with the official course schedule, once it is recognized that the title ‘Comparative history of architecture’ was retained despite the change to a post-antique survey as mandated by Beuth and Schinkel. The official title appears on none of the student notes in the Nachlaß, which are identified by their specific content, often by semester and year, and sometimes by notetaker. Stier’s plan for a new curriculum submitted in April 1848 provides a retrospective overview of how he had taught the course over the years. Information about the earliest iterations, 1834/35 through 1839/40, is provided by his annotations on the student manuscripts and the manuscripts themselves, with less information available for the years leading up to the reform of 1848.

In his plan for that reform, Stier explained why he wished to divide up this course, still called ‘Comparative history.’ It had proven completely impossible to cover all the centuries since Constantine in a single eight-hour course without becoming uselessly superficial. In the interest of thoroughness and practicality, he had for a time limited the material covered. He omitted Islamic architecture entirely; discussed only churches in the Middle Ages, as the buildings most relevant to the present; and tried to include as much of the Italian art period as possible. Eventually he found it necessary to alternate between medieval church architecture one year and the Italian art period the next. He had hoped that the students would exchange notebooks, but this had happened only rarely. A review of the students’ notes would show, he stated, that even with this measure he could not cover the material fully, and so he asked to increase the classroom hours to twelve, or six for each period, effectively creating two separate courses. Five days later Stier submitted a request, with the same justification, to offer a three-hour course on the first half of

548 The main heads can be reconstructed as follows from the two manuscripts; the second is less complete, ending in the middle of the section on architectural members. Bauwerke unter dem Gesichtspunkt einer Kunstform; Geräumigkeit, ästhetischen Großenmaße, der realen Größe; Aesthetische Proportion od. Symmetrie auch Ebenmaas, insonderheit in Beziehung auf die Formen von innern Räumen, von Öffnungen und von Baumassen; Künstlerisches Detail der Bauwerke, Architektur und Schmucksystem; Architectonische Glieder; Einfassungen der Fenster, Thüren, Nischen etc., und Umrahmungen überhaupt; Anderweitige Elemente für eine ästhetische Ausbildung der Bauwerke (articulation of wall surfaces with architectural elements, painted, sculptural, or mosaic decoration); Von der Schönheitslinien.

549 GStAPK I. HA Rep. 93B Ministerium für öffentliche Arbeiten, Nr. 32, f. 140v-141v.
the Italian art period (to c. 1650) in the current summer semester. This request was quickly approved by director Pommer-Esche.\footnote{GStAPK I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. III, Nr. 11, Bd. 5, f. 17-19, 20.}

This account is confirmed and expanded by the student notes and the notations Stier made on them, probably in the late 1830s. The notations are found either on individual manuscripts or in lists made on two of them.\footnote{AmTUB II.M.50 (Middle Ages, 1836/37), inside cover; II.M.48.B (Italian art period, 1837/38), first page.} Because Stier commented on both his own lectures and the notes, the notations provide a narrative of how the course took shape in its first six years. For the years after 1841/42 there are few student notes and almost no explanatory notations. As with the monuments course, some students bound the main sections individually. Some students did bind the two together, but only one of these full manuscripts survives,\footnote{AmTUB II.M.47, 1836/37 or later.} while several others were cut up by Wilhelm and Caroline.

For the first iteration of the course in 1834/35 there is much information, but no intact notes or traceable fragments. Writing to Vagedes in early 1835, shortly after the winter semester ended, Stier was quite sanguine about how well the course had gone. He had spent the winter alone, buried under piles of paper as he worked to understand the architecture of the Middle Ages, forging a new path that allowed him to see beyond the specifics and grasp the whole. The direct observation made possible by the trip in 1834 had been highly beneficial, given the poor state of current scholarship. He had been able to show his students all the driving force and manifestations of this fantastic and deranged art (diese ganze phantastische und verwirrte Kunst) and to lead them step by step through all its stages, through the ‘Byzantine’ and ‘Germanic’ periods. Understanding the Italian art schools had also been difficult. He had come to realize that he had not seen as much in Italy as he should have, and only now understood what he needed to look at and how. He had divided this period into eighteen different tendencies (Richtungen). This gave his young friends an overview that would facilitate further study.\footnote{AmTUB II.M.68, Stier to Vagedes, 1835, 3-4.}

Stier also described to Vagedes two key insights gained from preparing this course which subsequently informed his treatment of the material, as demonstrated by the student notes. First, Stier had come to see that art, even if broadly dependent on time, has a life-thread all its own, from which alone history can be read. The belief systems of men have little impact on art, and it is the forms themselves that constrain or inspire the souls of artists. The next year he planned to conceive general history yet more exactly (noch schärfer), and in the student notes for later years the historical introductions are very concise. Second, in a lecture at the local Kunstverein, he had shown the dependence of northern medieval art on the Romans, which he hoped would provide a firmer foundation for future scholarship, moving it away
from the current fantastic and sentimental enthusiasm (Schwärmerei). This, too, is evident as a guiding theme in his treatment of medieval architecture.

In his later notations, however, he found the first iteration of 1834/35 very inadequate (sehr mangelhaft). Studies on the trip in 1834 had laid the first foundation for a deeper and more sound view of the Middle Ages, and that winter he had been intensely but uncertainly engaged in organizing these studies and developing them by consulting collections of prints (Kupferwerke). He had not mastered the material, nor had he found a complete scholarly path through what he called ‘this labyrinth’. The Italian art period had hardly figured in his lectures at all. The next year, 1835/36, the course had improved, with the medieval system of structure and form now fully developed. After that, however, it had fallen apart. The historical survey for both the Middle Ages and the Italian art period had been exceedingly meager (äußerst dürftig), with the latter consisting only of a list of the most important masters.554

Stier recorded that for 1834/35 he had obtained at least one student notebook and cut it up; for 1835/36 he had two, one that had been cut up and one presumably left intact. Both sets of cut-up pieces had been organized ‘in the black folders for the system of structure and form of the Middle Ages’ (in den schwarzen Mappen für das System d. Constr. und Formen d. Mittelalt.). These folders contained many working notes (Studierzettel) from 1834/35 and later.555 At some later time, these folders were incorporated into eight newer folders for most of the post-antique periods that now contain an immense amount of manuscript material produced between 1834 and the mid-1850s. I have not attempted to analyze this material systematically. It ranges widely from fragments of student notes to a variety of working notes (lists of monuments, reading notes), and drafts for both lectures and publications. Caroline’s hand is evident throughout, including on many different kinds of working notes, indicating that she assisted Wilhelm in the basic research for the new course.556 The presumably intact notebook mentioned by Stier cannot be identified with any of the intact student manuscripts in the Nachlaß.

For 1836/37 Stier obtained at least two notebooks. One survives as an intact Reinschrift containing only the medieval portion, with no drawings but figure

554 AmTUB II.M.50 (Middle Ages, 1836/37), notation on the inside cover.
555 AmTUB II.M.50 (Middle Ages, 1836/37), notation on the inside cover.
numbers for separate illustrations. He described this as mostly complete, but
cursory in the section on early Christian architecture in Italy.\textsuperscript{557} It may be the one he
listed elsewhere as produced by Erbkam and including a complete introduction but
nothing for the Italian art period.\textsuperscript{558} The other, also a \textit{Reinschrift} without drawings,
likely contained both the medieval and later portions, but it was cut up. Only a
short fragment survives for part of the Italian art period, with Stier’s notation that
this was his first attempt at a scholarly treatment (\textit{wissenschaftliche Behandlung}) of the
Italian building style. The hand is similar to but not the same as in the medieval
portion from this year.\textsuperscript{559} Possibly from this year or later is an intact manuscript in a
version of Fischer’s abbreviation system with many slightly awkward drawings
throughout.\textsuperscript{560} It bears no date or other identifying information.

