Freedom from theory? An attempt to analyse Sten Karling’s views on (Estonian) art history

Krista Kodres

Europe after World War I was characterized by a new political map: many regions that had been under different colonial imperia, began to establish their national states. In 1918 an independent Republic of Estonia was established, comprised of the territory inhabited mostly by ethnic Estonians. That piece of land was colonized and Christianized in the 13th century during the process of the eastward colonization. Later on Estonia and neighbouring Livonia formed a part of the Swedish Kingdom and since the Northern War in the beginning of 18th century they belonged to Russian Empire. In the beginning of the 20th century, Estonia and Livonia were characterized by a situation where the top of the social hierarchy was formed by the Baltic-German and Russian elite, but Estonian and Latvian’s own business and cultural elite was gradually emerging. Finally, that latter elite managed to establish the Republics of Estonia and Latvia in 1918.

This article focuses on a Swedish-born art historian Sten Ingvar Karling (1906-1987), his research and his views. Karling was a professor in the Estonian national University of Tartu, established in 1919. Since Estonia itself at a time lacked academically competent art historians, Karling was chosen to develop the discipline. Over 1930s, his course of work took place in the context of a young nation-state that was in the process of its own construction of identity, as well as emerging National Socialism in Europe and the ideology of the Great Germany. Professionally, Karling’s academic work in Estonia was influenced by the processes that took place in German and Scandinavian art history in the 1920s-1930s, which was overshadowed by the political-ideological reality mentioned above.

In my article I focus mainly on Sten Karling’s ideas about the theoretical aspects of writing art history, the goals and borders in handling the artistic heritage. My aim is to show the sources of his ideas and establish a link with the process of modernization in Estonian national culture at the time.

Sten Karling in Estonia

In early 1933, Sten and Kerstin Karling arrived in Tartu. Sten Karling was a recently elected new art history professor at the university. Two years previously, he had defended his doctoral thesis, titled Trägardkonstens historia i Sverige intill Le Notres-stilens genombröt, in Gothenburg.

1 History of the art of gardening in Sweden until the break-through of Le Notre’s style.
At the beginning of February, a few weeks after his arrival, Karling wrote to his aunt Karin Karling in Gothenburg:

It was great fun to furnish the house with both old and new things... Last Sunday we visited Professor [Gustav] Suits..., Professor [Harri] Moora was there as well. Tomorrow we will stay in, as Professor Haliste will pay us a return visit. I have taken to wearing warm clothes now at lectures... A large amount of time is spent on preparing [lectures], but I had not planned anything else anyway. I have about 15 students, mostly women..... I have worked out a new study plan. Besides, I was made the head of the art history studio – this is apparently part of the chair. My amanuensis, master Waga, has remained a true assistant, dealing with all practical matters, orders pictures and so on. The studio is always in impeccable order and would be hard work if it were not so. After fierce cold ...

Tartu has turned out to be a most charming and pleasant town, with excellent climate, sounds of jingle-bells and people merrily bustling around in the streets....

Most of the letters sent to Gothenburg from Tartu over eight years all praise Estonia. It is obvious that the Karlings liked Estonia and we can be quite certain that had the war not interfered, the family would never have returned to Sweden. The departure occurred in 1941. As fate would have it, the ship taking the Karlings to Stockholm bore the name of the ‘great’ Soviet cultural politician Andrei Zhdanov. Between 1947 and 1972, Sten Karling worked as professor of art history at Stockholm University. He was also editor-in-chief of the most influential Swedish art history magazine *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift* for 25 years.

Eight years in Tartu left a mark not only in the life of Karling who arrived here in his prime, at 27, but also on the whole Estonian art history writing. Besides lecturing, he managed to do an amazing amount of work on research during these years. He left behind disciples and a legacy, both of which were essential in the further development of Estonian art history writing after 1939-45 war.

I should mention that although Karling published a great deal while living in Estonia, he formulated his theoretical position in only one publication, the monograph *Holzschnitzerei und Tischlerkunst der Renaissance und des Barocks in Estland* (1943), published after his departure from Estonia. It is remarkable that the author dedicated

---


3 Most renown students of Sten Karling Erik Forssmann, Gerhard Eimer, Lars Olof Larsson and Götz Pochat went to work in German universities.

