The term "school" is used here to characterise a strong institutionality of the academic/scientific pursuit of the subject. It applies, in my view, most strongly to the ways in which art history has been pursued in Poland, especially in post WWII Poland. In fact there is probably no other country in Europe where art history is such an institutionally, and therefore nationally recognised pursuit. In Great Britain, for instance, the wording "a school of art history", or an "English school of art history" would hardly make sense. In Germany and Switzerland art history was, and is, institutionally strong but we cannot speak much of a "national", nor of individual, localised schools of art history.

Of course one knows of the Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte; this is a term which consolidated itself in the early 20th century. It refers principally to a local genealogy of scholars: the founder of the school in the 1850s taught his successor in the chair at the university, who taught his successor, who taught his successor, and so on, until we get to today’s professors in Vienna. At the same time such local school may influence others; it may help another university to establish its own school. There has been much talk of Vienna helping Cracow; indeed Cracow's first professor of art history, Marian Sokolowski, actually went to lectures in Vienna for a while in the 1870s; however, so far there has been little proof of a direct institutional influence.

A strong school first of all is marked by continuity. Only very few outsiders have "entered" art history in and on Cracow in the last 130 years. To its members, the "school" presents a guaranty of quality: it speaks of the constant, dedicated pursuit of its members, it means certainty of method, or methods. And it is the method which is what is imparted from teacher to pupil, from one generation to the next. Basically, of course, a "school" is something that is tied to a locality. Nowhere does this appear more true than in Cracow. It must be understood in the context of the town’s extraordinary situation in the second half of the 19th century. Forming part of Austrian Galicia, Cracow was a town of zero political importance; but by contrast, its cultural importance was huge. In spite of it being only a medium-sized town, Cracow was in fact a cultural Wasserkopf, a constellation that was without parallel in Europe. That cultural importance was tied in with two factors, nationality and history: Cracow, the centre of national Polish history. By any standards this centre

\[1\] Malkiewicz (2005: 65-78): the chapter on Cracow and the Viennese School; German version: Malkiewicz (1983). The older standard work is: Boednag (1948).
In Cracow itself, all research appeared to be exclusively centred on the city itself, and what essentially guided it was local patriotism. Today, some Polish historians of art history, for instance Jolanta Polanowska, take a somewhat different view of the Polish developments before 1860, stressing factors of bona-fide antiquarianism and connoisseurship⁶.

Naturally, the new development of a separate pursuit of the field did not mean that it was pursued in total isolation. It was of course deeply tied in with the other humanities in Poland. Crucial was a new impetus in Polish academic, social and political thinking which the Poles call ‘pasytywizm’. In fact, a new school of Polish history, the Cracow School of History developed alongside the new art history and both fields supported each other, especially as regards the conviction that the chief topic should be Poland. I shall come back to that.

So much on the outer perimeters of the new Cracow art history. To underline it again: its institutional set-up was eminently solid, and it has lasted, virtually unchanged, to the present day. The principal aim was the scientific, specialised pursuit of the field. But what about the actual contents of this ultra-wissenschaftliche art history? What exactly was new about this art history? Was it good art history? It is of course debatable whether one should ask such questions at all.

What we surely have to do is to study what the Cracow art historians actually wrote. We may begin by stressing again that what was called for was precise detail. Thus the first thing to note is the monograph. What appeared to be needed at that stage was the detailed investigation of a single work, or a small group of works. All contributions to the journal Sprawozdania were highly detailed and specialized monographs.

We now have to turn to the work of the two early stalwarts of the Cracow School, Władysław Luszczkiewicz and Marian Sokołowski, who between them wrote more than two thirds of the contents of first 30 years of the Sprawozdania. Luszczkiewicz had been around for some time; his background was a double one, the heritage of Cracow and his European outlook, having studied painting in Paris and also imbued the architectural theories of Viollet le Duc⁷.

