

# ART HISTORY FOR ARTISTS

interactions between scholarly  
discourse and artistic practice  
in the 19th century



**07**  
**08**  
**09**  
**July**

**International Conference**

organised by Eleonora Vratskidou  
Alexander von Humboldt Postdoctoral Fellow  
Technische Universität Berlin

# ART HISTORY FOR ARTISTS

interactions between scholarly  
discourse and artistic practice  
in the 19th century

## ABSTRACTS

### **Convenor | Concept :**

Eleonora Vratskidou

Alexander von Humboldt Postdoctoral Fellow/Technische Universität Berlin

### **Scientific Committee:**

Heinrich Dilly, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg

Pascal Griener, Université de Neuchâtel

Hubert Locher, Philipps-Universität Marburg

Olga Medvedkova, CNRS-ENS (Centre Jean Pépin)

Michela Passini, CNRS-ENS (IHMC)

Matthew Rampley, University of Birmingham

Bénédicte Savoy, Technische Universität Berlin

Eleonora Vratskidou, Technische Universität Berlin

### **Technische Universität Berlin**

Institut für Kunstwissenschaft und Historische Urbanistik

Fachgebiet Kunstgeschichte der Moderne

Berlin, July 7-9, 2016

Hauptgebäude - Technische Universität Berlin

Straße des 17. Juni 135, 10623 Berlin

# Programme

**This conference  
aims to explore the interactions  
and productive tensions  
between art practice and  
art scholarship  
in the 19th century**

**Thursday July 7, 2016  
H 3005**

14.30 Registration

15.00 Eleonora Vratskidou  
Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung/  
Technische Universität Berlin  
**Introduction: Art history,  
a discipline rooted in practice?**

## **I. Art history in the art school: Institutional frameworks**

Panel 1  
Chair: Olga Medvedkova, CNRS-ENS

15.30 Heinrich Dilly, Martin-Luther  
Universität Halle-Wittenberg  
**Christian Friedrich Prange (1756-  
1836) und die älteste Provinzial-  
kunstschule Preußens in Halle  
an der Saale**

15.55 Eric Garberson  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
**Wilhelm Stier's (1799-1856)  
architectural history at the  
Bauakademie, Berlin**

16.20 Discussion

17.00 Coffee break

Panel 2  
Chair: Olga Medvedkova, CNRS-ENS

17.30 Pascal Griener  
Université de Neuchâtel  
**Another wolf in the sheep yard:  
David Sutter (1811-1880) and the  
teaching of art history at the  
École des beaux-arts in Paris**

17.55 Annalea Tunesi  
Independent researcher  
**The polymath Aleardo Aleari  
(1812-1878), professor of  
*estetica applicata alle arti*  
at the Art Academy in Florence**

18.20 Foteini Vlachou  
Universidade Nova de Lisboa  
**Defining the object of art history:  
Teaching at the Lisbon Academy of  
Fine Arts c. 1874-1911**

18.45 Discussion

19.30 Reception

Friday July 8, 2016  
H 1035

## II. Art history and the art of the present: Scholars and artists

- Panel 3  
Chair: Andrea Meyer  
Technische Universität Berlin
- 09.30 **Bénédicte Savoy**  
Technische Universität Berlin  
**Das Museum als Ort der  
Künstlerausbildung um 1800**
- 09.55 **Deborah Schultz**  
Regent's University London/  
University of Oxford  
**Photo archives and the role of  
photography in art education:  
The case of the Royal Academy in  
London in the late 19th century**
- 10.20 **Julia Witt**  
Technische Universität Berlin  
**Die Kunstgeschichte und die  
Reformen der deutschen  
Kunstakademien ab 1910.  
Eine unauflösbare Diskrepanz?**
- 10.45 Discussion  
11.30 Coffee break

- Panel 1  
Chair: Hubert Locher  
Philipps-Universität Marburg
- 12.00 **Robert Skwirblies**  
Technische Universität Berlin  
**„Die Einfalt der alten Zeiten“ und  
eine Bürgerschaft von Künstlern:  
Geschichtskonstruktion als Program-  
matik bei Johann David Passavant um  
1820**
- 12.25 **Spyros Petritakis**  
University of Crete  
**Rudolf Steiner's engagement with  
contemporary artists' groups:  
Art-theoretical discourse within the  
anthroposophical milieu in Germany  
in the early 20th century**
- 12.50 **Émilie Oléron Evans**  
Institut d'Études Avancées, Strasbourg  
**Crafting the history of decorative arts:  
Das Kunstgewerbe in Elsass-  
Lothringen (1900-1906)**
- 13.15 Discussion  
14.00 Lunch break – free time

- Panel 2  
Chair: Hubert Locher  
Philipps-Universität Marburg
- 15.30 **Petra Brouwer**  
University of Amsterdam  
**Colliding times: The contemporary  
in 19th-century architectural  
history books**
- 15.55 **Melanie Sachs**  
Philipps-Universität Marburg  
**Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Kunst-  
geschichte für die mitlebende Kunst:  
Historismuskritik in kunsthistori-  
schen Schriften um 1900**
- 16.20 **Yannis Hadjinicolaou**  
Humboldt Universität zu Berlin  
**‘Die Neue Sachlichkeit Rembrandts’:  
Aby Warburg's *Claudius Civilis***
- 16.45 Discussion  
17.30 Coffee break

- Panel 3  
Chair: Eleonora Vratskidou  
Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung/  
Technische Universität Berlin
- 18.00 **Pier Paolo Racioppi**  
IES Abroad Italy, Rome  
**The men of letters and the  
teaching artists: Debating  
invention at the Accademia di  
San Luca in Rome during the first  
decades of the 19th century**
- 18.25 **Lena Bader**  
Deutsches Forum für  
Kunstgeschichte Paris  
**Künstler vs. Kunsthistoriker?  
Streit der Interpretationen im  
Holbein-Streit**
- 18.50 Discussion

Saturday July 9, 2016  
H 1035

### III. Art history by artists: The artist as producer of art discourse

#### Panel 1

Chair: Eleonora Vratskidou  
Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung/  
Technische Universität Berlin

10.00 Claire Barbillon  
Université de Poitiers  
**How did 19th-century French  
sculptors write the history of  
ancient Greek sculpture?**

10.25 Wibke Schrape  
Museum für Asiatische Kunst,  
Staatliche Museen zu Berlin  
**From artists to art historians:  
Art discourse in transition in  
19th-century Japan**

10.50 Discussion

11.30 Coffee break

#### Panel 2

Chair: Bärbel Küster  
Technische Universität Berlin

12.00 Michael Thimann  
Georg-August-Universität Göttingen  
**Kunsthistorisches Praxiswissen:  
Carl Wilhelm Oesterley (1805-1891)  
als Professor an der Universität  
Göttingen**

12.25 Margherita D'Ayala Valva  
Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa  
**Artists' reading and copybook  
practice as a form of self-taught  
education**

12.50 Anne Gregersen  
University of Copenhagen  
**Artists' collections as producers of  
alternative art historical narratives:  
The example of J. F. Willumsen's  
collection**

13.15 Discussion

14.00 Lunch break – free time

#### Panel 3

Chair: Pascal Griener  
Université de Neuchâtel

16.00 Léa Kuhn, Ludwig-Maximilians  
Universität München  
**Configuring the gaze: Matthew  
Pratt's painterly in(ter)vention**

16.25 France Nerlich  
Université François-Rabelais de Tours  
**Setting new paradigms for art and  
science: Art history by Friedrich  
Overbeck and Paul Delaroche**

16.50 Jan Dirk Baetens  
Radboud University Nijmegen  
**Bruegel the Elder, Bruegel the much  
much Younger, and the Antwerp  
Raphael: The invention of Pieter  
Bruegel the Elder in the work of  
Henri Leys and his followers**

17.15 Discussion

18.00 Closing roundtable

## Theme

The conference aims to examine the shaping of art history as a discipline during the 19th century in relation to artistic training and exchanges between artists and scholars. The development of art history has been associated with an array of socio-political and economic factors such as the formation of a bourgeois public, the politics of national identity and state legitimacy or the needs of an expanding art market. This conference aspires to explore yet another, less studied dimension: the extent to which the historical study of art was also rooted in an intention to inform contemporary artistic production.

The scholarship produced by the first generations of art historians in this period was intertwined with their interest in the art of their time, its quality and future development. Throughout the century many art historians made studies entirely dedicated to contemporary art and sought to provide artists with new ideals. The connection between scholarly discourse and artistic practice was also validated at an institutional level. Since the late 18th century courses in art history, along with courses in history, archaeology, art theory and aesthetics, had been systematically incorporated into the curricula of art academies, schools of design, academies of architecture and polytechnics. These spaces of art education were among the first institutional homes of art history, and played an important role in the shaping of the discipline well before the establishment of autonomous university chairs - a development largely overlooked in the history of art history, but also in the history of art education.

The historical study of art questioned established canons and multiplied the aesthetic models available for artists. Many artists claimed a new role as creators for art history and for the museum, reacting against the growing commodification of art. At the same time, the influx of knowledge on past art was often seen as a burden for artistic creativity. The overall reflective turn upon art and its past, tainted by the Hegelian proclamation of the end of art, influenced the work of artists in ways that remain to be explored.

## I. Art history in the art school: Institutional frameworks

This section examines the training in art history and aesthetics offered in institutions of art education and addresses the artistic, political and economic considerations linked to its introduction to the curriculum. Papers focus on the teaching approaches, the role of the media of illustration (prints, casts, museum collections, photography), and the profile of the professors.

What was the impact of a systematised art historical and theoretical knowledge on academic doctrines, practical training, and ultimately on artistic production itself? How did the particular institutional framework of the art school and exposure to the problems of artistic practice affect the scholarly discourses produced in this context? Did teaching artists, architects or craftsmen generate different objects of study, foci, methods and ultimately a different kind of scholarship from that produced at universities or in museums?

## II. Art history and the art of the present: Scholars and artists

This section explores the changing attitudes of art scholars towards their engagement with contemporary artistic production. From the 1870s onwards, primarily in Germany, such an engagement was increasingly downplayed in the name of objective and unbiased scholarship detached from practical considerations, alongside the growing academic recognition of art history and its presence in the university. Nonetheless, the complex entanglement of scholarly discourse and contemporary art never really abated even well after this date. Papers address cases of fertile interactions, joint efforts, but also conflicts between scholars and practitioners. A main focus is also on the extent to which contemporary artistic experimentations and tendencies provided art scholars with new perspectives for evaluating past artistic achievements.

