Ideal and material ornament: rethinking the ‘beginnings’ and history of art
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The first lines of Johannes Ranke’s ‘The Beginnings of Art: Anthropological Contributions to the History of Ornament’ of 1879 – from a lecture delivered at the Bavarian Applied Arts Society – beautifully capture many emerging directions in the study of art and material culture at this time:

Outwardly unimpressive, inconspicuous, but extremely meaningful for the understanding of the general cultural development of humanity is the material that comprises the object of the following discussion….I speak not as a connoisseur of art, but rather as an anthropologist –…about material in which archaeology and anthropology join hands....[M]odern anthropology…has not renounced the study of the foundations of the spiritual development of mankind, the basic phenomena of societal life…represented in…objects like…implements, weapons, jewellery. In this way, anthropology becomes directly connected with cultural history and archaeology. But while both of these [latter] disciplines must seek their main task in the representation of the highest flowering of the human spirit, anthropology concerns itself with the ‘beginnings of culture and art’, as we still today partially observe in the peoples and races standing closer to a natural condition and, on the other hand, can reconstruct from cultural remains that the former inhabitants of our continent have left us.¹

I am very grateful to Karen Lang, Megan Luke, and Paul Lerner, who commented on an earlier version of this material, and to Spyros Papapetros, who made numerous helpful suggestions and provided encouragement. I would also like to sincerely thank Richard Woodfield for his interest and support. Earlier versions and sections of this research were presented at the Historians of German and Central European Art panel at the College Art Association meeting of 2011, moderated by Karen Lang, as well as at the Negotiating Boundaries: The Plural Fields of Art History conference at the University of Birmingham in 2013, moderated by Matthew Rampley.


Aeußerlich geringfügig, unscheinbar, für das Verständniss der allgemeinen Kulturentwicklung der Menschheit aber hochbedeutsam ist das Material, welches den Gegenstand der folgenden Besprechungen bildet.

...[I]ch spreche nicht als Kunstkenner, sondern als Anthropologe – doch über Materien, in welchen sich Archäologie und Anthropologie direkt die Hand reichen...[D]ie moderne Anthropologie...hat...doch nicht darauf verzichtet, auch die Grundlagen der geistigen
In this passage of this short work on prehistoric art, Ranke highlighted the value of seemingly insignificant, everyday objects and their fragmented remains for illuminating the humble beginnings of culture, instead of its ‘highest flowering’. Recounting the most recent prehistoric discoveries in Europe, he indicated that these artefacts and those of contemporary Naturvölker, or so-called natural peoples, together comprised an interconnected body of evidence for the study of the ‘primitive’. Ranke asserted, furthermore, a scientific persona and techniques opposed to those of the art connoisseur. Other contemporary commentators – including historians, anthropologists, and archaeologists – also contended that such newly disclosed periods and previously unappreciated types of objects were crucial to art and cultural history. They attempted to insert these into an expanded narrative of art’s development, to derive from them laws of its emergence and transformation, and to discover their implications for the shapes of their fields. As the subtitle of Ranke’s lecture and its audience of designers signal, the category of ornament was central to this rethinking.

Ranke was a distinguished anthropologist, physiologist, and editor of the publication of the German Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory. His research brings to the fore the importance of particular sites of encounter with and display of artefacts for the redirection of the attention of art theory in the late nineteenth century. These include the prehistoric excavation site, the ethnological museum, small regional collections of prehistoric and early medieval artefacts, as


Translations, unless otherwise indicated, are my own. Ranke became the first Professor of Anthropology in Germany, in Munich, in 1886. Andrew D. Evans, Anthropology at War: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010, 43.

2 This attitude is in line with the rhetoric of the field of anthropology at this time in Germany, as it tried to ‘invert’ the logic and hierarchies of humanism. Andrew Zimmerman, Anthropology and Antihilumanism in Imperial Germany, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001, 38.

3 Ranke also indicates, as was common in such literature of the time, that research on prehistoric peoples and contemporary Naturvölker can be complemented by the study of children’s drawings. Ranke, ‘Anfänge’, 13. The contemporary existence and parallel evidence of the latter two bolstered prehistoric archaeologists’ notions of the scientific, empirical character of their theories, which might otherwise be considered speculative, and also eliminated the need for textual evidence.

4 Connoisseurship had an unscientific connotation for Ranke. However, as is well known, at this time, connoisseurship was also associated with modern, scientific techniques and with the examination of marginal details.

well as publications and local and national organizations associated with them. He and other scholars of anthropology and archaeology were in dialogue with art theorists and historians, themselves representatives of a recently institutionalized discipline, in the midst of efforts to define itself in conversation with shifting, adjacent fields. In Ranke’s case, he was an early follower of the highly influential and compelling works of theorist and architect Gottfried Semper on the minor arts, which endowed the study of these with great urgency and scholarly esteem.

This article deals with a number of anthropologists and archaeologists who claimed to contribute to the field of art history through the study of ornament and their scholarly exchanges with art theorists and historians, including Semper and Alois Riegl. ‘Primitive’ ornament, especially ‘geometric’, functioned as an interface between art history and other disciplines and was a primary material with which scholars negotiated the meanings of ‘objective’ scientific method and the implications of such ‘beginnings’ for art scholarship and practice. In their deliberations about these issues and about the motivations of ornament, pattern, and art, moreover, these thinkers debated whether or not art emerged from technical and material determinants or if artistic will and pleasure were prior to and could assert themselves over these. Scholars of material culture often accentuated the technical, symbolic, and imitative origins of art and ornament. When certain art historians engaged, in response, with such non-traditional objects and research, some contested the ‘materialist’ interpretations put forward by their neighbouring disciplines and asserted, on their part, that psychological satisfaction governed the making and experience of such artefacts. Ultimately, these questions about primordial artistic motivations were embedded in larger arguments in German-speaking culture about whether modern people were controlled by technology and strictures of capitalist economy and constituted of solely material factors; whether cultural products could manifest mental freedom in a modernizing environment; and whether function, material, and historical craft techniques could continue to guide the making of objects in an industrialized age of ‘arbitrary’ commodity production.

It was largely ‘outsiders’ to art history like Ranke who produced the bulk of works in German-speaking culture’s preoccupation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with the ‘beginnings’ of art, ornament, and Weltkunst, or non-

---

6 The ‘non-sites’ of such publications refer to temporally and geographically distant subject matter and evoke the highly material archaeological practices that contributed to them.