Stier did not comment on the lectures he delivered in 1837/38 or 1838/39,
even though he had student manuscripts for both. For 1837/38 there is another
bound manuscript for the medieval period, possibly consisting of two separate
\textit{Reinschriften} (by different hands), and lacking drawings.\textsuperscript{561} It covers essentially the
same material as the notes for the previous year. For the Italian art period there are
also two fragments bound together, both \textit{Reinschriften} without drawings, in similar
but different hands with very different heading styles.\textsuperscript{562} For 1838/39 Stier had
another fragment for the Italian art period that he identified as from von Arnim’s
notes; he recorded here that he had no notes for the Middle Ages for this year.\textsuperscript{563}

The notes for 1839/40 are dispersed across three separate fragments, by more
than one hand, of transcriptions after notes mostly by Benda, but also another
notetaker named Roeder. All are identified by semester and year, and they cover the
Middle Ages and part of the Italian art period. Stier recorded that in this year he had
given his best lecture on medieval architecture in Germany, and that the
introductory overviews should be checked against his study notes (\textit{Studierzettel}).\textsuperscript{564}

For 1840/41 there are apparently no notes, and the situation for 1841/42 and
after is less than certain. The bound \textit{Reinschrift} copied by one Schalscha after
Scholz’s notes, mentioned above, covers part of the Italian art period. Despite the
apparently poor quality of these notes, Stier found them worthwhile enough to

\textsuperscript{557} AmTUB II.M.50, notation on first page of text.
\textsuperscript{558} AmTUB II.M.48.B (Italian art period, 1837/38), first page.
\textsuperscript{559} AmTUB II.M.48.A. The fragment retains the original pagination, which runs from 189 to
216.
\textsuperscript{560} AmTUB II.M.47.
\textsuperscript{561} AmTUB II.M.51.
\textsuperscript{562} AM TUB II.M.48.B, II.M.48.C. The first ends in mid-sentence, and the second picks up
again at the end of that same section.
\textsuperscript{563} AmTUB II.M.80.N, notation on first page.
\textsuperscript{564} AmTUB II.M.49 (Middle Ages through ‘Romanisch’); II.M.43 (‘Germanic’); II.M.55.A
(Italian art period). The notetakers are listed on each, with Benda appearing most frequently.
The entry in the list on II.M.48.B includes another student, Sommer, and the comments on
the content.
annotate extensively. Also after Scholz is a transcription by Caroline of sections on the Middle Ages. It is undated, but likely from either the same semester or close to it as the bound Reinschrift by Schalscha. As noted above it has many drawings on tracing paper pasted in. The notes from 1842/43 follow the same organization, but the smaller and less numerous fragments from subsequent years suggest that Stier was reorganizing this course, as he had also begun doing for the ‘Lectures on ancient monuments.

A closer look at the content of the student notes for the years 1836/37 to 1842/43, confirms that any explicit ‘comparative’ discussion was indeed omitted and that the course mostly followed the overall chronological sequence and subsidiary sections established by the ‘Sketch of a plan.’ The notes also confirm Stier’s statement in 1848 that he had compressed the material by omitting the architecture of the Arabs, although it usually received a brief mention in the introduction, as a separate, different architectural tradition arising after the fall of Rome. In the Middle Ages Stier covered only churches, while in the Italian art period he covered both churches and domestic buildings. It is unclear when he began alternating between the two periods.

In 1836/37, and likely in the preceding two years, Stier reduced the European Middle Ages to four periods from the five in the ‘Sketch of a plan’: 1. Early Christian to Charlemagne (311-768), 2. Charlemagne to the Pope Gregory VII (768-1073), 3. Pope Gregory and the first Crusade to Holy Roman Emperor Friedrich II (1073 to ca. 1220), 4. 1220 to the fifteenth century in Italy, the sixteenth century in northern Europe. Although general history structures the chronology, the historical introductions are minimal and emphasis falls on tracing artistic development that centers on the ceiling, or the means used to span a large space, and changes in the use of the Greco-Roman architectural forms. The developmental trajectory is a slow rise from the first period with its retention but also poor imitation of Roman forms and use of wooden beams rather than vaults. The second and third periods make more and better use of vaults, and by the end of the third a fully independent conception of architectural forms is achieved. In the fourth period this degenerates into obsolescence, preparing the way for the return to proper antique forms.

565 AmTUB II.M.77.C. The text identifying it as a Reinschrift after Scholz is quoted above. The original binding is partly missing.
566 AmTUB II.M.77.A, II.M.77.B. This combines the early period through Romanesque into one section. As noted above, it includes many drawings on tracing paper pasted in.
567 AmTUB II.M.45 (1842/43); II.M.10.B (1842/43); II.M.55.B and II.M.55C (1843/44); II.M.10.E (1845/46).
568 AmTUB II.M.50, unpaginated, end of introduction (mostly cut out after the main heading); TUB II.M.49, II.M.47, II.M.77 unpaginated, end of introduction. The first two also include a reference to the Chinese as the only people to follow a fully independent Kunstsystem, albeit of the lowest value with no great building types.
569 AmTUB II.M.50, each period is briefly summed up at the end of the introduction.
Starting in 1837/38, Stier reduced the four periods to three: 1. Early Christian to Charlemagne, 2. Charlemagne to the mid-thirteenth century, 3. mid-thirteenth century to the fifteenth/sixteenth century. The student notes use a mix of style-labels, which probably reflects both inconsistencies in Stier’s usage and changing terminology in the advancing scholarship. In the same notebook two different terms are sometimes used for the same period, for example Romanesque (Romanisch) and Byzantine, or Germanic (Germanisch) and Gothic, although Romanesque appears more frequently than Gothic and eventually replaces Byzantine.\footnote{570 AmTUB II.M.47 (1836/37 or later) II.M.51 (1837/38), II.M.43 & 49 (1839/40); II.M.45 (1842/43).}

Stier also reconfigured the sub-sections within each chronological division, reducing them and avoiding repetition, although not quite in the way Schinkel had suggested. Focusing on only one building type, churches, made a separate section on typologies largely superfluous. Stier condensed the material by incorporating the defining elements of the type, such as plan forms and function, into the section on the structural and architectural system. Thus for each chronological division he usually had three sections: a very short introduction, general principles or typical forms (in plan, elevation, section, and details, including windows and doors), and a survey of monuments, often divided geographically.

Stier adopted a similar strategy for the Italian art period, which he defined as a single unit stretching from the start of the fifteenth century to his own day. His lectures had two main divisions rather than the ten set forth in the ‘Sketch of a plan’, condensing and cutting repetition even more extensively than Schinkel had recommended. The first section was an introduction presenting very brief historical background and the general principles of the structural and architectural system along with those for the two building types he focused on, churches and palaces, as seen in plan, elevation, and details. The second was an historical overview divided into chronological subsections that increased in number and extent as he expanded his own knowledge from year to year. Within these subsections he presented key architects and their buildings in roughly chronological order. Stier regarded the two parts as separate entities, and there is no surviving manuscript that includes both. On Schalscha’s \textit{Reinschrift} after Scholz for 1841/42, he noted that the introduction to the Italian art period constituted a section unto itself and was not included in this notebook.\footnote{571 AmTUB II.M.77, notation on first page.}

The introduction is preserved in just three manuscripts, the intact one from 1836/37 or later, von Arnim’s notes from 1838/39, and Benda’s from 1839/40.\footnote{572 AmTUB II.M.47, II.M.80.N, II.M.55.A.}

Benda’s is the most complete, but the content is otherwise essentially the same. The initial section is very brief, barely mentioning social factors that accompanied and promoted changes in architectural style, which Stier defined primarily in terms of engagement with the structural and especially the architectural systems of the
ancients. This engagement began in Italy and spread to northern Europe. All subsequent stages were further developments of this, hence the terms Italian art period and Italian (building) style. He traces a trajectory from first beginnings in the fifteenth century, through perfection and then decline in the sixteenth, to full-blown decadence in the seventeenth by masters he calls ‘Mannerists’. Mirroring the situation at the end of the Middle Ages, this degeneracy led to a return to ancient purity beginning in the mid-eighteenth century and promoted by new scholarly study of ancient architecture. Stier acknowledged the French use of the term Renaissance, which he translated as ‘the rebirth of the art of the ancients’ (Wiedergeburt der Kunst der Alten) and connected only to the first phase of this developmental trajectory.

Stier introduced his discussion of the two primary building types by stating that churches became less important than domestic structures, primarily palaces, in part due to social changes, including the declining importance of religion in government and society. Still, the main reason lay in the art-system itself, which was more suited to palaces than to churches. The latter remained bound to the functions and forms of the Middle Ages and no longer set the direction for the new style. This direction also included the development of many more new secular building types, such as theaters, hospitals, and schools. In his discussion of churches, Stier followed the format established for the Middle Ages. In the section on palaces he focused on facades, employing organizing categories established in his first monuments course: horizontal and vertical articulation, window and door frames, decorative handling of wall surfaces.