## III. Art history by artists: The artist as producer of art discourse

This final section concerns the reactions of artists to the emergence of a community of professional specialists claiming control over art discourse: it examines the formation of parallel or counter discourses by art practitioners. In focus here are reformulations of art-historical canons, as well as contributions to art theory in art works, artists' writings and teachings, reading practices or collecting activity. A central objective is to reflect on the epistemological status of knowledge produced through

these various engagements and analyse the ways in which they converse with or challenge scholarly approaches. Special attention is paid to figures that combine artistic practice and scholarship.

The scope of the papers spans the mid-18th century to the first decades of the 20th century and includes cases from Germany, France, Italy, Portugal, England, The Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark and Japan. A programmatic emphasis is put on the circulation of teaching practices, discourses and actors across institutions or national boundaries. Encompassing cases of peripheral or extra-European contexts promises to produce valuable new insights.

*Eleonora Vratskidou*

## **I. Art history in the art school: Institutional frameworks**

## Heinrich Dilly

### ***Christian Friedrich Prange (1756-1836) und die Provinzialkunstschule Preußens in Halle an der Saale***

Von 1791 bis 1806 bestand in Halle an der Saale die älteste Provinzialkunstschule des Landes Preußen und der Königlich Akademischen der Bildenden Künste zu Berlin. Mit der Halleschen Friedrich-Universität war die „Königliche Kunst- und Bauhandwerksschule zu Halle“, wie sie amtlich hieß, personell eng verknüpft. Ihr Gründungs- und einziger Direktor Christian Friedrich Prange (1756-1836) war nämlich außerordentlicher Professor der Weltweisheit und der zeichnenden Künste an der Universität, und lehrte dort ganze 55 Jahre lang antike und moderne Kunstgeschichte. Im genannten Zeitraum durchliefen etwa 600 Schüler und Schülerinnen – letztere separat unterrichtet – die Institution, an der zeitweilig zwei weitere Lehrer tätig waren. Ihre Ziele hatte Prange 1778 in seinem zweibändigen „Entwurf einer Akademie der bildenden Künste“ dargelegt. Es ging ihm um praktische Winke und Differenzierungen, so auch in Sachen Geschichte. Nach der französischen Besatzung von 1806 bis 1813 blühte die Kunstschule gegen Ende der zwanziger Jahre noch einmal kurz auf. Danach und bald nach dem Tod ihres Gründers erlischt die Erinnerung an ihre Existenz und ihre Geschichte in Halle, in Preußen und Deutschland. Prange wird nur noch im Kontext von Anton Raphael Mengs erwähnt, dessen theoretische Überlegungen er ins Deutsche übersetzt hat.

Erst im Zuge der jüngsten Historisierung von Praxisformen wie dem akademischen Zeichnen und der Bildbeschreibung wurde ein Interesse an Pranges Schule wieder geweckt, so dass sie in eine längst überfällige Geschichte der Berliner Akademie der bildenden Künste aufgenommen werden musste, in der auch Pranges eigenhändiges Farbenlexikon seinen Platz haben könnte. Mit ihrem Netz bzw. Trabantenkreis der Provinzialkunstschulen in Magdeburg, Stettin, Breslau und – eben – Halle an der Saale bildete die Berliner Akademie ein ganz eigenes Konstrukt.

### ***Christian Friedrich Prange (1756-1836) and the oldest provincial art school in Halle an der Saale***

In 1790 King Frederick William III of Prussia approved new regulations for the Königlich Preussische Akademie der bildenden Künste (Royal Prussian Academy of the Visual Arts), founded in 1696. Among other reforms, the regulations established public lectures on the theory and history of art. Karl Philipp Moritz and Aloys Ludwig Hirt, whose activities have been thoroughly

researched in recent decades, founded the tradition of scholarly research and teaching which continues today at the Academy and its successor institution, the University of the Arts, Berlin.

Little researched is another innovation in 1790, namely the plan to establish provincial art schools in the kingdom and to connect their instructors closely with the Berlin academy. Whether this idea arose from the reform debates in Berlin or came from the provinces has remained unclear. The latter is more likely: already in 1786 Christian Friedrich Prange (1756-1836), extraordinary professor of wisdom, that is philosophy, at the Friedrichs-Universität in Halle, had been named honorary member of the Berlin Academy for two reasons. In 1778 he had published his three-volume *Entwurf einer Akademie der bildenden Künste* (Plan for an academy of the visual arts), which sparked the reform debate. In 1782 he had also founded a private drawing school. In 1791 he obtained its recognition by the state as a provincial art school. It was the oldest of its kind in Brandenburg-Prussia, although it remained in existence only into the 1830s. A second provincial art school was founded in Magdeburg in 1793/94; it existed under a different name and with other functions until 1963.

The ‘Königliche Kunst- und Bauhandwerksschule zu Halle’ (Royal Art and Building Trades School in Halle) was more closely connected with the Frederick University in Halle than with the Berlin Academy. For 55 years the founding and sole Director of the art school, Prange, taught ancient and modern art history at the University in the traditional lecture style using three different text books. These classes also served the approximately 600 male and female art pupils (the latter taught separately) who attended the art school only between 1796 and 1802. Unlike the University, the provincial art school recovered slowly from its closure under the French occupation. Only in the late 1820s did it flourish again. Soon after the death of its founder its existence and history strangely faded from memory for reasons that remain speculative.

Interest in Johann Christian Prange and his art school has been re-awakened only with the most recent historicizing of forms of practice such as academic drawing, color theory, and description of pictures, as well as art historical research and teaching at art academies. Prange’s art school must be incorporated into the long-overdue history of the Berlin Akademie der Künste as well as into the circle of its more successful satellites, the art schools in Magdeburg, Kaliningrad, Szczecin and Wrocław.

Heinrich Dilly  
Emeritus Professor of Art History  
Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg  
heinrich.dilly@kunstgesch.uni-halle.de



## Eric Garberson

### ***Wilhelm Stier's (1799-1856) architectural history at the Bauakademie, Berlin***

The case of Wilhelm Stier (1799-1856) allows for a particularly detailed examination of the teaching of architectural history by an architect in a 19th-century professional school. This paper reconstructs Stier's training and how he conceived and taught his first architectural history courses at the Bauakademie by drawing on his largely unpublished *Nachlaß* in the Architekturmuseum of the Technische Universität and documents at the Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Akademie der Künste, Zentralarchiv der Berliner Museen, and Kunstbibliothek.

Stier gained his expertise in architectural history primarily through independent study and travel, not during his training at the Bauakademie (1816-17). He spent four years (1817-21) as *Bauconducteur* in Düsseldorf and a few months in Paris in the atelier of the architect Lecoq de Launay. During his five years in Rome (1822-1827) he initially supported himself by working as a draughtsman for foreign architects and scholars. For two years he had a stipend from the Prussian government for study, under the supervision of Karl Friedrich Schinkel, to prepare him to teach the practice of 'aesthetic' architecture at the Akademie der Künste.

In 1828 Stier was appointed instead to the Bauakademie, a separate institution for training practical architects and state officials, to teach the capstone design course (*Entwerfen der Gebäude*). In 1829, to fill a gap in the curriculum, he developed a separate survey of architectural history (*Studien der Monumente der Baukunst*). In the curricular revision of 1832, this continued (as *Antike Monumente*) and provided the basis for another, one-semester course (*Vergleichende Geschichte der Baukunst*). How Stier conceived and taught these courses is documented in an ideal architecture curriculum sent to Schinkel in 1827, his own notes, and several sets of student notes. These and other source show that Stier illustrated his lectures with in-class drawings on the blackboard, specially prepared drawings, and prints.

Stier began from the firm belief that good practice requires an understanding of architecture as *Kunst* and in its relation to local and historical context; this allows the architect to draw upon all past periods in a manner appropriate to his own time. In the ideal curriculum, Stier envisioned two courses: 1) a theoretical and methodological introduction to the study of all art in context; and 2) a chronological survey of architecture, consisting of general cultural-historical

overviews of successive periods followed by separate surveys of extant monuments. The design course included brief historical lectures on each building type in which the students were to work up independent designs in a process similar to that of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. In the monuments survey, Stier partially realized his initial ideal: A two-part introduction established basic architectural and historical principles and provided an orienting overview from ancient India to the 18th-century. A large main section covered Greece and Rome in three parts: a general introduction to their shared but divergent construction and architectural system, an overview of building types, and a history of extant monuments. It was only in the early 1830s that he began his well-known studies of medieval and later architecture, soon expanding his teaching to include more in-depth treatment of these later periods.

*Eric Garberson, Associate Professor of Art History;  
Director, Doctoral Program in Media, Art, and Text  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
eggarberson@vcu.edu*

## Pascal Griener

### ***Another wolf in the sheep yard: David Sutter (1811-1880) and the teaching of art history at the École des beaux-arts in Paris***

David Sutter, a Swiss from Geneva, taught art history and perspective at the Academie des beaux-arts in Paris during the Second Empire. Yet his contribution, which may be described as very substantial, has not been taken into account by most of the recent literature on the Ecole. His appointment raised some eyebrows, because of the artist's background, and because of his lack of French credentials; it must be seen as part of the war waged by the comte Aurelien de Nieuwerkerke, the head of the Fine Arts in the imperial government, against the Academie des beaux-arts. The modalities of his teaching are very complex to analyze. Ultimately, his impact has to be seen as a teacher and as a producer of art books for artists, that is, for a public outside the Ecole. His impact on post-impressionists artists is real but difficult to pinpoint. What is at stake here is the power of theory to transform an artistic practice or a system of representations of this practice during the 19th century. Thus the case of David Sutter illustrates the difficulties met with by the contemporary historian, when he wants to assess the impact of art history as a discipline, on a community of artists during the 19th century.

*Pascal Griener*  
*Professor of Art History*  
*University of Neuchâtel*  
*pascal.griener@unine.ch*

## Annalea Tunesi

### ***The polymath Aleardo Aleardi (1812-1878), professor of estetica applicata alle arti at the Art Academy in Florence***

The figure of art historian as teacher at the art academy in Italy does not appear until the end of the 19th century. In earlier times, the art historian had been either an artist or a connoisseur. The Florence Art Academy had a long tradition, dating back to the Renaissance, in the study of the techniques of sculpture, painting, drawing and perspective based on historical examples; training was therefore more practical and visual than theoretical. However in 1860, a new reform was introduced at the Art Academy which combined the practical study of the various art disciplines with the study of estetica applicata alla storia dell'arte. The polymath Aleardo Aleardi (1812-1878) was appointed as professor of this new course in 1864 and ran it through 1878.

Aleardi was a poet of the neo-romantic movement, who had fought for Italian unity, a patriot whose poetic work was mainly related to historical subjects. This paper will follow his trajectory, from his early interests in visual art, which were constantly intertwined with his poetry and patriotism, up to his appointment as a professor of Aesthetics and History of Art at the Art Academy in Florence. Over ten years of activity, he gave 172 lessons, the texts of which are kept in pristine condition at the Biblioteca Civica Cappello in Verona, his birthplace. Aleardi also published further studies over his years of teaching. Analysing the way the professor treated the subjects of Aesthetics and History of Art will allow us to better understand his sources, his aim and didactic purposes. How did Aleardi present his lessons? How important was visual material in comparison to written material in his aesthetic study?

