

American Voices. Remarks on the Earlier History of Art History in the United States and the Reception of Germanic Art Historians¹

Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann

A wave of studies in the historiography of art history has recently swept over both sides of the Atlantic, bringing with it a vogue for scholarship on German art historians who were active in America.² Much information has been accumulated as a result.

1. This paper was originally published in *Ars*, 42:1, 2009, 128-52. As stated in the first note to the original publication, it draws upon two lectures. The first was given as 'The American Voice. Deutsche Kunsthistoriker im Exil in den Vereinigten Staaten', given at the meeting of Deutscher Kunsthistorikerverband, Hamburg, Germany, 23 March 2001, and then in English as 'German Art Historians in the United States and Paul Frankl', Moravská Galerie, Brno, Czech Republic, 26 June 2001, and as 'German Art Historians in the United States', Speed Museum of Art, Louisville, Kentucky, 27 September 2001. This lecture has been published in slightly different form as 'The American Voice. German Historians of Art and Architecture in Exile in the United States', in *Heaven and Earth. Festschrift for Karsten Harries*, Wolkenkuckucksheim: *Internationale Zeitschrift zur Theorie der Architektur*, Vol. 12, No. 1, August 2007, <http://www.tu-cottbus.de/theoriederarchitektur/Wolke/eng/Subjects/071/DaCostaKaufmann/dacosta-kaufmann.htm>. The second lecture was given as the introduction to a symposium, 'Pasts, Presents, Futures', at Princeton University on 7 December 2007. The material presented in this paper has been considerably enlarged, however. In the initially publication I thanked Jennifer A. Morris for her assistance, and here I would like to thank Meriel May Geolot and Elizabeth Petcu as well. I have made only slight corrections to the original publication in *Ars*, and have not included the illustrations, which were not essential to the points made.

2. For the study of German émigré art historians, see most comprehensively Karin Michels, *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft: deutschsprachige Kunstgeschichte im amerikanischen Exil*, Studien aus dem Warburg-Haus, Bd. 2, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999; and Ulrike Wendland, *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im Exil*, Munich: Saur, 1999. See particularly for the discussion carried on here Christopher S. Wood, 'Art History's Normative Renaissance', in *The Italian Renaissance in the Twentieth Century, Acts of an International Conference, Florence, Villa I Tatti*, 1999, Florence: Olschki, 2002, 65-92; Wood, 'Strzygowski und Riegl in den Vereinigten Staaten', *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 53, 2004, 217-34, and, though clearly more general than just an account of the immigrants and their reception, Thomas Crow, 'The Practice of Art History in America', *Daedalus* 135: 2, Spring 2006, 70-90.

Earlier accounts are Erwin Panofsky, 'Three decades of art history in the United States:

Nevertheless, the resulting picture of both the earlier history of art history in the United States and of the role of Germanic art historians in America remains faulty in several significant respects.

This essay offers a revised view of some aspects of the earlier history of art history in the United States that have previously been ignored, downplayed, or represented inaccurately. It presents that story as it unrolled before 1933 as providing precedents and accordingly a context for the reception of Germanic scholarship, among other things for the origins of current interests in a broader, globalized view of art history. It also offers a critique of some outstanding interpretations of the importance and identity of German scholarly émigrés.

The Earliest American Art Theory and Historiography

While the history of German-speaking exiles (and visiting scholars) involved with art history (and theory) is usually associated with the period beginning in the 1930's, the beginnings of this story start long before the twentieth century: they can be traced back before the foundation of the United States of America in the eighteenth century. The first original treatise on art that was written in any part of the western hemisphere was composed in German by someone who was in effect an émigré for religious reasons.³ Between the years 1762 and 1770 Johann Valentin Haidt (1700-1780) laid down his

Impressions of a Transplanted European', Epilogue of *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Papers in and On Art History*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1955, 321-347; and Colin Eisler, 'Kunstgeschichte American style: A Study in Migration', in Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn, eds, *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America 1930-1960*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969, 544-629.

Signs of more general interest in historiography, with pertinence for the discussion here, are Michael Ann Holly, *Past Looking : Historical Imagination and the Rhetoric of the Image*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996; Michael Ann Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984; Catherine M. Soussloff, *The Absolute Artist : the Historiography of a Concept*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1997; and Catherine M. Soussloff, ed., *Jewish identity in Modern Art History*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999.

3. The situation of art theory in New Spain is well discussed in Paula Mues Orts, 'El Arte Maestra: traducción novohispana de un tratado pictórico italiano. Estudio introductorio y notas', *Estudios en torno al arte*, 1, 2006. The main title discussed is however, as indicated, a translation; other well known works such as those by Miguel Cabrera, *Maravilla Americana*, Mexico, 1756, are not properly art history. The treatise on painting by Manuel Samaniego, found in manuscript in Quito, seems to be the earliest produced in South America, but dates probably c. 1800: see Jose Maria Vargas, *Manuel Samaniego y su Tratado de Pintura*, Quito: Editorial Santo Domingo, 1975.

thoughts on art in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. They are preserved in a manuscript written in German by an amanuensis that remains unpublished in the Moravian Archives in that city.⁴

Johann Valentin Haidt (known as John Valentine Haidt in America) was the offspring of a family of goldsmiths from Augsburg, where his grandfather had obtained a certain amount of fame.⁵ His father was prominent in this profession, and became royal Prussian goldsmith. Johann Valentin Haidt was himself born in Danzig (Gdańsk). When he was two years old he was taken by his father with his family to Berlin, when the elder Haidt assumed his duties there. Johann Valentin was first trained as a goldsmith, but then attended the newly founded Berlin academy of art. The younger Haidt also spent a number of years in Italy. According to his own information, he became familiar with the art scene in Rome around the year 1720. In Rome Johann Valentin Haidt joined a group of Pietistic Lutherans, and then moved to England.

In England Haidt converted to the beliefs of the *Mährische Einheit*, what is known in Czech as the *Jednota Bratská*. In the United States this religion is called Moravian. Haidt became a member of the community of the Moravian brotherhood that Count Zinzendorf had refounded from the tradition of the *Jednota Bratská*, the religion of Jan Comenius among others. Haidt went to the Moravian community in Herrnhag in Germany, and then to Herrnhut. There he became a painter. Because the *Herrenhutter*, as the Moravians are called in German, were only allowed to live in Saxony under the protection of Count Zinzendorf, and were not officially tolerated, Haidt's return to England and his subsequent voyage to America may be regarded as a form of emigration; he was certainly an immigrant to what became the United States.

In the year 1754 Haidt came to the Moravian community in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, where he lived until his death in 1780. He was a sort of missionary, who purportedly used his paintings as a means for proselytizing, and was named *Gemeinmaler* of Bethlehem. In this capacity he painted many portraits, Biblical histories, and historical events; there exist approximately 275 paintings from his hand. He also offered instruction in drawing to the youth of Bethlehem. While Haidt was

4. I am grateful to Vernon Nelson of the Moravian Archives, who discovered this manuscript, for supplying me with a transcript of the document. I leave full publication of the document to Elder Nelson.

5. For biographical information on Haidt see Vernon Nelson, *John Valentine Haidt*, ex. cat., Williamsburg, VA: Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Folk Art Collection, 1966; Charlene Engel, *Paintings by John Valentine Haidt*, ex. cat., Bethlehem, PA: Moravian College, 1992; and most recently, with fuller annotation, Vernon H. Nelson, 'Johann Valentin Haidt und Zinzendorf', in *Graf ohne Grenzen. Leben und Werk von Nikolaus Ludwig Graf von Zinzendorf*, ex. cat., Herrnhut, Germany: Universitätsarchiv in Herrnhut im Verlag der Comeniusbuchhandlung, 2000, 152-8.

living in Philadelphia in the year 1755, he also taught the famous Anglo-American painter Benjamin West.⁶

It was probably in connection with his activity as a teacher that Haidt conceived of writing a treatise on art. Haidt's treatise is a small manuscript, thirty-seven pages long, which exists only in the handwriting of an amanuensis or secretary. In it Haidt attempts to communicate the bases of drawing and painting. The tract is quite typical for the time. It deals with drawing, proportion, perspective, and other fundamentals. It is also of interest here because Haidt devotes a few pages to the history of art among the various aspects of art with which he deals. Although his words are relatively few in number, his comments on the subject are also completely in keeping with the character of the historiography of art history before Johann Joachim Winckelmann. In this regard, though not of course in its size, Haidt's treatise may be compared to the mammoth volumes of Joachim von Sandrart. While Sandrart's tomes are immense, his section on art history forms only a part of a much larger work, which includes lives of artists and remarks on art history in its three giant folios.⁷ Haidt's remarks on art history also appear standard in content, if they be compared with treatments offered in other works of their time. He talks about the failure of Roman painting to survive from antiquity, praises the painters of the Italian Renaissance, and regards their paintings as exemplary.

Given the understanding of art history that existed before Winckelmann, whose tracts he probably could not have known, Haidt may therefore also be considered to be an art historian. Thus he may be regarded as the first German art historian, also the first German art historian in exile, who worked in the United States.

The fate of Haidt's treatise is pertinent to a theme of the present essay as well: not all German utterances on the arts were heard, and his offers a good example of a German voice that in fact has remained largely unheard. Haidt's tract has remained largely unknown, since it has remained unpublished. With the exception of West (whose student days antecede the probable date of composition of the treatise) Haidt also seems to have had no immediate followers or known students of importance who worked as artists in the United States.

Possibly, however, Haidt's reputation did have some later effect, because two generations after his death the community of Bethlehem called Gustav Grünewald from Germany to come to Pennsylvania to become *Gemeinmaler*. Grünewald was a pupil of the famed painter Caspar David Friedrich. In America he painted landscapes depicting the Lehigh river valley which resemble some of Friedrich's works, but have

6. Ann Uhry Abrams, 'New Light on Benjamin West's Pennsylvania Instruction', *Wintherthur Portfolio*, 17: 4, 1982, 243-57.

7. See for these points Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, 'Antiquarianism, the History of Objects, and the History of Art Before Winckelmann', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 62, 2001, 523-41.

traces of new economic developments in them.⁸ Grünewald's work in Pennsylvania appears to anticipate American luminist painting for which he may provide a hitherto unrecognized source (his pictures were exhibited during his lifetime in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston), and in any event he represents an early example of the impact of German art in the United States.