From the 1870s, Luszczkiewicz concentrated on a number of Cistercian churches in remote parts of the country. His chief contribution was a series of very lengthy articles, each on a single building. He usually opens up with a little preamble, taking us into a typically ‘Polish’ countryside and into a pleasant Polish village that harbours a somewhat neglected group of medieval buildings. Luszczkiewicz then turns to a study, in considerable detail, of the documents. This is followed by the central part of the article, the description of the fabric and the explanation of the architectural system, especially the vaults and their systems of support. All this is accompanied by his own careful drawings. There is due reference to the French models and their German intermediaries. A careful description of all the other remaining buildings of the monastery follows. The short final paragraph does not, as one might expect from the flowery beginning, go into a final praise of architectural beauty, but points to further questions of research.

The characteristic of a monograph is, as the name says, a concentration on a single object or theme; but at the same time a monograph is intensely concerned with the context of that work.

A monograph in the fullest sense of the term tries to satisfy a particular sense of completeness, history, culture, almost every aspect one may think of. But for Luszczkiewicz this breadth, in turn, elicited periodic statements, namely that it is "the art" that really matters, "the real artistic significance" of a work⁸.

By the time of his death in 1900 Luszczkiewicz had acquired a very considerable authority. Yet the fully ‘complete’, or, if one may put it like that, the first fully matured academic art history was propounded by Marian Sokołowski. Sokołowski’s background was very different from that of the middle class Cracow-born Luszczkiewicz. A minor nobleman from Russian Poland, he took part in the 1863 uprising and was almost executed as a result. He then joined the exiled Polish elite in Paris, studied various subjects at various German universities and then listened to the lectures of Thausing and Eitelberger in Vienna. What made Sokołowski decide to embark on a career in art history we do not really know. Perhaps Vienna? Or was it simply the impression old Cracow made on him when

⁷ Tomkiewicz (1902).
⁸ His first major article: Luszczkiewicz (1879), "Prawdziwie artystyczne znaczenie..."; Luszczkiewicz (1872: 36).
details of the construction”. We also have to investigate the greater context, especially that of Western architecture14.

In 1885 Sokolowski wrote an appreciation of Eitelberger, the founder of Vienna School whom he appears to have got to know well in the 1870s. Here he briefly referred to what he felt was the way in which Eitelberger kept a balance between theoretical - scientific precision and more practical matters, but he then also points towards the art historian’s desire to explore the “the historical secrets” of art

This ostensible early lack of methodological reflection has led, in general post-WWII evaluations of Cracow and of much subsequent Polish art history, to some very critical statements. Precision of description and the production of monographs as the ultimate aim was labelled with the handy Polish word faktografi and thereby classified as uninteresting. Elżbieta Gieysztor Milobędzka has accused the Cracowians of an undue “conservatism”15.

However, these evaluations are far from sufficient if we want to understand more how art history worked at the time of its first academic development. I have already indicated a possible basic question: was the art history that they wrote in those days good?

The Cracow chroniclers of their own school occasionally emphasise that some of the results of the research of before 1900 are still valid today. Clearly it was Łuszczkiewicz who put Polish Romanesque architecture on the map. With regard to Sokolowski, I have scoured pretty much all subsequent Polish, German and English-language century research on Hans Sues von Kulmbach, up to the last few years: I am not a Renaissance Scholar, but it seemed very clear to me that, compared with Sokolowski’s massive intellectual effort of 1884, the whole of subsequent research on Kulmbach is simply feeble.

At this point one ought perhaps refer to some of the more fundamental contentions made in pursuit of the history of art history:

Heinrich Dilly in his often referred-to book on the story of the institutionalisation of German art history, based on theories taken from Wissenschafthissociologie, that is, the sociology of how and by whom the sciences are conducted and evaluated: Dilly insists that we should not construct a simple linear development from dilettante art history to so-called professional scientific art history. This could mean that all the statements, all the praise of the marvellous scientiftness of Cracow art history and its constant “progress” towards “perfection” amounts to just so much rhetoric17.

We can follow this with statements from Adam Labuda, in a book he edited on the history of Polish art history: what we are interested in are the modes of thinking, the methodologically important questions, and not the results which were produced by applying these methods. This would mean that, as historians of art history, we should not bother with writings which do not explicitly state a substantial methodological base18.