Before Aleardi started teaching his course, a division had developed at the Art Academy between romantic painters and the artists known as *Macchiaioli*. Both these groups were very political and strong supporters of Mazzini and Garibaldi. While romantic painters were deeply embedded in historicism, taking inspiration from mediaeval literature and poetry, the *Macchiaioli* wanted to break with the old romantic tradition introducing a *stile verista*, drawing inspiration on everyday life and using photography as an important auxiliary for the study of *chiaroscuro*. A further aim of this paper is to study how Aleardi's lessons conversed with these two different movements, the romantic and the *Macchiaioli*, which both aspired to the same political ideals, but which expressed themselves through opposing techniques. How did Aleardi interact with these diverging orientations? Did his teaching practice influence or help these artists in their different artistic developments?

*Dr. Annalea Tunesi, independent researcher*  
*annalea.tunesi@gmail.com*

## **Foteini Vlachou**

### ***Defining the object of art history: Teaching at the Lisbon Academy of Fine Arts c. 1874-1911***

The Academia Nacional de Belas Artes in Lisbon (founded 1836) was during the last decades of the 19th century not only the place where art history and aesthetics were first introduced and taught (a development generally overlooked in Portugal), but also the arbiter of what consisted the object of art history, through two different responsibilities: the management of the newly founded Museu Nacional de Bellas Artes e Arqueologia (1884), with the Academy's director also serving as the museum's director; and the decision of which objects were museum-worthy.

This paper aims to analyze the structure and content of the course of art history and aesthetics, through its first introduction at the Lisbon Academy of Fine Arts (1874) and its three subsequent reforms (1881, 1901 and 1911), as well as the literary production of the professors who taught them, its relevance and impact on the subsequent formation of the discipline of art history, while insisting on the ways that art history came to mean, to a large extent, the history of Portuguese art. The paper will also discuss a series of letters exchanged between the Academy's Inspector and the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts (1890-1892), that contribute to the understanding of the multivalent ways that the Academy intervened in order to ensure the opening of the museum to the public, determine the value of the various objects destined to the museum, and the definition of which areas of collecting and research were more important.

*Foteini Vlachou*

*Postdoctoral researcher, Instituto de História Contemporânea;  
Visiting assistant professor, Department of Art History, Faculdade de Ciências  
Sociais e Humanas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa  
nandia.vlachou@gmail.com*

## **Deborah Schultz**

### ***Photo archives and the role of photography in art education: The case of the Royal Academy in London in the late 19th century***

During the late 19th century, the Royal Academy in London began to acquire a collection of black and white photographs. These were specifically bought for use by the art students at the Royal Academy Schools. In particular, a set of bound volumes was purchased of photographic reproductions of Old Master drawings from important European collections, including the Louvre, the Uffizi, the Albertina, and the Kunstsammlungen zu Weimar. The range of photographs in these volumes is indicative not only of the works of art considered significant at that time for students to study, but also of the network of institutions involved in producing and disseminating photographs of works of art.

While recent conferences and publications have explored the formation of photo archives for academic research and in particular for art historical studies, this paper examines the role of photo archives for art students, using the collection at the Royal Academy in London as an example. It addresses a number of key questions: How was the collection at the Royal Academy formed? While for art historians, at both the private and the institutional level, the photo archive became a primary tool of enquiry, what role did it play for the art student? Recent studies have considered the ways in which art historical practice has been shaped by the development of photographic reproductions of works of art. This paper examines the extent to which the available images shaped the training and practices of art students.

This paper draws on primary archival research at the Royal Academy in London. It uses the photographic collection there as a case study by which to explore fundamental questions concerning the interaction of art education and burgeoning art historical methods within an institutional framework.

*Deborah Schultz, Senior Lecturer in Art History and Visual Culture  
Regent's University London;  
Academic Visitor, Department of Art History, University of Oxford  
deborahschultz7@gmail.com*

## Bénédicte Savoy

### **Das Museum als Ort der Künstlerausbildung um 1800**

„Was!“, schrieb der Maler Pierre-Charles Dandrillon an das Conservatorium des Pariser Musée des arts am 15. März 1794, „die Republik ist nicht in der Lage, den Genies dieselben Vorteile zu gewähren, wie die Despoten es tun? Habt ihr denn Florenz vergessen? Jeder, der dort ein Gemälde oder eine Zeichnung kopieren will, dem stellt man die Staffelei, ja Böcke und Gerüste zur Verfügung, man stellt sie neben das Licht, man macht Feuer und verteilt es. Bezahlte Kustoden kümmern sich um Menschen und Dinge. In der Düsseldorfer Galerie, beim Pfälzischen Kurfürsten, geht man sogar weiter: man versorgt all diejenigen, die keine haben, mit Farben, Pinseln, Papier, Stiften, ungeachtet aus welchem Land sie kommen und wer sie sind. [...] Diese Wohltaten der Despoten, sind sie nicht Recht und Pflicht einer demokratischen Regierung?“<sup>1</sup> — die Rechte und Pflichten einer demokratischen Regierung lagen in der revolutionären Rhetorik des ausgehenden 18. Jahrhunderts auch darum, Museen als Orte der Künstlerausbildung ordentlich auszustatten und zugänglich zu machen. Das betraf nicht nur die praktischen Seiten der künstlerischen Arbeit (Abstellräume für Staffeleien und Verfügbarkeit von Malutensilien) sondern z.B. auch Hängungs- und Ausleihprinzipien. Das Museum als körperlich erfahrbarer Raum des akademischen Diskurses — darum soll es in diesem Vortrag gehen.

*Bénédicte Savoy, Professor of Art History (Kunstgeschichte der Moderne)  
Institut für Kunstwissenschaft und Historische Urbanistik  
Technische Universität Berlin  
benedicte.savoy@tu-berlin.de*

<sup>1</sup> »Ne vous resouvenez vous donc plus de Florence, celui qui veut copier un tableau ou dessin, on le lui met près du jour sur un chevalet [...]. A la Galerie de Dusseldorf chez l'électeur palatin on fait plus, on fournit couleurs, brosse, papier, crayon à tous ceux qui n'en n'ont pas, qu'importe de quel pays ils viennent et qu'ils soyent«, Brief von Pierre-Charles Dandrillon an das Conservatorium des Musée des Arts, 15. März 1794, abgedruckt in: Yveline Chantarel-Besson: La naissance du musée du Louvre (II), Paris 1981, S. 222.

## Julia Witt

### **Die Kunstgeschichte und die Reformen der deutschen Kunstakademien ab 1910. Eine unauflöslche Diskrepanz?**

Bereits ab 1910 gab es erste Reformbestrebungen an den deutschen Kunstakademien. Mitten im Ersten Weltkrieg – den allseits spürbaren, notwendig werdenden gesellschaftlichen Umbruch vor Augen – setzte eine in breiter Öffentlichkeit geführte Debatte um die Neuordnung der Künstlerausbildung im Deutschen Reich ein. Künstler und Architekten meldeten sich gleichermaßen wie Kunsthistoriker und Publizisten zu Wort: mit Zeitungs- und Zeitschriftenbeiträgen, Pamphleten und Denkschriften. Darin wurde zumeist an den Kunstakademien kein gutes Haar gelassen, sie wurden als verstaubt und nicht mehr zeitgemäß empfunden. Neue Konzepte und Schulmodelle wurden propagiert. Eine Stärkung des Kunstgewerbes war die Devise. Eine Fusion von Kunstakademien und Kunstgewerbeschulen zu Schulen, welche eine universelle Ausbildung anbieten sollten, sah man als die einzig gangbare Lösung an.

Zur Untermauerung ihrer jeweiligen Argumentation rekurrten die Autoren wiederholt auf die Vergangenheit: die mittelalterlichen Bauhütten und Zünfte sowie die großen Strömungen der Renaissance und des Barock. So will der Architekt Walter Gropius mit seinem Bauhaus-Manifest von 1919 für Weimar auf dem Modell der Bauhütten der mittelalterlichen Kathedralen aufbauen. Der Kunsthistoriker Wilhelm Waetzoldt zeichnete 1918 ein Idealbild der unter königlicher Ägide stehenden Kunstakademie im barocken Berlin zur Beförderung der Künste insbesondere der Baukunst. Autoren, wie etwa Richard Riemerschmid und Hermann Eßwein in München sowie F.H. Ehmke und Hermann Muthesius in Berlin, nutzten die Geschichte der Kunst, vornehmlich die als ‚klassisch-deutsch‘ angesehenen Epochen und Künstler, für ihre jeweilige Argumentation. Rückblicke auf Dürer, Rembrandt und Menzel durchzogen wie ein roter Faden die Argumentationsketten.

Im diametralen Widerspruch zu diesem Argumentationsbild, welches auf die Epochen und großen Gestalten der Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte verweist, steht die Position, welche man dem Fach Kunstgeschichte an den Kunstakademien bzw. Kunstschulen zuwies. Im Ausbildungskanon junger Künstler spielte die Kunstgeschichte nur eine marginale Rolle.

So verschieden die Modellentwürfe für die Ausbildung klangen, so einheitlich abwertend stufte man die Kunstgeschichte als Studienfach ein. Es wurde z. B. von Bruno Paul 1917 als „Ergänzungsfach“ angedacht oder

solle, so Riemerschmidt 1919, teilweise nur als Nebenkurs in Form von „Vorträgen“ angeboten werden. Gropius Bauhaus-Programm enthält zwar das Fach Kunstgeschichte im Lehrblock „wissenschaftlich-theoretische Ausbildung“, will sie aber explizit nur zur Vermittlung von historischen Arbeitstechniken verstehen. Den Status der Lehrenden von Nebenfächern wie der Kunstgeschichte beschreibt Waetzoldt 1921. Er präferiert, dass Künstler oder Gelehrte als externe Lektoren zum Mindestgehalt beschäftigen werden. Von einer Kunstgeschichtslehre für Kunstschüler als regulärem Studienfach, getragen von einer ordentlichen Professur, ist auch hier keine Rede.

Und de facto fanden kunstgeschichtliche Lehrveranstaltungen an den Kunstakademien nur in minimalem Umfang und meist nur fakultativ statt. Häufig in den Abendstunden gelegen, erfreuten sie sich nicht unbedingt hohen Besuchsquoten. Um diesem Dilemma aus dem Weg zu gehen, forderte 1920 der Kunsthistoriker Fritz Hoeber an Kunstschulen eine genießbare, anschauliche „Kunstunterhaltung“ mit Seminarcharakter und Übungen mit Bezug auf die gegenwärtige Kunstproduktion.