Haidt and Grünewald are thus harbingers of the advent of a more general Germanic influence in the cultural history of the United States. In the nineteenth century this was to be felt in many fields in addition to the visual arts. From the early nineteenth century Germany exercised an enormous influence on American education and scholarship, the main topics of this essay. Between the years 1820 and 1920 almost 9000 American students went to Germany in order to study in German universities. The seminar system and the ideal of higher education that was created in the German universities placed their stamp on the American system. German education enjoyed immense prestige in the United States before the First World War: the president of Columbia College, New York, Frederick A. P. Barnard, after whom Barnard College is named, remarked in 1886 that success at an American university depended on study or residence in a German university.⁹

While the impact of Germany on American scholarship in the nineteenth and early twentieth century is relatively well known, it has not yet been noticed in this connection that Allan Marquand, the founder of Princeton's Department of Art and Archaeology in the 1880's, was one such student. After Marquand took his bachelor's degree at Princeton in 1874, he studied in Berlin in 1876. But Marquand was a student of philosophy, not of art history. Although the concept of *Kunstgeschichte* and the first documented departments dedicated to it originated in Germany, some of the main sources of academic art history in the United States are not derived directly or solely from them.

Remarks on the Early History of the Department of Art and Archaeology at Princeton University¹⁰

8. See Peter S. Blume, *Gustav Grünewald*, Allentown, PA: Allentown Art Museum, 1992.

9. As cited in Jürgen Herbst, *The German Historical School in American Scholarship. A Study in the Transfer of Culture*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1965 [2nd edition, 1st. edition Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1935]; see Herbst in general for this sort of information.

10. The specific information on the history of the Department of Art and Archaeology at Princeton University contained in this section relies on Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, *The Eye of the Tiger: the Founding and Development of the Department of Art and Archaeology, 1883-1923, Princeton University*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983; Lavin, 'Princeton: The Beginnings Under Marquand', in Craig Hugh Smyth and Peter Lukehart, eds, *The Early Years of Art History*

Although the impression may still persist that the discipline of art history was a mainly Germanic invention that was developed largely in Europe until the mid-twentieth century, and that impulses from German immigrant scholars were necessary to invigorate the study of art history in the United States, a vigorous tradition of scholarship and teaching the subject already existed at some American universities and colleges well before émigrés from Hitler's Germany (and Austria) arrived. Both the reception of European scholarship and the self-conscious presentation and assimilation (or non-assimilation) of European scholars took place not just in what was virgin territory for the field, but also in some milieus that were already quite well established. And while the background established by earlier teaching of art history in the United States has been previously acknowledged, its significance must be reevaluated.¹¹

Aspects of the earlier history of art at Princeton are treated here at some length in order to correct some recent accounts of the historiography of art history. This particular focus seems justified not as a panegyric or apologia, but because many important figures who taught at other universities and colleges until at least the mid-twentieth century were trained in Princeton, since very few graduate departments existed elsewhere in the United States until the last generation or two, and because many of the émigrés (including among others Erwin Panofsky, Paul Frankl, Charles de Tolnay, Kurt Weitzmann, William Heckscher) who taught, worked, and in some cases (Wolfgang Stechow) died in Princeton were important figures in the discipline. While study of other locales might lead to other emphases, the breadth of topics taught or studied in Princeton also provide a key context for reconsideration of the development of the field in the United States and the relation of German art history and art historians to it.

Already by 1831 the history of architecture was being taught at what was then called the College of New Jersey in Princeton.¹² This antedates the formal teaching of

in the United States. Notes and Essays on Departments, Teaching, and Scholars, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993, 7-11; Craig Hugh Smyth, 'The Princeton Department in the Time of Morey', in *The Early Years of Art History in the United States*, 37-42; E. Baldwin Smith, *The Study of the History of Art in the Colleges and Universities of the United States*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1912, reprinted in *The Early Years of Art History in the United States*, 12-36; David Van Zanten, 'Formulating Art History at Princeton and the Humanistic Laboratory', in *The early Years of Art History in the United States*, 175-82. Other materials are however cited where pertinent.

11. The background is mentioned particularly in Colin Eisler, 'Kunstgeschichte American Style', which however does not focus on Princeton, and errs in many details.

12. This occurred a year before Samuel F. B. Morse, a painter who is better known as the inventor of the telegraph, was named the first Professor of Fine Arts at New York University (the name of the current art historical institute there, the Institute of Fine Arts, recalls this

art history at colleges or universities elsewhere in the United States. Architectural history continued to be taught at Princeton in subsequent years during the nineteenth century. Even after a new department for art history and a new school for architecture had been established in the early twentieth century, architectural history continued to be taught at Princeton by art historians as well as by architects, and has been to the present.

During the academic year 1882-83, fully a half century before Hitler took power in Germany, a separate and independent Department of Art and Archaeology was moreover established in Princeton. In that academic year Marquand was formally appointed instructor of art history. By the end of the academic year 1882-1883 President James McCosh could report to the board of trustees of the college that sufficient funds had been raised to establish a chair for the field, which eventually was named after Marquand's uncle, Frederick Marquand, who had died in 1882, and whose estate was its major benefactor. Allan Marquand was appointed full professor. A formal program in instruction in art was also started.

Princeton was to be sure not the first place in the world where art history was taught in an academic setting. Domenico Fiorillo began teaching art history at the university of Göttingen in Germany a full century earlier, during the 1780s, hence within only two decades of the appearance of Winckelmann's landmark *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* of 1764, which is often taken to mark the beginnings of the discipline. In 1799 Fiorillo was appointed *ausserordentliche Professor* in Göttingen, assuming the first position devoted to the subject at a university anywhere in the world. In 1813 he was made *Ordinarius*. Fiorillo thus began the long line of academic professors of art history to which Marquand belongs.¹³

Princeton may also not claim to have been the first place to have had a professor of art history in the United States. This distinction goes to Harvard University, where Charles Eliot Norton began teaching the history of Fine Arts in relation to poetry in the year 1874 or 1875. Until recently the teaching of art history at Harvard took place in a department that was still called the Department of Fine Arts. But while the teaching of art history may have been evoked at Yale in 1881, in the next academic year at Princeton Marquand became the first professor appointed to a chair specifically devoted to art and archaeology. This appointment of a professor with an independent chair charged with the subject of the history of art (including the history

foundation), which is sometimes linked with the establishment of the teaching of art. However, it seems that Morse taught painting and sculpture, not their history.

13. For information on the earlier history of art in Germany, especially in its disciplinary form, I rely on Heinrich Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte als Institution : Studien zur Geschichte einer Disziplin*, Frankfurt a. M., Germany: Suhrkamp, 1979, and Regine Prange, *Die Geburt der Kunstgeschichte : philosophische Aesthetik und empirische Wissenschaft*, Cologne: Bohlau Verlag, 2004.

of architecture, which Marquand taught from the start of his career in the department) and archaeology, the organization of the subject as a separate field of study, and the institution of regular instruction leading to granting degrees in the subject may be regarded as strikingly new in the United States.

Princeton also seems to have been the first American university to have offered graduate instruction (training for students pursuing degrees beyond the baccalaureate, or B.A.) in the field. Arthur Frothingham, one of Marquand's first hires, offered a graduate course in Babylonian and Assyrian Archaeology as early as 1886, some years even before Princeton began to award the doctoral degree. Princeton was also in any event certainly the first American university with a graduate department devoted to the subject; it had an independent department that had spun off from the Department of Philosophy in 1895.

The age of Princeton's department may be measured against both national, and an important point of comparison, international standards. For example, although Yale University has an old art school in which art history may have been taught, no independent department of art history existed until 1940, partly through the efforts of the distinguished French scholar Henri Focillon, who was teaching there at the time. James Ackerman (b. 1919), would thus have been one of the first holders of an undergraduate degree in the history of art from Yale College.¹⁴ It was impossible to obtain a doctorate in art history at Yale until approximately this time; other renowned scholars like George Kubler had previously had to take their degrees in the now defunct program of History, the Arts and Letters.¹⁵

On the other side of the Atlantic, while individuals like John Ruskin, Slade Professor of Fine Art in Oxford, and teacher of Harvard's Norton, may have lectured on art history, no regular department existed in England until the Courtauld Institute was founded in London in 1932. Oxford itself did not have a regular chair specifically devoted the history of art until Edgar Wind was appointed professor there in 1955.

14. See George Kubler, 'Arts at Yale University', in Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History*, 70. Ackerman received his Bachelor's degree in 1941.

15. Thomas Reese, in his introduction to his edition of *Studies in Ancient American and European Art: The Collected Essays of Gerorge Kubler*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985, xvii-xviii describes how the noted French art historian Henri Focillon, who had been teaching at Yale since the mid 1930s and was Kubler's supervisor (see the publication of his dissertation, George Kubler, *The Religious Architecture of New Mexico in the Colonial Period and Since the American Occupation*, Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1990 [5th edition; 1st edition 1940] tried to persuade Yale's administrators to establish an art history department, and how he began to 'mold its future faculty' from the graduate students who were enrolled in Yale's interdisciplinary program in History, the Arts and Letters. Kubler was evidently one of the students who received a degree in this program and later became a member of Yale's Department of History of Art.

Only under the very recent tenure of Martin Kemp, the previous holder of the chair recently assumed by Craig Clunas, was it possible to earn an undergraduate degree specifically in this subject. In the Netherlands, where one might think the teaching of art history has long flourished, the oldest department, that at Utrecht, celebrated just recently the centennial of the appointment in 1907 of its first professor for the subject, Wilhelm Vogelsang.¹⁶

At the time of its founding the Department of Art and Archaeology at Princeton was comparatively new even in comparison with established institutions in the German-speaking world, where very few art history institutes existed in 1882, as distinct from places where there may have been some instruction or scholarship in the subject.¹⁷ Famous scholars like Jacob Burckhardt in Basel may have taught and written about the history of art, but Burckhardt was not a professor of art history, and he began to lecture exclusively on it only after 1886. After Fiorillo in Göttingen, and before the second half of the nineteenth century, art history was taught sporadically at German universities, and also probably (again in German) in Dorpat, then Russia, now Tartu, Estonia.¹⁸ Formal professorships for art history were however founded only in Bonn in 1860, in Vienna (Austria) in 1863, in Strassburg (now again Strasbourg, France) in 1871, in Leipzig in 1872, in Berlin (as opposed to individual professors like Kugler who taught art history) in 1873, and in Giessen and Prague (now the Czech Republic) in 1874. The origins of most other European departments, not to mention those in other parts of the world, postdate Princeton's.

How did what happened at Princeton occur? Marquand had been educated in theology and philosophy. He had earned his doctorate in the subject of philosophy with a dissertation on ethics from Johns Hopkins University, and he first became an instructor in the Department of Philosophy at Princeton. He specialized in logic, publishing on the subject, and inventing a logic machine.¹⁹

However, according to an old oral tradition Marquand's teaching was found to

16. To celebrate this occasion an exhibition was held in Utrecht and a book published on the illustrative panels that Vogelsang used in his teaching: see Annemieke Hoogenboom, ed, *De evolutie van de compositie: de kunsthistorische onderwijsplaten van Willem Vogelsang (1875-1954)*, Nobelreeks Vol. 19, Vianen: Optima, 2007.