4 This legacy has been tackled in: Mirjam Peil, ‘Kunstiteadlased Tartu Ülikoolis 1921-1940 (Art Historians in the University of Tartu 1921-1940), Tartu Ülikooli ajaloo käsikirjad, 7, 1979, 118-126; Mart Eller, ‘Tartu Ülikooli osast Eesti kunstiteadusest 1920-30.aste nädalast I ja II (On the role of University of Tartu in art historical research in the 1920s-1930s)’, Kunstiteadus. Kunstikriitika. Artiklite kogumik 5, 6, 1983, 60-75 and 1986, 158-173.
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this book to ‘young Estonian art historians’, as if he had a premonition that he was never to return.5

From 1996, the Institute of Art History at the Estonian Academy of Arts has organised the ‘Karling-conferences’ and thus Karling’s legacy is not forgotten. The first conference collection published a list of his writings on Estonian art – from monographs to art criticism and obituaries of artists and art historians – consisting altogether of 106 entries.6 The publication of the Estonian Society of Art Historians Estonian Art History and Criticism in the 20th Century naturally could not ignore his legacy either.7 Reading the materials critically it must be admitted that his art theoretical views have never really been tackled.

Regional art landscape

As mentioned above, Karling published his theoretical views only in one publication, monograph Holzschnitzerei und Tischlerkunst der Renaissance und des Barocks in Estland. Its foreword and theoretical part of the introduction cover just nine pages. He explains the aims of his research as follows:

The development of art history in Estonia in the chosen field, determining the artists who represented it and connecting them with European art history, was the main purpose of the current work. First of all I intended to write a few chapters about Estonian art history, but I was fully aware that I was thus filling a gap in the knowledge of the history of sculpture of the entire protestant North. The masters who worked in Estonia for a longer or shorter period of time also belong in the art history of Northern Germany, i.e. Lübeck, Mecklenburg, Schleswig-Holstein, Eastern Prussia, as well as Denmark and Sweden.8

5 The member of Learned Estonian Society Dr. A. Raun writes in the preface to Holzschnitzerei: ‘After writing the introduction for this publication professor Sten Karling had to leave Tartu urgently. He did not have a chance to go through the manuscript in detail once more.’ - Sten Karling, Holzschnitzerei und Tischlerkunst der Renaissance und des Barocks in Estland, Verhandlungen der Gelehrten Estnischen Gesellschaft, Dorpat: Öpetatud Eesti Selts, 1943, XI.
Karling’s words refer to the topical research issues in European art history at the time. Johnny Roosval, the prominent Swedish art historian, professor of art history at Stockholm University, had published an essay already in 1927, titled ‘Das baltisch-nordische Kunstgebiet’. Roosval repeated the idea of a united Baltic-Nordic region at an international congress of art historians in Stockholm in 1933, where Karling was also present. The main topic of the congress was ‘The Emergence of National Styles in Art’.10

Writing art history from a regional rather than a statist point of view was not altogether a new idea in Estonia either, although it had previously had another definition. The Baltic German art historians had formulated ‘Baltic art’ (Estonia-Latvia) as an art historical unit, while emphasising the role of ‘Motherland’ Germany in its development and shaping (Wilhelm Neumann’s Grundriss einer Geschichte der bildenden Künste und Kunstgewerbes in Liv-, Est und Kurland (1887) and ’700 Jahre baltischer Kunst’ (1900); Heinz Pirang’s Baltisches Herrenhaus (1926) etc.).

European art historians wrote national art histories throughout the nineteenth century. Geographical location as a significant art determinant was first formulated at that time and in the early twentieth century terms such as geography of art and culture geography11 were adopted. Among the first who raised the topic of regional art landscape (Kunstlandschaft) as a factor influencing art production was professor Josef Strzygowski,12 chair of the I Kunsthistorischen Institut at the Vienna University, working from 1920-25 in Abo Academy in Finland. Incidentally, in 1922 he was elected the first art history professor at Tartu University although he never actually took up the post.14 In his book Die Krisis in der Geisteswissenschaften, vorgeführt am Beispielen der Forschung über bildende Kunst (1923) he saw an essential role for the art historian in determining the character of geographically defined art landscapes. Besides the temporal-spatial component, Kunstlandschaft was also determined ethnically and demographically. According to Strzygowski, the research method of regional art landscape was to compare regional artworks (Denkmäler) to establish their special character via ‘real lines of development’ (tatsächliche Entwicklungsreihen).15