Im Vortrag möchte ich die Diskrepanz zwischen dem Gebrauch der Kunstgeschichte als Argumentationsebene für die Durchsetzung neuer Kunstschulmodelle und der geringen Wertigkeit des Lehrfaches Kunstgeschichte innerhalb der Künstlerausbildung zu Ende des Kaiserreiches und zu Beginn der Weimarer Republik darstellen. Als Basis dienen zeitgenössische Quellentexte sowie Archivmaterial, wie Lehrprogramme und Stundenpläne von Kunstakademien.

### ***Art history and the reform of the German art academies post 1910: An irreconcilable discrepancy?***

By 1910 attempts had already been made to reform the German Art Academies. During the First World War, changes in the sentiment of German society as a whole brought about an extensive debate on reforms to the education of artists in the German Empire.

At this time there were two primary formats for art education; the Art Academies, which were funded by the state; and the *Kunstgewerbeschulen* (Schools of Applied Arts), which were funded by the town or city administration, but subsidized by the state. In this presentation the terms ‘History of Art’ and ‘Art History’ refer, respectively, to the chronological epochs and to the academic subject.

Articles in newspapers, journals, pamphlets and memorandums were published by practical artists and architects, as well as art historians and other academic writers. The main tenor of this debate was that the art education at the Art Academies was outdated and the new model should unite the Art Academies and the Schools of Applied Arts, thus producing a new breed of artist who combined the academic abilities of the Art Academies and the technical competence of the Schools of Applied Arts.

The authors supported their arguments by referring to the history of cultural development, such as medieval “Bauhütten” and craft guilds, as well as to the artistic and architectural practices of the renaissance and baroque periods. The idea behind Walter Gropius’ “Bauhaus-Manifest” (1919) is based on the model of the “Bauhütte” on construction sites for medieval cathedrals. The art historian Wilhelm Waetzoldt emphasized the Royal Academy of Arts in baroque Berlin as an ideal for the advancement of arts and architecture (1918). Many other authors also used the *History of Art and Culture* to promote a similar idea.

In contrast, the academic subject of *Art History* was assigned a marginal position in the actual curricula of art schools at that time. Regardless of differences in the models proposed for a new kind of Art School, they all classified *Art History* as minor field of academic study. Bruno Paul (1917) speaks of it as “Ergänzungsfach” (a supplementary subject); Richard Riemerschmidt (1919) wanted to offer art history in the form of a “Nebenkurs”, literally “side lectures”, like a minor or secondary subject.

*Art History* was part of the subject area “scientific-theoretical education” in Walter Gropius’ Bauhaus-Program (1919), but only to convey practical historical techniques. De facto *Art History* courses at Art Academies comprised 1-2 hours of the weekly curriculum. Due to the limited nature of its presence in the curriculum during this period, most art academies had no Professor of Art History on staff. They resorted to local experts, either university professors or museum curators, who held the lectures at the Art Academies as part of their standard duties as public officials. Often they were elective courses, held in the evenings, resulting in poor attendance. Therefore, in 1920, the art historian Fritz Hoeber demanded a “Kunstunterhaltung” – a double meaning, literally implying both entertainment and discourse. He envisioned an enjoyable and colorful conversation about art in reference to actual art production, namely in the form of seminars and tutorials.

The presentation examines the roles played by the *Art History*, with its actual negligible presence in the curriculum, contrasted with the overwhelming presence of *History of Art* in the debate ongoing at the twilight of the German Empire and dawn of the Weimar Republic.

*Julia Witt, M.A.  
Ph.D. candidate in Art History  
Technische Universität Berlin  
julia-witt@gmx.de*

## II. Art history and the art of the present: Scholars and artists

### Robert Skwirblies

#### **„Die Einfalt der alten Zeiten“ und eine Bürgerschaft von Künstlern: Geschichtskonstruktion als Programmatik bei Johann David Passavant um 1820**

Der Beitrag beleuchtet, wie Kunstgeschichte um 1820 gezielt für einen Gegenentwurf zeitgenössischen Kunstlebens herangezogen wurde. Dies artikulierte sich besonders deutlich bei Johann David Passavant. Bekannt wurde dieser als Verfasser der ersten modernen kunstwissenschaftlichen Raffael-Biographie und Direktor des Städelschen Kunstinstituts in Frankfurt am Main. Nach einer begonnenen Ausbildung zum Kaufmann war er jedoch zunächst selbst Maler geworden und stand in Rom, wo er sich 1817-1824 aufhielt, den Nazarenern nahe. Der junge Passavant sah sich als Vertreter einer anti-akademischen, programmatisch selbstbewussten Künstlergemeinschaft, die sich weitgehend selbständig in der Praxis übte. In diesem Sinn gab er dem Städelschen Kunstinstitut 1818 ausführliche Empfehlungen für eine Organisation der Künstlerausbildung.

Passavant offenbarte ein Konzept, das Elemente der französischen Meisterateliers mit Vorstellungen der deutsch-patriotischen Lukasbrüder und einer dritten, neuen Komponente verschmolz: Aus dem politisch-sozialen Rahmen einer selbstbestimmten Bürgerschaft sollte ein prosperierendes, breitenwirksames Werkstattsystem erwachsen, um im nationalen Rahmen eine neue „Blüte“ der Kunst zu ermöglichen. Diese Idee leitete er aus der historischen Betrachtung der Renaissance in Mittelitalien her, mit der Passavant auf dem Weg nach Rom in eigener und geführter Anschauung konfrontiert wurde. In diesem Zusammenhang entstand 1819/20 auch seine erste Schrift, in der Passavant versuchte, Kunstgeschichte und Künstlermanifest zu verbinden: *Ansichten über die bildenden Künste und Darstellung des Ganges derselben in Toscana*. Kunstgeschichte war hier ein aktiver „Gang der Kunst“, der dort, wo er zur „Blüte“ geführt hätte, noch einmal beschritten werden sollte. Passavant setzte daher die seit Vasaris Viten bekannten Köpfe der mittelitalienischen Kunstgeschichte zu seinen deutschen Künstlerfreunden in direkte Relation.

Die heftige Kritik von Forschern wie Karl Friedrich von Rumohr, aber auch der Dialog mit seinen Freunden, führte Passavant nicht nur zur Verteidigung, sondern auch zur Vertiefung seines historischen Ansatzes. Die bewußt quellengestützte Raffael-Monographie von 1839 war Ergebnis dieser Auseinandersetzungen, und es lohnt sich zu fragen, wie die Ausbildungs- und Arbeitswelt der Künstler im 19. Jahrhundert mit diesem angewandten Geschichtsbild Passavants und der Nazarener in Beziehung stand – und wie sie von ihm geprägt wurde.

***‘The simplicity of old times’ and a community of artists: The construction of history as an artistic objective in Johann David Passavant’s early texts***

This paper examines how, around 1820, art history was employed in order to draft a counter-project for artistic life in the present. This is particularly evident in the case of Johann David Passavant. Passavant became famous as the author of the first modern art historical biography of Raphael (1839), and as the director of the Städelches Kunstinstitut in Frankfurt am Main (1840). After abandoning a career as a merchant, he decided to become an artist around 1815. In Rome, where he lived from 1817 to 1824, he was active as painter and close to the Nazarene circle. The young Passavant considered himself the representative of an anti-academic and self-confident community of artists who were largely independent in their practice. In this spirit, in 1818, he provided comprehensive recommendations for the organisation of artistic training at the newly founded Städelches Institut.

Passavant presented a conception that blended ideas drawn from the ateliers of French masters, from the patriotic German Lukasbrüder community and from a third component that was new in this context: a prosperous broadly effective system of workshops should arise from the political and social framework of a strong and independent community of citizens, leading to a new “blossom of art”. He derived this idea from the historical examination of Renaissance art in central Italy that he directly encountered and deliberately studied on his way to Rome, in Italian towns that once had been powerful republics. In this context Passavant contacted the Städel Administration for the first time and wrote his first book, *Ansichten über die bildenden Künste und Darstellung des Ganges derselben in Toscana*, in which he attempted to combine art history and artist manifesto. Here art history is an active “path” that should be followed again, to the place where it had once blossomed. Thereby, Passavant placed the leaders of central Italian art famous since Vasari’s *Vite*, in direct relation to his German artist friends in Rome.

Heavy criticism by scholars such as Karl Friedrich von Rumohr, but also discussions with friends, made Passavant not only better defend his argumentation, but also deepen his approach. His Raphael monograph of 1839, consciously based on the critical examination of sources, was the result of this engagement. It is therefore worth asking how the training and practice of 19th-century artists were related to – and possibly depended upon – this conception of applied history provided by Passavant and the Nazarenes.

*Robert Skwirbli, Dr. des., Research associate, Institut für Kunstwissenschaft und Historische Urbanistik, Technische Universität Berlin  
DFG Project Johann David Passavant in Paris und Rom. Eine Briefedition  
robert.skwirbli@tu-berlin.de*

## **Spyros Petritakis**

***Rudolf Steiner’s engagement with contemporary artists’ groups: Art-theoretical discourse in the anthroposophical milieu in Germany in the early 20th century***

Although much scholarly attention has been directed toward the impact of Rudolf Steiner’s thinking on painters such as W. Kandinsky and Hilma af Klint, who in the beginning of the 20th century were grappling with abstract tendencies, scarcely the historical presuppositions that enabled this cross-fertilization to take place have been put into a critical, art-historical framework. Thus, the decisive boost to the invention of abstract art is often presented –not least from the artists themselves– in terms of rupture with the academic historical understanding of representational painting and not in dialectical association with it. In my paper, I will elucidate certain aspects of the dynamic interaction between Steiner and young artists and explore the underlying mechanisms and premises that enabled shifts in artistic practice and aesthetic experience.

From 1909 on, as a result of the culminating crisis between the German and the English Theosophical Society, Steiner advocates a more esoteric-christocentric approach to art, denouncing the mainstream theosophical doctrine spread by Annie Besant. This is manifested in his famous lectures, held in Munich in 1910, particularly in that on the Greek painter Nikolaos Gyzis, professor at the Munich Academy. Steiner’s approach to Michelangelo’s *The Creation of the Sun and the Moon*, in that lecture, collides with the mainstream interpretation propagated by the Raphael and Michelangelo scholar, professor at Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in Berlin, Herman Grimm, whose seminal monograph on the latter artist saw numerous reeditions in the beginning of the 20th century. Steiner’s reconceptualization of art history’s aims and values is not narrowed to the Renaissance period but extends to 19th-century painters, such as A. Böcklin, J. M. W. Turner and A. Wiertz. I would like to contend that Steiner, in his quest to articulate a theory or “theology of colours” that would embrace Goethe’s legacy, seeks to establish a canonical lineage of painters that would allow him to reassess his contemporary art scene and steer thus the artistic production for his own purposes, in his endeavor to jump off Annie Besant’s aesthetic bandwagon and better adapt to the historical transformations of German society. The reactualisation of Goethe’s *Farbenlehre* as a “historical necessity” on the horizons of young artists that attended Steiner’s lectures, coincides with the reinvigoration of western esoteric Christianity, which the Goethe scholar sought to achieve.