17. This information is based on Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte als Institution*. Art history may have been taught elsewhere, but chairs, hence an institutional structure, did not seem to exist. The claim made (Wood, 'Art History's Normative Renaissance', 167) that art history was taught at twenty-nine universities thus exaggerates the real institutional situation.

18. This would have been as a complement to instruction in drawing. See Günter Krüger, *Die Zeichenschule der Universität Dorpat*, ex. cat. Lüneburg: Husum Druck- und Verlagsgesellschaft 1993 and 1995, 2 vols.

19. See Allan Marquand, *Logical Diagrams for n Terms*, n. p., 1881; Marquand, *New Logical Machine*, n.p., 1885.

be 'unorthodox and un-Calvinistic'. This seems to have led to his appointment to teach the subject of what may have initially been conceived of as 'Christian art and archaeology'. Though not formally trained, Marquand was well suited to teach art history, as he probably was already very familiar with works of art. He had grown up the son of Henry Marquand, who was president and benefactor of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, which had been founded in 1870. Marquand's pursuit of a career in a field in which he was not formally trained is also comparable to that of many distinguished British art historians, including many of recent memory (Kenneth Clark, John Pope-Hennessy, Michael Levey, et. al.). His involvement with art history and appointment as professor in the subject did not stem from emulation of *Kunstgeschichte*.

Allan Marquand also benefitted from gifts to Princeton from his uncle's estate, as noted.²⁰ While Marquand's position may thus be considered to have resulted in part from his being a scion of a family of great economic and social privilege, this family, like that of other Americans of his background, also used its wealth for the good of public institutions. Allan Marquand himself supported many organizations and institutions in the United States; for example, during his lifetime the art history library of Princeton, which now bears his name, was stocked with books he had purchased personally, and Marquand left a large bequest (much as his widow left his property to the borough of Princeton) through which in large part (and through other departmental faculty bequests) Marquand Library has continued to be able to purchase large numbers of books. In this regard Marquand may be compared to Aby Warburg, whose personal purchases led to the establishment of the library of the *Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut Warburg* in Hamburg, only Marquand's efforts began earlier than did Warburg's.

In any case, with Marquand as with Warburg something remarkable took root and bore fruit from seemingly idiosyncratic origins. Within three decades art history and archaeology were thriving at Princeton, indeed more than they were anywhere else in the United States. A report on the status of art history in U.S. colleges presented by Marquand to the International Congress of History of Art in Rome held in 1912 (famous for Warburg's lecture on the Palazzo Schifanoia) that was compiled by E. Baldwin Smith and published by Smith as a booklet in that year listed thirty-four courses being taught at Princeton.²¹ This number is much larger than that taught at any other college or university in the United States, even those with much larger

20. But this sort of alumni benefaction, and even the importance of family connections are by no means just Princeton matters: Charles Eliot Norton was a cousin of President Eliot of Harvard, who appointed him.

21. Smith, *The Study of the History of Art*, 21-3.

student bodies than the 1500 men who were then studying in Princeton.²²

Not only the age and early establishment of art history at Princeton are noteworthy, but the range of fields taught or studied. It has been observed that academic art history in the United States was always more open to non-Western art than was European scholarship.²³ But it has not been noted how much a role Princeton has played in this development, in fact, how much the general expansion of the field in both a geographical and chronological sense has had to do with the history of the Department of Art and Archaeology.

Princeton provides precedents for a more global view of art history. In so doing it thereby sheds a different light on recent critiques that have contrasted the sort of art history represented by Marquand and one of his important successors at Princeton, Charles Rufus Morey, with supposedly 'progressive' or 'advanced' art history, or pointed to Morey's social and intellectual conservatism.²⁴ For whatever the merits of these critiques, the introduction of new fields, the expansion of the conception of art history, even the application of new methods, and, a point of recent debate to which we shall return later, an awareness and openness to the theories of supposedly advanced or leading European scholars may certainly be considered 'progressive'. The application of another measure of supposed recent developments in the field imposed by a recent critic, namely attention to modern art, reveals that this along with the other phenomena mentioned were present at Princeton often before they were anywhere else.²⁵

Developments at Princeton, which might accordingly be called cosmopolitan as well as progressive, remind us of some features of the earlier tradition of the Enlightenment. Here it might be recalled that in certain ways Princeton may be compared to the University of Göttingen. Institutions of higher learning were established in Princeton and Göttingen during the reign of the same ruler, George II, Göttingen in 1734, Princeton in 1746. Göttingen consequently used to like to regard itself as a sister institution to Princeton, sending representatives to celebrations of the founding of Princeton, for example. Both universities were in any event founded and flourished in the glow of the Enlightenment; they were involved with what in the eighteenth century were intellectually innovative disciplines and discourses. Göttingen sponsored not just Fiorillo and art history, but the establishment of a modern approach to history and its introduction as a university discipline represented

22. Based on comparison of data assembled by Smith, *The Study of the History of Art*, 21-3.

23. See Wood, 'Strzygowski und Riegl', 232, quoting Alfred Neumeyer.

24. Wood, 'Art History's Normative Renaissance', 69-70; Crow, 'The Practice of Art History', 75-6, 79-81.

25. Cf. Wood, 'Art History's Normative Renaissance', and Crow, 'The Practice of Art History'.

by J. C. Gatterer and others in the mid-eighteenth century.²⁶ This approach was echoed by the later establishment at Princeton of new studies in art history, archaeology, and related fields. During the eighteenth century itself the Enlightenment was represented at Princeton by men such as Samuel Stanhope Smith, who among other things introduced and stressed studies of science, seeking to demonstrate the compatibility of science and religion.²⁷ Marquand, with his training as a philosopher, his involvement with a logic machine, and his purported penchant for theological freethinking, seems to stand in this tradition as well.

The early connection of art history with archaeology at Princeton represents a broadening of the conception of the field of art history that also may be related to intellectual origins in the Enlightenment. The modern study of both may be traced to their synthetic reformulation in Winckelmann's history of ancient art. Many nineteenth-century scholars also regarded the subjects as inseparable, not just for the treatment of ancient remains and monuments. Yet because of present institutional structures in Europe, it might sometimes be thought that art history and archaeology are separate disciplines. At Princeton, however, the two subjects have been conjoined from the beginning, in a way that was distinctive; the connection between art history and archaeology is expressed in the name of the department itself.

From the beginning of his activity in the department Marquand was personally involved with both archaeology and art history. In June 1883 he was sent to explore potential sites for excavations in Europe and notably the 'Orient', that is the Near East. This was to lead to the subsequent series of Princeton excavations. Marquand, and through him, Princeton, was also involved with the establishment of both the American School in Athens and what is now the American Academy in Rome, with the foundation of the Archaeological Institute of America, and, together with Arthur Frothingham, with establishing the premier national periodical for the field, the *American Journal of Archaeology*. In the field of ancient art history Marquand himself published several books on ancient architecture and silver.²⁸

Marquand's activity moreover indicates that from its beginnings interest in art history and archaeology at Princeton extended beyond the boundaries of Europe. Marquand's travel to the Orient, meaning the Near East, almost immediately on being appointed professor represents an initial expression of this interest. The early

26. See Peter Hans Reill, 'History and Hermeneutics in the *Aufklärung*: The Thought of Johann Christoph Gatterer', in *The Journal of Modern History*, 45, 1973, 24-5; Reill, *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1975.

27. Mark A. Noll, *Princeton and the Republic, 1768-182 : The Search for a Christian Enlightenment in the Era of Samuel Stanhope Smith*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989.

28. Early examples of Marquand's scholarship in this area are *An Archaic Patera from Kourion*, Concord, NH: n.p., 1888; *Early Athenian-Ionic Capitals Found on the Akropolis*, n.p., 1888.

institution of instruction in Babylonian and Assyrian archaeology also speaks for this involvement, which of course had been stimulated by the discoveries of Henry Layard and others in the mid-nineteenth century. Expanding the range of instruction, Marquand also soon began a course on what was called Phoenician art.²⁹ In 1899 Howard Crosby Butler traveled to Syria to seek out sites for excavation,³⁰ leading to a series of campaigns in that region.³¹ These were followed later by Butler's digs in Asia Minor, and excavations sponsored by Morey in Antioch.³²

From a relatively early date the study of later periods of art in the Near East was also pursued at Princeton. In art history as in other aspects of Near Eastern and especially Islamic studies, Princeton possesses an old tradition. Islamic art (in the form of Persian manuscripts) was taught at Princeton already in the 1920's;³³ Kurt Weitzmann also dealt with Islamic art in his writing and teaching during his long career in the United States.³⁴ In any event as early as 1949 Donald N. Wilber received what was probably one of the first American doctorates for a dissertation in Islamic architecture, (albeit from the School of Architecture) that he completed under the direction of E. Baldwin Smith, then chairman of the Department of Art and Archaeology.³⁵ And although a position dedicated to instruction in Islamic art and architecture was established at Princeton only in the 1990's, Weitzmann reports that the Department of Art and Archaeology made efforts already in the 1950's to hire Oleg Grabar, who had received his Ph. D. from Princeton in 1955.³⁶

29. Lavin, *Eye of the Tiger*, 14.

30. Lavin, *Eye of the Tiger*, 15.

31. Early examples of Butler's work is provided in *Syria: Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904-1905 and 1909*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1907 ff. In March 1910 Butler began excavations at Sardis, in modern-day Turkey: see *Sardis: Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis*, Leiden: E.J Brill, 1925, and *Howard Crosby Butler, 1872-1922*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1923.

32. See Charles Rufus Morey, *The Mosaics of Antioch*, London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1938. Morey's Antioch expedition is documented in the records of the department of Art and Archaeology, Mudd Library, Princeton University, number AC140.

33. This information comes from some remarks made (orally) in 2008 by Oleg Grabar.

34. See for example Kurt Weitzmann, "The Greek Sources of Islamic Scientific Illustration", in *Archaeologia Orientalia in Memoriam Ernst Herzfeld*, Georges C. Miles, ed. Locust Valley, NY: J.J. Augustin, 1952, 244-280.

35. See the later publication, Donald N. Wilber, *The Architecture of Islamic Iran: The Il Khanid Period*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955. Oleg Grabar has pointed out to me in personal conversation subsequent to the initial publication of this essay that there were earlier American dissertations on Islamic art.

36. See Kurt Weitzmann, *Sailing with Byzantium from Europe to America: The Memoirs of an Art Historian*, Munich: Editio Maris, 1994, 420-421.