7 While Alina Payne’s From Ornament to Object was not available to me when researching this article, which is revised from my 2011 dissertation, this work is an essential source on studies of ornament of this period. Alina Payne, From Ornament to Object: Genealogies of Architectural Modernism, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012. A number of works by Spyros Papapetros on ornament are also adjacent to my concerns. For example, Spyros Papapetros, ‘An Ornamented Inventory of Microcosmic Shifts: Notes on Hans Hildebrandt’s Book Project “Der Schmuck” (1936-1937’), Getty Research Journal, 1, 2009, 87-106; ‘World Ornament: The Legacy of Gottfried Semper’s 1856 Lecture on Adornment’, Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics, 57/58, Spring/Autumn 2010, 309-329.
Western art. They insisted that this documentation of non-classical artefacts be incorporated into art history, updating it into a field that could potentially consider all artistic products without bias. These scholars represented fields that emphatically announced their scientific status to the academic establishment of the time, in opposition to traditional forms of humanist study, and promoted their utility in modernizing disciplines that they accused of remaining under the spell of normative standards and metaphysical doctrines. Their texts gave prominence to the above-mentioned sites of ‘alternative antiquities’, as privileged domains of their expertise.

When anthropologist Richard Andree made the following statement in 1908 in his opening address ‘On the Value of Ethnology for the Other Sciences’ at a meeting of the German Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory, at the later end of this development that began around the time of Ranke’s text, this had become a common refrain. Andree declared:

> Until recently *Kunstwissenschaft*, [or the rigorous study of art] addressed itself only to the higher forms that stimulated joy and interest and were far advanced from the beginnings [of art], and only where preserved artworks and textual sources were to be found. Where the beginnings of art lie…can only be surveyed in full by investigating what has been disdained and with an expansion of art history to all peoples, including the primitive.

---

8 The term is Marlite Halbertsma’s. Marlite Halbertsma, ‘The Many Beginnings and the One End of World Art History in Germany, 1900-1933’, in *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches*, ed. Kitty Zijlmans and Willfried van Damme, Amsterdam: Valiz, 2008, 91. They were not outsiders in a conventional sense. They were part of academic and educated classes, had institutional links, and were part of scholarly dialogues, even if they belonged, in some cases, to disciplines not yet institutionalized at universities. They undermined the high cultural or natural-scientific focus of their disciplines through the study of marginal objects and proposed that art history and theory account for a range of ‘early’ and nonclassical art production and engage in comparative study. For all their attention to the ‘insignificant’, they were not content to label the objects that they examined mere artefacts of material culture, but rather regarded them as artworks, partly inspired by creative urges. In addition to Zimmerman’s *Anthropology and Antihumanism*, key texts on these disciplinary histories include Suzanne Marchand, *Down From Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750-1970*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996, and Marchand’s other writings.

9 ‘Peter Burke uses this phrase when referring to antiquarians interested in ‘barbarian’ antiquities. Peter Burke, ‘Images as Evidence in Seventeenth-Century Europe’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 64: 2, April 2003, 282.


> Unsere Kunstwissenschaft hatte bis vor nicht langer Zeit sich fast nur den höheren Formen zugewendet, die Freude und Interesse erregten und war zu deren Anfängen nur so weit vorgeschritten, als erhaltene Kunstwerke oder literarische Quellen bekannt waren. Wo aber die Anfänge der Kunst lagen, die sich zu der glänzenden Höhe entwickelte, auf der sie heute vor uns steht, das verschmähte man zu untersuchen und doch konnte nur bei einer Ausdehnung der Kunstwissenschaft auf alle Völker, die primitive mit eingeschlossen, ein voller Überblick gewonnen werden.
Origins: from monuments to ornaments

The earliest art history survey texts, or *Handbücher*, in nineteenth-century Germany began by reflecting on art’s ‘beginnings’. When Franz Kugler wrote the first such *Handbuch* in 1842, he devoted its first pages to ‘Art in its Early Developmental Stages’, starting with ‘Northern European Antiquity’. Kugler asserted that the earliest art derived from man’s need to commemorate and to give form to ideas by means of simple monuments. It was this and not ‘crude, sensual need’ or the ‘vain drive to imitate’ from which it originated. Kugler’s deliberations on the ‘beginnings’ of art, like others of his time and earlier, were highly speculative and ranged mainly over monumental architecture in Asia, the Americas, and Europe. Such attempts were not able to fix firm chronologies, and their theories of the motivations of the earliest art were easily disputed.

Similarly, the first pages of Wilhelm Lübke’s popular survey of 1860, *Outlines of Art History*, presented early monuments and their sensual materialization of spirit (Figure 1). In the edition of 1892, Lübke wrote, ‘The most simple, primordial form that the awakening drive to make art brings forth, is the artificially created tumulus, which designates the grave of a fallen hero.’ He outlined such forms in Central Asia and northern Europe but claimed that they could be found the world over.

However, when Max Semrau revised Lübke’s survey in 1903, he appended in its first pages a number of small prehistoric works (Figures 2-3). He described carved bone objects, some outlining animals and human figures with ‘astounding truth to nature’, and others that were ‘ornament’, made up of only ‘simple grooves and lines’. These were juxtaposed with naturalistic cave paintings and artefacts of

---

11 Dan Karlholm writes that the difficulty of identifying origins was solved in nineteenth-century art history surveys through ‘the postulation of a (myth of) originary sameness: an identical origin for all art forms’. Dan Karlholm, *Art of Illusion: The Representation of Art History in Nineteenth-Century Germany and Beyond*, Bern: Peter Lang, 2004, 43-44. This section is indebted to a suggestion made by Elizabeth Sears.


contemporary ‘primitive’ peoples. Such naive representations, along with ‘adorning activity’, were considered the primordial artistic forms, prior to monuments.\textsuperscript{15}

The discovery, investigation, and authentication of the age of prehistoric artefacts radically shifted thinking about art from around 1880 forward, compelling scholars to rethink methodologies and categories.\textsuperscript{16} Semrau’s revised Introduction to \textit{Outlines} evinced this recently transformed notion of art. Its earliest germ was not the Idea, at the beginnings of its progress through History, embodied in a rough heap of stones, but rather revealed in empirical findings and theorization of modest carved and decorated objects from recent excavations and encounters with peoples.\textsuperscript{17} Although Lübke also mentioned small objects, vessels, and implements found inside gravesites, he did not link them to a ‘joy in adornment’, as Semrau would. The latter wrote, ‘Especially the activity of handwork and industrial arts provides the breeding ground for [this pleasure in adornment and impulse to create], the production of implements, tools, weapons, clothing, jewellery, the numberless objects of daily use.’\textsuperscript{18}

However, these humble, everyday objects were tokens not only of psychological impulses, but also allowed theorists and historians to give more precise order to the past than had been possible with early monuments. Unlike the latter, they possessed internal formal characteristics that allowed tracking of change and could also be categorized according to the physical stratification of gravesites. They attested simultaneously to ever-present, universal impulses and to developmental stages, especially in the way they were regarded as braided together with the history of technological progress and with practical function.