Bringing these strands together, I will examine the means by which Steiner allowed young artists to engage with specific art-theory discourses and demonstrate the ways in which he interfered in the artistic production by commissioning art works or by providing instructions for them. I will focus in particular on Steiner's interest in the work of the Greek painter Nikolaos Gyzis, as well as on his connections with the artist group *Aenigma*, among whose members were Maria Strakosch-Gießler—a former student of Kandinsky—Anna May-Rychter and Irma von Duczynska.

Spyros Petritakis, M.A.  
Ph.D. candidate in Art History, University of Crete  
spyros.petritakis@gmail.com

## Émilie Oléron Evans

### ***Crafting the history of decorative arts: Das Kunstgewerbe in Elsass-Lothringen (1900-1906)***

This paper examines the collaborative formulation of a modern discourse on decorative arts in the journal *Das Kunstgewerbe in Elsass-Lothringen*, published in Strasbourg between 1900 and 1906, as the joint project of the artist Anton Seder, director of the Strasbourg Kunstgewerbeschule, and Franz F. Leitschuh, professor of Art History at the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Universität. The first editorial, penned by Leitschuh, pleaded for the creation of a space of dialogue and interaction between scholars and practitioners “reporting through words and images on artistic accomplishments past and present”, and reaching out to the general public with the aim to “let some beauty into the less privileged households” (« Zur Einführung », *Das Kunstgewerbe in Elsass-Lothringen* 1, 1900-1901, 2.).

As will be demonstrated, this agenda, at once cultural and artistic, would be pursued through a constant stream of contributions promoting the Jugendstil as the style for modernity, in line with the reforms to art education that were, at that time, led by the Kunstgewerbeschule. The journal acted as a printed platform for a new generation of craftsmen active in a number of places, including Munich, Darmstadt, Vienna and Dresden, but principally in and around Strasbourg, and accompanied the emergence of a cultural identity within the Reichsland. Richly illustrated, *Das Kunstgewerbe* actually showcased the works of teachers and students of the local schools of applied arts and will itself be taken as an artifact of the Jugendstil aesthetics.

Pedagogical and theoretical essays echoed contemporary artistic experiments in a new stylistic direction, connected to nature and departing from historicist tendencies. In spite of the journal's call for an aesthetic renewal, numerous articles also dealt with historical topics and even featured prominent scholars from the fields of art history and archaeology, a paradox that this paper will attempt to elucidate: praise for the Art Nouveau movement was consciously coupled with an exhaustive historical approach in order to create a sense of continuity in the evolution of crafts in the Reichsland and beyond, and in turn to inform contemporary artistic production. The purpose of art history was no longer to provide recurring models and patterns, but to raise awareness among the artists of the deep cultural roots of their activities. Acting to counter the perceived danger of a soulless modern style merely presenting



the exterior signs of modernity, the editors, along with the personnel of the Strasbourg school of applied arts, worked to establish a balance within the journal between projections of the future of crafts in the region, and reminders of the rich heritage in which students and readers were invited to take pride.

Thus, by echoing the re-evaluation of crafts in contemporary art historical scholarship, this mix of historical articles and opinion pieces on current practices and technical innovations contributed to the then visible shift in the standing of decorative arts: *Das Kunstgewerbe* offered a chance of self-affirmation for practitioners who could inscribe their own work within a genealogy of art history, thus converting their status from craftsman to artist.

Émilie Oléron Evans, Postdoctoral researcher  
Institut d'Études Avancées, Strasbourg (USIAS)  
oleronevans@unistra.fr

## Petra Brouwer

### ***Colliding times: The contemporary in 19th-century architectural history books***

From the first survey texts on architectural history that appeared in the middle of the 19th century, historical knowledge had a twofold function, aesthetic and historical. As an aesthetic theory, the history of building styles presented a scrupulous selection of exemplary, beautiful buildings, that served architects and the general public alike, to refine their taste. As a theory of the historical development of architecture, the chronological chain of buildings mirrored how all civilized cultures and ages had produced their own, characteristic style.

This paper argues that the twofold function of historical knowledge as produced by the survey text, resulted in colliding temporalities, whose incongruity only came to the surface in the last chapter on contemporary 19th-century architecture. If the architectural survey text was of central importance for the making of architectural history, then the last chapter put the usefulness of the survey's own knowledge production for contemporary architecture to the test. How, in this chapter, 19th-century architecture was evaluated in relation to its historical predecessors?

On the basis of the surveys of Thomas Talbot Bury, *The History and Description of the Styles of Architecture of Various Countries* (1849), Wilhelm Lübke, *Geschichte der Architektur* (1855), James Fergusson, *The Illustrated Handbook of Architecture* (1855) and Eugen Gugel, *Geschiedenis van de bouwstijlen* (1869) and their successive re-editions, I will explain how, in the last chapter of these books, contemporary architecture deserved both appraisal and utter disapproval. While being phrased in the same terminology (taste, fashion, copy, originality, invention, tradition) these judgments followed from opposing ideas on the relation between the present and the past. From the aesthetic point of view, the 19th century was full of promise. Architects' superior command of historicist styles mirrored the unprecedented availability of beautiful models for *emulation*. According to theory of historical development, the heterogeneous character of contemporary architecture painfully stood out against the homogeneous styles of the past. Historicism reflected its disoriented time, as well as architects' incapability to invent a style of their own.

Petra Brouwer, Assistant Professor Of Modern Architectural History  
Department of Art History, University of Amsterdam  
p.a.brouwer@uva.nl

## Melanie Sachs

### ***Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Kunstgeschichte für die mitlebende Kunst: Historismuskritik in kunsthistorischen Schriften um 1900***

Dieser Vortrag widmet sich dem kunsthistorischen Diskurs um 1900 im deutschsprachigen Raum und erörtert, wie Kunsthistoriker am Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts die Frage nach dem Einfluss der Kunstgeschichte auf die aktuelle Gegenwartskunst debattierten.

Während in der Mitte des Jahrhunderts die meisten Kunsthistoriker von einer positiven Wirkung der Kunstgeschichte auf die künstlerische Produktion ausgingen und von dieser sogar eine neue Blüte der nationalen Kultur erwarteten, taten sich um 1900 immer mehr Autoren mit dieser Vorstellung schwer. Auf diskursiver Ebene ist ein Rückzug vom Kunstbetrieb der Gegenwart zu bemerken, der mit dem Wandel des Kunstbegriffs in diesem Zeitraum und der damit einhergehenden Abwertung der akademischen und historistischen Kunst eng zusammenhängt. Es verbreitete sich die Auffassung, dass die Kunstgeschichte der Gegenwartskunst und damit der Entwicklung der Kunst schade, so dass viele Kunsthistoriker (wie z.B. Moriz Thausing, Eduard Dobbert, Franz Wickhoff oder August Schmarsow) sich offenbar genötigt sahen, sich in ihren methodischen Schriften gegen diesen Vorwurf zu verteidigen oder aber von einer Einflussnahme auf die aktuelle Kunst zu distanzieren.

Im Vortrag werden die verschiedenen argumentativen und konzeptuellen Strategien dargestellt, mit deren Hilfe die Autoren dieses Problem zu lösen suchten, sowie deren implizite Vorannahmen herausgearbeitet. Darüber hinaus wird gezeigt, dass dieses Phänomen sowohl als Effekt der Spezialisierung und Professionalisierung der Kunstgeschichte als auch als Folge einer Krise des Historismus interpretiert werden kann, die im allgemeinen mit Nietzsches Schrift "Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben" in Verbindung gebracht wird. Die Beschäftigung mit der Gegenwartskunst wurde demnach sowohl aus der Perspektive der verwissenschaftlichten Kunstgeschichte als auch aus der Warte der sich gegen diese wendenden Wissenschaftskritik problematisch. Beide forderten eine Trennung der Sphäre des Historischen und des Aktuellen. Damit erzeugten sie eine Kluft, die – so die These – die essentielle Rolle der Kunstgeschichte für die allgemeine Bildung zu gefährden drohte. Dies mag ein Grund dafür sein, dass Kunsthistoriker dennoch kontinuierlich versuchten, sich mit ihrer Gegenwartskunst zu beschäftigen und diese Kluft zumindest argumentativ irgendwie zu überbrücken.

### ***On the use and abuse of art history for coeval art: A critique of historicism in art historical writings around 1900***

This paper focuses on the art historical discourse as it occurred in German-speaking countries around 1900. It will discuss how, at the end of the 19th century, art historians were debating the impact of their discipline on art of their own time.

Whereas most art historians in the mid-19th-century were hoping to influence the contemporary development of art to bring about a new blossom of culture, around 1900 they were struggling with their relationship with contemporary art production. Within the disciplinary discourse, an alienation between art history and art can be noticed that could be regarded as result of a new understanding of art and the related devaluation of academic and historicist art. The opinion was spreading that art history does damage to current art and the ongoing artistic development. Therefore, in their methodological writings art historians such as Moriz Thausing, Eduard Dobbert, Franz Wickhoff or August Schmarsow either defended themselves and their work against this preconception or refrained from writing about contemporary art at all.

The aim of this paper is twofold: First, it discusses the different discursive strategies, which were used to dissolve this apparent contradiction, as well as these strategies' underlying assumptions. Second, it analyses the apparent contradiction between art history and contemporary art production both as a result of the specialisation that art history underwent as it was established as an academic discipline around 1900 and as a result of a crisis of historicism which is commonly associated with Nietzsches essay "The Use and Abuse of History for Life" ("Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben"). Dealing with present art became a challenge because of the scientification of art history and of the rising scepticism towards this specialised scientific approach. Both contradictory statements – so goes the thesis – were demanding a gap between the spheres of the historical and the present and were therefore putting the essential role of art history for general education at risk. Thus, art historians were constantly looking for ways to engage with contemporary art in order to bridge this gap.