Karling’s (as well as his first Estonian born graduates) wish to show the art history of the Estonian (Baltic) region as a special phenomenon was obviously influenced by the circumstances in Estonia in the 1930s. The 1925 University Law

---

stressed the need to ‘advance general research and especially research on Estonian life’.

The latter sciences were called ‘national sciences’, for example ethnography and art history besides literary and historical research. By contrast, since the nineteenth century Estonian intellectuals had been aspiring to connect Estonian cultural identity with Europe. A common regional art history that would embrace the countries by the Baltic Sea was thus most welcome. It must be said to Karling’s credit that he was able to support his thesis with convincing empirical material and added the Scandinavian dimension often neglected by the Baltic German research. On the other hand, he did not go along with openly hostile attitudes towards Germans that became quite common in Estonia in the 1920s and 1930s. Also his eminent Swedish colleague Johnny Roosval did not wish to see art history harnessed to topical politics: the borders of former art landscapes (Roosval called them - artedominien) ran differently in history from what they did in modern times and to use them in order to promote contemporary national identities would not be scientifically correct.

How Karling proved the coherences (Zusammenhänge) of an art region by comparative research method is seen in the following paragraph describing the altar in Kärla church (1591):

Here, the composition is associated with graphic models of the Low Countries – the motif can be seen already in the work of Rogier van der Weyden and Quintin Matsys. Elongated figures, soft limbs and finely cut folds characterise the ideal of courtly mannerism. The thin protruding Herma pilasters and acroteria urns seem to belong to the repertory of Vredeman de Vries. God the Father in a triangular gable, hands stretched out in blessing, is a typical motif in the sculpture of the Low Countries, although taken over from Italy.

Karling’s treatment of style

The title of Karling’s Holzschnitterei-monograph resembles the title of Heinrich Wölfflin’s book Renaissance und Barock, published in 1888. However, Sten Karling’s idea of an art style connected not only to Wölfflin. Karling wrote:

---

Stone sculpture, as well as bronze sculpture, as much as the latter exists, essentially represent courtly art and are therefore more connected with the renaissance ideal and humanism, whereas wooden sculpture is more popular. It was mostly used by the town council and citizens and realised for a long time only by artisans-woodcarvers associated with guilds.19

Associating art with a certain social group resembles Arnold Hauser’s later Social History of Art and Literature (1951), which also differentiated between ‘courtly’ (höfischer) and ‘bourgeois’ (bürgerlicher) gothic, renaissance and baroque. Taking a closer look, however, we see that for Karling these were not significant as social but rather as intellectual categories determining the essence of artworks. The term used by Karling, Wesen, refers to several art historians who, influenced by phenomenological philosophy, became keen to determine the ‘essence’ of an artwork in the 1920s and 1930s. The essence of an artwork was tackled by the Strzygowski, who has already been mentioned, as well as by Erwin Panofsky. According to the latter, every cultural expression was the representation of Wesensinn (essential meaning), displaying the spirit and emotions20 common in the era.

For Karling, therefore, an artwork had an essence determined, according to the above quote, by the spirit of its clients. An artwork expressed a ‘spirit’, the essence of which could be determined besides courtly/bourgeois, also by religion (‘protestant religiosity’ - protestantische Religiosität).21 At the same time, the spirit could in fact stretch all over an era, such as ‘gothic spirit’ - die Geist der Gotik.22 The spirit is expressed through the style of the period – Zeitstil (‘Durchgehend macht sich die Tendenz bemerkbar, den Zeitstil zu sprengen ’).23

Style as a phenomenon reflecting the era’s spirit or essence naturally formed one of the basic concepts of European art history, back to Winckelmann. A number of art historians were dealing with the concept of style also in 1930s. Mention should be made here of Alois Riegl and Max Dvořák, whose ‘voice’ is heard in Karling’s text as well:

Only by the end of the [sixteenth – K. K.] century, when the blending process had finished, a new, so far restrained urge for self-expression emerged, a need to break through the decorative. This reaction that functioned in different directions, had grown out of people themselves and fed upon the medieval soil.24

21 Karling, Holzschnitzerei und Tischlerkunst, 2.
22 Karling, Holzschnitzerei und Tischlerkunst, 3.
23 Karling, Holzschnitzerei und Tischlerkunst, 5.
24 Erst am Ende des Jahrhunderts, als der Verschmelzungsprozess abgeschlossen war, regte sich ein neuer, bisher zurückhaltener Drang nach Ausdruck, die dekorative Hülle zu durchbrechen. Diese Reaktion, die
‘The urge for self-expression’ used in the text clearly refers to the acceptance of Riegl’s concept of *Kunstwollen*, according to which the human race at all its development stages has a wish and a need to express itself artistically. Karling’s text reveals perhaps even more the impact of Riegl’s disciple Dvořák, especially where he tackles the replacement of renaissance with mannerism. The new spirit requests a new art expression:

[In the late sixteenth century – K.K.] we notice a tendency everywhere to blow up the style of the era in order to express something more personal. Yearning for a more spiritual way of expression and reaction against the antique-favouring renaissance legacy provides this art with mainly a mannerist character, which nevertheless differs from the sensual courtly mannerism. Pessimism caused by spiritual, material and political relations gives way to restlessness, fear and pain, at the same time to perceived resignation and reserve, even defiance.

This paragraph in Karling’s text clearly shows that he was familiar with Max Dvořák’s article, ‘Über Greco und den Manierismus’. The article about the sixteenth-century art as the embodiment of the spirit of the era was published in a collection compiled after the professor’s death, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*, in 1924:

This disappointment led to scepticism and doubts in the value of reasoned theories and forbidden customs... It would be possible to talk about spiritual catastrophe that came before political [catastrophe –K.K.].... What we can observe in art issues connected with Michelangelo and Tintoretto, was in fact the criterion of the whole era.

It should be mentioned that there were voices amongst art historians in the 1920s in favour of revising Riegl- Dvořák’s theory of the spirit of the era. Their argument was that according to empirical material, more than one art style has existed in parallel in different eras – thus there should also have existed several ‘spirits of an era’, expressed
by the same artistic styles. Wilhelm Pinder’s theory of generations, introduced in his 1926 book *Das Problem der Generation in der Kunstgeschichte Europas*, made an attempt to stitch together, by means of synthesising, the contradictory problem of stylistic pluralism and the ‘spirit of an era’. According to Pinder’s conviction, style is something dynamic and changing. This change is guaranteed by different generations of artists living together in the same era, whose spirit and activity are determined by the (different) moment of their birth. No every generation brings about a radical change in the period’s style, it only occurs when time is ripe for the change in the spirit of the era.

Karling did not directly refer to Pinder. At the same time the concept ‘generation’ cropped up rather frequently in *Holzschnitzerei*’s text; the structure of the research also indicated familiarity with Pinder’s ideas. Karling founded his book on overviews of the leading artists and the masters belonging in their stylistic circle. These masters, as seen in Pinder, create style in an era ready for changes. Master Tobias Heintze, for example, was the one via whom ‘the tradition of renaissance is broken’ (die Tradition der Renaissance wird gebrochen) and Christian Ackermann was the one who ‘mediates in Estonia the transfer to high-Baroque sculpture’ (Der Meister, der in Estland den Übergang zur Plastik des Hochbarocks vermittelt).

As style, for Karling, was a category of form that reflected the spirit of the era, it was only natural that in analysing individual objects he focused on form. Although *Holzschnitzerei* is a book mainly concerned with church art, it pays relatively little attention to the meaning of each altar or pulpit, to their iconographic programme. Karling occasionally explains who the figures are portrayed but does not find it necessary to treat iconography independently: all this, after all, represented the ‘the spirit of Northern Protestantism’. In tackling objects depiction of form prevails and there is quite a bit of Wölfflin there. For instance the paragraph characterising the psychological impact of forms created by Tobias Heintze used essentially the same conceptual categories as Heinrich Wölfflin in his book *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der neueren Kunst* (1915). Here, Karling’s *Anschauligkeit* refers to Wölfflin’s *Einheit*:

Instead of the initial soft modelling there is a coarse, almost chopped style that seems nervous and sensitive. This style is still lacking the nerve and rhythm of baroque.... what they all have in common, however, is fighting against romanism and aspiring a bigger artistic comprehensiveness [i.e. unity - K.K.].