The historical overview survives in several manuscripts, starting with one from 1836/37, which Stier identified as his first scholarly treatment of the material. It begins with a main heading numbered two, suggesting that the missing first heading and text were probably the general introduction. At this stage Stier had prepared only the first three sub-periods of whole Italian art period. Each is introduced with very brief synoptic description, followed by an overview of prominent architects and their buildings, both churches and palaces. The first period is the initial engagement with Roman models, with just three masters: Brunelleschi, Alberti, and Michelozzo. In the second period are architects who most fully adopted the Roman style and brought forth the freest and best proportions and forms, namely Bramante, Peruzzi, Sangallo, and Vignola, with the founders of the Lombard style in northern Italy as a separate subsection. In the third period are those masters who departed from the perfection achieved in the second period and anticipated the decline precipitated by the ‘Mannerists’ in the seventeenth century. There is some chronological overlap with the second period, as this group begins with Michelangelo and Palladio and concludes with Borromini. Three seventeenth-century architects, Maderno, Borromini, and Bernini, appear with no separate

573 AmTUB II.M.80.N ends at the start of the section on palaces.
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heading (possibly omitted by the notetaker). A single concluding paragraph sums up the mid-eighteenth century return to antiquity and the newfound perfection achieved by Schinkel.

The next year, 1837/38, Stier expanded the number of chronological subdivisions and masters for full coverage of the whole Italian art period from Brunelleschi to Schinkel, as recorded in the two manuscript fragments bound together for this year. The first includes an introduction that outlines three main periods: 1. Fifteenth and sixteenth century, with the greatest masters and best works; 2. Seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth century, the ‘Mannerists’ with their tasteless transformation and exaggeration of ancient forms; 3. Mid-eighteenth century to the present, a gradual return to pure ancient forms supported by scholarly study and publication. The first fragment covers the first period, broken down into four tendencies (Richtungen) that slightly re-order the four divisions from the year before: 1. Fourteen architects from Brunelleschi to Sangallo (the notetaker omitted the subsection head) 2. Masters who applied ancient forms most purely, Bramante, Peruzzi, Raphael; 3. Lombard school, with masters presented as a simple list followed by discussion of key buildings; 4. Pre-mannerists, 29 architects from c. 1500 to c. 1600, including Michelangelo, Palladio, Vignola, and Scamozzi. It ends with an unnumbered section on the Italian building style outside Italy that breaks off in mid-sentence and resumes in about the same place in the second fragment.

This continues with an unnumbered section on the ‘Mannerists’, which consists of an introduction and a survey (without numbered headings) of architects and buildings from 1600 to 1750 in Italy, from 1650 to 1750 in the north. The fragment ends with a section on the ‘Italian Building Style in its Newest Direction’. This consists of an introduction that incorporates architects and buildings in France with no heading and then separate sections for Italy, England, and Germany. In this final section, where scholarship played a role in the development of the new stylistic direction, Stier included brief references to publications on architecture and its history. In the ‘Sketch’ there were separate sections for textual sources.

The third Reinschrift of the historical overview, by Schalscha after Scholz in 1841/42, is inconsistent and incomplete in capturing Stier’s headings, but it shows that Stier maintained the same overall organization. Rather than three main periods with subdivisions, it presents five periods: 1. Beginnings; 2. Perfection; 3. Lombards; 4. Pre-Mannerists; 5. 1750 to the present, subdivided into 1. 1750-1815, 2. 1815 to the present. The text demonstrates a significant expansion in the amount of material covered, especially in the final period, where Stier expanded the discussion of relevant texts on architecture.

576 AmTUB II.M.48.C, unpaginated. This notetaker was much less consistent in applying Stier’s hierarchical headings.
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By examining the student notes in correlation with Stier’s own notations and the documentation for his career at the architecture academy it has been possible to demonstrate how he organized his surveys of architectural history between 1828 and 1848 and the categories and rubrics he employed. This is not quite a ‘virtual text’ of his lectures, but it does provide a good sense of the historical instruction Stier provided to his students during these two decades. While it remains an open question whether it would be possible, or even worthwhile, to reconstruct something closer to the ‘virtual text’ described by Janssen, the overview offered here provides a basis for further analysis and contextualization of Stier’s approach to architectural history.

Conclusion

The wealth of documentation for Stier’s life shows that he was in many ways a singular figure, one whose career was perhaps defined as much by his own failings as the circumstances in which he found himself. At the same time, situating Stier’s individual life within the tortuous history of the architecture academy has shown that the development of architectural history as an academic subject in Berlin was shaped by a complex interplay of administrative priorities, chance, and a few strong personalities. Besides Stier himself, these included Hirt, Beuth, and Schinkel, as well as ministers Schuckmann, Altenstein, and von Bülow.

In the years from the founding of the Bauakademie in 1799 to Stier’s appointment in 1828 the place of architectural history in the institution’s mostly practical curriculum was uncertain and subject to the vicissitudes of budgets and personalities. The directorate never succeeded in forcing Hirt to revise his ‘critical’ history, and they were never able to hire a replacement to teach the more basic, foundational course they deemed appropriate. Architectural history thus remained an element in hybrid courses taught by Gentz and Rabe, which combined history with the study of building types and, at least sometimes, design exercises. There it remained through successive minor reforms and even the final separation of the Bauakademie from the Akademie der Künste. Merely mentioned in most earlier curriculum drafts, architectural history received its fullest articulation in Schinkel’s curriculum for ‘aesthetic’ architecture at the AdK. While this was never fully implemented, his ideas about the place of architectural history in the training of architects were likely conveyed to Stier when the two met in Rome, and they appear to have informed Stier’s expansion of the historical lectures in his design studio into a separate history course.

That Stier could do this without formal or academic training as a historian is further evidence for the state of architectural history in the early nineteenth century. Having missed, perhaps happily so, Hirt’s problematic ‘Critical history’ at the Bauakademie, Stier gained his subject knowledge and professional skills from extended interaction with mentors and friends, travel, and self-study. As he noted,
he was exposed to historical treatises and early works of architectural history in Vagedes’s library, while architectural history as such was not taught in Paris. In Rome he supplemented the usual independent study of ancient and modern monuments with work for Hittorff, through which he gained not only practical skills in the study of buildings on site, but also an appreciation for and familiarity with periods and styles beyond the classical. Just as important was his close association with the historian and diplomat Bunsen, from whom he likely gained both an understanding of history and a tortured prose style.

Stier’s nearly three-decade career at the Bauakademie and Allgemeine Bauschule is richly documented in official documents, professional and private correspondence, and a uniquely extensive collection of student notebooks. Together these show that the development of his architectural history courses resulted from a mix of chance, administrative direction, and his own independent work. Initially appointed to fill a gap in the curriculum, he was allowed the freedom to construct his first courses as he went, drawing on his experience in Italy and the ideal curriculum he had submitted to Schinkel. In the reform of 1831-32 his teaching was redirected by largely top-down administrative decisions and instructions received directly from Beuth and Schinkel in response to his ‘Sketch of a plan’ for a new ‘Comparative history’. The reform of 1848 was a more consultative process in which Stier played a large role, although the final changes to his courses resulted from sparsely documented consultations among the faculty and decisions by the directorate and the commerce ministry. Throughout, his career was shaped, and in some way hindered, by the conflicting imperatives that informed how architectural history fared in the successive reforms of the independent architecture academy, namely the recurring tension between practical training and aesthetic or artistic concerns, between professional preparation and scientific or academic research. It is hard to know how Stier’s career might have turned out had he been appointed to the Akademie der Künste, for which his state stipend in Rome was to have prepared him. It is also hard to gauge how much his failure publish his planned survey of architectural history was due to his odd personality and lack of formal training as a scholar rather than lack of institutional support for his research.