The fact, however, is that before the 1890s we meet very few explicit and lengthy statements about art historical methods anyway. We remember that “historical precision” was the battle cry of the early Vienna School of art history as well. The methodological question that greatly worried Polish art historians early on was the choice between monograph and synthesis. What should come first? A large number of monographs or a single synthesis?19

For the members of Cracow School of History the answer was: do both at the same time. But Polish art historians felt that individual detailed monographs had to come first, simply because of the fact that many of the monuments were virtually unknown, moreover, a new practical empirical sense demanded that one had to do something in order to preserve these monuments in the first place. Secondly, once one had decided to produce a monograph, certainly when producing the first large monograph on a subject, a large open field of choice opened itself. Sokolowski’s work on Kulmbach is an example of how wide-ranging and comprehensive a monograph can be. It contributes

---

14 “Poetycznych uniesień i zachwycenia słów... prawdziwego badawc” also: “szczegóły konstrukcji...” Łuszczkiewicz (1872:6-8).
15 Sokolowski (1885). Details of Sokolowski’s approach could be deduced further from the mentions, in his texts, of Schnaase, Springer, Thausing and other contemporaries. Work, based on extensive archival material is being undertaken at the moment by Magdalena Kumińska. I wish to thank her for advice.
17 Dilly (1979: 172).
19 Mathesius (1994: 4-5).
constructing a vaulted church, namely by avoiding flying buttresses outside and using instead a reinforcement – pier attached to the pillars in the aisles, that is, behind the arcade in the nave. Whether the other members of the academic audience were really content with that definition of Polishness we do not know. It certainly was not the kind of praise of “Polishness” one would include in a tourist brochure or in a history book for schools. In any case, Łuszczkiewicz did not say it was Polish, it was merely an element that could be found in the churches of Cracow.

A quite different line was pursued by Sokolowski in his work on Kulmbach. At the very end he argued about the way in which it was local Cracow and Royal patronage which helped to create the works by a Nuremberg artist in Cracow. Together with the works of Italian Renaissance architects and artists in Cracow, all this helped to inaugurate Poland’s Golden Age, the most satisfying period of the country’s history. In that sense, Kulmbach’s works belonged to Poland.

A momentous and far reaching effect of this decision to concentrate on Poland was the decision to use the Polish language exclusively in all strictly academic publications, as permitted by the Austrian government, after the Ausgleich of 1867, to use the Polish language, which in the Prussian centre of Poland, Poznań, would hardly have been possible, and most definitely would have been forbidden in Russian Warsaw. There are virtually no foreign language summaries. We have to remember again that Sokolowski himself was as well versed in European art history and in as many, if not more, languages as any of his colleagues in the West. By the mid-1880s some German and Austrian art historians had become aware of Sokolowski’s work on the Nuremberg painter. A very short summary was published in the new Austrian journal Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft and a longer version was promised. But it never appeared, except for a short and lopsided version in a Berlin newspaper.

By 1900, there were attempts to broaden these, one may say, narrow methodological pursuits vis-à-vis the “Polish” element in art and culture. “Polish folk art” was brought in more prominently and there were more thoroughgoing attempts to pinpoint a “Polish”, or a “Vistula [Wisła] Gothic” style, as in the writings of Jan Sas Zubrzycki. The Cracow academics, however, remained sceptical as regards these attempts.

At the very end I am left with two major issues, faktografia and Polishness. For some, faktografia entailed the necessity, and the virtues, of rationalism and empiricism, for others it stood for a lack of imagination. I think this alternative is too simplistic, certainly for the early generations of art historians, in Poland, or in any other country.

It is at this point that one ought to return to the issue of institutionalisation. One may say that heavy institutionalisation leads to faktografia, to a preponderance of monographs. Institutionality, we may conclude, tends to ask for, and to legitimise, monographic work. But a monograph can mean a study which goes way beyond faktografia, as Sokolowski work has shown. But whatever the results of a strong institutionalisation, it is in itself an interesting cultural and sociological fact; it is a value in itself. Put most simply: it was its institutionalisation which has succeeded in putting the subject, art history, on the map.