\textsuperscript{15} Wilhelm Lübke and Max Semrau, \textit{Grundriss der Kunstgeschichte}, vol. 1, 13th ed., Stuttgart: P. Neff, 1904, 2: ‘Wo sich Ornamente finden, sind es einfache Einkerbungen und Strichlagen. Die Tier- und Menschenbilder aber sind durch eine überraschende Naturtreue und Lebendigkeit ausgezeichnet.’ Further, ‘…die schmückende Thätigkeit…bis in die ältesten Zeiten zurückreicht.’ Semrau cites Ranke’s ‘Anfänge’ among other recent works of anthropology and prehistory. Semrau was a Renaissance scholar who had, together with Aby Warburg, studied with August Schmarsow. Both of these figures also wrote on ornament.

\textsuperscript{16} Pfisterer, ‘Altamira’.

\textsuperscript{17} In this regard, Gustav Klemm’s \textit{General Cultural History of Mankind (Allgemeine Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit)} of 1843-51 was an important precedent. This work greatly influenced Semper. Harry Francis Mallgrave, ‘Gustav Klemm and Gottfried Semper: The Meeting of Ethnological and Architectural Theory’, \textit{Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics}, 9, Spring 1985, 68-79; Hvattum, \textit{Gottfried Semper}, 42-46.

Johannes Ranke’s ‘Beginnings of art’: origins, pattern, and Technik

While Ranke’s short ‘Beginnings’ was unillustrated, in the edition of 1911-1912 of his Man, he also addressed the ‘art production’ of prehistoric peoples, with accompanying illustrations. These demonstrate the range of object-types that formed his conception of the ‘primitive’ and encompassed by his expansive designation ‘ornament’, comprising not only non-utilitarian, decorative items, but also useful ones with surface decoration: figurative and abstract carvings on bone and bone tools, jewellery, weapons, and everyday implements, or Geräte (Figures 4-9).

In the previously quoted opening passage of his essay, Ranke indicated that ‘spiritual development’ is to be apprehended from such material remains of Europe’s prehistory. He described a physical landscape recently discovered to be littered with such residues of its own deep past, as well as a psychological one profoundly altered by the fresh awareness of such ‘inerasibly imprinted’ ‘traces’ and remnants of long lost settlements and gravesites. His essay repeatedly stressed the fragmentary and ‘low’ quality of ‘primitive’ evidence, referring, for instance, to the ‘crudest shards and debris, which earlier researchers set aside as worthless’.

As a prehistoric archaeologist, Ranke was materially oriented. He marvelled at the physical preservation of remains and examined useful tools and implements made of bone and antler, such as daggers, knife handles, awls, needles, and harpoon tips, as well as the decorations found on these. In conjunction with his attention to their physical qualities, Ranke’s thinking was comparative and developmental. He was eager to order these fragments from the past and to allocate artefacts, techniques, and styles to progressive stages and the advance of technology.

Ranke was a devotee of Semper, whose Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts: Or, Practical Aesthetics of 1860-63 he cited reverently as the progenitor of his own approach to the study of early and minor art forms, and especially the question of the priority of the latter over representational art. To sort out the confusion in the practice and teaching of art in the wake of historicism in design and architecture.

---

20 This broad notion of ‘ornament’ is in line with a topos, beginning with the literature of New World exploration, of admiration for the decorated implements of tribal peoples and the association of ‘primitive’ peoples with the ‘ornamental’. Frances Connelly, The Sleep of Reason: Primitivism in Modern European Art and Aesthetics, 1725-1907, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995, Chapters 1 and 3.
21 Ranke, ‘Anfänge’, 4, 18: ‘Ein eigenartiger längstverschollener Ackerbau hat an vielen Orten seine Spuren als sogenannte “Hochäcker” dem Boden seit Jahrtausenden unvertilgbar aufgedrückt,’ for example. Further, ‘Für die Keramik beweisen das gerade jene rohesten Scherben und Trümmer, welche frühere Forscher wohl oft als werthlos bei Seite zu werfen pflegten.’ In addition to Henry Christy and Édouard Lartet, Ranke cited the research of a contemporary network of archaeologists, anthropologists, explorers, physicians, and other scientists. He also compared these findings to those at Herculaneum and Pompeii, as well as to those of Heinrich Schliemann in Mycenae.
and the industrial simulation of traditional materials and techniques, Semper had proposed a radical comparative study of ‘simpler’ early craft forms – attempting to illuminate the ‘inner law[s]’ of art making and the profound connection of certain materials, processes, and forms. Such study – inspired by recent developments in anatomy and linguistics – could elucidate the ‘simplest essence of objects’ and place the study of aesthetics and the minor arts on a scientific footing. It would demonstrate that ‘aesthetic necessity…is most lucid and comprehensible in these oldest and simplest inventions of the artistic instinct.’ In a culture in which art historical styles seemed to operate along the lines of the logic of fashion – in Semper’s oft-used metaphor, implying incremental changes lacking necessity, and a fragmentation of the unity of labour and product – honing in on the laws of art’s beginnings that persisted even as it transformed, if only symbolically, had great force.

Semper’s Style outlined the qualities of a range of basic materials and mediums and the fitting techniques by means of which they had been historically manipulated (Figure 10). He linked these procedures to the real and symbolic uses of their end products. His attention to material and physical process is noteworthy – twisting, plucking, squeezing, and so on, in the case of yarn, for example. However, the most basic results of these operations are symbolic – of purpose, as well as of the ordering that he believed are the deepest functions of art. The enthusiastic archaeologists, anthropologists, and other theorists of art who embraced Semper’s practical and material insights as tools to remake the study of culture tended, however, to underplay his convictions regarding symbolic meanings and transformation, the power of the idea over materials, and the expression of aesthetic ordering principles.