Aside from a few polemical articles and his work for Hittorff, Stier’s main contribution to the development of architectural history in the nineteenth century lies in his highly successful teaching career. According to Lübke, Stier had an electrifying lecture style, one that made the monuments of the past come alive. He inspired great devotion in his students, who assembled before his house to sing him songs on his birthday each year. With a better understanding of the mass of student notes in the Nachlaß, gained with the aid of textual scholarship, it is now possible to outline in some detail what the students were taught in the first two decades of Stier’s career. He must have been a gifted lecturer indeed to spark such interest with the obsessively detailed and complex material presented in the ‘Sketch of a plan for a comparative history of architecture’ submitted to Beuth and Schinkel in 1834. This
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manuscript is the central document for any examination of Stier’s teaching. Correlated with the narrative of Stier’s career, his own initial lecture texts, and the student notes, it makes it possible to trace how his courses developed between 1828 and 1848. The account presented here focuses the big picture, so to speak, leaving further analysis for subsequent investigations.

Indeed, there are many questions that can be pursued, now that the documents have been sorted through and the trajectory of Stier’s career established. These mostly concern the relation of that career, and specifically his teaching, to the larger field of art and architectural history in the period. A comparison of Stier’s courses with Hirt’s would show similarities but also differences, especially in the waning reliance on Vitruvius and the move toward a single chronological but primarily formalist, as opposed to contextualist, survey and away from dual overlapping typological and historical surveys. Similarly, much work remains to be done to situate Stier in the larger architectural, art historical, and historical discourses of his time.
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Appendix One
Curricula for the Akademie der Künste and Bauakademie, 1820s

Karl Friedrich Schinkel
Lehrplan für die Baukunst bei der Akademie der Künste
Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium, Ve, Sekt. 17, Tit. I, Nr. 3, Bd. 1, f. 196v-201v

Unterrichts Abtheilungen
I. Vollständige geometrische und stereometrische Projektions-Lehre, mit Rücksicht auf Steinschnitt, auf der Tafel vorgetragen

II. Lehre der Säulen-Ordnungen nach Vitruv, vergleichend mit den Monumenten, praktisch an der Tafel vorgetragen.

Hieran schließt sich die Übung im architektonischen Schönzeichnen, durch Darstellung ganzer Gebäude, die Vorbilder werden aus den Monumenten gewählt.

Anmerkung
Die Zeichnung geht besonders auf Präcision der linearischen Zeichnung, auf Leichtigkeit im Ausdruck der mit Schatten und Licht auszuführenden architektonischen Zeichnungen, auf Verstand und Geschmack in der Behandlung damit der Künstler bewahrt werde vor einer gewissen ängstlichen, zeitraubenden Manier, welche häufig im Gange ist.

III. Die Projection in ihrem ganzen Umfange zwecklich an der Tafel vorzutragen. Die Gegenstände an denen diese Wissenschaft geübt wird sind aus den Monumenten des Alterthums zu wählen.

IV. Allgemeine Theorie der Baukunst
a) Geschichte der Constructionen vom Alterthum bis auf die neue Zeit


Die Resultate für die Verhältnisse de Constructions-Theile aller Art, an sich und untereinander, werden nach den Erfahrungen der bestehenden wichtigsten Bauwerken aufgeführt und zugleich verglichen mit den Resultaten der Calcüle vorzüglicher Mathematiker.
Anmerkung
Die beiden Abtheilungen a und b, wenn gleich in verschiedenen Stunden und von verschiedenen Lehrern gelehrt, schreiten gleichmäßig nebeneinander fort.

c) die Lehre der bey Bau-Constructionen in Anwendung zu bringenden Maschinen, praktisch an der Tafel gelehrt.

Die Gestalt, das Maaß und Verhältniß, die Anwendung um die Wirkung der Maschinen wird entwickelt.

V. Allgemeine Geschichte der Baukunst
a. Geschichte der Gebäude nach ihrem verschiedenen Bestimmungen bis auf die neue Zeit.

b. Vollständige Entwicklung und Darstellung der Hauptgebäude bis auf die neue Zeit, praktisch an der Tafel gelehrt.

Anmerkung
Die beiden Abtheilungen a und b schreiten gleichmäßig und in steter Beziehung auf einander so wohl als auf dem Cursus IV nebeneinander fort.

VI. Lehre von den Bau-Verzierungen durch Sculptur und Malerei.
 a) Übung und Kenntnißnahme durch Zeichnung von den vorzüglichsten Verzierungen der Plastik an den Monumenten, woran sich ein Grad der Übung im Zeichnen des menschlichen Körpers, besonders nach dem Canon des griechischen Alterthums anschließt.
 b) Übung im Modelliren auf einem gewissen Grad, in Beziehung aller bei a berührten Punkte.
 c) Übung und Kenntnißnahme durch Zeichnung und Färbung von den vorzüglichsten Verzierungen der Bauwerke durch Mahlerei.

VII. Über den Styl in der Baukunst, zusammenhängend mit der Geschichte der, mit der Baukunst in nährer Verbindung stehenden Künste, vorgetragen.

VIII. Übung im Entwerfen von Bauplänen nach gegebenen Bedingungen, wodurch erst alle die in den 7 vorhergehenden Abtheilungen des Unterrichts erlangten Kenntnisse und Fertigkeiten ein Eigenthum des Künstlers werden und ihm zu einem Künstler machen. Nach ausgegebenen Programmen werden die Aufgaben unter Aufsicht der Lehrer bearbeitet. Alle Vierteljahre werden kleine, alle Jahr große Preis-Aufgaben gelöst, die ersten bestehen in leichten Zeichnungen welche den Gegenstand bis auf einem gewissen Grad vollständig, unter den Augen des Lehrers entwickelt, -- die zweiten bestehen in vollständig ausgeführten sauber gezeichneten
Plänen, zu deren Bestimmung der Studirende sich alle Hülfsmittel bedienen kann, jedoch wird zuvor, unter den Augen der Lehrer, den Entwurf zu dieser Bestimmung ohne Hilfe bewirkt und streng darauf gehalten, daß die vollständige Bearbeitung nicht von der ersten Skizze abweiche, weshalb zur Controlle, eine genaue Durchzeichnung derselben bei dem Archive bleibt.

Die kleinen und großen Preis-Bearbeitungen werden mit den, von einer, aus dem Senate der Academie, gewählten Commission abgefassten Erkenntniss, öffentlich ausgestellt.

Der große Preis in einer reichlichen Unterstützung für eine mehrjährige Kunstreise.

IX. Übung in praktischer Bau-Ausführung durch Anstellung bei vorzüglichen öffentlichen Bauten, unter Leitung von Architekten, die entweder selbst academische Lehrer sind oder mit solchen, in Beziehung auf die Leitung der Studirenden sich in Verbindung setzen.

Bemerkungen für die Ausführung des beiliegenden Lehrplans

Dauer des Studiums
Unter drei Jahr sind die Kenntnisse und Fertigkeiten, welche der anliegende Lehrplan bei den Studirenden bezweckt, nicht zu erreichen.

Im ersten Jahr würden nur die Materien I, II, III, bearbeitet, wobei demselben die Zeit bleibt die Studie der Statikm Mathematik, Hydrostatik und Hydraulik zu verfolgen, über welche er ein Attest der Reife nöthig hat, um die Baustudien auf der Academie der Künste fortzusetzen (wie solches ad c in der Einleitung des beiliegenderes Lehrplans vorgeschrieben.)

Im zweiten Jahre würden die Materien IV, V, VI, VIII, von dem Studirenden bearbeitet.

Im dritten Jahre wäre die ganze Zeit mit den Übungen VIII und IX auszufüllen.

Lehrer für die Abtheilungen des Unterrichts
Die Matieren I.II.III. verlangen in zweien nebeneinander laufenden Cursen einen Hauptlehrer, welcher zu Unterstützung und Anweisung im practischen schönen Zeichnen zwei Gehülfen haben muß.

Hr. Hummel als Hauptlehrer
Hr. Archi. Zielke Hr. Archi Menzel als Gehülfe
Die Materien IV., V. erfordern drei Lehrer
Den ersten für den antiquarisch-theoretischen Theil
Die beiden andern für den praktischen Theil der an der Tafel unterrichtet wird.

Für die beiden letzteren sind wegen der großen Wichtigkeit der Materie zwei Hülfsarbeiter, theils um während des Unterrichts, beim Aufstellung der Constructionen den Studirenden hülfreiche Hand zu leisten und auf die Richtigkeit ihres Verstehens zu wachen, theils um die Lehrer zu unterstützen bei Anfertigung der für den Vortrag nöthigen Original-Blätter.