Melanie Sachs, M.A., Ph.D. candidate in Art History  
Philipps-Universität Marburg; Research associate, German Documentation  
Centre for Art History – Bildarchiv Foto Marburg  
melanie.sachs@staff.uni-marburg.de

## Yannis Hadjinicolaou

### **‘Die Neue Sachlichkeit Rembrandts’: Aby Warburg’s *Claudius Civilis***

Artistic practice in both theory and history of art history is often ignored as if only language played a role in the creation of theory, whereas the artwork supposedly concerned exclusively craftsmanship. Aby Warburg’s *Claudius Civilis* is an example that can help to overcome this idea. Warburg was fascinated by Rembrandt’s famous painting (1661) when he first saw the picture in the book by John Kruse *Die Farben Rembrandts*; right afterwards, in 1926 he commissioned a copy to the painter Carl Schuberth in Stockholm. Both the reproduction in Kruse’s book and the manual painted copy had a direct impact on Warburg’s thinking. With no impasto, Schuberth’s copy of *Civilis* gave Warburg an explicit motivation for exploring what he termed as Rembrandt’s “New Objecthood” (“Neue Sachlichkeit”) in his talk “Italienische Antike im Zeitalter Rembrandts” in Hamburg (1926).

Schuberth’s copy, today in London, is a symptomatic work revealing the role of memory and history as well as the successive layers of meaning in each respective present of the past. In the case of *Claudius Civilis* emerges a “triangle of memory” uniting the history of Tacitus from roman antiquity with 17th-century Amsterdam and early-20th-century Hamburg. Warburg’s understanding of Rembrandt’s “New Objecthood” interacts with the directions in German society of Weimar-Republic.

Yannis Hadjinicolaou, Research associate  
Institut für Kunst- und Bildgeschichte, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin  
Project: Symbolische Artikulation. Sprache und Bild  
zwischen Handlung und Schema  
hadjinig@cms.hu-berlin.de

## Pier Paolo Racioppi

### **The men of letters and the teaching artists: Debating invention at the Accademia di San Luca in Rome during the first decades of the 19th century**

Around 1814 the antiquarian Giuseppe Antonio Guattani, professor of History, Mythology and Costume at the Accademia di San Luca (Rome) started the publication of the still little known *La Pittura comparata nelle opere principali di tutte le scuole* (Roma, Bourlié), published and sold in instalments of small size (in octavo) later collected in one volume.

The publication contained a collection of prints engraved by Stanislao Morelli, reproducing short sequences of famous paintings (Italian and foreign) compared to each other according to the same subject. *La Pittura comparata*, addressed by Guattani to the artists, was aimed at showing the different “inventions” adopted by painters of different epochs and schools in depicting the same subject, in order to discover the correct and the wrong ways of narrating a certain story (Guattani focuses in particular on attributes, architecture, costume etc.). The “philological correctness” is the *leitmotiv* of the book: according to Guattani, only those artists familiar with the ancient literary sources had successfully represented the subjects of their paintings. History painting was still considered by the classicist Guattani at the apex of the hierarchy of genres.

In 1822 the young Tommaso Minardi, considered as one of the most important representatives of the Italian Purist Movement, became professor of drawing and, few years later, of painting, drawing and art theory at the Accademia di San Luca. He began to reform the roman academy proposing new models as sources of inspiration for the young artists: the 14th- and 15th-century Italian painters along with a closer observation of Nature. These ideas were expressed by the artist in his lecture *Delle qualità essenziali della pittura italiana dal suo rinascimento fino all’epoca della perfezione* (1834).

My intervention will address the polarization between the purist-romantic tendency and the classicist one at the Accademia di San Luca through some significant examples, above all the criticism expressed by the artistic environment on the *Pittura Comparata* and the *Lettera intorno ad un quadro di Antigone dipinto dal Cav. Giuseppe Errante di Trapani*, both by Guattani.

Pier Paolo Racioppi, Adjunct Professor of Art History, IES Abroad Italy (Rome)  
ppracioppi@libero.it

**Lena Bader**

### ***Künstler vs. Kunsthistoriker? Streit der Interpretationen im Holbein-Streit***

Ein folgenreicher Bilderstreit bestimmt die Begründung der deutschsprachigen Kunstgeschichte und lässt das Fach gleich zu Beginn öffentlichkeitswirksam hervortreten: die im ersten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts entfachte Debatte um zwei Versionen der als Ikone der deutschen Kunst gefeierten *Madonna des Bürgermeisters Meyer* von Hans Holbein d. J. Aufsehen erregende Ausstellungen, unzählige Aufsätze, exklusive Besucherbefragungen, offizielle Pressemitteilungen und zahlreiche Reproduktionen wurden bemüht, um dem „Rätsel der zwei Originale“ auf die Spur zu kommen. Brisanz und Reichweite des Konflikts erschließen sich auch daraus, dass eine Vielzahl gesellschaftlicher Gruppen daran teilnimmt. Namhafte Künstler der Zeit und akademische Fachvertreter bestimmen das Geflecht der involvierten Akteure.

Der sogenannte Holbein-Streit ist konstitutiv für die Institutionalisierung der Kunstgeschichte; er gehört zu Recht zu den kanonischen Themen der Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Der fortschreitenden Komplexität des Geschehens zu trotz wurde die Geschichte des Holbein-Streits indes entlang streng hierarchischer Frontlinien nachgezeichnet. Stichwort gebend war nicht zuletzt Max J. Friedländers frühe Überzeugung von der „Überlegenheit der historisch eingestellten Kenner über die den Schönheitsmaßstab des 19. Jahrhunderts anlegenden Künstler“. Der Rückblick auf den Streit der Interpretationen war von Beginn an ideologisch aufgeladen. Infolge einer geradezu sensationalistischen Erzählung vom Triumph des Originals (gegenüber der Kopie) wurde der Holbein-Streit zum Signum für den Sieg der Kunsthistoriker (gegenüber den Künstlern) erklärt. Starke Schlagworte und wiederkehrende Thesen prägen seitdem das Stimmungsbild.

Die Fokussierung der Echtheitsfrage ist forciert: Weder ist der Holbein-Streit ein bloß kennerschaftlicher Attributionsstreit, noch war der Konflikt mit der Echtheitserklärung von 1871 gelöst. Vielmehr radikalisierte sich das Bilderrätsel im Anschluss an die Entdeckung des Originals. Der Streit wird „nicht etwa am grünen Tisch einer Konferenz“ ausgetragen, wie seinerzeit mit Blick auf den Holbein-Kongress von 1871, den ersten Kunsthistorikertag der Geschichte, festgehalten wurde, sondern *ad oculos*, im Zuge einer intensiven Arbeit am Bild. Erstaunlich kreative Bildexperimente, die von einer mindestens ebenso engagierten wie komplexen Reflexion begleitet wurden, bestimmen das Ge-

schehen. Als ein Streit um Bilder, mit Bildern und für Bilder fordert der Konflikt den Wissenschaftshistoriker auf, die Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte in gegenstands- und fachspezifischer Perspektive zu schreiben. Erst mit Blick auf das bisher weitgehend vernachlässigte Bildmaterial, das die Debatte begleitet, wird erkennbar, wie sich das Fach an der zunehmenden Verbildlichung und Durchdringung seines Gegenstandes konkretisiert.

Der Perspektivwechsel berührt eine zentrale Frontlinie der bisherigen Narration, der zufolge sich die Professionalisierung der Kunstgeschichte einem Distinktionsprozess zwischen Kunsthistorikern und Kunstschaffenden verdanke. Ungeachtet personeller Überschneidungen, die ohnehin den heraufbeschworenen Konflikt zu relativieren auffordern, entzieht sich der Holbein-Streit vor allem dadurch einer Dichotomie von kennerschaftlichem Diskurs und künstlerischer Praxis, dass er von einer Form von Kennerschaft zeugt, die sich zu allererst in bildpraktischen Erfahrungen manifestiert: Das umfangreiche Bildmaterial verdankt sich dem Umstand, dass Kunsthistoriker vielfach als Bildproduzenten tätig waren bzw. eng mit ihnen zusammenarbeiteten. Das Zusammenspiel von Bildkritik und Bildpraxis, nicht ihre Division, bestimmt die Verwissenschaftlichung der Kunstgeschichte. Aus ihrer Wechselwirkung erklärt sich auch, warum der Holbein-Streit kein bloß kennerschaftlicher Streit um zwei Kunstwerke ist, sondern ein umfassender Bilderstreit um Theorie und Praxis der Reproduktion. Anhand ausgewählter Etappen aus der vernachlässigten Bildgeschichte zum Holbein-Streit schlägt der Vortrag daher vor, die Bedeutung dieser künstlerisch-kreativen Hervorbringungen für die Kunstgeschichte zu erörtern, um ihr bild- und methodenkritisches Potential herauszuarbeiten.

#### ***Artists vs. art historians?***

#### ***Disputing interpretations in the Holbein controversy***

A passionate image controversy brought about the founding of art history in the German speaking world, all before the eyes of the public: The debate, which unfolded in the first third of the 19th century, surrounding two versions of the painting celebrated as an icon of German art, the *Madonna of Jakob Meyer zum Hasen* by Hans Holbein the Younger. Spectacular exhibitions, countless essays, discerning visitor surveys, official press releases, and numerous reproductions all endeavored to get to the bottom of the “puzzle of the two originals.” The explosive force and reach of the conflict is also explained by the participation of a variety of social groups. The network of actors involved is comprised of renowned artists of the time and academic representatives.

The so-called “Holbein dispute” is constitutive for the institutionalization of art history; it rightly holds a place among the canonical topics in the discipline’s historiography. However, in spite of the progressive complexity of events, the history of the Holbein dispute was traced along strictly hierarchical lines. In particular, Max J. Friedländer set the tone with his early belief in the “superiority of historically-minded connoisseurs over artists invested in the standards of beauty of the 19th century”. From the very beginning, the retrospective view of the conflict of interpretations has been ideologically charged. As a result of an almost sensationalistic account of the triumph of the original (over the copy), the Holbein dispute was declared a sign of the victory of art historians (over artists). Since then, strong buzzwords and recurring theories have dominated scholarly opinion.

The focus on the question of authenticity has been overstated. The Holbein dispute is neither a mere debate among experts over attribution nor was the conflict resolved with the declaration of authenticity in 1871. Rather, following the discovery of the original, the riddle of the picture became more radical. The dispute is not carried out “at the green table of a conference” as was recorded at that time regarding the Holbein congress of 1871—the first art history conference in history—but *ad oculos* in the course of intensive visual work. Astonishingly creative image experiments, which were accompanied by reflection that was at least as engaged as it was complex, dictated events. As a dispute about images, involving images and for images, the conflict encourages historiographers to write the history of art history from a subject- and discipline-specific perspective. Only when one takes a look at the, up to now, largely neglected pictorial material that accompanies the debate, does the way in which the discipline has solidified itself through the increasing visualization and permeation of its subject become apparent.