Like his guide Semper, Ranke attended to the material processes by which the ornament he examined was created. Often incised on the handles of rudimentary implements, it was also generated by simple tools. He noted the distinct sorts of marks on these objects, differentiating them with a great range of terms to designate the techniques and types of instruments with which they would have been fashioned, and their appearance. However, his highlighting of the cutting, notching, and carving of these objects also emphasized the active minds and bodies that produced them, bringing to the fore not only material, but also wilful action and attention.

Semper’s view that the minor arts preceded monumental forms and constituted art and architecture’s beginnings would have contributed to Ranke’s

---


23 Semper, Style, 73.
reception of these modest objects.\textsuperscript{24} Ceramics, for example, predated monumental architecture and were actually the source of architectural principles and elements. Pottery had been preserved at gravesites because of its use in funerary rites, and thus could function for the scientist like a ‘fossil’.

That is why fossil pots are as interesting for the history of art (and of humanity in general) as the prehistoric remains of plants and animals are for natural history. Pots are the oldest and most eloquent of historical documents. If one examines the pots produced by a given group of people, it is usually possible to say what they were like and what stage of development they had reached!\textsuperscript{25}

Above all, the originary status of and developmental clues offered by textile and ceramic arts were impressed upon his avid readers.

The subtitle of Ranke’s work, ‘Anthropological Contributions to the History of Ornament’, implied, moreover, that the evidence of ‘spiritual development’ was concentrated in surface decoration – inscribed in lines. In the first part of the essay, he focused upon the outlines of human and animal forms on bone and antler objects, on figurative images. He believed that these ‘lively drawings’ or engravings – emphasizing their linear quality – (and a handful of plastic works) deserved the title of ‘art’ and were ‘witnesses to a certain development of the sense of art’ and ‘joy in natural beauty’\textsuperscript{26}. In addition, Ranke drew attention to simple, abstract elements of ornamentation, parallel and crisscrossing patterns, cut and impressed onto bones, pots and other implements, with simple instruments or by the fibres of woven textiles. The second part of the essay turns to this ‘geometric ornament’\textsuperscript{27}. He related its intricate systems of lines and their varied orientations and textures in great detail.

While admitting that there was some evidence that the imitation of natural objects might occur earlier among both ‘uncivilized races and children’ than the execution of geometric design,\textsuperscript{28} Ranke was anxious to discover proof of the priority

\textsuperscript{24} Semper, \textit{Style}, 73, 96.
\textsuperscript{25} Semper, \textit{Style}, 468.
\textsuperscript{26} Ranke, ‘Anfänge’, 8: ‘…lebensvolle Zeichnungen…’; ‘…Zeugen einer gewissen Entwicklung des Kunstsinns, einer Freude am Naturschönen…’.
\textsuperscript{27} It was around 1870 that archaeologist Alexander Conze identified ‘geometric ornament’, which was previously not deemed worthy of study, as a discrete style of Greek art and ornament. A. A. Donohue, \textit{Greek Sculpture and the Problem of Description}, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, 77.
\textsuperscript{28} Ranke, ‘Anfänge’, 13: ‘…uncivilisirten Rassen ebenso wie bei unseren Kindern…’.

In addition, as Pfisterer writes, the first ‘naturalistic’ cave paintings were discovered in 1879 in Altamira, Spain by Marcelino Sanz de Sautuola and these findings first published in 1880. The authenticity of these paintings and the fact that they predated geometric ornament would not be fully agreed upon by the scholarly community until around 1900. Pfisterer, ‘Altamira’, 15-16. In these decades and through the early twentieth century, scholars grappled with the notion that naturalism might precede abstraction and that the latter might be more advanced than the former.
of craft techniques that result in the generation of abstract pattern, which could be regarded as a ‘stepladder’ in the development of figuration. He preferred to bring to light empirical and technical origins that were revealing of ornamental and artistic principles, like Semper’s theories, and these were more readily found in nonrepresentational design.29

Examining fragments of clay vessels found in excavated layers of caves with traces of geometric ornament, Ranke argued that it was directly transferred from the impress of woven baskets and textiles used in the manufacture of these objects. He also described linear designs on spearheads, chisels, and other tools as reminiscent of the weave of basketry, or of textile motifs.30 While the former implied that ornamental patterns on ceramics are the physical result of production techniques, the latter seemed to be subsequent wilful reproductions and migrations of patterns first generated automatically by these craft procedures. This implied that geometric ornament was initially a product of technology and then later transmitted, by means of human agency, if only as decoration, to other mediums.31

For Ranke, in these cases, the study of art and ornament achieved a scientific and material character, requiring the detection and ‘reading’ of the traces of technical process and examination of repeatable phenomena.32 Similarly, in the next decades, British scholars of ornament like Henry Colley March and Alfred Haddon, also trained in medicine and biology, coined and propagated the theory of the skeuomorph, an ornament of structural origin, later deliberately repeated (Figure 11).33

On the one hand, Ranke desired to provide the links that Semper had argued were ultimately ideal, with a material basis. He writes,

---


31 This is the process of Stoffwechsel (change of material), ‘the transference of functionally conditioned motifs from one material to another whereby they assume symbolical significance’, although Ranke does not emphasize this symbolic aspect. Wolfgang Herrmann, Gottfried Semper: In Search of Architecture, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1984, 86.