From the 1920's the purview of art history at Princeton was expanded even further eastwards. Under Morey's chairmanship George Rowley offered what were probably some of the first university courses on Chinese art taught anywhere in the West.³⁷ The case of Japanese art is even more remarkable: probably the first (European or American) doctorate in that field was awarded by the Department of Art and Archaeology to Alexander Soper. Soper received his PhD in Japanese art in 1944, while Morey was still chairman, in the midst of some of the worst fighting during the Second World War. In 1959 the first PhD program in Chinese art and archaeology in the United States was also established at Princeton by Wen Fong with the historian Frederick W. Mote. Fong had received his degree in art history in 1958, one of the first if not the first awarded in the United States on Chinese art, and had taught at Princeton since 1954. In 1962 Shujiro Shimada began teaching Japanese art, expanding the Far Eastern program.

At Princeton the canon of European and American art was also steadily expanded chronologically. The contributions of American scholars including those at Princeton to the study of medieval art have long been acknowledged, but, as noted, they have recently been criticized because of their conservatism, and also regarded as ersatz responses to Germanic domination of studies in ancient and Renaissance art. If, however, we look back to the origins of medieval studies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century academy, some of these endeavors may also be considered to have been in the forefront of scholarship: the scholarly study of medieval, as well as Early Christian, art, as distinct from their Romantic emulation, was still then in its infancy. Consequently when he began teaching in the late nineteenth century Marquand could say that he was embarking into the 'unexplored fields of Romanesque and Gothic'.³⁸ The situation of scholarship in what would seem to be even relatively better known fields of medieval art such as these highlights the fact that earlier medieval art and late antique art, in which much work was done at Princeton³⁹

37. John Coolidge, 'The Harvard Fine Arts Department', in Smyth and Lukehart, *The Early Years of Art History in the United States*, 52 reports that when he was an undergraduate at Harvard (1931-5) Langdon Warner taught a seminar on Chinese and Japanese sculpture.

38. Lavin, *Eye of the Tiger*, 9.

39. See for example Charles Rufus Morey, *Christian Art*, London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1935; Morey, *Early Christian Art: An Outline of the Evolution of Style and Iconography in Sculpture and Painting from Antiquity to the Eighth Century*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953; E. Baldwin Smith, *Early Christian Iconography*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1918; *Architectural Symbolism of Imperial Rome and the Middle Ages*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956; Howard Crosby Butler, *Early Churches in Syria, Fourth to Seventh Centuries*, Smith ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1929; not to mention the abundance of books by Weitzmann written in Princeton, e.g. *Late Antique and Early Christian Book Illumination*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1977.

were even less familiar. Hence turning to the study of medieval art in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century was not simply the result of seeking a field that was free of European domination, as has recently been argued.⁴⁰ This may also explain why the study of medieval art was an area in which many Americans, including many active elsewhere (Chandler Post, Arthur Kingsley Porter), made major contributions, as has long been noted.

Although a larger study of the historiography of medieval art would be necessary for further clarification, American scholarship on medieval art during the early twentieth century may not simply be described as a matter of fact gathering, either. The pursuit of facts was guided by what may be called theories about the development of medieval art, as is seen by a perusal of writings by Morey, among others.⁴¹ Morey's foundation of the Index of Christian Art did not consist merely of providing a tool for the study of medieval art, but one that in the context of the time may be seen as methodologically 'progressive'. In the early twentieth century focus on iconography had no less a theoretical agenda than did Warburg's contemporaneous creation of iconology, one which moreover was also pursued by such scholars as Emile Mâle.⁴² The system introduced by the Index of Christian Art has both enjoyed a long life and impact on other, later forms of approach that were even emulated in Europe.⁴³

Instruction and scholarship in earlier periods of art, including Byzantine, Early Christian, and early medieval art and architecture, together with classical and Near Eastern art and archaeology, may however have come to dominate instruction in the department during Morey's chairmanship, and that of his immediate successors in this position. Lorenz Eitner, who developed Stanford University's art history department and museum on Princeton's model, once remarked that he had not had any courses on any subject later than early medieval art while a student at Princeton. He once joked that when he published his 1944 monograph on the 'Flabellum of Tournus', a work of the Carolingian period, it was regarded as strikingly modern.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, it would

40. Wood, 'Art History's Normative Renaissance'; Crow, 'The Practice of Art History'.

41. See Charles Rufus Morey, 'The Sources of Medieval Style,' *Art Bulletin*, 7, 1924, especially 35-6.

42. Emile Mâle, *L'art religieux de la fin du moyen age en France: étude sur l'iconographie du moye âge et sur ses sources d'inspiration*, Paris : Librairie Armand Colin, 1908; Mâle, *L'art religieux après le Concile de trent: étude sur l'iconographie de la fin du XVI siècle*, Paris : A. Colin, 1932.

43. See the introduction and essays in Colum Hourihane, ed, *Image and Belief: Studies in Celebration of the Eightieth Anniversary of the Index of Christian Art*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999; Hourihane, ed, *Insights and Interpretations : Studies in Celebration of the Eighty-Fifth Anniversary of the Index of Christian Art*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

44. Lorenz E. A. Eitner, *The Flabellum of Tournus*, New York: The College Art Association of America, 1944. This story was told to me in a private communication by Eitner, 1984. Similar stories exist about other classes taught by Princetonians, or writings by them on 'later' topics.

be a mistake to argue that modern art was only considered at Princeton to have begun with the nineteenth century, and that later periods were ignored.

The study of Renaissance art was in fact carried on at Princeton from the first years of the Department, as it was for that matter elsewhere in the United States during the early years of education in art history, much as was the study of classical antiquity. As is the case with the engagement with classical antiquity, the volume and significance of studies of Renaissance art at Princeton independent of the arrival of émigrés such as Panofsky should not be underestimated.⁴⁵ Marquand himself was as much an important scholar of the Italian Renaissance as he was one of classical antiquity. He published numerous books on the Della Robbias and on the sculptors Buglioni.⁴⁶ Marquand's activities and interests in classical antiquity and in the Renaissance should therefore be considered to have made these topics 'normative' already from the origins of the Department of Art and Archaeology.

In 1910 Marquand in fact brought Frank Jewett Mather to Princeton to teach later periods, which included the Renaissance. Mather was appointed Marquand professor in that year, a sign of recognition that indicates that the study of later periods, as they were called, was regarded as 'normative', since the only professor to hold a chair at the time was teaching them. Mather published prolifically on the Renaissance, both on 'northern' and on Italian Renaissance artists.⁴⁷ And other Princeton professors of earlier times did so as well. For example, besides his work on China, Rowley published a major monograph on Ambrogio Lorenzetti.⁴⁸ In his later career Ernest DeWald, another Princeton luminary, turned to the study of Italian art.⁴⁹ Given this activity, it is mistaken to argue that it was the impact of émigré scholars that led to the creation of a view of the Renaissance as normative.

The introduction of a humanistic approach to Renaissance studies was also not

45. Crow, 'The Practice of Art History', 76; Wood, 'Art History's Normative Renaissance,' 68.

46. His many publications on the Della Robbia begin with Allan Marquand, *A Search for Della Robbia Monuments in Italy ...*, New York: Scribner, 1893, and *The Madonnas of Luca della Robbia*, Concord, NH: s.n. 1894, and continue throughout his career; for the Buglioni see Marquand, *Benedetto and Santi Buglioni*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1921.

47. E.g. *Formative Influences on Giorgione's Art*, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1942; *A History of Italian Painting*, New York: H. Holt and Company, 1949 (first ed c. 1938); *Two Early German Painters, Dürer and Holbein*, New York: Mentor Association, 1914; *Venetian Painters*, New York: H. Holt and Company, 1936; *Western European Painting of the Renaissance*, New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1939.

48. George Rowley, *Ambrogio Lorenzetti*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1958; this book was evidently the result of long years of research, regardless of the eventual date of publication.

49. E.g. Ernest T. DeWald, *Italian Painting 1200-1600*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

due solely to émigrés. In the earlier twentieth century education in the classics was still strong in the United States. At Princeton the impact of humanism on studies of Renaissance literature was emphasized by Charles Grosvenor Osgood and Morris Croll; Croll's publications indeed antedate many late twentieth-century studies of the importance of rhetoric for Renaissance conceptions of style by two generations.⁵⁰ Rensselaer W. Lee, chairman of the Department of Art and Archaeology and Marquand Professor from the mid 1950s, would have been educated in this environment. He wrote his dissertation under the direction of Osgood and Croll. Because of the similarity of their interests Lee has mistakenly been called a student of Erwin Panofsky,⁵¹ but Lee in fact received his B.A. from Princeton in 1920, and his doctorate there in 1926. This was granted for a dissertation on 'Platonism in Spenser', a topic that would have fit in well with the Neo-Platonic readings of the Renaissance later offered by Panofsky, Edgar Wind, et al.

Lee is best known for the 1940 publication of the landmark essay, 'Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting'.⁵² As much as any other single work this essay may be said to stand for a humanistic approach to Renaissance and Baroque art. It is perhaps because of the affinity of his approach that he became friendly with Wind while at Smith College, and also from the 1930s with Panofsky, whose advice and criticism he acknowledges in the first note of 'Ut Pictura Poesis', and whom he invited to teach in the department at Princeton on a regular basis while he was chairman. Lee certainly spoke with Panofsky about such matters on a common, and probably equal basis: he once recalled that their first conversation in Princeton was about Spenser's view of the Three Graces.⁵³

The shift toward the modern period, defined in this context or criticism as meaning from the mid-nineteenth century on, has recently been regarded as key for current developments in the historiography of the discipline.⁵⁴ But an interest in 'modern art', if not central, was nevertheless also present at Princeton quite early. At the time of his appointment Mather was among other things the art critic of the *New York Evening Post*; he thus anticipates the role of other art historians, at Princeton and elsewhere, who had previously been or simultaneously were critics of contemporary art. In 1910, the first year of his appointment, Mather began teaching a course on modern tendencies in art, meaning in this case developments in English and French

50. As exemplified by Morris T. Croll, *Style, Rhetoric and Rhythm*, ed. J. Max Patrick et al., Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966.