This change in perspective touches on a central front of the narrative thus far, according to which the professionalization of art history is due to a process of distinction between art historians and creators of art. Regardless of overlaps in personnel, which call for the evoked conflict to be relativized anyway, the Holbein dispute evades a dichotomy of connoisseur discourse and artistic practice in that it was born of a form of connoisseurship that manifested first and foremost in practical experiences with images: The extensive pictorial material exists thanks to the circumstance that art historians were often active as creators of images or worked closely together with those who were. It is the interplay of image criticism and image creation, not their division, that brought about the establishment of art history as a humanistic discipline. Their interaction also explains why the Holbein dispute is not just a debate among connoisseurs about two *works of art* but a comprehensive *image* debate about the theory and praxis of reproduction. By means of select stages of the neglected visual history of the Holbein dispute, the lecture thus suggests the importance of these artistic-creative offerings to art history be discussed so as to carve out their iconical and methodological-critical potential.

*Dr. Lena Bader*

*Head of section, Deutsches Forum für Kunstgeschichte Paris*

*lbader@dfk-paris.org*

### **III. Art history by artists: The artist as producer of art discourse**

## Claire Barbillon

### ***How did 19th-century French sculptors write the history of ancient Greek sculpture?***

During the 19th century, sculptors who wrote texts were less common than their painter colleagues, and their books are not as easy to find. However certain of them and not the least important ones left texts of great value from an aesthetic point of view. From the beginning to the end of the century, one of the main topics in their reflexions was knowledge about and interpretation of the sculpture of the ancient Greeks. Using a diachronic approach, this paper will attempt to locate constants but also variations in these historiographical constructions, which do not find a direct equivalent in the artistic production of the sculptors. Thus we can identify artistic duos, Pierre Simart and Pierre-Jean David d'Angers, Eugène Guillaume and Auguste Rodin, Antoine Bourdelle and Aristide Maillol who develop a surprising theoretical closeness with regard to their aesthetic differences.

*Claire Barbillon*  
*Professor of Art History*  
*Université de Poitiers*  
*claire.barbillon@univ-poitiers.fr*

## Wibke Schrape

### ***From artists to art historians: Art discourse in transition in 19th-century Japan***

This paper addresses the formation of the Rinpa genealogy as a case study of 19th-century Japanese art discourse in transition from an art history practiced by artists to an academic subject based on the model of European art history. Art and aesthetics were a major resource in the formation of Japan as a modern state in the Meiji era (1868–1912). In this process, art historians re-constructed the Kōrin-school (Rinpa) as a distinctively Japanese aesthetic tradition and used it to promote a national identity of “Beautiful Japan” to both Japanese and Western audiences. The foundation for this art-historical narrative was laid by a prominent painter of the lineage itself. Sakai Hōitsu (1761–1828) commemorated the centenary of Ogata Kōrin’s (1658–1716) death with a memorial event, a special exhibition, a series of paintings, and a couple of wood-block printed publications. He thereby promoted Kōrin as the founder of the Ogata Lineage (Ogata ryū) and himself as his legitimate successor. Hōitsu’s disciple, Ikeda Koson’s (1803–1868), consolidated this self-proclaimed artistic genealogy through his publication of copybooks with small-scale reproductions of both Kōrin’s and Hōitsu’s compositions. Hōitsu and Koson thus generated, conceptualized, and promoted a visual canon of what became the Kōrin-school in early 20th-century art-historical discourse and is known today as Rinpa.

My paper examines the formation of the Rinpa genealogy from artists’ paintings and publications in the 19th to art historians’ publications in the early 20th century. It focuses on artists’ and art historians’ use of pictorial evidence and textual narration as two different ways of knowledge production. The corpus of Ikeda Koson’s paintings, model sketches, and copybook publications thereby illuminates the entanglement of painting production, artist’s education, art connoisseurship, and art historical knowledge production in premodern Japan. A comparison between Hōitsu’s, Koson’s, and early 20th-century publications illuminates continuities and discontinuities of an art discourse in transition due to inflicting normalizations of Western academic art history and a growing interest of Japan to promote itself as a civilized nation.

Accordingly, my paper approaches the topic of the conference from an extra-European and reverse perspective in the sense of an “Art History by Artists”. It thereby questions the homogeneity of art history as a scholarly discourse as well as Eurocentric perceptions of a global art history including subsequent marginalization of non-academic and extra-European art historical traditions.

*Wibke Schrape, curatorial assistant  
Museum für Asiatische Kunst, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin  
w.schrape@smb.spk-berlin.de*

## **Michael Thimann**

### ***Kunsthistorisches Praxiswissen: Der Maler Carl Wilhelm Oesterley (1805-1891) als Professor der Kunstgeschichte an der Universität Göttingen***

Das 19. Jahrhundert hat in Deutschland eine Reihe von Künstlern hervorgebracht, die von der malerischen Praxis zunehmend zur kunsthistorischen Forschung gewechselt sind und die eigene Kunstpraxis z.T. vollkommen aufgegeben haben. Johann David Passavant, Ernst Förster und Ferdinand Olivier als Hauptvertreter der idealistisch-nazarenischen Richtung sind hier zu nennen. Im Fokus meines Vortrags steht mit Carl Wilhelm Oesterley (1805-1891) nun ein romantischer Maler, der an der Dresdner Akademie und im römischen Umkreis der protestantischen Nazarener (Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Rehbenitz, Friedrich Olivier) seine wesentliche künstlerische Ausbildung erfuhr und zu einer Meisterschaft vor allem in der Zeichnung führte. Davon zeugen seine bekannten Künstlerportraits wie auch seine italienischen Landschaften und Nachzeichnungen nach alten Meistern des Tre- und Quattrocento. Nach der Rückkehr nach Deutschland um 1829 blieb Oesterley ein praktischer Künstler, wurde aber zugleich Professor für Kunstgeschichte an der Georg-August-Universität in Göttingen. Der bemerkenswerte Fall, dass Oesterley angestellter Künstler und Kunsthistoriker in Personalunion war, ist zugleich Thema meines Vortrags.

Oesterleys künstlerische wie kunswissenschaftliche Produktion soll in meinem Vortrag in eine Interaktion gesetzt werden. Einerseits, da Oesterley nachweislich seine eigenen künstlerischen Arbeiten und Nachzeichnungen nach alter Kunst in seinen Vorlesungen und Übungen eingesetzt hat, andererseits, da er als Hannoveraner Hofmaler weiterhin praktisch tätig blieb und nazarenische Historienbilder entwarf und ausführte, die fraglos eine von fundierten kunsthistorischen Kenntnissen durchsetzte Kunst sind. Die Frage meines Vortrags lautet, wie sich die Interaktion von Kunstpraxis und Kunstgeschichte in dem doppelgleisigen Werk Oesterleys gestaltet. Meine These ist, dass sich am Beispiel von Oesterley eine Form von kunsthistorischen Praxiswissen beschreiben lässt, das nicht in den gewöhnlichen Kategorien des akademischen Kunstbetriebs seinen historischen Ort hat. Ich möchte vielmehr die spezifische epistemologische Konstellation herausarbeiten, in der sich Kunstpraxis und Kunstgeschichte bedingen und eine synthetische Form von Praxiswissen konstituieren resp. eine kategoriale Differenzierung von künstlerischem Praxiswissen und ‚wissenschaftlichem‘ Wissen inaugrieren.

Mein Vortrag stützt sich auf ein derzeit am Kunstgeschichtlichen Seminar der Georg-August-Universität laufenden Forschungsprojekt zu Carl Wilhelm Oesterley, in dem sein künstlerischer Nachlass neu inventarisiert und analysiert wird und erstmals seine kunsthistorische Lehrtätigkeit auf Grundlage der handschriftlich erhaltenen Vorlesungen aus den 1830er und 1840er Jahren rekonstruiert werden wird. Der Vortrag versteht sich aber nicht als Werkstattbericht, sondern beschreibt das heuristische Prinzip, mit dem Oesterley auf neuer quellenmäßiger und wissenschaftshistorischer Grundlage in den Diskurs der Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte eingebracht werden könnte.

Michael Thimann  
Professor of Art History  
Georg-August-Universität Göttingen  
mthiman@gwdg.de

## Margherita D’Ayala Valva

### ***Artists’ reading and copybook practice as a form of self-taught education***

Not surprisingly, and despite his futuristic claims to jettison backward-looking art and literature, Umberto Boccioni was seldom inspired by modern life, when representing his era. Boccioni was a painter who read a great deal: not only Bergson – notoriously his generation’s bestseller – but also Ruskin, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Wilde, Ibsen, D’Annunzio, and Angelo Conti, as recent scholarly research has revealed. He collected and assembled images of past artworks cut out from journals in a newly discovered album which will soon be published as his “Atlas of Memory”, and in the same years (1907-08) transcribed passages from his readings into his notebooks. This cutting-copying practice – very common in the era of reproductive study methods, or simply typical of the artists’ unstructured forms of education and impulsive literary choices – is for the artist a very useful way, analogous to a sketch, to keep in mind some relevant passages, parallel to his visual assemblages, in order to use them for his praxis, or to re-write them in his own writings.

My broader research on artists’ reading practices, of which Boccioni’s constitutes a case study (focused on his notebooks, studied at the Getty Research Institute), addresses more general questions related to artists’ education, attempting to suggest a possible relationship between theoretical equipment and skill development, between the copybook practice and the assembling/repetitive nature of the practical apprenticeship.

My paper will also present another case study representative of this peculiar practice of reading and interpreting, related to Boccioni through the Milan-centred Divisionist movement, but here considered mainly for its relevance as a form of self-taught education: Divisionist painter Angelo Morbelli’s readings and re-writings at the turn of the century. Although Morbelli, unlike Boccioni, received a complete academic education, his notebooks testify to a peculiar interest in art sources (in particular art treatises, such as Eastlake, Mérimée, Montabert, Selvatico), with a focused eye on technical matters. His method of cutting out passages and decontextualizing them for his own practical purposes, observed in his first copybook named *Burning issues! (Questioni palpitan-ti!)*, 1880s, can be verified in his two later copybooks *The way of the cross of Divisionism (La via crucis del Divisionismo)*, 1912-17, where the more fragmentary quotations from the readings are frequently interspersed with personal notes



and reminders on technique, evincing a more familiar and even dialectical relationship to his sources.

Eventually, Gino Severini's notebook entirely dedicated to technique (*Notes techniques 40 années d'expérience*), containing notes, letters and cut-outs from articles mostly dating back to the 1920s onwards, is the last case proposed here, where the fragments attempt to compose a vademecum supporting the artist's daily practice. Among these pages are conserved various recipes, notes from friends' advices, transcriptions from treatises, on typically 1920s topics, related to the artist's coeval activity (tempera, fresco painting, mosaic).