But the connection first of ceramics and textiles is in no way, as Semper appears to assume, a purely ideal one, for the most part originated as one transferred the line-compositions of basketry and spinning – found to be tasteful and beautiful – to objects produced by other techniques in order to give them an artistic form. There exists between textile art and ceramics a completely direct connection.\(^{34}\)

However, he acknowledged, in line with Semper, that this ornament was in some sense symbolic. Describing a group of vessels, he writes, ‘This primordial, constantly repeating ornament of the vessels braids, so to speak, around the fragile receptacles with an ideal protective wrapping derived from textile art, which accords it, for the viewer, a certain intensified solidity.’\(^{35}\)

On the other hand, Ranke attempted to extract from these ornaments the European *Urmensch’s*, or primordial man’s, ‘sense of art’, his ‘artistic strivings’, ‘need for beauty’, and ‘artistic development’.\(^{36}\) These drives and desires coexisted, he believed, with production and mechanical processes and were brought to bear on the repeated use, complication, and secondary transfer of motifs originally generated by material and technique. For Ranke and his colleagues, in these years, the encounter with prehistoric and ‘primitive’ material elevated certain categories of the minor arts, which partly suggested a germ of artistic will beyond their technically analysable features. This was also the case with jewellery. Only the ‘desire to adorn oneself’ and the ‘joy in bright colours’ could explain, Ranke

\(^{34}\) Ranke, ‘Anfänge’, 18:

\begin{quote}
Aber die Zusammenhang zunächst des keramischen und textilen Ornaments ist keineswegs, wie Semper anzunehmen scheint, ein rein idealer, meist so entstanden, daß man die als geschmackvoll und schön empfundenen Liniencompositionen der Flechtwerke und Gespinnste auf die durch andere Technik hergestellten Gegenstände, um ihnen eine künstlerische Gestaltung zu geben, übertrug. Zwischen textiler Kunst und Keramik besteht ein vollkommen direkter Zusammenhang.
\end{quote}

Several times, Ranke points to the patterns of basketry reeds and weave of textiles left upon the bodies of clay vessels as physical impressions (*Abdruck* or *Eindruck*), proving ornament’s technical origins. The indexical sign is deemed to have greater evidentiary value as a beginning point than an iconic one. It is evidence of a mechanical or natural process, without human intervention. This attitude is indicative of the historical mode of scientific objectivity, which valued the photograph or tracing over the idealized scientific drawing. See Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison, *Objectivity*, New York: Zone Books, 2007.

On the other hand, Riegl and others deploy art historical techniques to foreground human agency, as discussed later in this article.


asserted, the discovery of prehistoric necklaces made of animal teeth; drilled and
coloured crystals; or bone needles, employed, surely, for ‘the arts of dressing’.

Parallel evidence from anthropological studies was also relevant to the
pressing theoretical problems posed by this material, not only the source of abstract
patterns, but also the priority of abstraction or figuration in representation.
Numerous likenesses of this kind confirmed Ranke’s assertion of the technical
origins of geometric pattern. He concluded, ‘On the whole wide earth, with its
peoples of the most different races separated by almost immeasurable distances, the
original connection of plaited-ornament with the ornament of ceramics is such that
a proper vessel, produced according to the original techniques, must bear on it this
ornament, as an expression of primitive technical process.’

Geometric ornament, typology, and psychological motivation

Riegl, as is well known, responded spiritedly to Semper’s theories of materials and
techniques in the history of the minor arts and their legacy, as an emphasis on
material and technical origins, in the work of anthropologists like Ranke and
archaeologists like Alexander Conze. Conze and others examined non-classical
works and maintained the importance of studying all available fragments and
objectively reconstructing sites, transforming the field of classical archaeology. In
his On the History of the Beginnings of Greek Art of 1870, on geometric ornament,
Conze bemoaned the ‘terrible gaping holes’ created by the passing of time and
human and natural destruction in the knowledge of Greek art. The extreme
productivity of the Greeks, however, manifested in the sheer number of artefacts
they left behind, could counter this, aiding in the effort to ‘recognize the lost whole’.
He argued that ‘one is thereby compelled, to label none of the often humble remains
as insignificant, or to set them aside as meaningless….’ In this, he resembled the
wide-ranging British anthropologist and archaeologist Augustus Pitt Rivers, who

Bekleidungskünsten’. Riegl will make a similar observation about prehistoric necklaces, cited later in
this article.
38 Ranke, ‘Anfänge’, 23:
Auf der ganzen weiten Erde bei den durch fast unermeßliche Räume getrennten Völkern der
verschiedensten Rassen ist also der ursprüngliche Zusammenhang der Flechtornamente mit
den Ornamenten der Keramik der, daß ein rechtes Geschirr, nach der ursprünglichen Technik
hergestellt, diese Ornamente als Ausdruck des primitiven technischen Verfahrens selbst an sich
tragen mußte.
39 Alexander Conze, Zur Geschichte der Anfänge griechischer Kunst, Vienna: k.k. Hof- und
Staatsdruckerei, 1870, 1: ‘…furchtbar klaffende Lücken…’; ‘…auf Wiedererkennen des verlorenen
Ganzen…’; ‘Freilich ist man dabei genöthigt, von den oft unscheinbaren Resten keinen, wenigstens
ohne ihn scharf geprüft zu haben, als zu unbedeutend zu verwerfen, oder als zu nichtssagend
einstweilen bei Seite zu lassen.’ See Marchand, Down from Olympus, 94, 97.
around this time promoted a similar philosophy of archaeological practice. Such principles, along with the most modern forms of textual and visual authentication and analysis, formed an important plank of the program of the Institute for Austrian Historical Research in Vienna, where Riegl was trained.

Conze had first identified the ‘geometric style’ of ornament in early Greek art around 1870, according, for the first time, what had been regarded as ‘primitive’ and crude patterns the designation of independent artistic ‘style’ (Figure 12). Riegl devoted the first chapter of his Problems of Style: Foundations for a History of Ornament of 1893 to this decoration. Recalling this ‘discovery’ in 1897, in ‘On the Origin of the Fine Arts’, Conze wrote that while the human form had earlier stood at the centre of the study of Greek art and represented its highest achievement, even in this field, scholars were compelled to study preceding periods. Here they found ‘the first germs of that rich drive announce itself’ and a different ‘world of forms’ composed only of combinations of lines. Drawing upon this and other research, scholars like prehistorian Moritz Hoernes would come to consider ‘geometrism’ a feature of the human mind, and along with naturalism, one of the two poles of human creativity (Figure 13).

Conze had believed in 1870, following Semper, that such motifs had originated mechanistically from materials and techniques. In his ‘technical-historical’ discussion of textiles in Style, Semper had hinted at the earliest emergence of pattern from the warp and weft of interwoven fibres. Discussing the origins of architecture in the creation of woven walls used to create enclosures, he wrote that the ‘transition from plaiting branches to plaiting bast for similar domestic purposes’ was a natural one: ‘Next came the invention of weaving: first with grass stalks or natural plant fibres, later with spun threads made from vegetable or animal stuffs.