51. Michels, *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft*, 103, 118.

52. First published in the *Art Bulletin* in that year, and then as a book, New York: W.W. Norton, 1967.

53. Personal communication to the author, c. 1981.

54. Crow, 'The Practice of Art History.'

painting from the mid-nineteenth century. This may have been one of the first such courses in art history ever offered at an American, even possibly at any university or college. Furthermore, since artists such as Monet were still alive at the time, it may be considered one of the first such courses ever offered on contemporary art. From the beginning of the twentieth century Mather published books on what was then contemporary art, and he, Morey, and others wrote about American art as well.⁵⁵

Mather had Alfred Barr as his student. Barr was the first director of the Museum of Modern Art. Barr received his B.A. from Princeton in 1923 and M.A. from the department the following year. In addition to studying modern art with Mather, Barr had studied medieval art with Morey.⁵⁶

While instruction in and the study of more recent, especially contemporary subjects may have occasionally met with some resistance at Princeton after Marquand and Mather, these subjects nevertheless could in the end be pursued and ultimately approved, especially when Baldwin Smith became chairman after Morey had left Princeton in 1945.⁵⁷ Despite his comments, Eitner himself was allowed to write his dissertation on the nineteenth-century French painter Géricault.⁵⁸ Eitner's dissertation was handed in and accepted in 1952. A year before William Seitz had been allowed to write his dissertation on a contemporary, post-1939-1945 war topic, albeit after some discussion, no doubt because of the novelty of the undertaking.⁵⁹ Regardless of questions about the validity of the project, Seitz was indeed allowed to proceed, and he was granted a degree for a thesis on abstract expressionism defended in 1955. Seitz's dissertation represents the first scholarly treatment of Abstract Expressionism, and it is the first dissertation anywhere on contemporary, postwar art. Seitz was to become an

55. Mather, Morey, and William James Henderson, *The American Spirit in Art*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1927. Mather's works on modern art include *Homer Martin, Poet in Landscape*, New York: Private print, 1912; *Modern Painting. A Study of Tendencies*, New York: H. Holt and Company, 1927; *Sixteen Essays on American Painters of the Nineteenth Century*, New York: H. Holt and Company, 1931; *Charles Herbert Moor, Landscape Painter*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957.

⁵⁶ See further Sibyl Gordon Kantor, *Alfred H. Barr and the Intellectual Origins of the Museum of Modern Art*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002, 21f. on Barr and Morey, 27-9 on Mather. While Kantor notes Mather's conservative taste, she also cites Barr's comments on how important it was that Mather exposed him to modern art.

⁵⁷ Nevertheless, earlier in his career Morey also wrote "The Art of Auguste Rodin", *The Bulletin of the College Art Association of America*, 1918, 1 (4): 145-154.

⁵⁸ Lorenz E. A. Eitner, 'The Work of Theodore Gericault, 1791-1824', PhD Dissertation, Princeton University, 1952.

⁵⁹ As was pointed out in the website of an exhibition held at the Museum of Modern Art, New York, 7 November-30 December 2007, 'William C. Seitz: Defending the Modern'. See <http://www.moma.org/visit/calendar/exhibitions/64>.

important curator at the Museum of Modern Art.

Innovation in the study of newer media has also been part of Princeton's departmental history. The first endowed professorship devoted to the history of photography was established at Princeton in 1972, and held for a long time by a former curator from the Museum of Modern Art, Peter C. Bunnell.

Remarks on the Reception of European Art Historians in America

These local American developments provide the backdrop for consideration of the response to Germanic scholarship, which as noted was at its height just during the early years of the Princeton department. However, after its apogee in the early twentieth century, the prestige of Germanic scholarship in America diminished abruptly when the United States entered the First World War in the year 1917. Instruction in German ceased to be offered in many American schools and colleges. Another sign of the antipathy to Germany is the cancellation of subscriptions to German scholarly periodicals, which happened in many American libraries (as for example, at Princeton University). This change in fortunes has also been recognized in other accounts.⁶⁰

But after 1918 scholarly relations were resumed. The relatively young discipline of art history expressed much interest in the writings of German scholars. Several studies have traced the place of German scholarship in twentieth-century America before and after 1933, noting for instance that Americans followed the work of their German colleagues, sent their students to study abroad with them, and invited prominent scholars to visit the United States.⁶¹

Adolph Goldschmidt and Joseph Strzygowski have been singled out as enjoying an important early reception in the United States.⁶² Recent scholarship has also often contrasted Strzygowski with Riegl in terms of their reception.⁶³ Strzygowski is thought to have had a relatively large impact in the United States, in contrast with Riegl, who is thought to have been almost completely unknown in

60. Eisler, *'Kunstgeschichte American Style'*, and especially Wood, *'Art History's Normative Renaissance'*, pp. 66-9.

61. See Eisler, *'Kunstgeschichte American Style'*, Wood, *'Strzygowski and Riegl'*, 218-20.

62. See for the recent reception of Goldschmidt Gunnar Brands and Heinrich Dilly, eds, *Adolph Goldschmidt (1863-1944): Normal Art History im 20. Jahrhundert*, Weimar, Germany: VDG, 2007; Kurt Weitzmann, *Adolph Goldschmidt und die Berliner Kunstgeschichte*, Berlin, Germany: Kunsthistorisches Institut, Fachbereich Geschichtswissenschaften der Freien Universität Berlin 1985; Wood *'Strzygowski und Riegl'*, and *'Art history's normative renaissance'*.

63. See most recently, with reference to earlier studies, Georg Vasold, *'Riegl, Strzygowski und die Entwicklung der Kunst'*, *Ars*, 41, 2008, 95-111.

America until the 1970's.⁶⁴ It has been argued that after this point Riegl has proved fruitful for recent art history, while Strzygowski has fallen into oblivion, yet while Riegl supposedly offered little for a globalized art history, Strzygowski's non-Eurocentric, anti-humanistic approach in some ways anticipates this interest, albeit in a problematic manner.⁶⁵

Recent accounts have also somewhat recognized the singular position of Princeton in respect to the reception of Strzygowski, Riegl, and Germanic scholarship in general. It has been observed that Morey sent his students to Germany, that Strzygowski lectured at Princeton, that Marquand wrote about him, and that Morey, while supposedly not fully understanding Riegl, was one of the few scholars to cite him. It has also been noted that Goldschmidt was given an honorary degree at Princeton.⁶⁶

More can be said, however. Goldschmidt was also offered a professorship in the Department of Art and Archaeology, which he turned down. There were good reasons why Strzygowski, with his geographically broad approach, might have been well received and read at Princeton in particular. Marquand's own early trips to the Near East antedate Strzygowski's, including significantly even the latter's reception of the doctorate. The early emphasis on the importance of the 'Orient' for ancient and medieval art at Princeton also anticipates that of Strzygowski, and the more global view available at Princeton is at least contemporaneous with that of the Germanic scholar. On the other hand, Strzygowski himself took a scholarly interest in what was being written in the U.S., specifically at Princeton: he reviewed a book by Morey in the *Art Bulletin*.⁶⁷

Significantly, Riegl's early reception at Princeton was moreover both broader and deeper than has hitherto been noticed. Two typescripts of an English-language outline of Riegl's *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie* that probably date from 1928-1929, when they were made for the seminar in Medieval Illumination, still exist in Marquand Library at Princeton. A handwritten note on one of them reads 'Four Copies'.⁶⁸ The existence of multiple copies suggests that these outlines were being used in classes, and the variation in the pagination and hence composition of the outlines suggests that they had been utilized, and worked on, over a period of time: the outlines were in fact given to the library in 1938. They were probably used in seminars conducted by

64. Specifically Riegl's *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie* is said to have been untranslated and unread: see Wood 'Strzygowski and Riegl', pp. 220ff.

65. Wood, 'Strzygowski and Riegl'.

66. Wood, 'Strzygowski and Riegl' and 'Art History's Normative Renaissance'.

67. Joseph Strzygowski, review of Charles Rufus Morey, *The Sarcophagus of Claudia Antonia Sabina and the Asiatic Sarcophagi*, *Art Bulletin*, 7, 1924, 71-3.

68. Alois Riegl, *Outline of Riegl, 'Spätrömische Kunstindustrie'*, 1.

Morey, who, given his citation of Riegl's book in a publication of 1924⁶⁹, is also the most likely person to have prepared these text for his graduate seminars. In any case, Riegl's work was well known at Princeton, and read elsewhere. Because of the widespread importance of Princeton's classes for the training of art historians at the time, familiarity with Riegl would have been disseminated through Princeton students who themselves became important professors, curators, and directors.⁷⁰

This is certainly the case with Riegl's resonance in studies of non-Western art in the United States. In the light of the invocation of Riegl by proponents of world art history, it is indeed puzzling that one critique has dissociated him from the possibility of envisioning a globalized view of the field because of the supposedly Eurocentric bias of his optical theories.⁷¹ Even before Riegl's texts had been translated into English Wen Fong was in fact alluding to Riegl's theories in his teaching and in his publications on Chinese painting.⁷² Many origins for an expanded view world art history exist in the historiography of art c. 1900,⁷³ and Riegl is one of them.

In an aphorism that has been made famous by Riegl's sometime critic Panofsky,⁷⁴ Walter Cook, the first director of the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University, compared the immigrants who came to New York with splendid apples that Hitler shook from the German tree and that fell into his lap. Although Panofsky himself lived in Princeton, and also was associated with the Institute for Advanced Study, the Department of Art and Archaeology and its members have been granted only a small role in this process. But if we use Cook's unfortunate, if ironic, metaphor, Morey may be said to have been involved with directing the apples' fall. Morey advised Cook, who had studied with him and remained close to him, and suggested immigrant scholars to be invited to New York. Similarly Morey was also an adviser to Abraham Flexner, who was at the time setting up the Institute for Advanced Study: he suggested that Panofsky as well as other émigrés be hired. Morey was moreover responsible for bringing Panofsky to live in Princeton in the first place: in 1934, a year before he was appointed at the Institute, Panofsky was offered housing on Prospect

69. Morey, 'The Sources of Medieval Style,' 35-36.

70. There are other instances of early familiarity with Riegl, but this story should be sufficient to dispel the recent myth.

71. Cf. Whitney Davis, 'World Art Studies. What, Why, How', course offered at the University of California, Berkeley, webpage accessed 20 January 2009.

72. See for example Wen Fong, 'The Problem of Forgeries in Chinese Painting: Part One', *Artibus Asiae* 25: 2/3, 1962, 108; 'Chinese Painting. A Statement of Method', *Oriental Art*, 9, 1963, 77.

73. See Ulrich Pfisterer, 'Origins and Principles of World Art history—1900 (and 2000)', in Kitty Zijlmans and Wilfried van Damme, ed., *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches*, Amsterdam, Netherlands: Valiz, 2008, 69-89.

74. See article on Kunstwollen in *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. Karl Maria Swoboda, Filser, 1921.

Avenue in exchange for teaching in the Department of Art and Archaeology. Panofsky thus taught at Princeton University before he was a member of the Institute for Advanced Study.⁷⁵ Panofsky was also to teach regularly in the Department thereafter.