Looking across to the Poland’s brother and sister art historians in the German-speaking lands, the art history in those regions for a long time prided itself of having gone beyond “mere” empiricism and of becoming ever stronger on ideas and theories. At the same time, leaving the Vienna School aside, German art historians were far less tied in with institutions than their Polish colleagues. When one now turns to politics, more broadly speaking, and the issues of nationalism in particular, one has to stress that the high flying ideas of the German art historians did not prevent many of them from joining an extreme, destructive Nazi-German chauvinism. Polish art historians, although they served the public in many instances, and most successfully with the art historical rebuilding of the old centre of Warsaw, as far as national identification was concerned, always retained their sanity.

23 Łuszczkiewicz (1881). Łuszczkiewicz’s much extended considerations in Łuszczkiewicz (1887).
24 See: Repertorium (1884); cf. Dr. Marian Sokolowski [sic] (1885a). See: Loewenfeld (1885); cf. also Antoniewicz (1886).
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contained a large number of art historical artefacts which, everybody agreed, belonged intimately to that Polish national history; in fact, one could say, these artefacts, these buildings, sculptures, paintings etc. WERE the Polish history. 

It was this Polishness which provided the bonding of all cultural pursuits in the town. Concretely speaking, the "school", the institution of art history was, and still is, made up of a number of bodies, or consists of a number of parts of those bodies, which can only very briefly be mentioned here. Art History, firstly, "happens" within Academy. The Cracow Akademia Umiejetnosci guaranteed pure scientific pursuit, that is, academic research for its own sake in a range of neatly defined, specialised fields, art history amongst them (from 1873). Linked to the Academy was the possibility of a regular publication of research: the Sprawozdania Komisyi Historyj XIztuki, from 1877 onwards published the research strictly limited to art history. Secondly, there are the newly established museums. Secondly, there are the institutions which apply the results of art historical research to the conservation of old buildings, and thirdly there are organisations which serve non-academic audiences, the tourists. More important than all these, except for the Academy is, finally, the Instytut Historii Sztuki, the department of Art History, fully established in 1882, at the venerable Jagiellonian University. One ought to stress that its foundation came quite early in the European context, for instance the majority of German university departments were founded later, not to speak of Britain.

Most of the early members of the profession were tied in with several, or all these institutions. Characteristic of this institutionality is the strong sense of hierarchy. An immense reverence is paid to those who are in the higher positions. It entails a practice amongst its members to praise each other, especially when somebody has died; the ancient custom of the obituary. The praise always consisted of two chief elements: an unstinting, dedicated researcher, and a wonderful, dedicated teacher. All members of the School did their research with the utmost dedication at all times, all members of the School were the most dedicated teachers. Resulting from all this is furthermore a sense of the group's own history. The bibliography of the history of the Cracow School of Art History is enormous, virtually all of it written by the Cracovians themselves. Naturally, such a history is marked by a clear beginning. Here Cracow excelled again. For instance, the Vienna School of Art History, as it originated about twenty years before Cracow, grew out of a new school of history writing and out of the concerns linked with the Vienna Applied Art Museum. In Cracow, the beginning of the School of Art History coincided completely with the creation of a new academic pursuit of the subject. Cracow art history defined itself from the start as pure art history.

One has to take into account the problem in translating "nauka", or "Wissenschaft" into English, as "science" denotes mainly the natural sciences and in normal English language it would be unusual to use "science" or "scientific" in relation to art history. The words that convey the sense of "naukowy" or "wissenschaftlich" would be "scholarly", or "academic", although, characteristically, the latter term has lost almost all its institutional meaning in the English-speaking world. For the Cracovians "tylko czysta nauka... / only the purely academic" was worth pursuing...", a comment that one may follow from the beginnings to the present day (in this case a quote from Lech Kalinowski, one of the most distinguished later members of the Cracow School, in 1996)².

There were never enough words to drive home the point: "the most thorough precision...the perfection of the academic/scientific methods...the enormous precision and accuracy...".

All researchers pursued this with a dedication that went beyond normal professionalism and appeared more like a mission.