41 Gubser, Time’s Visible Surface, 105-114.
42 Donohue, Greek Sculpture, 77; Adolf Michaelis, A Century of Archaeological Discoveries, trans. Bettina Kahnweiler, London: J. Murray, 1908, 206-215. Conze mentioned a number of works that had acknowledged the place of geometric ornament in Greek art history but gave the greatest credit to the latest of such references, that of Semper. Conze, Zur Geschichte, 3. This cue offered by Semper amounts to a line or two in the course of his ‘technical-historical’ account of ceramics.
44 Moritz Hoernes, Urgeschichte der bildenden Kunst in Europa von den Anfängen bis um 500 vor Chr., 1st ed., Vienna: Holzhausen, 1898. Moritz Hoernes, Urgeschichte der bildenden Kunst in Europa von den Anfängen bis um 500 v. Chr., 2nd ed., Vienna: A. Schroll and Co., 1915. This duality of the geometric and naturalistic uncovered by archaeology and anthropology would have contributed to Wilhelm Worringer’s conception of the poles of abstraction and empathy in his 1907 work.
45 Conze, Zur Geschichte, 18.
The diversity of natural colour in the stalks soon led to their use in alternating arrangements, resulting in the pattern.\textsuperscript{46} He mentioned elsewhere, in passing, the relationship of weaving techniques to geometric designs, in lace, for example, ‘Linen threads were then spun over with the stitch….This method always produces geometric patterns.’ Or, in the case of plaited mats, ‘Mat plaiting yields the richest variety of geometric patterns, especially when the elements are varied in colour and width.’\textsuperscript{47}

Originally regarding Semper’s brief and scattered comments on these decorations as decisive, Conze and others had believed upon examination of this style that they had approached ‘an idea of the first origin of fine art anywhere on earth’.\textsuperscript{48} Semper’s writing had seemed to prove that technical necessity must precede pleasure in the origin of pattern:

Instead of regarding this style as emerging from human pleasure in this mathematical world of forms, as an expression of the feeling for abstract regularity and diversity, Semper indicated that these forms must necessarily emerge in the most primitive technical procedures, particularly weaving and basketry, in the basic fulfilment of the purpose of these techniques, [and] that man was first stimulated to enjoy these forms after their emergence [.]

[A]nd then this introduction of the first stirrings of his spiritual activity, what man had long called a play-drive and regarded as a root of art, led to the application of the world of geometrical forms as adornment.\textsuperscript{49}

However, Conze’s next comments seem to indicate, in 1897, a new flexibility in the interpretation of the emergence of pattern and geometric ornament. He writes,

[S]omeone who wanted to accept something primordial and innate could give the impulse for the reception and free further development of a world of forms that had emerged from technical necessity to a feeling already

\textsuperscript{46} Semper, \textit{Style}, 247-248.
\textsuperscript{47} Semper, \textit{Style}, 223-224, 226, 489.
\textsuperscript{49} Conze, ‘Über den Ursprung’, 98-99:

Anstatt den Stil nun etwa aus einem ursprünglichen Vergnügen der Menschen an dieser mathematischen Formenwelt, als einen Ausfluss anzusehen des Gefühles für abstracte Regelmässigkeit und Abwechslung, wies Semper darauf hin, dass in den primitivsten technischen Prozeduren, vornehmlich des Flechtens und Webens, solche Formen zur einfachen Erreichung des Zwecks dieser Techniken mit Nothwendigkeit entstehen mussten, und knüpfte daran die Hypothese, dass der Mensch zu allererst durch das Entstehen solcher Formen unter seiner Hand zu einem Gefallen an ihnen angeregt worden sei und dann mit dem Einsetzen seiner geistigen Tätigkeit, mit ersten Regungen dessen, was man längst unter dem Namen eines Spieltriebes als eine Wurzel der Kunst angesehen hatte, sich in die rein schmückende Verwendung der geometrischen Formenwelt habe überleiten lassen.
existing in humans [...]. Or someone who wanted to lay more stress upon what humans acquire through external influences could give precedence to the training of the senses in regularity and symmetry, under the influence, for the first time, of long, daily practice with generated forms. Or, finally, one could allow the innate and the acquired to work together.50

This new allowance for the potential influence of an innate feeling for decoration, alongside mechanical and technical forces, at the beginnings of Greek art was due, in part, to the influence of Riegl’s polemical works, as well as to the great expansion in research on early and ‘primitive’ art and ornament since 1870.51 In the later essay, Conze also alluded to a number of these recent works to further modify his earlier beliefs. He outlined the theories of the ‘beginnings’ of art of a number of texts written since 1870 based upon anthropological research, as well as on children’s art. That most of these also either attributed art and ornament’s origins to technical sources, to the desire to communicate, or attributed seemingly abstract motifs to imitation of animal forms that had previously gone undetected allowed Conze to regard Riegl’s argument as one of a number of possible explanations.

Riegl emphatically countered the emphasis on technical and functional origins, as well as the underplaying of artistic will and pleasure, in the work of scholars in the fields of archaeology and anthropology influenced by Semper. Riegl’s study of ornament also required the understanding of the most recent prehistoric, archaeological, and anthropological literature and discoveries, such as carved bones, jewellery, and ceramics and implements with geometric patterns (Figure 14). His understanding of these ‘germs and roots’ was applied, however, to discovering their significance for the global evolution of the arts.52 Riegl relegated naturalistic prehistoric sculpture to the most ‘primitive’ level of creativity, guided by the drive to imitate,53 while pointing to prehistoric two-dimensional, linear drawing and patterning as products of more sophisticated mental and artistic capacities. The latter required a faculty for abstraction and stylization and

50 Conze, ‘Über den Ursprung’, 99:


52 This is Semper’s phrase. Hvattum, Gottfried Semper, 133.

psychological 'freedom' from nature. In these more advanced mediums, as well as in bodily decoration, the drive to adorn came to the fore. This preceded practical need as a factor in artistic development and, indeed, the emergence of the craft techniques that supposedly gave rise to geometric ornament, he argued.

In his discussion of geometric ornament, Riegl clarified the stakes for a non-materialist art history in providing an alternate theory of these designs and works. He strenuously advocated including ornament, even the most 'primitive', in the narrative of the fine arts as a whole. In his view, it was not the aim of art history to simply pinpoint technical, functional, or even chronological origins, but rather to insert objects into the stream of history, propelled by human creativity and agency. To treat objects in this way was to link them with each other, to acknowledge exchange, transmission, and progression. This granted the dignity of historical unfolding to even what, in geometric ornament, seemed to lack animation, spontaneity, traces of the hand, and the scope and interest of the human body and its past. These were qualities ordinarily associated with the art of 'cultures still at a low stage of development', 'occup[ying] the lowest rank' 'on our scale of values'. This identification of artistic motivation was, in his argument, the capacity of the art historical discipline, which could discern the operation of the psychological, illusory, and immaterial in the workings of art and decoration.