Hr Hofrath Hirt für den ersten Theil
Hr Prof. Rabe & Architekt Constenoble-x für den zweiten Theil
Hr Bau-Conducteur Bürde-x and Beckmann-x als Hülfesarbeiter

Die Materie VI. erfordert
zwei Lehrer, den ersten fürs Zeichnen, den zweiten fürs Modellieren

Hr Architekt Mauck fürs erste
Hr. Prof. Wickmann fürs zweite

Die Matirie VII. erfordert einen Lehrer

Herr Prof. Toelken

Die Materie VIII. erfordert eine gemeinschaftliche Aufsicht und Leitung durch mehrere Lehrer mit Zuziehung von Mitgliedern des Senats der Academie.


Bemerkung
Die hierauf mit einem x bezeichneten Lehrer würden anzustellen seyn. Denen andern wäre, bei vergrößerten Geschäft, welches der Lehrplan ihnen zuteil, eine bessere Stellung *** ihres Gehaltes zu geben.

Es scheint angemessener bei dem festbestimmten Lehrplan, daß kein Honorar für den einzelnen Cursus gezahlt wird, sodann der Beitrag für die gesammten Studien
in einer allgemeinen Casse kommen. Bei der Vollständigkeit des Unterrichts darf man ein ansehnliches Studien-Geld annehmen.

Proposed Curricula for Akademie der Künste and Bauakademie, 5 December 1823
GStAPK I. HA Rep 89 Geheimes Zivilkabinett, jüngere Periode, Nr. 20399, Bausachen, f. 4-5
Enclosures to the letter from Altenstein and von Bülow to Friedrich Wilhelm III

Anlage A
Gegenstände des Unterrichts in der höheren Bau-Kunst und dem ästhetischen Theile derselben, welcher an der Academie der Künste zu verbinden ist.

1. Lehre der Säulenordnungen, nach Vitruv, vergleichend mit den Monumenten vorgetragen, woran sich die Uebung im architektonischen Schönzeichnen schließt

2. Die Perspective und Schattenlehre

3. Allgemeine Theorie der Baukunst
   a. Geschichte der Konstruktion
   b. Entwicklung der Konstruktionen, Kenntniss vom Material, Resultate für die Verhältniße der Konstructions-Theile; Erfahrungen an den wichtigsten Bauwerken gemacht und verglichen mit den Resultaten der Calcule vorzüglicher Mathematiker
   c. Lehre der bey Bau-Konstruktionen in Anwendung kommenden Maschinen

4. Allgemeine Geschichte der Baukunst
   a. Geschichte der Gebäude nach ihren verschiedenen Bestimmungen bis auf die neure Zeit
   b. Vollständige Entwicklung und Darstellung der Hauptgebäude

5. Lehre von den Bauverzierungen durch Sculptur und Malerei
   a. Uebung und Kenntnissnahme durch Zeichnung der vorzüglichsten Verzierungen der Plastik an den Monumenten, woran isich im Grade der Uebung im Zeichen des menschlichen Körpers nach dem Kanon des griechischen Alterthums anschließt
   b. Uebung in Modellieren auf einem gewissen Grade in Beziehung der ad. A. berührten Periode
   c. Uebung und Kenntnissnahme durch Zeichnung und Färbung von den vorzüglichsten Verzierungen der Bauwerken durch Malerei
6. Ueber den Styl in der Baukunst und den damit in Verbindung stehenden schönen Künste

Anlage B

1. Arithmetik, Geometrie, Trigonometrie, Analysis nebst beschreibender Geometrie

2. Statik, Hydrostatik, Mechanik fester Körper und Hydraulik

3. Maschinenlehre und Maschinenberechnung

4. Naturlehre und Bau-Physik

5. Practische Geometrie, Feldmesskunst und Nivellieren

6. Allgemeine Baulehre, Arbeiten des Zimmermans, Mauerers, Steinmetzen, Schloßers u. s. w.

7. Von den städtischen und landwirtschaftlichen Gebäuden

8. Straßen-, Brücken-, Kanal-, und Schleusen-Bau

9. Strom-, Deich- und Strassen-Bau

10. Maschinen- und Mühlen-Bau

11. Situations-Karten-Zeichnung

12. Bau-Verzierungen

13. Architectonische und Maschinen-Zeichnung

14. Modellieren
Appendix Two
Documents for a ‘Comparative history of architecture’, 1833, Stier and Schinkel

Wilhelm Stier, ‘Skizze eines Planes zu einer vergleichenden Geschichte der Baukunst’
Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität zu Berlin, I.I.M.15

This condensed outline shows the structure of the headings and the topics covered. It simplifies Stier’s intricate system of letter sizes and forms and single and double underlining. Spelling and abbreviations have been retained. The Anmerkung and Einleitung have been transcribed directly from the manuscript. The rest has been constructed from the table of contents and the full outline that makes up the entirety of the manuscript.

Sections are color coded to show the revisions suggested by Schinkel in his report of 12 September 1833, which is given in full below:
  Sections to delete
  Sections to combine with others
  Sections to consider combining with others

SKIZZE EINES PLANES

ZU EINER

VERGLEICHENDEN GESCHICHTE

DER BAUKUNST

Bestimmt zu Vortraegen
auf der Koeniglich Preussischen Allgemeinen Bauschule

Berlin d. 1ten Septbr 1833
Wilhelm Stier

Anmerkung. In der nachfolgende Skizze eines Planes für die vergleichende Geschichte der Baukunst, ist mit der größeren Ausführlichkeit, die Baukunst der Griechen und Römer berührt worden und hiermit die Methode specieller angedeutet, nach welcher beabsichtigt wird, überhaupt eine jede Schule der Baukunst in der Darstellung zu behandeln.
Einleitung

Zweck und Ursache des Studiums der Geschichte der Baukunst, und daraus erwachsene Vortheile für die gegenwärtige Ausübung dieser Kunst. – Allgemeine Ursache der Entstehung verschiedener Baustyle und ihre wesentlichen Unterscheidungszeichen. – Der gesammte Umfang der verschiedenen Richtungen der Baukunst, dürfte unter den nachfolgend verzeichneten Abtheilungen durchaus umfaßt werden und die angedeutete Folge einer bequemen Darstellung günstig sein. – Entwicklung der Methode nach welcher ein jeder Baustyl, am bequemsten und gründlichsten aufzuführen sein dürfte.

Die Baukunst der alten Indier

I. Einleitung
II. Constructions und Architectur-System
III. Die Gebäude in ihrem allgemeinen Princip
   1) Felsbauten
   2) Bauten im Freien mit inneren Räumen
   3) Monolithbauten
IV. Bekannte Monumente

Die Baukunst der alten Aegypter

I. Einleitung
II. Constructions und Architectur-System
III. Die Gebäude in ihrem allgemeinen Princip
   1) Tempelgebäude
   2) Grabmäler
   3) Berühmte Wasserbauwerke der Aegypter
IV. Vorhandene Monumente und historische Nachrichten
   Geographische Vorkenntnisse
   1) Monumente in Nubien und Aethiopien
   2) Ober-Aegypten
   3) Mittel-Aegypten
   4) Unter-Aegypten

Bauwerke der Phoenizier und Juden

I. Einleitung
II. Bauwerke der Phoenizier
III. Bauwerke der Juden

Bauwerke der Babylonier vor Alexander dem Großen

I. Einleitung
BAUWERKE DER PERSER VOR ALEXANDER DEM GROSSEN
I. Einleitung
II. Bauwerke

BAUWERKE DER GRIECHEN UND ROEMER
I. Einleitung zum Studium der Säulenordnung
II. Constructions- und Architectursystem der griechischen Säulenordnung beim Tempelbau eingeschlossen das Dach und die Ornamente
Buch I. Einleitung zum Studium der Säulenordnungen
Buch II. Constructions und Architektursystem der griechischen Säulenordnung beim Tempelbau eingeschlossen die Ornamente und das Dach
Cap. I. Allgemeines von Säulenordnung, Ornament und Dach
  1. Elementare Entwicklung des Konstruktionssystems
  2. Konstruktion der horizontalen Steindecke nach 3 Motiven
     A. Elemente der Steindecken-Konstruktion
     B. Spezielles über Anordnung ganzer Decken nach den drei Motiven
  3. Begriff der Säulenordnungen
  4. Die architektonischen Glieder, ihr Zweck, ihr Ursprung, die Gattungen ihrer Form
  5. Ausdruck und Charakter der architektonischen Formen: Schwere und Leichtigkeit
  6. Nähere (nicht spezielle) Zergliederung des Gebälks
     a. Struktur und Form des Gebälks an der Außenseite
        1. Gebälk an der außenseite in 3 Theile zerlegt
        2. Höhenverhältniß des Gebälks zu den Säulen
        3. Verhältniß der drei Haupttheile des Gebälks zueinander
        4. Form der drei Haupttheile des Gebälks
        5. Vollkommener Steinverband des Gebälks
     b. Struktur und Form des Gebälks an der inneren Seite
        1. Der Architrav
        2. Der Fries
        3. Das Deckgesims des Frieses
  7. Struktur und Form der Deckenstützen und Wandpfeiler
     1. Säulen
        a. Der Säulenstamm
        b. Das Kapitäl
        c. Die Base
     2. Mauerpfeiler oder Anten
     3. Die freien Pfeiler
     4. Die Caryatiden, Perser und Telemonen
5. Pfeiler mit menschlichen Figuren verbunden
8. Die Unterbauten
9. Die Giebel
10. Das Dach
11. Die Ornamehte