*Margherita D'Ayala Valva, Researcher (Assistant Professor)  
Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa  
margherita.dayala@sns.it*

## **Anne Gregersen**

### ***Artists' collections as producers of alternative art historical narratives: The example of J.F. Willumsen's collection***

While the art museums in the 19th and early 20th century increasingly were grounding their collecting and exhibition practices on a teleological and normative understanding of art history, the private collections of artists from this time present another and more idiosyncratic approach to the historicization of art. When analyzing these collections it becomes apparent that they often are visualizations of an art historical discourse that question the official canon and produce alternative narratives. It is therefore highly relevant to discuss how artists' collections relate to notions of representativeness, canon and value of art and how they have contributed to shaping art history. Furthermore, it is noteworthy how some artists strategically have intervened with the governmental art museums' control over art discourse by envisioning public access to their collections – either by attempting to establish regular museums for them or through the phenomenon of a “maison-musée”.

Early examples of European artists' collections include the ones of J.A.D. Ingres and Bertel Thorvaldsen, later came the ones of Auguste Rodin, Edgar Degas, Pablo Picasso, prince Eugen, J.F. Willumsen, and Joaquín Sorolla among others. Except for Degas, all of these artists ended up with a museum housing their own art together with their collection. In this paper, the museum collection of Danish sculptor and painter J.F. Willumsen (1863-1958) will be explored as a local case study of an international phenomenon with general characteristics. Willumsen began his collection around 1890 (with a trade between him and Paul Gauguin), but it took on another dimension from 1911, when he purchased an early El Greco painting, “The Adoration of the Shepherds” (1567-70). In the next two decades, it vastly expanded with items from the antique and medieval periods, a number of original Italian master drawings, a painting by Jacopo Bassano, and other originals centered on the time of the Renaissance, Mannerism, and Baroque. It also includes a large amount of incorrectly attributed works to artists such as Leonardo da Vinci, Titian, Raphael, and Michelangelo. From the early 1920s, Willumsen referred to his collection of approximately 2000 objects as his “museum” and struggled from this time on to establish the official museum that finally opened in 1958. However, when the museum opened, it only displayed works by Willumsen, and his collection was confined to storage.

Willumsen's collection reveals a complex history understanding that incorporates various modes of categorizing and systemizing objects. It is partly in line with a positivistic art history and with the official canon of the late 19th and early 20th century. At the same time it draws on the worldview of the *Wunderkammer* and the invention by artists around this time of what Matei Calinescu has referred to as a "private and essentially modifiable past" (*Five Faces of Modernity*, 1987). It shows how the relations between the past and the present were being negotiated by artists in their search to connect their own work to the past, and how this produced genealogies that were very different from the ones that informed the collection and exhibition practices of most museum institutions.

The paper will address these issues and discuss how collections such as Willumsen's can contribute to understanding the various ways in which art history was being historicized in the early 20th century.

Anne Gregersen, Postdoctoral researcher  
Department of Arts and Cultural Studies, University of Copenhagen  
annegregersen@hum.ku.dk

## Léa Kuhn

### ***Configuring the gaze: Matthew Pratt's painterly in(ter)vention***

My paper addresses how artists employ practice to intervene in theoretical debates and shape artistic discourse. Specifically, I will be looking at a painting by the American-born painter Matthew Pratt from Philadelphia, submitted to the annual exhibition of the Society of Artists of Great Britain in London in 1766.

Pratt's canvas was exhibited with the telling title "The American School". It shows a studio scene where artists of different ages practice drawing or painting, depending on their level of artistic formation. At the time of his contribution, Pratt himself had been studying for two years with Benjamin West in his London studio. Accordingly, research has mainly focused on identifying contemporary painters depicted within the painting, and, more recently, on reaching an understanding of the fictional aspects of the depiction as part of Pratt's self-fashioning as a painter.

This paper, however, analyses Pratt's painting within the broader context of the ongoing discussion on the influence of geography on artistic production. Two years before the founding of the Royal Academy of Art in London in 1768, questions of an adequate artistic formation and controversial opinions on the current state of "British painting" were extensively discussed in public. At a time of intensified debate over the (non-)existence of a "British school of painting", Pratt exhibited a painting that simply claims the existence of an "American school".

I argue that Pratt's canvas can not only be understood as the depiction of an American school in a literal sense, meaning as a studio scene with a group of artists studying with Benjamin West. Instead, Pratt's painting also makes a visual contribution to the issue of "artistic schools" in general. Consequently, Pratt's posited "American school" needs to be closely examined. This will reveal more about the connection between the peripheral position that Pratt held in the London art world, and tell us more about his chosen subject. The paper also examines what could have been the specific contribution of a painting to a discussion compared to a purely verbal one. It demonstrates that the geographical aspect as well as the temporality of the notion of 'school' needs to be taken into account in our assessments of this development in artistic discourse.

Léa Kuhn, M.A., Ph.D. candidate, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München  
lea.kuhn@kunstgeschichte.uni-muenchen.de

## France Nerlich

### ***Setting new paradigms for art and science: Art history by Friedrich Overbeck and Paul Delaroche***

Turning painting into the new medium of art history, that was the bold project of two major 19th-century painters. Responding to a similar request by two pedagogical institutions in France and Germany (the Ecole des beaux-arts in Paris and the Städelches Kunstinstitut in Francfort/Main), Paul Delaroche and Johann Friedrich Overbeck did not rely on traditional representations of old masters (in the modus of portrait galleries or Vasarian anecdotes): on the contrary they deliberately proposed a view of art history as an interpretation of its manifestations. Through the close relation they had to scholars, antiquarians, librarians and amateurs, but also through the conscious definition of their actual place in art history, both painters were deeply involved in the ebullient reflection on ancient art and the many ways to grasp it. It does therefore not surprise that the elaboration of the *Hémicycle des beaux-arts* and of the *Triumph of Religion in the Arts* was grounded on strong documentation (and exchanges with scholars), but neither Delaroche nor Overbeck conceived their work as an illustration of scholarly discourses, encyclopaedic exhaustiveness or canonical consensus. On the contrary, both artists established with authority their own view of art history. Their diametrically opposite positions express the growing tensions between the philosophy and the science of history (Geschichtsphilosophie and Geschichtswissenschaft), and the transcendent or immanent interpretation of artistic creation.

Turning the “language of the painter” (Charles Blanc) into a new scholarly language, Delaroche and Overbeck set new paradigms which disturbed most of the contemporary critics. Object of international debates, several reproductions and diverse translations, both works however lastingly affected the way of visualising art history. In addressing these two works, I want to shed light on a major shift that affected art practice in the 19th century, when it came to take part in the scholarly discourse as a new authority. The question of the visual articulation of facts and their interpretation is an essential point as the visualization of theory was here at stake, but, maybe even more important is the fact that the new ratio of power came from the consciousness that art is from now on able to formulate a discourse on itself.

*France Nerlich, Professor of Art History, Université François-Rabelais de Tours  
france.nerlich@univ-tours.fr*

## Jan Dirk Baetens

### ***Bruegel the Elder, Bruegel the much much Younger, and the Antwerp Raphael: The invention of Pieter Bruegel the Elder in the work of Henri Leys and his followers***

Although Pieter Bruegel the Elder (c. 1525-1569) is nowadays recognised as one of art history’s major figures, his legacy was heavily contested in the 19th century. In particular in Belgium, where Bruegel had lived and worked, aesthetic and political strives, often intricately interwoven with one another, fuelled a passionate debate around the artist. 19th-century vanguard realists and symbolists claimed Bruegel as a 16th-century predecessor, while contemporary academic artists rejected his work as comical, vulgar and bizarre. In addition, in a country deeply divided between nationalist liberals and conservative catholics, art historians of the former group had difficulties incorporating Bruegel’s ambiguous artistic legacy into the national canon, while catholic writers disallowed Bruegel altogether because of his alleged sympathies for the 16th-century reformation.

A pivotal role in the gradual rehabilitation, or, perhaps better, reinvention, of Bruegel was played by the so-called “Antwerp school” of Henri Leys (1815-1869) and his followers, a group of anti-academic, outspoken liberal and sometimes anticlerical painters who specialised in scenes set in the 15th and 16th centuries and executed in a style based on the art of that time – including Bruegel’s – but often also referring to modern-day politics. Leys, himself an avid collector of prints and paintings by Bruegel, not only found in the older master’s work an aesthetic that enabled him to depict the past in an ostensibly authentic way, but also a creative vision that was, paradoxically, in line with modern artistic developments such as the rise of realism. In addition, Bruegel’s suspected role in the reformation enabled Leys to infuse his historic scenes with a political message that referred, under a 16th-century guise, to 19th-century Belgian party politics.

This paper focuses in particular on Leys’ *Studio of Frans Floris* (1868), his final masterpiece and, in the words of art critic Edouard Fétis, his artistic testament. By suggesting the improbable presence of a painting by Bruegel in the studio of the Italianate Flemish Renaissance artist Frans Floris De Vriendt (c. 1519-1570), the “Raphael from Antwerp” and Bruegel’s main competitor and nemesis, Leys’s painting stages a programmatic confrontation between both 19th-century artists. This confrontation was highly personal for Leys,

who was regularly compared to Bruegel and contrasted to Floris, and who here emphasised his own position by including one of his own paintings next to Bruegel's in the studio of Floris. In a complex dialogue between these paintings in the painting, mediated by Floris's own *Judgement of Salomon* (1547) central in the scene, Leys's work suggests the main difference between the school of Floris's "academism" and that of Bruegel's "realism" for the development of *modern* art: the first is like a mother who crushes her descendants under the weight of convention and tradition, while the second sets her offspring free by constantly referring it back to nature itself. It was this line of thinking that would lead Belgian art historians to the final rehabilitation of Brueghel at the end of the century.

*Jan Dirk Baetens, Assistant Professor  
Departments of Art History & Literary and Cultural Studies  
Radboud University Nijmegen  
J.Baetens@let.ru.nl*

# IMPRINT

Fachgebiet Kunstgeschichte der Moderne  
Institut für Kunstwissenschaft und Historische Urbanistik  
Technische Universität Berlin  
Fakultät I  
Sekt. A 56  
Straße des 17. Juni 150/152  
10623 Berlin  
Tel.: +49 (0)30 314 29649  
evratskidou@gmail.com

[www.arthistoryforartists.com](http://www.arthistoryforartists.com)  
[www.kuk.tu-berlin.de](http://www.kuk.tu-berlin.de)

Edited by Eleonora Vratskidou  
Designed by Meike Bunten

*Specials thanks to Eyke Vonderau, Merten Lagatz, Philippa Sisis,  
Christine Howald, Dorothee Wimmer, Marianthi Vezertzi, Chrysa Vratskidou,  
Christopher Sauder, Lindsay Parkhowell, Eric Garberson,  
Lia Yoka, Richard Whitlock, Christina Dimitriadis and Eduardo Cadava.*

Unterstützt von / Supported by



**Alexander von Humboldt**  
Stiftung/Foundation