It was crucial for Riegl to demonstrate that human pleasure in and conscious desire to create ornament were not activated and set in motion after the mechanical and technical generation of geometric pattern. They must have been already operative in order for it to come into being in the first place. Citing the very passage from Semper's *Style* on the emergence of pattern from weaving that Conze had, he interpreted it in the diametrically opposite way, returning what is ideal in Semper's theory, which had been made material by his followers. Not only does the intellect consciously choose to create pattern, in which it delights, Riegl asserted, but also it aims to break free of external limitations and to imbue its psychological freedom into the objects of its fashioning. This was his retort to the values of

---

54 He believed, however, that advanced linear ornament was ultimately rooted in natural forms and laws and by no means arbitrary. Riegl, *Problems of Style*, 15.
55 This was even more clear in the case of prehistoric jewellery, like necklaces. Riegl, *Problems of Style*, 32, 33.
57 Riegl, *Problems of Style*, 10-12, 16, 20, 27. Arguing that materialism is 'ahistorical', he wrote that it was his intention to 'reintegrate the historical thread that has been severed' by it. He acknowledged, however, that historical links could not actually be proven among the earliest cases of geometric ornamentation or in its occurrences among contemporary isolated cultures.
60 Riegl implies that the making of art is motivated by the desire to imbue 'dead' (todt) materials and techniques with mental life. Riegl, *Stilfragen*, 20.
Naturwissenschaft, which, he believed, constructed a worldview in which phenomena emerged and changes occurred due to material necessity, lack, chance (the arbitrary), technical forces, and human frailty in the face of nature.\textsuperscript{61}

Riegl was concerned with a continuous art history in which minor and seemingly insignificant objects would be attended to and barbaric and neglected periods would be incorporated.\textsuperscript{62} In addressing late Roman art in 1901, he pressed for a discipline from which prejudice was removed, in which the subjective taste of the scientist and period norms did not interfere with the selection and analysis of objects of study. Such scholarship would, however, not be limited to the mere collection of data and iconographic information but would discover synthetic principles illuminating multiple mediums and periods and the field as a whole.\textsuperscript{63}

Many of the objects through the study of which he famously developed his insights into late Roman decorative art were fibulae, or cloak pins (Figure 15).\textsuperscript{64} In a wonderful passage in Man on the fibula, Ranke demonstrated its importance for prehistoric archaeology and anthropology, and the intertwining in this article of the motivations and methods of chronology, technology, artistic expression, function, chaotic variety, and historical lawfulness (Figure 16). He writes, quoting Otto Tischler,

’The fibula, or the clasp, which holds garments together, is’, as Tischler says, ‘one of the most important prehistoric implements of human jewellery….In the course of two millennia, artistic mood has proclaimed itself in it in exuberant abundance, and one is…amazed…when confronted with this chaos of variety. But even seemingly arbitrary fashion follows certain laws, which change from century to century and from people to people, and which it is our task to research with inductive methods.’\textsuperscript{65}

Fibulae and similar accessories were the very objects with which Swedish archaeologists Oskar Montelius and Hans Hildebrand pioneered the typological

\textsuperscript{61} Riegl, Problems of Style, 5.
\textsuperscript{62} Riegl, Late Roman Art Industry, 5-17.
\textsuperscript{63} Riegl, Late Roman Art Industry, 6-8, 10.
\textsuperscript{64} Riegl, Late Roman Art Industry, Chapter IV, on ‘Art Industry’.
\textsuperscript{65} Ranke, Der Mensch, 633-34:
’Die Fibel, oder die Sicherheitsnadel, welche das Gewand zusammenhielt, ist’, wie O. Tischler sagt, ’eins der wichtigsten vorgeschichtlichen Geräte des menschlichen Schmuckes….Im Laufe von Jahrtausenden hat sich an ihr die künstlerische Laune in überschwenglicher Fülle kundgetan, und man ist…verblüfft…wenn Man diesem Chaos von Varietäten gegenübersteht. Aber auch die scheinbar willkürliche Mode folgt bestimmten Gesetzen, welche sich von Jahrhundert zu Jahrhundert und von Volk zu Volk ändern, und die auf indutivem Wege zu erforschen unsere Aufgabe ist.’
methods of archaeology, as did Pitt Rivers independently.⁶⁶ They were considered the most important artefacts for prehistoric dating. Authorless industrial implements – masses of which were gathered to construct meticulous chronological series, drawing on older techniques of numismatics⁶⁷ – slight changes could be read from them by those equipped with the proper skills.

In a text of 1903, Montelius elucidated this technique of determining the chronology of prehistoric periods that was crucial to the scientific investigation of prehistoric graves and other monuments. The key was to have the largest number of objects possible available for study and to examine ‘all monuments and all findings’, without exception.⁶⁸ Only by doing so could one create a ‘system’, made up of mutually cohering parts. This led to the typological method, allowing one to identify ‘types’ of objects, clearly distinguishing one from another, ‘like a natural scientist must be able to differentiate individual species from one another’.⁶⁹

Montelius examined weapons, implements, jewellery, and vessels, along with their ornamentation, ‘in order to…learn the course of development – the genealogy, so to speak – in which order the types…follow one another’ (Figure 17).⁷⁰ It was crucial that types were determined according to ‘inner characteristics’ and that every ‘member of the chain’ was only minimally distinct from the next. However, among different categories of artefacts, some composed more ‘sensitive’ series than others; that is, they changed and developed quickly, providing detailed material for comparison. Fibulae were one such ‘sensitive’ class of items, but even more so were ornamented objects, ‘able to exhibit greater or lesser variations’.⁷¹

In most cases, a ‘simple natural form’ would be discovered, which was the prototype.⁷² Montelius argued, in addition, that certain ‘rudimentary’ forms deserved special attention, just as they do among natural scientists. These are ‘parts of an object that once had a function but that have gradually lost their practical meaning’.⁷³ Like Semper, Montelius attempted to identify an original, simple kernel that could be traced over time, even as it lost its original function, was transferred to