The step towards creating an "independent", an emancipated art history in the 1870s appeared specially remarkable because of what was considered a thoroughly bad situation before: so far, art historical concerns had been subsumed under archaeology, history, philology or even philosophy. Art history had been conducted in a completely wrong way; it only amounted to dilettantism. It was imprecise, the use of documents was wilful, moreover, everything was subjected to a severe kind of chauvinism, "The atmosphere [in the days before 1870] was heavy, appalling, doomed from the start"⁴.

² Puchla (1993).
⁴ See: Bochnak (1990: 58).
⁵ "Atmosfera to bylo ciężko, fatalna..." Quotes from Cracow writings in the early 1900 reds: Bialosocki (1987: 676).
not only to its topic in the narrow sense, but also much more broadly to the study of religious history, cultural history, the history of mentalities of the period in question, though it does all that from an art historical centre.

For the art historian, in methodological terms, this entailed a constant playing the material and visual factors off against other historical factors. For instance, art historians, too, must go to the archives to find at least the dates of the buildings. However, as Łuszczkiewicz stresses, this does not mean that building was actually conceived and built on that date. For the art historian, the main way of arriving at dates that make sense is the analysis of the style of the building. Sokolowski held that there need not have been dates on the two altarpieces he investigated, the art historian’s analysis can establish their relative dates by itself. I would conclude here that the stress on art history, or any other branch of the humanities, as being different, may limit our knowledge, but at the same time it actually extends our understanding, simply because it helps to define and redefine our methods and procedures, in juxtaposition of the methods of other disciplines in the humanities.

In the end, all this must be left as an open question which pose considerable epistemological and even ontological problems. What I hope I have demonstrated is at least some of the richness of the work produced by the early Cracow School of Art History.

At the end I want to just turn briefly to the national issue. I have left the national element as a separate matter. Yet, Poland, the art of Poland, or the art in Poland, was of central importance to the Cracovians. In fact, the main purpose of the academy’s installation of art history as a subject was to undertake new research of art in Poland. The Sprawozdania, Cracow’s journal, was entirely devoted to Polish art; all the serious work undertaken by its members had to be. What was most astonishing, however, was a statement at the beginning, in 1877, in the introduction to the first issue of the Sprawozdania, namely that Poland does not possess “masterworks of the first rank”.

It is quite likely that this statement had something to do with the outlook of the new Cracow school of history and with the new Polish “positivist” frame of mind generally, one of whose messages was that the task of a national history is also to conduct national self-criticism.

One may go back here to some comments in one of the “old” art history volumes on Cracow buildings, dating from before the “new” Polish art history’s condemnation of simplistic local patriotism. The national issue appeared to be something very straightforward indeed: Cracow’s Wawel Cathedral “is, so to speak, the national shrine of Poland, the mirror of the Polish kingdom and the nobility, mirroring its history”. This was said in 1866, not by one of the local Cracow chauvinists, but by August Essenwein, an architect and historian who worked in Austria and Germany, in his lavish book on Cracow architecture of 1866.

Clearly, nobody would want to argue with such a statement, one would tend to take it for granted still today, as it was then. But for the new Polish art historians, it had no real meaning. We cannot investigate our old buildings by simply taking them as memory. The Introduction to the first issue of Sprawozdania warned: our monuments must not be valued only as souvenirs / memory.”

Nothing, one might state, reflects the change that was brought with the new art history more than its new evaluation of what could be called national Polish art and what could not be.

I already reported on Łuszczkiewicz’s way of dealing with the Cistercian churches in Poland. We may take a village, or the countryside in Poland to look “Polish”, but the 13th century Cistercian churches belong firmly into the context of French and German, of West European Cistercian architecture. With the 14th century Gothic Łuszczkiewicz could be a little more specific. In 1881 a meeting in the Academy of art historians as well as of historians, the official-sounding question was posed: “Can one consider the construction [constructional methods] of the 14th century churches in Cracow signs of a special kind of Gothic in Poland”. Łuszczkiewicz embarked on lengthy peroration on Gothic and brick in Brandenburg, Pomernia, the Baltic towns, with the Teutonic Knights, etc., finally homing in on the Gothic churches of Cracow. Yes, there is a very particular way here of

21 Essenwein (1869: 76).
22 „zabytki nasze…zbyto o tyle je szanujemy…a ile są…pamiętka”. A word from editorial staff in: Sprawozdania (1877/1879).
he settled there in the early 1870s? In any case, he very rapidly built his academic career. Sokolowski taught at the university from 1879, being instituted as professor in 1882.