It was also Morey, perhaps on the recommendation of Albert Friend, who brought Weitzmann to Princeton to work on illustrations of the Septuagint, even though he had a different interpretation of the subject.⁷⁶ Morey also recommended him to the Institute for Advanced Study. Weitzmann suggests that Morey deliberately tried to have the Institute for Advanced Study create complementary positions to those in the university.⁷⁷

This suggests that other reasons may be sought for the reason why émigrés may not immediately have been appointed as professors in the Department of Art and Archaeology, as distinct from visiting professors. More opportunities were available in a new institution with resources, like the Institute for Advanced Study or the Institute of Fine Arts in New York, than at Princeton University, which was under financial pressure during the Great Depression.⁷⁸ Despite its comparably great wealth at present, this wealth has largely come in more recent, post-war years. In any case, the well established and comparatively large faculty in the Department of Art and Archaeology at Princeton in the 1930s would have allowed for limited openings: Weitzmann was in fact offered a professorship in the Department by Morey's successor, Smith, when Morey retired in 1945.⁷⁹

At Princeton as elsewhere Panofsky and many other German scholars (especially Weitzmann) no doubt had a great impact on American scholars and students. This tale has often been told, and is probably correct in its outlines. What may be emphasized here is that there are many other tales that have largely gone untold heretofore: it is hard to say if many German art historians enjoyed a favorable reception similar to that of Panofsky and others like him.⁸⁰ While some immigrant scholars may have encountered positive conditions for scholarship and teaching, for example at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York, others, who taught in places like Iowa, namely Horst Jansen or William Heckscher, were not so favored by their circumstances. Jansen for example ran into conflict with the painter Grant Wood, the well-known artist of 'American Gothic' because of Jansen's interest in contemporary

75. See Panofsky, 'Three Decades of Art History in the United States: Impressions of a Transplanted European', *College Art Journal*, 14, 1954, 8; Weitzmann, *Sailing with Byzantium*, 87.

76. Weitzmann, *Sailing with Byzantium*, 77.

77. Ibid.

78. Alexander Leitch, *Princeton Companion*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978.

79. Weitzmann, *Sailing with Byzantium*, 153.

80. These are the stories told in Eisler, 'Kunstgeschichte American Style', for example.

art.⁸¹

It is also difficult to say what the undergraduates who heard such distinguished scholars as Richard Krautheimer, Janson, Heckscher, or Wind when they were teaching in such places as Louisville, Kentucky, Iowa City, Iowa, Ames, Iowa, or Northampton, Massachusetts actually took away from their classes. While Heckscher may have accomplished something magnificent when he taught young people in his interment camp in Canada—a Nobel Prize Winner for Chemistry remembered him fondly as a major early influence—it is unclear how much he or others brought to the formation of professional art historians in the United States. A variety of people have claimed to be Heckscher's students, but the evidence for such claims is slight. That is because the place where Heckscher was teaching at the end of his career, Duke University, had at the time he was there no graduate program in art history, so did not form professional art historians. Rather Duke may be said to have been more of a regional southern college than a great national or international university, as it is now. One may well wonder what students then at Duke, or in the other places where similar luminaries worked, actually appreciated in his classes, beyond the fact, as one of Heckscher's undergraduate students at the end of career has told this author, that they did not understand Heckscher's jokes in Latin.⁸² Although Krautheimer may have impressed students at Vassar, when he taught there later, Wind does not seem to have left much of an impression at another young women's college, Smith, where he taught before going to England; one lasting impression was that Wind and his spouse swam naked.⁸³

There are other, more serious reasons why some scholars were not heard, or held their voices back. A good example is provided by Paul Frankl. Frankl was one of the two regular professors (*ordinarii*) of art history, along with Panofsky, who came to America after the Nazis took power in Germany.⁸⁴ In this regard he can be considered one of the most important German professors in this field who came to the United States. Frankl provides an important counterpoint to Panofsky, because although he did not have a permanent position at the Institute for Advanced Study, he was hired there on a yearly basis until his death.

Although his academic career was carried on in Germany before 1933, Frankl

81. See Wanda Corn, *Grant Wood: The Regionalist Vision*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983, 58-60. This is of further note, in that Jansen is sometimes regarded as a proponent of the Renaissance as 'normative art history'.

82. Private communication of c. 1982 by Elizabeth Sears. Charlotte Schoell-Glass and Sears, *Verzetteln als Methode: der humanistische Ikonologe William S. Heckscher*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008, do not discuss the impact of his teaching in America.

83. Personal Communication of R. W. Lee, c. 1980.

84. Wolfgang Stechow was Professor Extraordinarius.

was not strictly speaking German. His family, like Sigmund Freud's, in fact came from Moravia, where his ancestors had been rabbis. Frankl was born in 1878 in Prague, and educated first at the university there, before he studied art history with Heinrich Wölfflin in Berlin. He then eventually became, as remarked, Goldschmidt's successor at the university of Halle. When the Nazis came to power, despite his '*deutsche Gesinnung*' Frankl lost his position because of his Jewish roots. Because of difficulties in finding a German publisher, his great theoretical synthesis *Das System der Kunstwissenschaft* had to be published in Brno in the year 1938, and its first stock was largely burned. In 1938 Frankl did however have a bit of luck in that he could travel to the United States, where he stayed, later becoming first a guest at the Institute for Advanced Study, and then regularly being invited back, until his death.

In the United States Frankl published two important books. One of these is on Gothic art, a volume in the standard series of handbooks put out by the Pelican History of Art, the other an important compilation of sources on the Gothic.⁸⁵ But although Frankl published these works and lived in Princeton until his death in 1962, he never enjoyed the influence of Panofsky or for that matter of many other German-speaking art historians in the United States. One important fact is that although Frankl's books in the United States were published in English, they were written in German, and then translated.

Frankl never found his own American voice. He belonged to German-speaking society in the United States.⁸⁶ Although he stayed in America for almost a quarter of a century, Frankl rebuilt bridges to Germany very early after the end of the 1939-1945 war in 1945, and seems to have retained his attachment there. It has been suggested that Frankl's personal history, and the reasons why he did not adapt very well, are dependent on his own personal characteristics: his political, Germanophilic attitudes, the relatively advanced age at which he came to the States, and his lack of linguistic ability, at least as far as speaking English was concerned.⁸⁷

This last reason was undoubtedly very important for his fate. In comparison with Panofsky and many other German-speaking scholars, Frankl never really mastered English, in the sense that he was comfortable writing or speaking it. It has even been said that Frankl was too little confident in his ability in English to obtain a regular position in an American university.⁸⁸ Frankl wrote his diaries in German, and

85. Paul Frankl, *The Gothic. Literary Sources and Interpretations through Eight Centuries*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1960; *Gothic Architecture*, Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1962.

86. *Papers*, Princeton University Library, CO779.

87. See Gert van der Osten, 'Paul Frankl 1878-1962', *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, 24, 1962, 7-12, which remains the best biography of Frankl.

88. Osten, 'Paul Frankl', 10.

evidence from them indicates that Frankl often spoke German in America.⁸⁹

There are other grounds why important utterances by Frankl remained largely unheard, and these have a broader relevance. Irving Lavin, one of Panofsky's successors at the Institute for Advanced Study, has emphasized that in contrast to Walter Cook's aphorism, intellectual exchange was no one-way street for immigrants. Following other remarks by Lavin on the training of Americans, it has more recently been suggested that:

The first wave of European professors, as they stepped in to meet the demand for trained personnel, found their new American charges lacking the level of erudition they would have assumed in their European counterparts (and cultural misunderstandings doubtless led these professors to exaggerate both the norms they had known and the deficiencies they were discovering). Thus they tended to prune away many of the more complex and speculative elements of art history in favor of conceptually simple and often mechanical tasks: decoding iconography, tracing fragments of dispersed ensembles, identifying hands, dating.⁹⁰

While this picture may be correct in part, and is consonant with the interpretation of undergraduate instruction suggested above, some more comments may be offered. Lack of training may have characterized some American students in the post-war generation, yet course catalogues of the Institute of Fine Arts in New York in the later 1960s listed the prerequisites for Panofsky's graduate seminars as knowledge of Greek, Latin, French, German, and Italian. Evidently these criteria could be met (he continued to attract students), and they have continued to be met by some scholars.

Better reasons for the 'pruning away' therefore seem to be offered by other statements that Panofsky himself made. It was not simply Americans' lack of culture or education that led Panofsky and other art historians like Frankl deliberately to hold themselves back. Panofsky described more positively some aspects of his move to America:

it was a blessing to come into contact--- and occasionally into conflict--- with an Anglo-Saxon positivism which is, in principle, distrustful of abstract speculation; to become more acutely aware of the material problems which in Europe tended to be considered as the concern of museums and schools of technology rather than universities; and, last but not least, to be forced to express himself, for better or worse, in English.⁹¹

As has been said elsewhere before, although Americans were interested in practical

89. The diaries are preserved in Princeton University Library; they are also the source for the comment about the German-speaking society to which Frankl belonged.

90. Crow, 'The Practice of Art History', 77.

91. Panofsky, 'Three decades', 14.

problems of art history, they lacked any interest in theoretical questions.⁹²

This argument may be further refined. The more reflective and philosophically oriented theories of Panofsky, as they had been proffered in German, were not of the same character as those of Riegl, which could still engage Americans of an empirical bent. It has recently been written that Riegl's was 'a committed empiricism acutely centred on the discussion of objects, but always directed beyond the small questions.'⁹³ However, the earlier theoretical writings of Panofsky in German were heavily Neo-Kantian; the knowledge of the Germanic philosophical tradition which they assume, while attractive for more theoretically interested art historians of recent date, probably made them less accessible to Americans from the 1930s through the 1960s.

Panofsky for one seems to have recognized this. Students who attended Panofsky's classes in the 1940s or studied with him or with other Germans then or in the 1950s say that they never heard him or other German professors talk about theoretical issues.⁹⁴ When he published versions of his previous German essays in *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, or reformulated some of his ideas in an essay his book *Studies in Iconology*, Panofsky left out many of the theoretical or philosophical points of his arguments, and expressed himself in a much simpler, clearer, and more object-oriented manner.⁹⁵ Besides a few essays on iconography, he mostly restrained himself from theoretical expression in his English-language essays and books, a remarkable contrast with his German publications.

Here the fate of another book that Frankl wrote in America is instructive. Frankl's *Zu Fragen des Stils* is a revision of his monumental *Das System der Kunstwissenschaft*⁹⁶ that evinces critical views on style and changes of opinion from his earlier work. They are in particular to be contrasted with the ideas on style in relation to the geography of art expressed at the time by other German scholars in exile, such as

92. This point has been made by Eisler, 'Kunstgeschichte American style', and repeated by more recent critics.

93. Jas A. Elsner, 'The Birth of Late Antiquity: Riegl and Strzygowski in 1901', *Art History* 25: 3, 2002, 359.

94. These were remarks made to the author in answer to questions about this point by David Coffin, John Rupert Martin, Lorenz Eitner, and James Ackerman.