Cap. II. Einzelnes und Ausführliches von Säulenordnung, Ornament und Dach

I. Abschnitt. Vorherrschende Formen der griechischen Säulenordnungen
   A. Die architektonischen Glieder
      I. Ursprung und Zweck, Art und Notwendigkeit der Form im Allgemeinen
      II. Form der Glieder im Einzelnen
      III. Art der Anwendung der Glieder
      IV. Gegenseitiges Hohenverhältniß
      V. Von der schicklichsten nächsten Verbindung der verschiedenen Glieder
   B. Allgemeine Betrachtungen und Regeln über das Zusammensetzen der Simswerke
   C. Die Dorische Ordnung
      Einleitung
         ¶ 1. Historisches-Ueberreste
      Cap. I. Säule mit Zubehör
         ¶ 3. Das Kapitäl
      Cap. II. Ante mit Zubehör
         ¶ 4. Schaft der Ante
         ¶ 5. Kapitäl der Ante
         ¶ 6. Base der Ante
      Cap. III. Gebälk an der Außenseite des Gebäudes
         ¶ 7. Verhältniß des Ganzen zur Säule
         ¶ 8. Der Fries
         ¶ 9. Das Kranzgesims
         ¶ 10. Das Architrav
         ¶ 11. Eigenthümliche Behandlung vom Deckgesims des Giebels
      Cap. IV. Gebälk im Inneren der Portiken
         ¶ 12. Die drei Gebälktheile im Allgemeinen
         ¶ 13. Der Architrav
         ¶ 14. Der Fries
         ¶ 15. Das Gesims
Cap V. Die Decke
   ¶ 16. Anordnung der Steinbalken unter den mannigfachen Situationen  
   ¶ 17. Anordnung und Form der Cacetten  
   ¶ 18. Specielles über die Form des Unterbaus
D. Die Ionische Ordnung
Einleitung
   ¶ 1. Historisches–Ueberreste
Cap. I. Säule mit Zubehör
   ¶ 3. Das Kapitäl  
   ¶ 4. Die Säulenbasen
Cap. II. Ante mit Zubehör
   ¶ 5. Schaft der Ante  
   ¶ 6. Gesimsartiges Anten-Kapitäl  
   ¶ 7. Anten-Kapitäl mit Schnecken  
   ¶ 8. Base der Anten
Cap. III. Gebälk an der Außenseite des Gebäudes
   ¶ 9. Anwendung von drei Gebälkformen  
   ¶ 10. Das Alt-Ionishe Gebälk  
   ¶ 11. Das Neu-Ionishe Gebälk mit Zahnschnitten  
   ¶ 12. Das Neu-Ionishe Gebälk mit Sparrenköpfen
Cap. IV. Gebälk im Inneren der Portiken
   ¶ 13. Wenige Ueberreste  
   ¶ 14. Vom Architrav  
   ¶ 15. Vom Fries  
   ¶ 16. Vom Deckgesims
Cap V. Die Decken
   ¶ 17. Geringe Ueberreste
Cap. VI. Unterbau
   ¶ 18. Specielles über die Formen des Unterbaus
E. Die Corinthisch Ordnung
Einleitung
   ¶ 1. Historisches–Ueberreste
Cap. I. Säule mit Zubehör
   ¶ 3. Das Kapitäl  
   ¶ 4. Die Säulenbasen
Cap. II. Ante mit Zubehör
	¶ 5. Der Schaft der Ante
	¶ 6. Das Kapitäl der Anten
	¶ 7. Die Base
Cap. III. Gebälk an der Außenseite des Gebäudes
	¶ 8. Verhältniß des Gebälkes zur Säule, der drei Hauptheile unter sich
	¶ 9. Specielle Beschreibung vom Kranzgesims
	¶ 10. Vom Fries
	¶ 11. Vom Architrav
Cap. IV. Gebälk im Inneren der Portiken
	¶ 12. Wenige Ueberreste
Cap. V. Die Decken
	¶ 17. Ihre Bildung vornehmlich nach römischen Ueberresten erklärt
Cap. VI. Der Unterbau
	¶ 18. Specielles über die Formen und Verhältnisse des Unterbaus

II. Abschnitt. Formen der griechischen Säulenordnungen welche gegen den Geist der Gesamtmasse von eigentümlicher Bildung sind

A. Dorische Ordnung
  1. Die Ordnung vom Monument des Thrasyllos
  2. Vom kleinen Tempel zu Paestum
  3. Vom Tempel zu Cadachio
  4. Vom Tempel zu Cora
  5. Ordnung mit Stierköpfen von Delos

B. Ionische Ordnung
  1. Die Ordnung vom Tempel am Illyssus
  2. Ordnung vom Erechtheum u. d. Tempel der Minerva Polias zu Athen
  3. Aus dem Innern des Apollotempels zu Bassae
  4. Gebälk von der inneren Thorhalle des Tempels zu Eleusis
  5. Bruchstücke vom Junotempel zu Samos
  6. Gebälk vom Tempel des Antonin und der Faustina
  7. Ordnung vom Grabe des Theron
  8. Ordnung des kleinen Tempel auf der Burg von Selinus

C. Corinthische Ordnung
  1. Griechische und römische Ueberreste mit jonischem Gebälk

D. Vermischte griechische Architecturreste, welche keiner besonderen Säulenordnung angeschlossen werden können

III. Abchnitt. Specielles über Form und Gebrauch der Pfeiler
IV. Abschnitt. Ornamente

(Die Einleitung s. oben in der Einleitung zu den Ordnungen)

Cap. 1: Die Elemente der Ornamente

¶ 1. Elemente dem Pflanzenreich nachgebildet
   a. Die Würzel
   b. Der Stengel
   c. Die Blätter
   d. Die Blumen
   e. Die Früchte
   f. Blatt und Blümenknospen, Stacheln und Dornen
   g. Die Ranken
   h. Gemischte Formen

¶ 2. Elemente der menschlichen Gestalt und dem Thierreich nachgebildet

¶ 3. Vermischte Elemente

¶ 4. Elemente rein geometrischer und stereometrischer Natur

Cap. 2: Schematismus der Ornamente

Cap. 3: Charakter der Ornamente, Regeln über das Zusammensetzen der Ornamente, und Anleitung zu ihrer Erfindung

Cap. 4: Ueber die Ausführung der Ornamente im mannigfachsten Material

Cap. 5: Historische Ueberreste der verschiedenen Ornament-Gattungen

V. Abschnitt. Das Dach speziell geschildert

Buch III: Konstruktions und Architektursystem der römischen Säulenordnung beim Tempelbau