---

The work of the masters thus carried the ‘spirit of the era’, expressed in certain emotionally charged formal qualities. It should be emphasised that regarding art history as an outlet of the era’s history of spirit, and using Wölfflin-like categories to characterise styles, was not only typical of Karling. In the late 1920s and in the 1930s, Dvořák and Wölfflin were the most respected art historians in Central and East-European academic circles.

Change of style

The problem of style change was a major aspect of art history in the early twentieth century. Those constructing the big systems embracing the entire existing art history were not able to ignore this issue. Karling mostly shared the views of style change with Dvořák and Pinder: as shown above, he saw changing art as an inevitable part of the changing (spirit) of the era. On the other hand, the initiators of stylistic change were, in his opinion, the generations of artists who encouraged by a leader. The latter construction enabled him to argue why one long period of time – ‘era’ (Zeitalter) – could contain several style modifications. Karling thus often examined style and change of style together; opposition made it possible to characterise both the old and the coming style. It would be useful here to take a look at his views on gothic style because this shows another significant aspect in his approach. He wrote:

The spirit of gothic, its dynamic force lives on in the art of artisans, so that it can prove itself – after the initial awe of the unknown – in independent forms, with the same power and passion as in late gothic. This is primarily wooden sculpture, where auricular baroque emerges as the direct legacy of late gothic. Only after fierce resistance did the woodcarvers give up their singularity to the new powerful current of international academism, which invaded the entire Northern Europe at the end of the seventeenth century.

Also, in the paragraph quoted already before, in a different context:

Only by the end of the [sixteenth – K. K.] century, when the blending process had finished, a new, so far restrained urge for self-expression emerged, a need to break through the [merely – K.K.] decorative surface of an artwork [i.e. the

33 Pochat, ‘Epochenbegriff’, 142-164.
Southern renaissance, formally taken over in Northern Europe, was overcome – K.K.]. This reaction that functioned in different directions, had grown out of people themselves and fed upon the medieval soil.\textsuperscript{35}

The topic of his book – the art of woodcarving/ sculpture – was not merely a bearer of 'gothic spirit' but also the best possible expression of the art development of the Northern countries:

Better than in architecture where the new is added to the old before takeover primarily in details, better than in painting with its one-sided subject matter and form restriction, it is sculpture that reveals the development of culture of the Northern countries. In this field, the gothic legacy never retreated in the face of new forms, and the examples of Italian renaissance were never slavishly followed.\textsuperscript{36}

It is notable that Karling favoured the Middle Ages because this period was allegedly more democratic, ‘carried by people’, whereas the renaissance was alien and elitist to the Northern countries. This view clearly idealises the Middle Ages and is nothing new; in German cultural space it can be traced back to Goethe and Hegel. The idea of gothic style as the bearer of the Germanic national spirit was supported by several art historians in the early twentieth century. Karling could have been influenced by the idea of opposing spirit of South-North art regions, indicated by Riegl and explained by Strzygowski,\textsuperscript{37} as well as interpretations of gothic by the private docent at Königsberg University, Karl-Heinz Clasen. Johnny Roosval was already mentioned – his concept of the common Baltic-Nordic artedominium enabled to extend the existing ‘spirit’ of the Gothic typical of the Northern countries (i.e. primarily German) to Scandinavia.

Riegl for example wrote that ‘the spirit has been the strongest in German art will from the start. Spiritual is non-material, non-embraceable, immaterial; hence the Germanic indifference towards the embraceable, pictorial in art’.\textsuperscript{38} In his book \textit{Die
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gotische Baukunst (1930), Karl-Heinz Clasen wrote that ‘this [gothic – K. K.] became a style that gave the western and northern part of Europe the perfect visible image of this spirit.’