95. This is evident in many of his essays, even for instance Erwin Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1939, which may be contrasted with the German antecedents of the themes treated in these essays.

96. Paul Frankl, *Das System der Kunstwissenschaft*, Brno (Brünn) and Leipzig: R.M. Rohrer, 1938; Frankl, *Zu Fragen des Stils*, ed Ernst Ullmann, Leipzig and Weinheim: VCH, 1988. See the recent comments by Stephan Hoppe, Matthias Müller, and Norvert Nußbaum, 'Einleitung', in *Stil als Bedeutung in der nordalpinen Renaissance. Wiederentdeckung einer methodischen Nachbarschaft*, Regensburg, Germany: Schnell & Steiner, 2009.

Nikolaus Pevsner in *The Englishness of English Art*,⁹⁷ or Panofsky in 'The Iconological Antecedents of the Rolls Royce Radiator'.⁹⁸

During the period of the last years of Frankl's life, the 1950s and early 1960s, a lively exchange of ideas about problems of style, about which he wrote, was occurring in the United States, even though only a few American scholars took part in it. Meyer Schapiro's well known essay on style appeared in 1953;⁹⁹ James Ackerman's important considerations of style appeared in 1962 and 1963;¹⁰⁰ George Kubler's *The Shape of Time* was first published in the year 1962¹⁰¹, the same year in which Frankl died.

In her introduction to *Fragen des Stils* Josepha Weitzmann-Fiedler says that Kubler and Ackerman used Frankl's *System von Kunstwissenschaft*.¹⁰² Ackerman's himself has remarked that it was a struggle to read it, however.¹⁰³ It is also true that Meyer Schapiro cited Frankl in his essay on style of 1953.¹⁰⁴ Kubler also invited Frankl to be a visiting professor at Yale, but so far as may be determined, that was his only teaching activity in the United States.¹⁰⁵

However, Frankl's *Zu Fragen des Stils* remained unpublished during his lifetime. Frankl died in 1962, and his work, which contains observations that could have been important if they had been published during his lifetime, remained long unknown. Although Josepha Weitzmann-Fiedler, his long-time assistant on the book, tried to have his work published, only a quarter century after his death did it eventually see the light of day.¹⁰⁶ Frankl's book appeared in print too late to have been able to contribute to contemporary theoretical debates.

Moreover, as important as they may now appear, the essays of the American authors interested in these debates were also untimely. The scholars who cited Frankl are the only American art historians of their generation (Ackerman, who is often left

97. Nicholas (Nikolaus) Pevsner, *The Englishness of English art*, Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1964 (1st ed. 1962).

98. Erwin Panofsky, 'The Ideological Origins of the Rolls Royce Radiator', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 107, 1963, 273-88.

99. Meyer Schapiro, 'Style', in A. L. Kroeber, ed., *Anthropology Today*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1953, 287-312.

100. James S. Ackerman, 'Theory of Style', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 20: 3, 1962, 227-37; and his comments on style in 'Western Art History', in Ackerman and Rhys Carpenter, eds, *Art and Archaeology*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963, 130ff.

101. George Kubler, *The Shape of Time*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

102. Kubler, *The Shape of Time*, 8.

103. Personal communication, c. 2000.

104. Meyer Schapiro, 'Style', in *Aesthetics Today*, ed. Morris Philipson, Cleveland, OH: World, 1961.

105. Paul Frankl, *Zu Fragen des Stils*, 8, and see the foreword by Weitzmann-Fiedler, 7-8.

106. Ibid.

out of the mix is a bit younger) who possessed any kinds of theoretical interests. They are at any rate the only ones who often expressed such concerns. Ackerman confirmed this impression when he said how at the time he had expressed 'disaffection from the absence of a theoretical base in American Art History—about its naïve positivist character, with the exceptions of Meyer Schapiro and George Kubler.'¹⁰⁷

Ackerman is describing here a plenary lecture that he had delivered before the Annual Meeting of the College Art Association in Washington, D.C., in 1958, which was then published in the *Art Journal*.¹⁰⁸ Ackerman not only regretted the difference in training that Americans in the post-war era had in art history, but more important, politely if caustically criticized the specialization and overemphasis on the search for facts and on scholarly techniques that characterized the field. He complained about the lack of theoretical thinking in the United States, and called for a more theoretical posture in art history in America. Ackerman's remarks support Gert von der Osten's assessment of Frankl's reception in America. In his obituary for Frankl Van der Osten explained the reasons for the failure for Frankl to have had much impact in the United States saying that in the Anglo-Saxon world of pragmatic thought Frankl's fundamental knowledge and views found almost no listeners.¹⁰⁹

Furthermore, Ackerman emphasized in another lecture before the Annual Meeting of the College Art Association of America in 2001 that if he sent a theoretical essay to one of his German teachers, either he did not acknowledge its receipt, or even asked him why he wasted his time with such questions. Ackerman says that the German exiles may have intentionally avoided theorizing when they came to America, because they believed that the innocent Americans should be kept untainted by the dangers of abstract thinking—what they thought had been one of the causes for the collapse of their own fatherland.

This lack of interest in theory among native-born Americans and lack of expression by German immigrants lasted for a long time. To this extent the account of the 1950s and 1960s offered by a recent critique of the practice of American art history is correct: more critical and theoretical reflection was necessary before the field could 'grow up' to another level.¹¹⁰ During the 1960s and 1970s Ackerman often regretted the situation in public and private.¹¹¹ It is also significant that exactly at the same time that many German art historians retired, the early 1970s, the so-called new American

107. 'Profile of James Ackerman', *CAA News*, 26: 1, January 2001, 1-2.

108. James Ackerman, 'On American Scholarship in the Arts', *College Art Journal*, 17: 4, 1958, 357-62.

109. Van der Osten, 'Frankl', 9.

110. Crow, 'The Practice of Art History'.

111. In his classes and personal remarks. Strikingly Ackerman is not mentioned by Crow, 'Practice of Art History'.

Art history appeared.

The history of art history in the United States since the early 1970s is a large, complicated story that obviously demands fuller attention than can be offered here; only a few observations must suffice. First, the earlier lack of interest in theorizing has had further, unintended consequences that have continued to play a role to this day in American art history. In the United States a need existed to catch up on theory of a critical, philosophical character. Perhaps with the change in forms of education humanistic approaches also could not continue unabated. In any case, as important as it may have been in many other regards, the sort of art history that European émigrés presented to Americans was one in which theoretical reflection was largely absent. At the time when this author became a graduate student in art history in America, in the early 1970s, theoretical approaches in the United States were still represented by only three scholars, those already mentioned—Ackerman, Kubler, and Schapiro. The great interest in theory, and along with it in the pre-American works of German-speaking authors, that became fashionable in art history the United States may be one result of trying to make up for the past, to catch up.

German scholars wrote and said much in America, but they did not bring over many of the theoretical interests and critically reflective aspects of the discipline that were already available in Europe. To that extent recent critiques are correct. German émigrés did not directly contribute in the United States to the development of theory or a more reflective, acclaimed as intellectually sophisticated, art history.

This newer art history also met with resistance, and in some places (at Princeton and elsewhere) was achieved at some personal cost. Nevertheless, a rather different critique now may be in order. Charges of Eurocentrism and the restriction of the canon are not to be leveled completely accurately, neither against earlier American scholars, at least not all those at Princeton, and certainly not against them exclusively. Many of the leading figures prominent for promoting advances in recent historiography have by no means led to an expansion of the canon even within European art history in any significant way, but instead reinforced discussion of some of the most familiar figures in the history of European art.¹¹² Certainly they have had little to offer to what is now seen as the most pressing issue in the field: the construction of a world art history.¹¹³

Coda: 'German Jewish Identity in Art History'

112. I have commented on this situation a number of times; see for example my response in 'Visual Culture Questionnaire', *October*, 77, 1996, 45-8.

113. See James Elkins, 'On David Summers's *Real Spaces*', in *Is Art History Global?*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007, 41f.

Many, but by no means all, of the art historians who emigrated from Germany and elsewhere in Central Europe during the 1930s were fleeing because of the racially Anti-Semitic policies of National Socialism. National Socialism discriminated against them, as it would persecute and exterminate others, because of their Jewish ancestry. It thus may seem more than a matter of irony that recent interpretations of these German scholars have stressed their possession of 'German Jewish identity'.¹¹⁴

The notion of 'Jewish identity' might be useful in other circumstances, the identification of Jewish manuscript illumination, for example. But eerie echoes are present if the discussion concerns not art, but art historians. Some historians have not only identified scholars as Jewish, but asserted that their Jewishness determined their interpretations, that for example the Jewishness of such scholars directs their view of the Renaissance.¹¹⁵ Others have suggested that scholars like Panofsky and Ernst Gombrich (who strictly speaking was not a refugee, since he left Austria for London before the *Anschluss* of 1938 in order to work on a biography of Aby Warburg) sought to evade their Jewish identity.¹¹⁶ And even more, the most comprehensive account of 'transplanted' art historical scholarship has assigned a common 'German Jewish identity' to all Germanic art historical émigrés.¹¹⁷

For many reasons these sorts of arguments are problematic at best. In the first place the application of the concept of 'identity' is questionable. At the same time that 'identity', a concept that originated in the social sciences, may have become prominent in cultural studies and identity politics, psychologists and sociologists have dismantled its usefulness.¹¹⁸ Feminist theorists and indeed historians of art history alike have also questioned the idea of any sort of unitary or consistent identity.¹¹⁹ Thus while arguments for 'German Jewish identity' may be consonant with post-modern tendencies that deny the existence of individual subjectivity in favor of collective identity, they ignore another post-modern argument that avers that any individual

114. Cf. *Jewish identity in Modern art history* ed. Soussloff; Michels, 'Deutsch-jüdische Identität und politischer Habitus', in *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft*, 176-88.

115. Cf. Michels *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft* 176-7, 161, Wood, 'Art History's Normative Renaissance', 92; and Keith Moxey, 'Panofsky's Melancholia', in *The Practice of Theory: Poststructuralism, Cultural Politics, and Art Theory*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994, 65-78.

116. Soussloff, *The Absolute Artist*, 131-7; Wood, 'Art History's Normative Renaissance', 81; Michels, *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft*, 178.

117. Michels, 'Deutsch-jüdische Identität und politischer Habitus', *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft*, especially 176-9.