Buch IV: Griechische und römische Säulenordnungen

A. Mit Steinsäulen und Holzgebälk
B. Durchaus von Holz
C. Unter den mannigfachsten Beziehungen, beim Bau profaner Gebäude
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Buch V: Thüren und Fenster in der griechischen und römischen Baukunst
   Geringe Anzahl von Ueberresten...
Buch VI. Das antike Gewölbesystem von constructiver und architectonischer Seite
   A. Bogenstellungen
   B. Anwendung des Gewölbes bei Decken
      (zugleich bei A u B Verbindung der Säulenordnung mit dem
      Gewölbesystem in konstruktiver und architektonischer Auffassung)
Buch VII: Einzelne Merkwürdigkeiten der griechischen u, römischen Baukunst in
   Construction und Form, Verbindung der mannichfaltigen Ueberresten,
   Nachrichten und darauf gestützte Vermuthungen
Buch VIII: Decorationssystem bei den Griechen und Römern
   I. Decorationen der Wandflächen
      A. Plastische Decorationen
      B. Musivische Decorationen
      C. Gemalte Decorationen
         1. Nachbildung plastischer und musivischer Dekoration
            durch Malerei
         2. Historische Bilder in der Decoration vorherrschend
         3. Arabesken in der Decoration vorherrschend
   II. Dekoration der Decke
      A. Plastische Decorationen
      B. Musivische Decorationen
      C. Gemalte Decorationen
   III. Decorationen der Fußboden
Buch IX: Die Kleinarchitektur
   (Die Gerätschaften im weitesten Sinne bei den Griechen und Römern)
   Einleitung: Uebersicht des Gebiets – seine wichtige ästhetische Stellung
   Cap. I. Hausgeräth
      a. Gefäße
      b. Möbel
      c. Leuchter
      d. Griffgeräth
   Cap. II. Geräthschaften bei religiösen Gebräuchen und Feiern
   Cap. III. Waffen
   Cap. IV. Geräthschaften zu vermischten Zwecken
   Cap. V. Musikalische Instrumente
   Cap. VI. Schmuck
   Cap. VIII. Fontainen Prachtbrunnen jeder Art
Buch X: Die Lehren des Vitruv über Säulenordnung, Construction, Ornament und Decoration

III. Die Gebäude bey den Griechen und Römern in ihrem allgemeinen Princip
Cap. I. Vom Bau der Tempel
A. Einleitung
B. Specielle Schilderung der Tempelbau
1. Lage der Tempel
2. Baumaterial
3. Generalplan des Tempelgebäudes
4. Cella
   a. Grundplan
   b. Wände
   c. Decke
   d. Beleuchtung
   e. Fußboden
   f. Götterbild
   g. Anderweitiger Besitz und Zier der Cella
   h. Thüre
   i. Cellenwände am Außen, Quaderwänden
5. Opisthodomos
6. Portiken: Pronaos und Posticum
7. Unterbauten
8. Giebel
9. Akroterien
10. Dachwerk
11. Benennungen der Tempelgattungen nach Vitruv
C. Specielle Schilderung der Umgebungen des Tempels
1. Schlacht- u Brandopferaltar
2. Kolossen
3. Peribolus
4. Anderweitige Anlagen innerhalb des Peribolus
5. Anderweitige nächste Verbindung mit Baumalleen, Lustgärten, u.s.w.
6. Wahrscheinlicher Schmuck einer großen Tempelanlage bei Festtagen

Cap. II. Wohngebäuden in den Städten und auf dem Lande
A. Einleitung
B. Specielle Schilderung der baulichen Anlagen
1. Lokal
2. Höfe
3. Atrium
4. Wohnliche und Wirtschaftliche Anlagen und Verwandtes
5. Anlage mehrerer Etagen bei den Wohngebäuden
6. Äußeres antiker Wohngebäude
7. Detailausbildung und Nebenwerk

C. Gartenanlagen
D. Einzelne Ueberreste oder Schriftliche Nachrichten, zu grösserer Verdachtung

III. Gebäude für Staatsverwaltung und Handel

Einleitung
A. Basilika
   1. Zweck – Benennung
   2. Planform
   3. Durchschnitte und Ansichten – Dekorative Behandlung
   4. Einige Andeutungen über Anordnung in der Christlichen Zeit
   5. Historische Nachrichten über den Bau von Basiliken
B. Curia
C. Prytaneum
D. Schatzhaus
E. Gefängniss
F. Comitium
G. Forum, Handelsmärkte

Cap. IV. Theater, Odeon

Einleitung
A. Theater
   1. Ursprung und Bedeutung der theatralischen Spiele
   2. Allgemeines vom Theatergebäude
   3. Orchestra und Bühne
   4. Decorationen
   5. Zuschauerraum (Cavea)
B. Odeum

Cap. V. Bauliche Anlagen für Übungen, Spiele und Lustbarkeiten

gymnischer und kriegerischer Art, für geistigen Genüß und Bildung

A. Einleitung
B. Bauliche Anlagen
   1. Einleitung
   2. Palästra
   3. Stadium
   4. Hippodromos, Circus
5. Gebäude für die Bäder (an und für sich)
6. Anlagen für gesellige und wissenschaftliche Unterhaltungen (Museen?)
7. Begriff von Gymnasium, Palästra, Balneum, Thermae
8. Thermen
9. Amphitheater
10. Naumachien

VI. Grab- Ehren- und Siegessmähler
1. Einleitung, Allgemeines
2. Die Bestattung und ihre Feier
3. Form öffentlicher Ehrenbezeugungen
4. Die Grabstätte, der Begräbnisraum
5. Aeusseren Form der Felsenkammern
6. Heroengräber
7. Kegel- und Pyramidenform
8. Statuen einzeln stehend
9. Ehrensäulen, Rostra, Obelisken
10. Die Reiterstatue, die Riga, die Quadriga
11. Der Baldachin
12. Gebäude in Sarkophagenform
13. Tempelartige Denkmäler
14. Choragische Monumente
15. Das thurmartige Monument
16. Das treppenartige Monument
17. Ehren- und Siegesbogen
18. Säulenhallen
19. Von den Umgebungen und Umschließungen der Grab-, Ehren-, und Siegessmaehler

Cap. VII. Merkwürdige Bauanlagen vermischter Art
1. Der Leichenwagen des Alexander
2. Der Tempel zu Hierapolis
3. Das Prachtzelt des Ptolomäus Philadelphus
4. Die Schiffe des Ptolomäus Philopator
5. Die Syracusa des Hiero

VIII. Der Wasserbau
IX. Der Strassenbau
X. Der Brückenbau

IV. Die Geschichte der Baukunst bei den Griechen und Römern
(Der Geschichte wird ein kurzer Abriß der alten Geographie vorangeschickt. Hiebei namentlich auf das Lokal der vorhandenen Monumente Rücksicht genommen. Jedem Abschnitt der Kunstgeschichte wird eine kurze Schilderung der historischen Verhältnissen überhaupt vorangeschickt.) Neben den Bauwerken werden die
berühmtesten Werke der bildenden Kunst wenigstens nahmhaft gemacht und in der Gypssammlung betrachtet.

Erste Periode: von den ersten Anfängen bis Olymp 50 (580 v. C)
Zweite Periode: Olymp 50-80 (580 bis 460 v. C)
  1. Berühmte Gebäude von denen nur noch Nachrichten vorhanden
  2. Gebäude von denen Überreste vorhanden
Dritte Periode: Olymp 80 – 111
  1. Werke in Attika
  2. Peloponesische Haupttempel
  3. Werke in Ionien
  4. Werke in Sicilien
Vierste Periode Olymp 111 – 158
Kunst bei den Italienischen Völkern vor Olymp 158 III.
Rom, vor 606, Olymp 158 III.
Fünfte Periode: von 606 der Stadt Rom Olymp 158 III. bis zum Untergang der Kunst
  1. Von der Eroberung von Korinth bis auf August
  2. Das Zeitalter der Julier und Flavier
  3. Von Nerva bis auf die dreissig Tirannen
  4. Von den dreissig Tirannen bis Constantin

DIE ERSTEN CHRISTLICHEN BASILIKEN
Vornehmlich vom Anfang des IV\textsuperscript{h} bis Ende des VI\textsuperscript{h} Jahrhunderts, und zunächst verwandte und gleichartige spätere Bauten

VORSCHULE DER BYZANTINISCHEN KUNST
Bauten der Neugriechen, Gothen und Lombarden und nächste Folge davon in Italien und dem Orient vornehmlich vom Ende des V\textsuperscript{h} bis Ende des X\textsuperscript{h} Jahrhundert
  1. Rundbauten
  2. Schiffkirchen
  3. Glockentürmen an den alten Basiliken
  4. Die Königspalläste zu Verona, Ravenna, Ingelheim, der Lateranische Pallast zu Rom