What also strikes the eye is that, according to Karling, people carry their gothic spirit even after the end of the Middle Ages. During the sixteenth century the Middle Ages and renaissance ‘blended’, after which the ‘gothic spirit’ again emerged powerfully in mannerism – as an ‘era of decorativeness’ - to finally give way to academism. Karling thus supported the idea of styles above time, like Wölfflin and Dvořák: the development of art styles is cyclical, i.e. closed, but the same spirit can return in a new context and with a new form. Renaissance and mannerism could therefore both be, regardless of the different form language, ‘gothic’; in this context the latter indeed became an adjective.

The disappearance of the national ‘spirit of gothic, its dynamic power’ was a negative process where precious values were lost. As evident in several above paragraphs, Karling saw change of style as the result of the passionate fight between the forms. The following passage emphasised this as well:

After the Thirty Years’ War, this mood gave way to more optimistic attitudes. In its new baroque form, the humanist culture now reached the bourgeoisie, which was trying to imitate the aristocracy to its best abilities. The wealthy Dutch merchants stood at the helm of classicism that was successfully taking over Northern Europe. It was making way to high baroque, although this was actually catholic, an expression corresponding to the royal absolutism. The art of handicraft of the North drowned in that pompous but internally empty deluge of forms.

And finally:

Our treatment of wooden sculpture in Estonia from early sixteenth century into the deep eighteenth century is not primarily a description of the emerging Southern representative forms and their final triumph but rather a research about how the Northern handicraft reacted to the modern era and how it stubbornly defended its own values [! – K. K.].

The above extracts show how Karling thought the style change actually happened: it was certainly not abrupt, but rather a long ‘blending process’, where ‘the new is added to the old before the takeover primarily in details’. He thus saw change as (at least occasionally) as growth, one form becoming the other. This is how Karling characterised, for example, the transformation of auricular style into acanthus style in the 1670s when ‘the auricular style initially survived, but gradually changed, losing its nerve of lifeblood and finally became acanthus’. Karl-Heinz Clasen attempted to summarise the concept of the organic growth of art more philosophically:

Nothing in art emerges by chance, the individual forms and styles instead appear via the growth and change of slow, inner laws... Single stages of this growth and development are perhaps not as important as the growth and development themselves, plus the force from which they emanate. This kind of driving force also works with historically changing forms and can be seen as an inner principle.

Karling’s writing desk

Having tackled Karling’s theoretical views at length and indicated the numerous art historical publications that probably influenced him, one might naturally be curious about what books he had on his writing desk. The art history curriculum in university of Tartu that he established in 1933 makes it quite clear what books he considered important enough to make them compulsory reading for his students.

---

44 Unsere Darstellung der Holzskulptur in Estland vom Beginn des XVI. Jahrhunderts bis tief in das XVIII. Jahrhundert ist daher nicht vornehmlich eine Schilderung des Vordringens und endgültigen Sieges der aus dem Süden stammenden repräsentativen Formen, sondern eher eine Untersuchung über die Reaktion der nordischen Handwerkerkunst auf das Neuzeitliche und die hartnäckige Verteidigung ihrer Werte. - Karling, Holzschnitzerei und Tischlerkunst, 9.
47 E. V. Tartu Ülikooli Filosoofiateaduskonna öppe- ja eksamikord ning eksaminõuded (The Study Regulations of University of Tartu), Tartu, 1939, 37-39.
So: at the lower level of art history the students had to read ‘some methodological works, e.g. H. Wölfflin, *Die klassische Kunst*, or *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, by the same author’ 48. The medium level requested ‘a few art theoretical works, such as M. Dvořák, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*, W. Pinder, *Problem der Generationen*, H. Cornell, *Karaktäriseringsproblemen i konstvetenskapen*. 49 Besides theoretical works, the compulsory literature list naturally contained quite a few treatments of the period/style and art country/region. These also included Alois Riegł’s *Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom* (1908) and Karl Heinz Clasen’s *Die gotische Baukunst* (1930). We can therefore be certain that we are not mistaken in describing Sten Karling as a promoter of the ideas of these art historians. What one cannot find in the list, however, is Strzygowski’s *Die Krisis in der Geisteswissenschaften* and since there is no catalogue of university’s art historical library remaining it is hard to decide about the book’s existence there.