118. As remarked by Schoell-Glass, 'Aby Warburg', 227.

119. See further for these points Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004, 109-113, with further references.

identity is at best a patchwork construction.¹²⁰ As Charlotte Schoell-Glass has suggested, scholars like Aby Warburg had many other different identities, Jewish only one among them.¹²¹

To assign individuals a particular Jewish identity may thus well be to apply a 'forced identity', to use a term of Schoell-Glass, who has offered a powerful critique of this notion.¹²² For many individuals of Jewish background identification with being Jewish was not primary, or even significant in their makeup. Many Jews in Germany and accordingly German-Jewish immigrants may have regarded themselves first as German, as Berliners, or as cosmopolitan. As Peter Gay has suggested, it is the Nazis who defined them, negatively, as Jewish.¹²³

The problem becomes greater when the individuals discussed were Christian, or expressly identified with their Christian faith. This is obviously the case with those émigrés who, to use the term, had no 'Jewish blood' at all, and yet are said without qualification to possess 'Jewish identity' willy-nilly.¹²⁴ The case of other scholars, who may have been persecuted as Jewish by the Nazis, but were in fact Protestant by confession, like Stechow, is also clearly more complicated than such simple Jewish identification allows. Moreover, when other scholars like Gombrich are said to evade their Jewishness, an even clearer objection may be made. As Gombrich himself said in reaction to this accusation, he remembered quite well what his religious identification was. A few years before his death he wrote in response saying that he was baptized a Lutheran, and could still recite portions of the catechism.¹²⁵

The example of Otto von Simson highlights the difficulties with arguments for 'German Jewish identity'. Von Simson was one of the few émigrés who returned to Germany, dying in Berlin where he was born, after having served as a German diplomat and professor in the Freie Universität Berlin. Like many other Europeans, Von Simson had Jewish ancestors, in his case on both sides of his family, including Moses Mendelsohn in his mother's family and the famed president of the 1848 Frankfurt assembly, Eduard von Simson. But his great grandparents were already

120. See Kenneth J. Gergen, *The Saturated Self: Dilemmas of Identity in Everyday Life*, New York: Basic Books, 1991.

121. See Charlotte Schoell-Glass, 'Aby Warburg: Forced Identity and Cultural Science', in *Jewish identity in Art History*, 227, 228.

122. See Charlotte Schoell-Glass, 'Aby Warburg: Forced Identity and Cultural Science', in *Jewish Identity in Art History*, 227.

123. Peter Gay, *My German Question: Growing up in Nazi Berlin*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

124. Cf. Wendland, *Biographisches Handbuch*, Michels, *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft*, and Wood, 'Art History's Normative Renaissance', 65 n 1.

125. Letter to the author of 1999.

practicing Christians, and Von Simson remarked that his family had been Christians for five generations on both sides of the family. Otto von Simson was thus Christian by birth, although he was brought up in circles, which certainly had many Jewish contacts. Otto himself converted to Roman Catholicism in 1937, and in his later years he was outspokenly a believing and practicing Catholic. Most important, he circulated among high Catholic nobility: his first wife was Princess Aloysia (Louise) Alexandra von Schönburg Hartenstein (1906-1976), and his second was Marie-Anne Altgräfin zu Salm-Reifferscheidt-Krautheim und Dyck, whose first husband (and therefore married name) had been Wolff Metternich zur Gracht. Otto von Simson worked in Catholic colleges when he first emigrated to the United States, Marymount College and St. Mary's College, Notre Dame. Thus to treat Von Simson as possessing Jewish identity (and to speak of his Jewish ancestry in this context) would seem to smack of the Inquisition, or even of the Nuremberg Laws. And regardless of the laws promulgated in 1938, Von Simson was drafted into the German army (*Wehrmacht*) in that year, and also despite calling attention to his 'non-Aryan' ancestry, joined the *NS Dozentenbund*.

126

To some extent some recent scholarship that has sought to speak of 'German Jewish identity' has tried to deal with some of the complexities that are connected with the concept. Nevertheless, unless the issue touches upon some kind of specific religious question (Who is a Jew?), which can be complicated enough, outside of this realm the whole discussion seems tainted. As Gombrich himself suggested in response to the question of how you define a Jew:

We lack a term to designate all individuals of Jewish ancestry, and thus we cannot but use basically racist terminology. In fact, I think it was precisely the diversity of language and culture among the Jews of the diaspora that left race as the only distinguishing criterion, after religion had ceased to serve that purpose.¹²⁷

It is probably not the intention of recent scholars who have dealt with these issues of identity to repeat or promulgate racist ideology. Nevertheless, even if the notion of 'German Jewish' émigrés is meant positively, to describe all émigré German art historians as Jewish is also to apply a kind of myth, or antimyth. To quote Gombrich again.

In the Nazi propaganda of my youth...It was constantly asserted that the Jews were behind everything, and that it was they who were responsible for what

126. The information contained in this paragraph is based on interviews with Professor von Simson conducted in 1994 and recorded in transcripts kept in the Special Collections of the Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles.

127. 'The Visual Arts in Vienna: Gombrich on the Jewish catastrophe', *The Arts Newspaper*, September 1997, 29.

the Nazis called 'degenerate art'. Nazis, of course, were great myth-makers, and intentionally so. But even if you turn a myth on its head, you do not get the truth. What I have to contend with here is clearly a kind of anti-myth which has to be exposed in the interests of truth.¹²⁸

The logic—and purpose— of arguments that determine that some scholars's views are to be related to their Jewishness, but the opinions of their antagonists are to be dissociated from their Nazi or racist ideology is also clearly open to question, to say the least. On the one hand, for example, some of the earlier ideas of Joseph Strzygowski and Hans Sedlmayr have been dissociated from their later, outspokenly Nazi pronouncements. Yet it has been convincingly demonstrated that Strzygowski held virulently racist and anti-Semitic views throughout his career, and that these determined even the 'global' geographical beliefs expressed in his early writings that have been regarded as otherwise prophetic or progressive.¹²⁹ And while Sedlmayr's theoretical writings, though criticized long ago, have also been translated and paid new attention in recent years, it has recently been revealed that he was an early member of the Nazi party, and that his reactionary views, as they were expressed during his openly Nazi period, remained remarkably consistent throughout his career.

130

Independent of these considerations, Strzygowski's writings can be judged on their own merits. It is not because they were 'Jewish émigrés' or particularly 'positivist,' nor because they desired to 'suppress' his writing as a deformation of empiricism that scholars may have ignored Strzygowski's arguments about Armenian architecture.¹³¹ It is also not just because of the racist theories that are implicit in Strzygowski's views of Armenian art that they may not have been considered

128. 'The Visual Arts in Vienna', 28.

129. Vasold, 'Riegl, Strzygowski und die Entwicklung der Kunst'. Vasold's useful critique is perhaps however 'superficial', to use his word (*oberflächlich*), in his reading (106n) of Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art*, Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 2004, because this book does not in fact argue that Riegl was a proponent of nationalist writing of history: like the authors discussed in the essays by Ján Bakoš whom Vasold approvingly cites, it in fact argues that this is the product of later writers who drew upon Riegl.

130. Sedlmayr is for instance included in *The Vienna School Reader: Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s*, ed. Christopher S. Wood, New York: Zone Books, 2000. Hans H. Aurenhammer, 'Hans Sedlmayr 1896-1984', in *Klassiker der Kunstgeschichte*, ed Ulrich Pfisterer, Munich: Beck, 2008, 2, 76-89, Aurenhammer, 'Zäsur oder Kontinuität? Das Wiener Kunsthistorisches Institut in Ständestaat und in Nationalsozialismus,' 11-54 and Benjamin Binstock, 'Springtime for Sedlmayr? The Future of Nazi Art History,' *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 53, 2004, 73-86, have pointed to continuities in Sedlmayr's career and publications.

131. Cf. Wood, 'Strzygowski und Riegl,' 223, 232.

seriously. The implications of Christina Maranci's dissertation on Strzygowski's contribution to Armenian architecture suggest rather that on almost every point of fact about Armenian architecture and archaeology that Strzygowski himself could have known (as distinct from data with which he could not have been familiar at the time he wrote) his information was incorrect or presented in a distorted manner.¹³²

The notion of objectivity or historical validity implicit here might be questioned by some historians, who argue that history is constructed. But if history is constructed, why, if Strzygowski's 'facts' are wrong, should his work on Armenian architecture have been consulted, if his ideology is racist? And why is (German) Jewish identity not then also to be considered a construction, and a racist one at that?

Here the words of William Heckscher may be recalled, 'Sobald Kunstgeschichte spezifisch deutsch, jüdisch, marxistisch oder sonst irgendwie einseitig betont ist, ist es keine Kunstgeschichte mehr, sondern ein Abart volkischer, rassistischer weltanschaulicher Bemühungen.'¹³³

The notion of 'German Jewish' art historians in exile includes a wide variety of different sorts of individuals, among them many such as Heckscher who were not Jewish at all. As far as their writings or teaching are concerned, German-speaking art historians in the United States (including those who had visited or were read in the United States before 1933, but did not emigrate there, Jews and non-Jewish alike), like those who were born in the western hemisphere, expressed themselves in a wide variety of ways. This paper has sought to recall some significant utterances that have not been remembered, heard, or interpreted correctly in recent scholarship, to provide a fuller context for understanding them, and, finally, to offer a critique of the notion that some unitary identity may be applied to the many different sorts of German émigré scholars who came to America.

Not every one of the voices of German émigrés spoke clearly: some European scholars did not fully express themselves, because they did not give voice to the entire range of their intellectual interests when they were in the United States. The voices of others remained unheard, were not listened to, or were heard by only a few people.¹³⁴ The history of German art history in America is therefore a history of partially as well as fully heard voices, of heard and unheard expressions. And this applies to those scholars who were born in the United States as well. There are many sorts of American voices, German émigré and native born, that have contributed to the polyphonic, international, discourse of art history.

132. Christina Maranci, 'Medieval Armenian Architecture in Historiography: Josef Strzygowski and His Legacy', PhD Dissertation, Princeton University, 1998.

133. Quoted in Schoell-Glass and Sears, *Verzetteln als Methode*, 46.

134. This subject deserves further attention: see most recently for example David Rosand, 'Hans and Erica Tietze: A belated tribute', in *Studi Tizianeschi*, 5, 2007, 11-17, especially 16.

Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann American Voices. Remarks on the Earlier History ...

Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann is Frederick Marquand Professor of Art and Archaeology at Princeton University. He is the author of many books and articles on a wide variety of topics. His most recent book is *Arcimboldo: Visual Jokes, Natural History, and Still-Life Painting*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 2009 (published in 2010). His current work concerns issues of global exchange in art and world art history.

Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann
Department of Art and Archaeology
313 McCormick Hall
Princeton University

kaufmann@Princeton.EDU