At the beginning Sokolowski actually worked with Łuszczkiewicz on early medieval Polish monuments, but his knowledge of Western art was wider than that of all other Cracow researchers. Apart from his main research on Poland, Sokolowski wrote on a diversity of topics, from Classical antiquity, the Italian Renaissance and Old Ruthenian art as well as getting involved in the contemporary art of Cracow, all of which he published in the daily and weekly Polish press. His lecturing, too, was mainly devoted to the European context, while in his seminars he used Polish topics.

Sokolowski’s main early contribution is an enormously long and most complex investigation of two altarpieces in Cracow by the Nuremberg painter Hans Sues von Kulmbach. It is a monograph of a very high degree of completeness. Sokolowski begins with an assessment of previous research which he largely dismisses, followed by the actual beginning which, he says, citing Anton Springer, requires ‘a detailed description’. What Sokolowski meant by that was actually the religious content the legends, in that case, of St. Katherine and St. John. He then goes on to the techniques of painting and colouring down, to their chemistry. This is followed by what he terms the ‘artistic character of the work in the narrowest sense of the word’. What he largely means by that is mimesis. According to Sokolowski, Kulmbach tried hard to render reality, the actual episodes, the narrative, the bodies, the faces. Sokolowski here still adheres to the old criteria, the ideals of the High Renaissance which provided the ‘natural’ solution, a solution which this painter tried to reach, while he was still also tied into medieval habits of stiffness and inelegance. Sokolowski briefly mentions Giovanni Morelli and his art historical method, but he does not really take it up. Instead of investigating the significance of the detailed rendering of hands and ears, as Morelli did, Sokolowski analyses the painter’s operation looking at combination of line, tone and colour and their spatial effects, the way figures are, or are not, surrounded by illusionist space. One may state that Sokolowski goes well beyond the discussion of the figurative elements, looking forward to Wölfflin’s formalist method. At the very end Sokolowski constructs a stylistic progression from the earlier altar on the left to the later altar on the right and although he repeats that the latter is more accomplished because it comes closer to the Renaissance, the earlier altar compensates this with more fantasy and imagination. Again, Sokolowski must be counted amongst the most advanced art historians, trying to evaluate medieval art in its own terms.

But there is still much more to Sokolowski’s monograph: the further parts deal with iconography. He begins with scouring the written sources of the legends, here displaying immense theological learning. But he then maintains that this is not at all sufficient: one rather has to investigate the popular use and interpretation of religious legends in the late Middle Ages, and thus Sokolowski adopts what is later called an iconological approach, and also a cultural history, or even a history of mentalities. Only then we proceed to what art historians before Sokolowski had hotly debated: the name of the artist and his origins in Franconia and his relationship with Albrecht Dürer. The final part briefly characterises the general political and social situation in Cracow as well as in Nuremberg. Today we would call all this a study of patronage.

What is most needed here is of course an exact methodological comparison with other art historical writings of the time. In any such investigation we should adopt precisely the same ethos preached by the Cracow art historians: diligence, precision. What does not help is the fact that neither of our two authors, Łuszczkiewicz or Sokolowski, wrote at any length on their methods. In a small book on Cracow monuments of 1872 Łuszczkiewicz makes sure in the title, twice, that it is about “art”: “The monuments of the fine arts of Cracow. Architectural monuments of the 11th to the 17th centuries from the standpoint of the art historian...” It starts off with a few modestly couched remarks on his aims, chiefly on how not to pursue art history. “We always emphasise art, but this should not result in... / poetic raptures and enthusing words”. The “real scholar” has to give the utmost attention to the “the

10 Sokolowski (1883).
11 Sokolowski (1883:57).
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