⁶⁹ Montelius, Die älteren Kulturperioden, 3, 14: ‘…ein chronologisches System…’; ‘…wie der Naturforscher die einzelnen Arten von einander zu unterscheiden verstehen muss…’.
⁷⁰ Montelius, Die älteren Kulturperioden, 16: ‘…um den Gang der Entwicklung – so zu sagen die Genealogie – kennen zu lernen…’.
⁷¹ Montelius, Die älteren Kulturperioden, 16: ‘…nach den inneren Merkmalen…’; ‘…jedes Glied der Kette…’; ‘empfindliche’; ‘…grössere oder kleinere Variationen aufweisen können’.
⁷² Montelius, Die älteren Kulturperioden, 17: ‘…eine einfache natürliche Forme…’.
⁷³ Montelius, Die älteren Kulturperioden, 17: ‘…‚rudimentären’ Bildungen: Theile des Gegenstandes, welche einmal eine Funktion hatten, allmählich aber ihre praktische Bedeutung verloren haben’.
other materials, became only symbolic, or remained as an indexical imprint of technical process.

Such findings highlighted for Montelius, as for all of these thinkers, the question of human agency. Montelius asked, ‘Is human freedom really so limited that we cannot just produce an arbitrary form? Are we compelled, to move step by step from one form to another, even if they are minimally different?’ He answered this question affirmatively: ‘Development can occur slowly or quickly, but man is always obliged in the process of creation to obey the same laws of development, which are valid for the rest of nature.’

In drawing connections between such artefacts and normative works of art, Riegl and others linked techniques from the study of material culture to the values of art history and aesthetics. Small ornamented implements and jewellery were objects from the realms of archaeology, prehistory, and ethnology, in which fields illustrations of groupings of these were common in publications. Riegl strove, however, to describe other dimensions of these artefacts that, although bound to their historical period, were not addressed by their precise dating. While he utilized empirical methods, he tried to endow their making and experience with volition, as well as demonstrate how they were driven by the requirements of design. He also theorized, guided by the tenets of philosophical formalism and psychological theories, how stylistic changes corresponded to those in perception of makers and beholders.

In his review of 1905 of Bernhard Salin’s Old Germanic Animal Ornament: Typological Studies of Germanic Metal Objects from the 4th to the 9th Centuries, Riegl faulted Salin’s insistence that aesthetic criteria could not be applied to such early works and his lack of attention to the taste, or Geschmack, of the makers of this ornament (Figure 18). Fibulae are ‘sensitive carriers of stylistic development’, Riegl argued, and this cannot be understood through material causes – ‘practical need and the demands of material and technique’ – but rather on the basis of the shifting Kunstwollen, or artistic will. Like Ranke and Montelius, Riegl highlighted the

74 Montelius, Die älteren Kulturperioden, 20:

Ist die menschliche Freiheit wirklich so beschränkt, dass wir nicht jede beliebige Form bilden können? Sind wir gezwungen nur Schritt für Schritt von einer Form zur anderen, sei sie auch wenig abweichend, überzugehen? ... Die Entwicklung kann langsam oder schnell verlaufen, immer ist aber der Mensch bei seinem Schaffen von neuen Formen genötigt demselben Gesetze der Entwicklung zu gehorchen, welches für die übrige Natur gilt.

75 The methods of study of anonymous industrial objects and ‘primitive’ ornament seem to have been poised in between those of natural scientists who accumulated masses of interchangeable, repeatable data and, on the other hand, those sciences that attended to unique traces and markings and found in them intimations of narrative and psychology. See Ginzburg, ‘Clues’, 106-107.


unique responsiveness of fibulae. Nevertheless, as he argued in his Introduction to *A Historical Grammar of the Visual Arts*, a true science of art identified artistic motivation, the causes of stylistic features and development, while the mere assignment of artefacts to periods was the capacity of an ‘antique dealer’.  

However, although scholars like Ranke did not formulate sophisticated theories of artistic will as engine of artistic development in the way that Riegl did, they also believed that the ‘need for adornment’ and a ‘drive to make art’ contributed to its emergence and unfolding, mixed with other motives. Riegl’s arguments did not account for the nuances and shifts in their deliberations or acknowledge the complexity of their materialisms. Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison argue in *Objectivity* that the will structured the nineteenth-century sense of self, and the techniques and the personae of scientific objectivity and artistic subjectivity arose in conjunction with each other. In this view, the belief in artistic will and desire was the fitting complement to the scientific objectivity that Riegl and other scholars aspired to. The ‘scientific self’ that theorized the artistic drive, need for adornment, or will had to suppress his or her own will – in the highest exercise of this facility – in order to examine objects outside of the normative boundaries of taste. The empirical examination of artefacts, the ‘reading’ of objects without accompanying texts, the discovery of artistic motivation, these were tools and ‘techniques of th[is] scientific self.’ In these debates about ‘beginnings’ and the mental or material motivations of pattern, ornament, and art, the will not only seemed to motivate the artist to create and leave its traces in his or her products, but also enabled the scientist to examine what otherwise seemed to lack interest because it was crude or ‘early’.

When several years later, in 1911, art historian August Schmarsow also wrote a review of Salin’s *Old Germanic Animal Ornament*, he seized upon this precise problem (Figure 19), modifying, however, the terms of these earlier art historical encounters and signalling a shift in this paradigm. Schmarsow permeated the boundaries of the ‘objective’ historian’s distance from the object and attribution of psychological motivation to it. In Schmarsow’s theory, the maker of ornament, in

---


79 Daston and Galison, *Objectivity*, 37, 228, 231. They argue that scientific objectivity and artistic subjectivity were products of a culture that came to believe in a ‘monolithic self, defined by an indomitable will’ and were ‘poles of same axis of the will.’ ‘To embrace…objectivity was to turn the will inward upon the self, the supreme act of will.’

80 Daston and Galison, *Objectivity*, 38.

---
forming the work and enjoying his own achievement, moved his or her body rhythmically, and these gestures remained stored in it for later viewers. The viewer and historian, conversely, had to be receptive to this energetic activity and ‘primitive’ bodily cadence. Art history, in his view, was not a technique of the withdrawal of the self, of the meticulous gathering of knowledge, or mediation between the controlled scientific self and the wilful artist. Art history required, rather, the imaginative contribution of the historian.
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