The art history curriculum contained another significant book, namely Robert Hedicke’s *Methodenlehre der Kunstgeschichte* (1924). Hedicke was a student of Max Dvořák and shared his views on art history as the history of spirit. Hedicke’s 300-page book about methods of art history teaching develops Dvořák’s direction, aspiring towards ‘scientific objectivity and general validity as an ideal’ 50. In the introduction to the handbook for students, the author mentions historians and art historians to be studied, from ‘Winckelmann via Ranke, Burckhardt, and Schnaase to Justi, Dehio, Neumann, Heidrichin and from there to the general history of the spirit.’ 51 The most inspiring were Wilhelm Dilthey and Max Weber respectively and also Strzygowski and his book *Die Krisis in der Geisteswissenschaften*, as were Riegł and Wölfflin.

Examing Hedicke’s book further we cannot but notice that the views explained here are also reflected in the writings of Sten Karling. There should be no doubt that Karling appreciated *Methodenlehre*, as Hedicke’s book is the only theoretical treatment at the higher level of the art history curriculum recommended reading list at Tartu University. 52

Sharing the general conceptual view of art history as history of spirit, Karling also seems to share Hedicke’s opinion that ‘the analysis of an individual artwork and general intellectualities and general cohesions of change must be separated’ 53. This is especially evident in *Holzschnitzerei*: the theoretical introduction forms a separate whole in the book’s structure, followed by a treatment that is characterised (primarily) by focusing on works. In the vein of Hedicke (who probably borrowed from Strzygowski), it can be called working ‘with monument-historical method’ - *denkmalsgeschichtliche*
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*Method* and aiming at establishing the ‘row of monuments’ (*Entwicklungsreihen* by Strzygowsky)\(^{54}\). Here the primary source was the monument/artwork itself, whereas written sources were secondary. Karling used the monument-focused method together with another art history method – ‘figurative-artistic’ - *bildkünstlerische*, explained by Hedicke as follows:

> The figurative-artistic method must examine the spiritual in artistic figuration (design) and for that it requires measuring devices. These devices are the main principles of figuration, inductively deduced as a result of long empirical experience and appearing subsequently as easily usable measuring devices of figuration. The main principles are first employed to analyse the work and then its location in the row of monuments, searching for the content of its artistic figuration. This clarifies the monument’s individual figuration, expressed in general concepts of figuration. We thus establish the style of the monument, belonging in a circle of artworks and the style of its era.\(^{55}\)

In my opinion, employing the monument-focused figurative-artistic method is characteristic of all Karling’s art history texts concerning Estonia. It should be emphasised that for both Hedicke and Karling, the described method was by no means subordinated to the ‘intellectual-historical method’ but was in fact equal to it. As already emphasized, Karling did not express his theoretical views anywhere else except in *Holzschnitzerei*.\(^{56}\)

‘Monument-focused figurative-artistic method’ in the early decades of the twentieth century was naturally not only typical of Karling. Looking at international art history writing, we see that this approach was in fact the mainstream in European art history between 1900 and the 1940s. Willem Bode’s *Die holländischen und flämischen Malerschulen* (1917), Albert Erich Brinckmann’s *Barockskulptur* (1917), Erwin Panofsky’s *Die deutsche Plastik des 11. bis 13. Jahrhunderts* (1924), Adolf Feulner’s *Die deutsche Plastik des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (1926), Anton Ulbrich’s *Geschichte der Bildhauerkunst in Ostpreussen* (1926-29) and other research works on the list of the Tartu University art history curriculum, plus Karling’s own writings, all concentrate on examining the monuments/works, trying to determine their place in the ‘row of works’ both


\(^{56}\) One has to take notice that *Holzschnitzerei* is a monograph and that format presupposes more large introduction than an article, the format that prevails in Karling’s production on Estonian art history. However, his later monograph *Medeltida träskulptur i Estland* (Göteborg, 1946), lacks theoretically loaded introduction; here Karling just repeats shortly thoughts familiar from the introduction of *Holzschnitzerei*. 
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synchronously and diachronically (comparative-historical method), and then place them within the style of the era. 