KIRCHENBAU DER BYZANTINISCHEN KUNST
I. Einleitung
II. Constructionssystem
III. Architectursystem
IV. Kirchenbaukunst in ihrem allgemeinen Princip
  Die Anordnung des Planes, der Durchschnitt und Façaden nach demselben System welches bei der deutschen Baukunst angedeutet ist.
V. Geschichte des Kirchenbaues
1. In Deutschland
2. In England
3. In Frankreich
4. In Portugal und Spanien

BAUKUNST DER ARABER, DER TÜRKEN UND DER NEUEREN PERSER UND INDER
I. Einleitung
II. Constructions- und Architectursystem
III. Die Gebäude in ihrem allgemeinen Princip
   1. Die Wohngebäude
   2. Moscheen
   3. Sonstige Bauanlagen
IV. Vorhandene Bauwerke

KIRCHENBAU DER TEUTSCHEN BAUKUNST
I. Einleitung
II. Constructionssystem
III. Architectursystem
IV. Die Kirchen Baukunst in ihrem allgemeinen Princip
   I. Behandlung des Planes
   II. Anordnung der Durchschnitte
   III. Anordnung der Facaden
V. Vorhandene Bauwerke
   Einleitung
   1. In Deutschland
   2. In England
   3. In Frankreich
   4. Italien (s. den Abschnitt: ITAL. BAUSCHULEN, Teutsche Bauschule, Einfachste Formen)
   5. In Portugal u Spanien

WELTLICHE GEBÄUDE DES MITTELALTERS IN NORD- UND WESTEUROPA
Einleitung
I. Specielle Charakteristik der Auffassungsweise des Byzantinischen und Teutschen Baustyles bei der Anwendung für Weltliche Gebäude
II. Construction, architectonische und ornamentische Behandlung des Holzbausystems
III. Specielle Charakteristik der constructiven, architectonischen und ornamentischen Behandlung des mittelalterlich-antiken Bausystems von der letzten Hälfte des XVI. und der ersten Hälfte des XVII. Jh.
IV. Specielles über den Plan und die innere Einrichtung der weltlichen Gebäude des Mittelalters, und Eigenthümlichkeiten hiebei nach verschiedenen Ländern

V. Überreste weltlicher Gebäude des Mittelalters

ITALIENISCHE BAUSCHULEN VOM ENDE DES X. BIS ENDE DES XIV. JAHRHUNDERTS

(Bauwerke welche zum grössten Theil mehr gebildet sind aus Mischungen von Elementen des antiken, vorbyzantinischen, arabischen und deutschen Baustyles, als irgend einem derselben mit Entschiedenheit zugehören.)

Einleitung
I. Normanisch-Sicilische Schule
II. S. Marco zu Venedig
III. Pisanische Bauschule
IV. Byzantinisch-Antike Bauschule
V. Byzantinisch-Teutsche Bauschule
VI. Teutsche Bauschule. Einfachste Formen
VII. Teutsche Bauschule. Vielgemischt mit antiken Formen
VIII. Teutsche Bauschule. Reichere und reinere Formen
IX. Übergang der Bauschulen von S. Marco und Pisa in die Antike

DIE WERKE DER BAUKUNST VOM ANFANG DES XV. JAHRHUNDERTS BIS AUF DIE NEUESTE ZEIT

Insoweit im Geiste der neu italienischen Baukunst, der griechischen und römischen Bau-Kunst sich anschließen, und Theile der Baukunst welche in Verbindung mit diesen Werken hervorgehen.

Einleitung
I. Allgemeiner historischer Überblick
II. Quellen für das Studium
III. Constructionsprincip
IV. Architectursysteme
   A. Blüthezeit der neu-italienischen Kunst
      1. Erste Anwendung des antiken Formensystems
      2. Florentinische Quaderarchitektur
      3. Blüthe der Venetianischen Kunst
      4. Bramante di Urbino
      5. Reichste Auffassung antiker Formen
      6. Reichste Auffassung architektonischer Form
   B. Anfang und Übergang zum Manierismus
   C. Manieristen
   D. Erste Stufe zu einem reineren Style nach den Manieristen
   E. Rückschritt zum Manierismus.
F. Zweite Stufe zu einem reineren Style
G. Dritte Stufe. Vollkommene Wiederbelebung des Geistes der alten Baukunst

V. Ornamentsysteme
VI. Decorationssysteme
VII. Die Gebäude in ihrem allgemeinen Princip und merkwürdige vorhandene Werke

Einleitung
1. Wohngebäude (zweiten u dritten Ranges)
2. Villen und andere Wohngebäude auf dem Lande
3. Fürstliche Paläste ersten Ranges
4. Gebäude für Staatsverwaltung, Handel, Unterricht und Ähnliche
5. Theater
6. Kirchen
   I. Basiliken
   II. Einfache Kuppelform als Kirche
   III. Kirchen mit der Hängekuppel
   IV. Kirchhöfe

VIII. Kleinarchitectur
IX. Summarischer Kunstgeschichtlicher Überblick
des Ganges der Baukunst vom XV. Jahrhundert bis auf die neueste Zeit; das Leben ausgezeichneter Baukünstler, Kunstschulen und Art des Kunstbetriebes in dieser Zeit ueberhaupt.
X. Nachtrag der Literaturgeschichte der Baukunst
insoweit sie nicht in den bisherigen Quellenstudien bereits berührt worden ist.

ANDEUTUNGEN ÜBER DIE BAUKUNST DER CHINESEN

ANDEUTUNGEN ÜBER DIE BAUWERKE DER ALTEN MEXIKANER

Schinkel’s report of 12 September 1833

Transcribed from the copy sent to Stier by Beuth, Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität zu Berlin, II.M.67.C
Original in Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, I. HA Rep. 76 Kultusministerium Vb, Sekt. 4, Tit. XI, Nr. 15, Bd. 1, f. 100-101

Berlin d. 18/4 49 Wilh. Stier
In diesem sehr sorgfältig und umsichtig zusammengestellten Plan für die Vorlesungen über

"Vergleichende Geschichte der Baukunst"


Meines erachtens dürften aus einer vergleichenden Geschichte der Baukunst diejenigen Theile des hier aufgestellten Planes wegbleiben, die den Charakter einer vollständigen Lehre eines speziellen Theils umfassen. Diese Theile die, welche ohnehin nicht anders als durch Übung in der Fertigkeit der Selbstbildung künstlerischer Gegenstände und durch vielfaches ausführliches Studium, behandelt werden können, müssen ganz für sich bestehende Lehrfächer als Vorstudien des Cursus über die vergleichende Geschichte bilden.

In diesem Sinne würde ich ganz fehlen lassen:

Aus dem Abschnittt:

Bauwerke der Griechen und Römer
Abschnitt I. C. von Cap I an
" D. von Cap I an
" E. von Cap I an
Abschnitt IV. ganz.

Da ferner im Verlauf der Abhandlung die griechische und römische Architektur zusammen gemischt vorgetragen wird, so ist:

Buch III von römischen Ordnungen u. Tempelbau

nicht besonders zu behandeln, sondern kann gelegentlich in den Zusammenhang von der Abtheilung

II. Constructions und Architectur System
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Buch II. Cap. II
eingeschaltet werden.

Ferner wird

**Buch X die Lehre Vitruvs**
am denselben früheren Capiteln beiläufig eingeschaltet werden können und als selbständig hier füglich ausfallen.

Ob die Geschichte der Baukunst bei jeder Abtheilung hinterher als ein selbständiges Capitel behandelt, oder mit der Geschichte der Gebäude gleich verbunden vorgetragen werden soll, mögte sich bei näherer Ausführung der Materie erst deutlich ergeben. Vorauszusehen ist aber, daß bei letzterer Art an Zeit viel gewonnen wird und Wiederholungen vermieden werden können.


Übrigens wird dieser ganze Kursus, wenn bei der Aussuchung das Maas jeder einzelnen Abtheilung und die richtige Balance derselben unter einander in Beziehung auf ihre Ausdehnung erst gefunden seyn wird, von höchst ersprießlichen Folgen seyn.

Einzelne Bermerkungen, welche sich hie und da in den Verschiedenen Abtheilungen auf Specialien beziehen, werden sich mit dem Herrn Verfasser in mündlicher Berathung besser erörtern und feststellen lassen, als durch schriftlichen Ausdruck.

gez.: Schinkel 12/9