Theorising was not absolutely necessary here as (according to Hedicke) it was not the task of an art historian, but ‘intellectual historians’. Aesthetics was not necessary either, because it was merely a ‘help-science’ (*Hilfswissenschaft*). Karling as a scholar was therefore primarily keen on art historical material itself. Estonia needed its national sciences, new knowledge about the history and art history of the country; the professor at the national university naturally had a duty to provide this knowledge. The monuments as well as archive materials were waiting in Estonia like innocent virgins for someone to take them, pluck them. In a word, the material needed to be ‘fertilised’, i.e. described, systematised, lined up – all these procedures that the positivist understanding of a duty set to the humanities in the early twentieth century. However, was this ‘theory freedom’, in fact, freedom from theory or to what extent were Karling’s ‘monument-focused’ art history texts determined by a theoretical framework that he introduced in the introduction to *Holzschnitzerei*? By way of the answer I would like to present another extract from *Holzschnitzerei*, about Elert Thiele’s triumphal crucifix produced around 1660 for the German St Mary’s Church in Narva:

The powerful body of Christ is carved with typically baroque fascination with the play of muscles, but at the same time with anatomical precision, which isolates sculpture from space. The muscles are tight and firm around the skeleton. Although it is covered by a layer painted over the original polychromy, the quality of the master is clearly visible. The work has nothing of the mannerist slimness, nothing of excess baroque, only realism based on later gothic tradition. The concept is still full of pessimism, reflecting the crisis years of the world view.

---


Conclusion

Karling’s discussions of the nature of art and the historical and regional factors that influence it were quite brief and in his numerous publications he hardly stressed the need for theoretical self-reflection. It is, however, obvious that his presentation and evaluation of artistic material was theory based.

We can’t deny that his ideas were entwined with the political-ideological reality of the 1930s. By strongly supporting the idea of the Baltic-Nordic artdominium, Karling opposed himself to the competing discourse of the (Baltic-) German discourse of art history.

The latter that regarded Estonian and Livonian art history as a part of (Baltic-)German art history, had already been constructed in the 19th century by local Baltic-German historians and fixed by Georg Dehio in *Geschichte der deutschen Kunst* (1919-1926). These ideas were supported by the leading German art historians of the 1920s-1930s, especially Wilhelm Pinder (*Geschichtliche Betrachtungen über Wesen und Werden deutscher Formen*, published in three volumes 1935-40).

Niels von Holst, an art historian of Baltic-German origin who took part in a project *Deutsche Kunst im Osten* initiated by the German Academy since early 1930s, felt the oppositional character of the idea about Baltic-Nordic artdominium very clearly and expressed his discontent.60 The only public discussion on the two different art historical narratives was held in Berlin in 1938.61 In the Art History Society of Berlin Karling gave a speech where he spoke of various Estonian medieval objects and linked their form with Flemish-Burgundy or French cathedral sculpture. There Karling was strongly opposed by both Wilhelm Pinder and Carl Heinz Clasen who considered the forms originate from Lübeck or Prussia.62

Karling’s work was influenced both by ideas on art history that were mainly spread in the German language and cultural sphere and by being a Scandinavian who felt home in Estonian national culture and supported its goals. By mixing all this, Karling created a model that to a large extent defined Estonian art history writing in the Soviet times as well. The Baltic-German artistic heritage that was so far considered local, yet colonial and foreign, was transformed by Karling (and his Estonian disciples) to ‘Estonian’, appropriated and integrated with the European and especially with the Baltic-Nordic history of ‘high art’.

This kind of logic of the construction of heritage63 was in fact coherent with the aim of legitimizing one’s own national independence through a new positive history narrative that took place intensively in the whole of Europe over the 1920-1930s. In

---


61 I am addressing these two narratives more comprehensively in my article ‘Two Art Histories: the (Baltic) German and Estonian Versions of History of Estonian Art’ to be published in 2011.
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Estonia that inevitably turned both against the one-time Baltic-German colonizers as well as the new historical construction of national socialist ideology.


Krista Kodres
Institute of Art History of Estonian Academy of Arts
Suur-Kloostri 11, Tallinn 10133 Estonia
+372 5156606
Krista.Kodres@artun.ee